

Forest of Dean District Council
Council Offices
High Street
Coleford
Gloucestershire
GL16 8HG

Highways Development
Management
Economy Environment and
Infrastructure
Shire Hall
Westgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 2TG

18 December 2025
Your ref: P0672/25/OUT
Ask for: Neil Coleman

Dear Tony Pope

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
(DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2015
ARTICLE 18 CONSULTATION WITH HIGHWAY AUTHORITY**

PROPOSAL: Outline application for the erection of up to 180 residential dwellings (including affordable housing) with public open space, landscaping and vehicular access points (all matters reserved except for means of access)
LOCATION: Land North Of Carisbrook Road Mitcheldean Gloucestershire
APPLICANT: Gladman Developments Ltd

Gloucestershire County Council, the Highway Authority acting in its role as Statutory Consultee has undertaken a full assessment of this planning application. Based on the appraisal of the development proposals the Highways Development Management Manager on behalf of the County Council, under Article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order, 2015 recommends that this application be **deferred**.

The justification for this decision is provided below.

This is an outline application (all matters reserved except for access) for a proposed residential development of upto 180 dwellings on land to the north of Carisbrook Road, Mitcheldean.

It is noted that the site is not contained in the current Forest of Dean Local Plan (upto 2026) or Allocations Plan (adopted 2018). However, it is allocated within the Draft Local Plan (upto 2041) which is yet to be adopted for development of 180 dwellings through Policy LP.93.

Planning History

An outline planning application for 125 dwellings was refused on this site in December 2018. There were a number of reasons outlined for refusal with most notable from a highways point of view being ***'Insufficient information has been provided to assess the highway impacts of the development particularly the impact on the Gloucester Road/Hawker Hill/New Road mini-roundabout and the Abenhall Road/Gloucester Road junctions. As a consequence, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in a severe impact on the highway network and it is considered contrary to the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework'***.

Vehicular Access

A single access point is proposed via a priority junction off Ross Road. It is noted that when compared to the previous application the access has been relocated further to the north just to the north of the junction with Hollywell Road. This takes the form of a priority junction, with a 5.5m wide carriageway for the site access road, 2m wide footways on both sides of the site access road and 6m corner radii. This form of junction and the geometric parameters are considered appropriate to the type and scale of the proposals, and the characteristics of Carisbrook/Ross Road.

Ross Road is subject to a 30mph speed limit at the point of the proposed vehicular access. The applicant has based visibility splays on the recorded 85th percentile speeds and applied no wet weather reduction, which is robust. The Applicant has calculated visibility requirements using the formula in MfS/MfS2, resulting in visibility splays of 2.4m x 50.7m to the left (i.e. the east) and 2.4m x 54.3m to the right (i.e. to the west) for vehicles exiting the site access. This is an appropriate approach and GCC confirms that the resulting visibility splays have been calculated correctly and demonstrate that sufficient visibility can be achieved.

Vehicle tracking of both a single vehicle and refuse vehicle has been provided at the access point and this is accepted.

It is noted that a revised Road Safety Audit has been undertaken based upon the relocated access arrangement. This identified two minor issues to be addressed and a designers response has been included.

- Potential encroachment into opposing lane with left turn in from refuse vehicle – as per the designers response it is noted that the access dimensions are appropriate and adequate visibility is provided to ensure that any conflict would not occur. The Highway Authority is satisfied that no further amendments are required.
- Height of dropped kerb adjacent to bus stops – as per the designers response the applicant has agreed to investigate the height of these kerbs to avoid any trip hazards and will amend if necessary. This will be included within a condition on any permission.

Pedestrian/Cycle Access

2m footways will be provided either side of the access to aid pedestrian/cycle access to/from the site. It is also noted that the proposals include for a 2m footway extension along the eastern side of Ross Road to link with the existing footway and dropped-kerb crossing at the Ross Road bus stops and also a footway extension to the north of the access to provide an additional uncontrolled pedestrian crossing

point. Both to link with the existing footway on the western side of Ross Road. A further 3m shared footway/cycleway is also proposed to exit the site and provide an uncontrolled crossing point to the southern extent of the site on Carisbrook Road to link with the existing footway to/from Deansway Road/Oakhill Road.

Both the vehicular access and proposed pedestrian improvements in the vicinity of the site are included on Drawing P24048-101D and can be conditioned for further detail.

Additional Gateway Features

The ATC survey recorded 85th percentile speeds above the posted limit southbound on Bradley Court Road at the change in speed limit from 30mph to the national speed limit, around 100m north of the Carisbrook Road/Bradley Court Road junction. The Applicant has offered to provide additional gateway features to encourage reduced speeds on entering the 30mph speed restriction. The indicative proposals include the provision of dragon's teeth to supplement the existing features. The Applicant also identifies that existing signage could be replaced with speed limit signage on a yellow highlighting background, similar to what is present on other roads in the area.

These are shown on Drawing P24048-101D and can be conditioned for further detail.

Active Travel Audit (PERS assessment)

A PERS (Pedestrian Environment Review System) audit has been undertaken to ascertain if any improvements are necessary to cater for pedestrians/cyclists routing to/from the site and nearby facilities/amenities.

This has been reviewed and provides a comprehensive overview of the local area. It has identified a number of improvements contained in Drawing P24048-103 and these can be conditioned for further detail.

Trip Generation/Distribution/Modal Share

The previous application utilised a comparison between trips associated with a local donor site (Hollywell Road forms the single vehicular access to a cul-de-sac that comprises Hollywell Road, Glebe Close and Ash Grove – 127 dwellings) and similar sites contained within the TRICS database. TRICS data was utilised to understand people based trips and census 2011 data to understand localised modal share.

Given that the previous application was 2019, the survey for the donor site has been updated in 2024 to ascertain a potential localised vehicular trip rate. This shows that a two-way AM trip rate is much lower with a PM two-way trip rate similar to those adopted in the previous application.

The Highway Authority is unable to ascertain the suitability of these trip rates without further evidence being provided. TRICS data should be used to compare with the donor survey particularly given that this was only undertaken on a single day. The donor survey should also be extended to cover a 7 day period to derive typical travel patterns. Multi-modal trip rates should also be provided. It is considered that Census 2021 or similar data should be utilised to understand local modal share. This information should be provided before agreement can be reached on suitable trip rates.

Trip distribution based upon turning count surveys is an acceptable approach.

Impact Assessment

General comments include;

- The trip rates are not yet agreed and therefore the impact assessment would need to be revised based on agreed trip rates (see above);
- A future opening year of 2029 is unrealistic. Reserved matters applications are required to be consulted upon/approved and therefore it is unlikely that construction will begin until at least 2027. A 2-year build out of 180 dwellings is unrealistic;
- Growth factors have been derived from localised TEMPRO growth which is accepted, but these should be adjusted to take into account any known committed developments in the vicinity to be checked through the LPA.

Junction Capacity Assessments

Overview

Similar to the previous application, the main consideration in terms of development impact (as per the previously agreed scoping exercise) would be the following;

- Proposed Site Access junction;
- Carisbrook Road/Bradley Court Road junction;
- Hawker Hill/Gloucester Road/New Road mini-roundabout and Gloucester Road/Abenhall Road junction.

Site Access and Carisbrook Rd/Bradley Court Rd junctions

Junctions 10 models have been submitted for both the site access junction and the Carisbrook Rd/Bradley Court Rd junction. These models will need to be revised with agreed trip generation as well as an agreed future year assessment.

Hawker Hill/Gloucester Road/New Road mini-roundabout and Gloucester Road/Abenhall Road junction

This still remains a concern with regards to the current and future operation of this junction. The observations outlined within the Transport Assessment as well as within our previous consultation response regarding the potential issues at the junction still remain valid, and it is considered that any increase in traffic movements arising from the proposed development will exacerbate the situation without considering what solutions may be feasible and required.

The applicant has provided a combined assessment of both the Hawker Hill/Gloucester Rd/New Rd mini-roundabout and the Gloucester Rd/Abenhall Rd junction within Junctions 10 software, which can potentially model closely spaced junctions with limitations. This has been reviewed and comments are below;

- The observed and modelled queues differ significantly and therefore although the differences between the different scenarios can be understood, the model provided does not match accurately the existing observed conditions and cannot be relied upon. Has the model been calibrated/validated to existing conditions? This needs to be confirmed.

- Although it can be seen within the model and has been observed that there is an existing issue at this set of junctions, the addition of the proposed development only exacerbates the situation.

- Notwithstanding the above, revised trip generation and tempo/committed development growth (based on comments above) is required to be included within the assessment.

In the first instance, the Highway Authority would request that the drone footage outlined within the Transport Assessment and raw traffic/queue data is provided to fully understand the factors creating issues at the junction, and to also understand what mitigation would be feasible and suitable.

The applicant has put forward suggested mitigation in the form of a potential upgrade to the existing puffin crossing across Gloucester Rd as well as hatching to ensure the right-turn into Abenhall Rd is not blocked, although both of these need to be investigated further based on the above information being provided.

Once this information is received and reviewed, the Highway Authority would welcome a discussion with the applicant on what (if any) additional modelling is required as well as what mitigation would be suitable in this instance.

Internal Layout/Parking

This will be assessed as part of a forthcoming reserved matters application but will need to conform with guidance set out in Manual for Gloucestershire Streets (2020 and 2021 Addendum)

S106 Contributions

Proposed contributions include;

Public Transport

Potential contribution asks are currently being discussed with the GCC Integrated Transport Unit and will be confirmed.

Home to School Transport

The pupil yield from 180 dwellings is 54 primary spaces. As Mitcheldean Primary will not have sufficient capacity there is a deficit of 13.70 places which will need to be sought elsewhere within the primary area and require home to school transport.

Contribution sought of **£210,033.60** which is based on average daily rate to procure vehicle (£368.48) multiplied by 190 annual school days over three academic primary years.

Travel Plan

Funding will be sought to secure the implementation of a future residential travel plan. Options are set out in GCC's 'Advice Sheet No7 – Residential Travel Plans'. Options include;

- Option 1 - The developer/owner is responsible for funding and implementing the TP, incentives, the appointment of a TPC etc. This option requires a non-refundable

monitoring fee and a bond/deposit, repayable on successful completion of the TP or kept to implement remedial measures if the developer/owner does not comply with the agreement.

- Option 2 – GCC would absorb all risk and be responsible for the implementation of the TP, incentives, the appointment of a TPC etc. This option requires a non-refundable monitoring fee and a contribution, repayable only on expiry of planning permission with no building having started. The premium for GCC to deliver the TP is to cover the additional risk the organisation incurs and to plan for remedial measures. This option removes any responsibility from the developer for the implementation of the plan (other than hard measures such as walk/cycle links, cycle parking etc., which are separate to the TP).

Within the Travel Plan submitted, it is confirmed that the applicant and future Travel Plan Co-ordinator will be responsible for implementing the travel plan. Therefore, based on a development of 180 dwellings, this will require a contribution of **£47,100**. This amount includes the non-refundable monitoring fee of £5,000

Recommendation

It is recommended that this application is deferred to allow the applicant to consider the above and review and provide the necessary further information.

The Highway Authority therefore submits a response of deferral until the required information has been provided and considered.

Yours Sincerely

Neil Coleman
Development Co-ordinator