

Peter Evans Partnership  
Transport Planning & Highway Consultants

21<sup>st</sup> May 2019

Our Ref: 1471R/AJK/DH

S Baimbridge Esq  
Case Officer  
South Somerset District Council  
Planning Department  
Brympton Way  
Yeovil  
BA20 2HT

Dear Mr Baimbridge

**RE: CASTLE CARY CUMNOCK ROAD, SOMERSET  
APPLICATION NO: 18/01602/FUL - BMI CASTLE CARY**

Shared space for the level of housing is appropriate for future adoption. Somerset County Council in their red book on Estate Roads in Somerset June 1991 use advice based on Design Bulletin 32 First Edition 1977 as published by the Department of Environment and Department of Transport. This advice along with the 1992 version of DB32 were both revoked in 2007 when Manual for Streets was published by The Department for Transport to replace earlier national housing design guidance. This is the National Guidance that many counties including Devon, Gloucestershire, Cornwall and Dorset all use with reference to the design of streets in residential development.

The Somerset Guide suggests with no technical basis that up to 20 houses can have a shared street with a cul de sac design. This is totally contrary to MfS which indicates that a shared street can carry up to 100 vehicle movements in the peak hour which equates to around 170 houses off a cul-de-sac. The reason MfS indicates this level of traffic is because of the level of traffic is low, the ability to service and the relationship with pedestrian traffic. Over this level of traffic it is better to provide a traditional street with footpath cycleway adjacent to the road carriageway.

The reason for a shared surface is it encourages low vehicle speeds, creates safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists and enables residents to interact without feeling intimidated and encourages social interaction. As the site road is a loop road the affected level of traffic is only 24 vehicles in the peak hour which is well the 100 vehicle movements set out within the MfS.

One of the reasons that Somerset has quoted for not adopting a shared street is because the traditional pallet of highway materials not used however it is feasible that traditional black top and kerbing is used but that it is all at the same level with no kerb upstand. For clarity just to confirm it is expected that the first section of road into the site and to the nursery site will be provided with traditional footpaths and road carriageway. Within the site the roads will become shared surface which will enhance the built environment.

Cont'd/...

Mr Baimbridge

-2-

21<sup>st</sup> May 2019

As this site is in a central historic part of Castle Cary with the listed properties and maintenance of existing buildings as part of the development there are good reasons for having shared space and to provide a 1970's, 1980, and 1990's road and footway arrangement would be totally out of keeping for the nature of the development and the type of development the client wants to provide.

#### **PAUSE ON SHARED STREETS**

In July 2018 there was a pause issued by the Housing and the Communities and the DfT on shared surface street design. This was because of partially sighted and disability comments with reference to busy town centres issued in new guidance. However subsequently in September 2018 the DfT clarified that this only applied to town centres and not to new streets in residential areas. The pause related to the fact that surfaces were not clearly defined, however within a residential development it would be straightforward to de-mark different areas as part of the shared street and this has been accepted elsewhere by Somerset such as part of the Houndwood Phases 1 and 2 residential development (MDC app refs: 2010/1471, 2013/0999 and 2016/2232/VRC) in Street which I understand is to be adopted in any event.

I trust this clarifies matters.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrew J Kenyon', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**ANDREW J KENYON**