



Michelle Fielder, Planning Department
Surrey Heath House
Knoll Road
Camberley
GU15 3HD

Date: 29th January 2018

Our Ref: SRE/19111/17-154

By email only

Dear Michelle,

Re: 17/0871 - Princess Royal Barracks Deepcut - Phase 2B Resubmission

I write in respect of your recent email of 25th January 2018 and the comments received from SCC highways, summarised as follows:

1. **Cycle Parking** – It is not acceptable to provide cycle parking within sheds in the rear gardens of properties. It is for this reason that the planning condition number 27 states that *"Such provision for flats and apartments may be communal whereas for single dwellings the cycle parking shall be integral to the main structure of each dwelling separately accessible from any garaging."*
2. **Pedestrian Visibility** – Pedestrian visibility splays have not been indicated on the drawings and therefore the submitted details are not in compliance with condition number 24.
3. **Carriageway Width** – SCC advise the main carriageway widths within the development are proposed at 4.8m wide which will make it difficult for other HGV's to pass.

Odyssey responses to the above comments are dealt with in turn below:

Cycle Parking

Cycle parking for the 66 flats will be located within communal cycle stores in compliance with Condition 27. Cycle parking for 32 single dwellings will be provided within garages that are integral to the main structure of these dwellings, also in accordance with Condition 27.

Whilst the submitted Parking Strategy Plans states 'all' houses are provided with bikes stores, this would be specifically required only for the 117 dwellings that do not have an integral garage in which to store bicycles. Paragraph 4.6.2 of the TA refers to sheds in the rear gardens, however to clarify, the 117 dwellings without garages would be provided with purpose built secure cycle stores integral to the main structure of these individual plots, next to a patio area rather than in the garden itself.

All patio areas have access via the front (or side) of the dwellings so there will be no requirement to carry a bicycle through the house. This would be a much-preferred option for residents compared to having the cycle store within the dwelling. **Drawing no.1307-D-1211** attached to this letter details the cycle storage strategy. Plots such as M2-104, 105 and 106 have their cycle store slightly set aside from the dwelling due to window locations, but they will be integral to the design and functionality of the property.

SOUTHAMPTON
Odyssey House
Unit 3 Winchester Hill Business Park
Winchester Hill, Romsey
Southampton, SO51 7UT
01794 537980

BASINGSTOKE
Tuscany House
White Hart Lane, Basingstoke
Hampshire, RG21 4AF
01256 331144

LONDON
Elizabeth House
39 York Road
London, SE1 7NQ
020 7620 2444

Email: info@odysseyconsult.co.uk
www.odysseyconsult.co.uk

Pedestrian Visibility

Drawing No.17-154-107 and Drawing No.17-154-108 attached to this letter illustrates the pedestrian inter-visibility splays of 2m by 2m to be provided on each side of all vehicle and cycle accesses in accordance with Condition 24. The depth is measured from the back of the footway or verge and the widths outwards from the edges of the access. No fence, wall or other obstruction to visibility between 0.6m and 2m in height above ground level shall be erected within the area of such splays.

Carriageway Width

The proposed main carriageway width of 4.8 metres is in accordance with the Site Wide Design Code (page 26) which states for 'minor residential streets' a minimum width of 3.7 – 4.8 metres is required. 4.8 metres would be sufficient width for a HGV to pass an oncoming light vehicle (car or van). The proposed site layout would also cater for the unlikely event that two HGVs wished to pass one another whereby there are plenty of opportunities to give way using the site's internal junctions which are spaced at appropriate intervals.

In addition to the above responses, Odyssey note SCC's comment that the electric vehicle (EV) charging rate per property has increased due to the recently updated requirements for EV charging. Although it is also noted that revised details to address this are not being formally sought by Surrey Heath Development Control at this stage.

I trust the above is sufficient to address SCC's outstanding highway comments on the Phase 2B Resubmission, but please feel free to contact me with any remaining issues that have not been properly dealt with to the satisfaction of SCC.

Yours sincerely



Simon Ellis
Principal Transport Planner
London Office