APPENDIX A

Initial Appraisal Consultation Form

98 Chapel Road/165 St. Mary's Street

Part A: General

Reference: App A Dec 2009

Developer/Agent Details

Name: Colin Warburg	**Company: Warburg Property Development Limited**
Address: Lansdowne House, Castle Lane, Southampton Hampshire SO14 2BU	
Telephone: 02380222662	**Facsimile: 02380231762**
Email: Colinwarburg@btinternet.com	

Development Details

Brief Description *(Including Existing site use):* Existing community hall, dance club. Now demolished. Was around 1200 sq.m. Previous Petrol Station on West of site. Previous Kwik Fit Station on West of site. Full details given within planning application and attached notes.	
Location: 165 St. Mary's Street / 98 Chapel Road, Southampton	
Number/Street Name/Road	**98 Chapel Road (number to be confirmed)**
Town/City/County	**Southampton, Hampshire**
Size (E.g., GFA, No. of Units)	
Opening Year(s): 2011/12	

Please tick the applicable box from the questions below.

	YES	NO
(i) Is the development Residential with more than 50 units?	☐	☒
(ii) Is the development Non-residential with a GFA of over 500 sqm?	☒	☐
(iii) Is the development likely to generate over 30 two- way vehicle trips per hour?	☒	☐
(iv) Is the development likely to generate over 10 HGVs a day?	☐	☒
v) Is the development likely to generate one or more Special Order Abnormal Loads a year?	☐	☒

If the answer to any of the above questions is **Yes**, please complete Parts B, C and D of this form. Please note that the information provided in Parts B, C and D will used for any subsequent assessment that may be required for this planning application.

Part B: Travel Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Development Site

Journeys to and from the Development Site

Provide an estimate of journeys to and from the development site during the peak traffic periods, for each category of travel listed in the table below. For example, peak travel periods for residential and employment uses are normally 08:00 to 09:00 and 17:00 to 18:00 during weekdays. For retail developments, the peak hour normally falls on Saturday between 11:00 and 16:00.

	Weekday Peak Hour of Adjacent Road Network		Weekday Peak Hour of Proposed Development		Weekend Peak Hour of Proposed Development	
Travel Mode	AM	PM	AM	PM	Saturday PM	Sunday PM
Walk	56		16	70	70	81
Cycle	28		12	50	50	59
Car with driver only	348		4	18	18	21
Car with passenger	49		28**	122**	98**	114**
Bus	13		42*	180*	228*	284*
Train	0		9*	39*	39*	46*
Taxi	13		0	0	0	0
Delivery/Goods Vehicles (up to 7.5t)	109		1	1	1	0
Heavy Goods Vehicles (over 7.5t)	21		1	1	1	1
Abnormal loads	1		0	0	0	0
Special abnormal loads	0		0	0	0	0

* Number of people travelling by this means (not number of buses/Trains)

** Based on average 2 people in a car.

Committed Developments and Programmed Highway Improvements

In order to assess the impact of your development, please identify nearby major developments that have planning consent and any highway schemes that are programmed (by the local highway authority or the Highways Agency) but are yet to be implemented.

165 St. Mary Street, 36 Residential units, 500 sq. m office, 350 sq. m Retail, 20 parking spaces.
Renewal of Road from 165 St Mary Street to Train crossing on Chapel Road.
Deanery Site – 165 residential units. The road just to the East of site being considered has had the pavements renewed and the road raised by up to 450mm, as a consequence of discussions with the Environmental agency.
Development opposite St. Mary's Church – 12 affordable housing units.
Addition of mini-roundabout at corner St. Mary Street / Chapel Road.
Crossing's to be added along Chapel Road
20 mph speed limit to be imposed on entrance off Ewan Street along St. Mary's Street and Chapel Road.
NOTE: 165 St. Mary Street forms part of this development and therefore items included here need to be considered for inclusion on this proposal.

Part C: Transport Impacts

Identify the likely transport impacts of the development

Please tick the applicable box from the questions below.

		YES	NO
(i)	Will the development increase conflicts between all types of vehicles?	☐	☒
(ii)	Will the development increase conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians?	☐	☒
(iii)	Will the development increase conflicts between vehicles and cyclists?	☐	☒
(iv)	Will the development provide on-site parking? If YES, please provide total number of parking spaces proposed: 74-76	☒	☐
(iv)	Will the development increase demand for on-street parking?	☒	☐
(v)	Will the developments increase traffic queues and delays at nearby junctions? If YES, please identify the critical junctions in box **C1** below.	☐	☒
(vi)	Will the development increase traffic noise? If YES, please briefly describe the nature of the impact and identify the areas likely to be affected in box **C2**.	☒	☐
(vii)	Will the development reduce air quality? If YES, please briefly describe the nature of the impact and identify the areas likely to be affected in box **C3**.	☐	☒
(viii)	Will traffic generated by the development affect the areas of townscape, landscape and the natural/historic environment importance?	☐	☒

C1: Please identify all the critical junctions from question (v)

C2: Please describe the nature of the noise impact from question (vi)

A general noise increase from the complex with respect to cars is not anticipated except at peak times (hockey games, Disco sessions). Previous use as a garage/Kwik Fit would have generated an average of around 5052 cars per week to the West of the site, plus around 1300 cars per week to the Hall, with parking at the rear and surrounding area. The average of cars attending the site is estimated at around 8,777 (based on no sharing) or around 38% increase. However, other rinks e.g. Oxford find that 3% of travel is by one person in a car whilst 40% is with one or more. It is therefore reasonable to anticipate that off the 8,777 that 3/43 would be driver only and the rest shared – based on 2 sharing this would give us an average of cars attending site off 612+4082 or 4,694. Or a decrease in traffic by 7%. In addition, the same area of access (West end of site) is proposed with this development keeping any noise produced away from the residential units at the back of the site. In addition this number is based on a 20 hour period rather than the 14 hour period for the garage, 8 hour for the Kwik fit and 5 hour for the Night Club. The hourly average for previous use would have been 59 cars / hour. Whilst proposed average would be 34 cars/ hour. Hence the overall decrease off 42%. Peak traffic along the road today is 397 cars/ hour. It is predicted that peak within the complex would be for Disco sessions (e.g. Friday evenings 6.30-11pm, Sat/Sunday 8.30-11pm and for Ice Hockey Games Sat/Sun 5-8.15pm.) Once the complex has established itself, it is anticipated that up to 700 might attend one of these sessions. This could give rise to 140 cars being involved over these periods. Any coaches involved with this are expected to pull up in front of the complex for drop off and return later for pickup. All pedestrian access is to the front (North) of the site, with the complex shielding the residents to the South from any noise produced.

C3: Please describe the nature of the impact on air quality from question (vii)

Part D: Transport Impact Mitigation

Identify the likely mitigation measures

Please tick the applicable box from the questions below.

		YES	NO
(i)	Will the development/adjacent developments provide measures to improve safety for all road users?	☒	☐
(ii)	Will the development provide measures to promote walking?	☒	☐
(iii)	Will the development provide measures to promote cycling?	☒	☐
(iv)	Will the development provide measures to promote the use of public transport?	☒	☐
(v)	Will the development provide measures to minimise car parking?	☒	☐
(vi)	Will the development provide measures to improve freight traffic movements, where applicable*? (e.g. for warehouse and distribution centres)*	☐	☒
(vii)	Will the development provide mitigation measures*? (e.g. public transport services and facilities, pedestrian and cyclists facilities, highway improvements)*	☒	☐

D1: Please describe the main mitigation measures that are likely to be proposed

Safety for all:
Use of existing work on road to reduce speed to 20 mph.
Use of crossing places across Chapel Road – level crossing.
Improvement to pavement by replacement
Slowing of traffic with pedestrian facilities
Improvement of road condition by resurfacing

Promotion of Walking:
Appropriately costed parking balanced to discourage use of using car, but equally not be too inappropriate so that complex becomes overall too expensive. Number of spaces balanced to provide correct facilities for the complex without undue burden on surrounding area.
Improvements to Pavements, additional crossing facilities.
Signposting from Above Bar/Station/other area's to the site.

Promotion of Cycling:
Provision of cycle spaces

Use of Public Transport:
Signing / mapping of current bus stops around the area and in city centre – signage to the complex for walkers. Further discussions with bus companies to improve location of current stops.
Work with Trains to provide information. Possible copy of Oxford ticket for train/skate.
Work with council to include on their information.

Minimise car parking:
Restricted parking facilities within complex, balanced to those needed so as to not provide local people with inappropriate parking.
Cost parking on the site appropriately to make competitive for driver only to use alternative means e.g. public transport.
Signpost to other area's such as local church facilities. Other car parks nearby.
Location of other facilities / allowing for one journey to cover multiple activities i.e. convenience store, other shops, café, restaurant as well as Ice facilities, gym/fitness facilities.
Link to city College/Solent University and other local employment.

Mitigation measures:
Improvement to adjacent roadways.
Addition of level crossing.
Improvement to adjacent pavements.
On site cycle storage

Summary:

The above information can be used to assess the need for a Transport Assessment.

The current thresholds suggest the need for a transport assessment on the following:

1. Food retail exceeding 800 sq. m. The current facility looks to provide around 650 sq.m – this would suggest a Transport Statement only is required.
2. Restaurants / Cafes – The current size suggested is around 250 sq. m which is below the threshold for an assessment.
3. Drinking establishment – should a bar be included in the complex this would be less than 125 sq. m and again be below the threshold for an assessment.
4. Assembly & Leisure – indoor sports and leisure use – in this case the complex exceeds the suggested threshold of 1500 sq. m giving an option to ask for a Transport assessment / transport plan.
5. Other considerations:
    a. 30 or more 2 way vehicle movements in any hour – this is exceeded.
    b. More than 100 two way vehicle movements in a day – is exceeded.
    c. More than 100 car spaces – this may be exceeded – await final plans.

However, the initial appraisal given above shows:

A decrease in overall traffic from previous use by 7%
A decrease in average car use per hour by 42%

Balanced with this the complex could give rise to a peak car usage of 140. Although harder to estimate this might be compared to around 75/hour with previous usage.

It would therefore be suggested that a full Transport Assessment for this complex is not appropriate.

Following a meeting with the council 12th February 2010 a transport assessment was requested. This would cover detail of the assumptions made above and provide modes of transport available to the site.

Signed:_____ **Date:**_____