

## **Appendix B1: A review of City of Wolverhampton Councils ‘Guide to the adoption requirements for the design and construction of new residential roads’**

- [Section IC1: Introduction](#)
- [Section IC2: List of organisations consulted](#)
- [Section IC3: Brief summary of main topics raised](#)

### **Section IC1: Introduction**

- 1.1** In April 2010 City of Wolverhampton Councils Transportation Service undertook to review the existing ‘Guide to the adoption requirements for the design and construction of new residential roads’. The purpose of the review being to update standards in light of recent guidance publication and to provide a more accessible format for users.
- 1.2** In June 2010 approval was gained for City of Wolverhampton Council to use an existing web site produced by four local authorities in the East Midlands as a basis for the guidance. The ‘Highways, transportation and development’ (HTD) document was based upon extensive consultation with a variety of organisations, the details of their own review of guidance to produce HTD is detailed below.
- 1.3** Wolverhampton’s Transportation Service have taken the HTD document and adapted it for use on Wolverhampton, this guidance is then intended for circulation to consultees as part of the development and approvals process, prior to adoption of the guidance by the City Council.

## **A review of ‘Highway Requirements for Development’ – the initial guidance upon which HTD and ultimately WCC guidance are based.**

### **Section IC2: List of initial organisations consulted**

#### **Leicestershire County Council**

- The Planning and Transportation Department: groups and branches involved with development control (planning and highways), traffic-management programmes and improvements, road safety, street lighting, maintenance (including divisions), the environment and landscaping structure plan, public transport and rights of way.
- The property, education and Chief Executive’s departments.

#### **District councils**

- We consulted all district councils and, where appropriate, we also consulted planning departments and technical service departments (or similar) separately.

#### **Adjoining authorities**

- Leicester City Council.
- Rutland County Council District Council.

#### **Leicestershire Constabulary**

- The traffic management division and architectural liaison officer.

## **Disability groups**

- Age Concern Leicestershire
- Centre for Deaf People (Leicester)
- Leicestershire Action for Mental Health
- Leicestershire Disabled Living Centre
- Leicestershire Guild of the Disabled
- Mencap (Leicester)
- Royal Leicestershire Rutland and Wycliffe Society for the Blind.

## Developers

Alfred McAlpine Homes Midlands Ltd	Jelson Ltd
Allen Homes (Central Midlands) Ltd	JS Bloor Ltd
Augusta Developments Ltd	McLean Homes East Midlands Ltd
Barratt Homes (Nottingham and Northampton offices)	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd
Beazer Homes	McLean Homes East Midlands Ltd
Birch Homes Ltd	Peveril Homes Ltd
Black Hawke Properties Ltd	Penwise Properties
Bryant Homes East Midlands Ltd	Persimmon Homes (Midlands) Ltd
Bellway Urban Renewal (Midlands)	Trinity Care PLC
David Wilson Homes Ltd	Westleigh Developments Ltd
East Midlands Housing Association	Wilcon Homes Midlands Ltd
Henry Boot Homes Ltd	William Davis Ltd
	Wimpey Homes

## Services

- Anglian Water Services Ltd
- British Gas Transco
- British Telecom PLC
- Cable & Wireless Communications
- Connect Ltd
- East Midlands Electricity PLC (Leicester, Lincoln and Northampton offices)
- ENERGIS Communications Ltd
- IPM Communications
- National Grid Company PLC
- NTL: Midlands Ltd
- Seven Trent Water.

## Section IC3: Brief summary of main topics raised

- 1.4** This summary covers our consultations with our own (Leicestershire County Council) departments and with external public and private organisations. It does not cover the results of the residents' survey which we summarise in Appendix B2.
- 1.5** This is only a very brief summary intended to give a 'flavour' of the topics raised. The comments are not verbatim (word for word as given to us) and, where necessary, we have combined similar comments from different organisations into a single point.

### Traffic calming

We need to consider the following.

- Introducing more traffic calming in developments.
- Providing road humps before houses are occupied.
- Standardising the design of road humps and reducing the numbers provided.

### Parking

We need to do the following.

- Carry out a long-overdue overhaul of parking standards in line with PPG13.
- Consider a matrix-based approach to parking provision (based on where and when people park and for how long).
- Review standards while recognising that reducing standards could cause safety, capacity and public-nuisance problems if it results in greater on-street parking.
- Check there is enough parking provision (problems at Meridian Business Park were highlighted).
- Maintain existing parking requirements for out-of-town business parks such as Grove Park where, we understand, occupiers are demanding provision which meets existing standards.
- Consider if Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are needed to support any parking restrictions. (We need to allow enough time to get these.) We also need to consider what happens if a TRO needed for a development is not implemented.
- Where parking occurs on footways, we may need to 'beef up' (strengthen) the footway.
- Take into account that on-street parking increases opportunities for committing crime, is a safety hazard and causes obstructions.

### Public transport and green travel

We need to do the following.

- Include public-transport issues.
- Consider how estate design affects access to public transport – developments based around cul-de-sacs may not provide best accessibility. We also need to look at reducing the current maximum walking distance to a bus stop from 400 metres.
- Consider bus-only links between both new estates and surrounding developments, and within new estates.
- Provide public-transport facilities as part of new developments, including lay-bys where appropriate.
- Include criteria for green travel plans.

### **Statutory undertakers' issues (including service strips on Type 'D' roads) and street lighting**

We need to consider the following.

- Service strips are a problem. Residents do not understand them, which leads to complaints that there is no footway, and people plant bushes, trees and so on in them. They can also cause maintenance problems and damage to traffic, and be too narrow for the purpose (for example, to accommodate BT boxes, electricity cables and so on).
- Electricity company prefers ducted arrangements for Type 'F' roads. However, a problem is that developers do not consider service arrangements at an early enough stage
- There is limited advice on laying TV cables.
- Details of street lighting design and installation procedures need to be included at the planning stage, with high-pressure sodium lamps specified as the standard requirement.

### **Other layout issues**

We should consider the following.

- Prescribed standards have resulted in developments which are 'dominated by the car'. We need to recognise that we are designing 'for people, not cars'. We need a much more flexible approach to all road and footpath design while maintaining a high emphasis on road safety.
- We need to consider how crime and social disorder affect developments and 'design out' crime (this covers the layout of roads, footways and cycleways as well as lighting, landscaping, parking and so on).
- Road layouts should be designed to prevent vehicles speeding.
- We received a lot of comments about Type 'D' (shared surface) roads which are not thought to be suitable for small houses or dense developments. Pedestrians feel intimidated by cars and there are safety concerns which result in residents asking for footways to be provided.
- Some people expressed dislike of Type 'E' and 'F' roads.
- We need to look at drainage procedures (tie up Section 38 and Section 104 procedures) and certain aspects of drainage design.
- We need to provide specific references to junction geometry for the various road categories.
- We need to review visibility-splay requirements in line with the current PPG13 document.
- More emphasis is needed on cycling and walking.
- There can be maintenance problems with 'unofficial footways'.
- There need to be more footpath links in developments.
- We need to provide more information and advice on street lighting, lining and signing, and requirements for structures.
- Staggered footpath barriers need redesigning.

### **Specifications, materials and maintenance**

We need to consider the following.

- There needs to be more scope for using a wider variety of high-quality paving materials.
- Standards for types and forms of street furniture need to be more flexible. In particular, we need to take account of requirements in conservation areas.
- Specifications on top soiling and grass seeding need improving, including references to British Standards.
- The specification for block paving needs amending.
- There needs to be more use made of stone mastic asphalt.
- We need to include references to recycled material.
- We need to include references to commuted sums for the future maintenance of structures, traffic signals and so on.
- Cracking problems in footway edgings need looking at.

### **The environment and landscape**

We need to consider the following.

- There is not enough protection of trees during construction.
- We need to improve information and advice on landscaping design and layout and include references to British Standards. We should ask for proposals at the planning application stage.
- We should include the requirement for surveys of existing trees on development sites.
- There should be fees for staff to oversee landscaping works. Plus, we need to consider that overseeing and maintenance periods can extend up to 24 months after planting. This is twice the normal 12-month period for the roads.
- Service equipment can restrict landscape designs.
- We need to look at car-park planting schemes.
- We need to identify responsibility for maintenance.

### **Disability issues**

We need to do the following.

- Increase the number of controlled crossings.
- Give more thought and care to the use, types and location of tactile paving and other surface treatments. People with sight problems can be confused if, for example, a carriageway colour is similar to the blistered paving colour. We need a policy to cover this.

## CoWC – Highways Technical Guidance Note

- Clearly mark the highway space for each form of travel.
- Take care in placing street furniture and statutory undertakers' boxes (for example, gas, water, cable TV) and so on.

### Planning and sustainable development issues

We need to consider the following.

- Standards need to give priority to means of transport other than the private car.
- We need to review documents in the light of new policies in the draft replacement structure plan. For example, we need to look again at development density, good design and parking.
- There need to be a strong links with the local transport plan.
- We should cross-reference to the '*Statement of Requirements for Developer Contributions in Leicestershire*'.

### Other issues

- In terms of highway construction, the existing standards have served well.
- The existing document is repetitive and not very user-friendly.
- We need to review the 5% S38 fee.
- We need to reduce the adoption threshold from 75% of frontage development completed to 50%.
- We need to update references to normal ICE (Institution of Civil Engineers) contracts to include all types of ICE contracts.
- Adjudication clauses need reviewing.
- More emphasis is needed on contact between developers and County Council area offices.