



INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

FROM: HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT; PLACE DIRECTORATE

Application No: 21/P/1766/OUT

Development Control Case Officer: Ursula Fay

Location: Land At Farleigh Farm And, 54 And 56 Farleigh Road, Backwell,

Proposal: Outline planning application for demolition of 54 and 56 Farleigh Road; residential development of up to 125 dwellings (Class C3); strategic landscaping and earthworks, surface water drainage and all other ancillary infrastructure and enabling works with means of site access (excluding internal roads) from the new junction off Farleigh Road for approval; all other matters (internal access, layout, appearance, scale and landscaping) reserved for subsequent approval.

Date: 6 September 2021

Recommendation

No objection (subject to below comments and conditions)

Planning Conditions Required

- Increase in width of the Ghost Island to 3m
- Traffic calming measures such as speed cushions
- Construction Management Plan
- RSA 1/2

Planning Obligations (S106 & S278) Required

- TRO order (£3,100.00) and any associated traffic management costs.
- Contribution via S106 agreement to public transport of £100,000.00 to upgrade 4 bus shelters
- Highway Improvement works secured via S278 agreement, as specified below.

Recommendations to Applicant

- Relocation of proposed toucan crossing to the east of the site
- Gradient of the proposed access no greater than 1:12
- Transport Assessment requirements:
 1. Review TRICS sites included and undertake sensitivity test with anomalous sites removed.
 2. Undertake sensitivity test based upon distribution amended for peak period education and shopping car trips travelling to and from Station Road
 3. The impact of the development on the operation of the Backwell crossroads signals should be run to assess the impact of sensitivity testing the trip generation and distribution.
 4. Provide details of a commercial partner to operate the Car Club, with details of the funding arrangement that would ensure the service operates commercially at the end of the funding period.
- Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure
- Early contact with Network Management team
- Consultation with the Street lighting team

Formal comments from Highways & Transport Development Management

Summary

The applicant is proposing 125 residential dwellings and new access onto the A370.

Previous Recommendations

15/P/0315/O (Residential development of up to 220 new dwellings with supporting infrastructure and facilities including the demolition of 56 Farleigh Road, creation of new vehicular access from Farleigh Road) and a subsequent appeal was dismissed.

1.0 Access

Further information required

1.1 Location

The location of the site (Fig A):



Fig A

Formation of the access requires the demolition of two properties 54 & 56 Farleigh Road.

1.2 Access Junction and visibility

The applicant proposes to access the site via a new priority junction access from A370. Ref: Proposed Access Dwg No: P706/13. A substandard visibility splay demonstrating of 2.4 x 90m is to the west and east has been submitted. The current speed limit is 40mph and requires 120m of visibility (DMRB). The applicant proposes that the speed limit on A370 within the proximity of the

site access should be reduced from 40mph to 30mph. This would require a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and separate legal processes beyond the consideration of this planning application. There is no guarantee that a proposal to reduce the speed limit would successfully negotiate the statutory processes and be implemented. The acceptability of the visibility splay relies on a lower speed limit. There is a cost associated with a TRO (£3,100.00) which would need to be covered in a S106 Agreement for the order costs and any associated traffic management.

Within the submitted visibility splays is a grass verge. The Highway Authority would recommend that vegetation within the visibility splays at both sides of the access are to be maintained, ensuring that no vegetation exceeds a height of 600mm (for acceptable visibility) as drivers need to be able to see obstructions 2m high down to a point 600mm above the carriageway (Manual for Streets, paragraph 7.6.3, p. 91). This will need to be **conditioned**.

1.3 Ghost Island

Ref: Proposed Access Dwg P706/13. A ghost island right turn is proposed for traffic entering the site from the west with a maximum 2.6 metres in width. The additional lane created by road markings is to allow traffic waiting to turn right from the A370 into the minor road into the development and must do so without impeding through traffic movement. CD123 details the requirements for ghost islands. The A370 is used by HGV's and buses and is a key strategic link. The width must be sufficient to enable access and ensuring that any side swipe/head on/nose to tail/shunt type collisions leading to personal injury are mitigated and should therefore be widened to a 3m width. **This should be conditioned**.

1.4 Neighbouring properties

The junction keep clear markings are noted to overhang into access to the driveways of properties 52 and 58. There is concerns for vehicles entering and existing the properties at either side of the junction and potential areas of conflict and associated gradients of the neighbouring properties in relation to the safe use of the access to 125 properties. This should be addressed as part of the RSA.

1.4 Toucan Crossing and pedestrian crossing

To the west of the site the applicant proposes a new 3.0m wide toucan crossing near to Backwell Leisure Centre. Four existing traffic islands are to be converted into a pedestrian crossing incorporating dropped kerbs, tactile paving and a pedestrian refuge.

The A370 is used by HGV's and buses, is a key strategic link and part of the winter gritting route. 3.4 metres is required to allow for a snow plough for each side of the carriageway. The applicant is to advise the remaining width of each lane of the A370 following installation of the pedestrian crossing (from a traffic island).

The applicant is to reconsider the location of the proposed toucan crossing when its location is close to the Backwell crossroads with pedestrian facilities and may only have limited use to access the Backwell Leisure Centre. Due to proximity of the toucan crossing to the Backwell crossroads this may interfere with the function of the A370. The applicant is to consider the crossing to serve to the east of the site near to Church Lane to enable pedestrian to cross prior to the section where there is no footway. This would facilitate pedestrians trips by those in the wider area and not just restricted to the site trips. The pressure of additional trips could be addressed by enabling trips that link to the pub and Festival Way for links into Bristol.

1.5 Speed reduction from 40mph to 30mph at the proposed access

The applicant is proposing a change in the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph and the speed roundels will be updated. Consideration must be made to all road markings that may need to be adjusted to the new speed limit where appropriate including centre lines. The road markings cannot be removed

without damaging the surface of the road. To facilitate any lining changes the developer around the access may contribute to a surface dressing scheme to allow the new markings to be implemented at that point. Otherwise, the road markings would need to remain until such a time as any surface dressing scheme in the future. The applicant must consider if there are other signs that may need updating due to the change in the speed limit and should form part of the mitigations.

The HA are concerned that vehicles may not comply with the 30mph limit given the segregated nature of the two lanes of traffic and vehicle speeds are likely to remain high unless traffic calming measures such as speed cushions on the approach to the islands are introduced. Without additional measures the pedestrian islands are unlikely to have any impact on vehicle speeds which may increase the collision rate. A traffic calming scheme will need to be implemented to ensure speeds comply with the proposed 30mph limit. **This should be conditioned and delivered by a Section 278 agreement.**

1.6 Vehicle Tracking

Ref: Swept Path Analysis Dwg No P706/14. Acceptable vehicle tracking for a large refuse vehicle and large car has been submitted.

1.7 RSA

Due to the significant changes proposed a RSA1/2 is required and any previous audits will require a review and a refresh. All Road Safety Audits must be undertaken by an independent audit team. The CVs of the audit Team Leader and Team Member must be submitted along with an audit brief to be approved in writing by the council prior to the audit being undertaken. This will highlight issues and sensitive sites prior to the audit. An NSC Highway Engineer/Officer should be invited to be present at any audit site visit. If the approval process is not followed there could be a risk of the audit being rejected. **This is to be conditioned.**

1.8 Gradient

In order to prevent the grounding of vehicles, drives which fall away from the highway should have a gradient not exceeding 1:12 (8%). Steeper gradients may be considered by the council for drives which fall towards the highway. All private drives must be adequately drained to prevent surface water from discharging onto the highway.” (NSC Highways Development Design Guide, paragraph 5.5.2)

The access road has a footways on either side to enable pedestrian links to Farleigh Road and is acceptable. Paragraph 6.3.27 of Manual for Streets (p. 69): “Designers should attempt to keep pedestrian routes as near to level as possible along their length and width, within the constraints of the site. Longitudinal gradients should ideally be no more than 5%, although topography or other circumstances may make this difficult to achieve.” The applicant is to advise any implications of the site gradient on all abilities requiring access from the site.

1.09 Emergency Vehicles

The Building Regulation Fire Safety requirement B5 (2010) Section 13 ‘Vehicle Access’ advises that there should be vehicle access for a pump appliance within 45 metres of single family houses. The 45m reach (from the rear of the pumping appliance) **must reach all points within the property.** Dead end access routes longer than 20m require turning facilities to ensure Fire and Service vehicles do not have to reverse more than 20m. The applicant should ensure this is addressed in the future RM applications.

1.10 PROW

Improvements to PROW's could be part of the considerations and the PROW team have been consulted for comment. Public footpath LA2/4 is located to the south of the applicants site.

2.0 Transport Assessment

Further information required

The TA has been reviewed by external consultants and the following comments and issues have been raised.

The modelling as presented is generally acceptable, presenting the Backwell Crossroads signals being at or slightly in excess of capacity, which will be worsened by local development including this site. The applicant identifies the absence of capacity improvement schemes and another site approved recently to justify only funding improvements to non-car modes of travel.

The approach the applicant has taken to demonstrate that the 2014 based data is still acceptable and that growth has not occurred does raise some concerns that should be addressed. The site selection to generate the vehicle trip rates includes some surveys which appear anomalous, resulting in a much lower trip rate. The distribution using census data is an approach, but the base data is dated and other significant peak period journey purposes would take more traffic through the signals. **These matters should be addressed.**

At this time, a recommendation of refusal is not proposed. However, the impact under the alternative assumptions would be greater, and potentially result in levels of congestion, with associated noise and equality issues, that would be deemed unacceptable. It is considered essential that these sensitivity tests and implications are made available to allow a fully informed decision.

2.1 Trip Generation

The site and general location are described in sufficient detail to understand the nature of site characteristics that should be considered in any TRICS assessment. PFA consider that there is a degree of robustness to the figures based upon their use to of 'Houses Privately Owned' sites on the basis of 30% of the proposed houses coming under the heading of affordable. Experience has shown that the difference between privately owned, rented and affordable units is not significant, and that 30% affordable units although identifying policy frequently do not get delivered. Therefore, the trip rates calculate in this manner should be reasonable but not overly robust.

The site selections appear appropriate, but inspection of the trip rate graph for the nine sites used does show some significant variations in peak period. There are some extremely low trip rates from some sites in the peak periods used, and typically these coincide with much higher trip rates either earlier, later or both.

This would indicate sites particularly affected by longer journeys to and from work. The selection set should be reviewed, and a sensitivity test undertaken using only sites which do not exhibit the trip making pattern described above.

Review TRICS sites included and undertake sensitivity test with anomalous sites removed.

2.2 Trip Distribution

PFA have used 2011 census data to derive the trip distribution. This data is now very dated but is still generally accepted as a reasonable model of likely work trip destinations. However, it does not take account of other journey purposes undertaken during the period.

In this location, education and shopping trips would be likely to head towards the west, and as these form major elements of peak period travel could have a significant impact on the distribution.

It is recommended that a sensitivity test is undertaken using the proportion of peak period traffic for the three peak period journey purposes work, education and shopping to adjust the distribution. All other journey purposes should be included with the work journey proportion.

This is considered appropriate especially given this site's location relative to school shopping trips and travel to Bristol, because there is a genuine potential for some drivers to initially take children to school and then travel back along the A370 to work in Bristol. These trips would actually travel twice through Backwell Crossroads and add to the through traffic at the site access. A similar impact could be experienced in the evening peak with someone returning from Bristol and as part of that journey collecting some shopping from the village centre.

Undertake sensitivity test based upon distribution amended for peak period education and shopping car trips travelling to and from Station Road

2.3 Traffic Impacts

Due to the current pandemic restrictions new surveys are not being undertaken and traffic flows have to be derived from available data. PFA have compared the 2014 count at Backwell Crossroads, used for the 2015 application, with later counts in 2017 and DfT data from June 2019. They have concluded that traffic flows since the 2014 count have reduced, and therefore use of the 2014 data represents a robust approach.

They support this by assuming that the effects of the pandemic will be to stabilise or reduce peak period traffic in the future due to people working from home. This may prove to be correct, but when considering residential proposals the effect will be to have more people around with access to vehicles across the day, and with more flexibility about the use of their vehicles.

This may actually result in an increase in local journeys at all times of the day especially where local destinations are not that close to the housing or whether route is not considered safe for pedestrians/cyclists and especially at times of inclement weather.

A further consideration, and something we have experience of elsewhere, is that the peak traffic levels remain constant, but the 'shoulder peaks' reduce. Essentially the inverse of peak spreading. Consideration of the 2017 data shows that it is lower than the 2014 data. It is difficult, given the acceptance of the use of the 2017 data for the West of Rodney Road application, to suggest that there could be issues with it. However, we would take the view that as a July count it would still run a risk of significant reductions due to holidays and the effects of better weather (if that was the case on the day of the count). The effect would be to reduce both peak periods due to holidays, as well as people leaving work early having an impact on the evening peak hour. This is consistent with what is shown.

The comparison with the DfT data shows a 10% lower morning peak and 2 ½% lower evening peak. As these are two single day assessments from different months it cannot be concluded that there is no growth in traffic over the period.

It is considered that the applicant should provide a more robust case to justify use of the 2014 data with no growth as their baseline. This should include monthly traffic flow by day to show daily and

monthly variations and compare the MCC's to the average weekday for the month of each count. It is accepted that this can only be done if data exists, potentially through historic traffic signal operating information.

If it does not, then the base data proposed should be accepted, but with a sensitivity test taking growth to 2019, and treating matters 2021 allowing for zero growth over the period of the pandemic restrictions.

Committed development has been appropriately accounted for using the accepted traffic flows from the planning application which was consented. This is been added to both the 2021 and 2026 assessment flows. The effect is to make the 2021 assessment flows more robust than they need to be, and these could actually be discounted from that assessment.

No growth has been applied to the base data to create the 2021 baseline flows, but as set out above, it is considered that growth to 2019 should be included. Growth from 2021 to 2026 has been calculated correctly.

The correct hours have been assessed. The correct years have been assessed as 2021 for the application and 2026 for the design year.

The TA identifies five stages are used in the operation of the signals. The signal operation is controlled with the use of MOVA which provides additional vehicle approached detection in addition to the usual vehicle and queue detection loops. This improves junction operation, but at present cannot be modelled using Linsig. Improvements are considered to be up to 8% performance improvement, but the actual junction improvement achievable is junction specific.

The operation of the Backwell crossroads signals have been calibrated to observe queue lengths. Therefore, unless the traffic signals team at North Somerset Council identify any phasing, staging or timings that are unacceptable to them, we must conclude that the modelling of the junction appropriately reflects what would be expected to occur.

It has previously been concluded that there are no economically viable measures that could be introduced to generate more capacity at the signals. However, the degree to which queues and delays may increase does need to be robustly assessed. Therefore, it is considered that the junction analysis should be rerun to include the sensitivity tests for trip generation and distribution.

The modelling of the access junction is considered appropriate and considered to be unlikely to change with the requested changes in trip generation and distribution. This is due to the significant level of reserve capacity at the junction. Consequently, there is little merit in rerunning the analysis.

The mitigation measures being proposed focus on non-car modes of travel, benefiting all local residents by encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport. This will be delivered by physical improvements to Farleigh Road, extending the 30 mph limit east of the site and creating new controlled and uncontrolled pedestrian crossings. A financial contribution is also proposed towards enhancement of other existing infrastructure, and contribution may be made to improving bus accessibility or viability. Both sums would need to be agreed, and no indication of the scale has been made.

The site would also benefit from a Travel Plan (TP) specifically looking to inform and encourage non-car modes of travel by residents. Proposed measures include a travel pack, a £120 green travel voucher and the funding of an electric car club for three years.

In the absence or the ability to deliver tangible traffic signal capacity improvements, seeking to offset the impact of the development by encouraging greater local use of non-car travel is the appropriate approach. The proposed physical, financial and TP measures should deliver some degree of benefit. The only measure of concern is the funding for three years of electric car club and whether that would be likely to be viable in the longer term. If it is not going to be commercially viable, it is considered that an alternative use for the funding be more likely to deliver a long-term benefit.

The impact of the development on the operation of the Backwell crossroads signals should be run to assess the impact of sensitivity testing the trip generation and distribution.

2.4 Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan (FTP) has been produced and is appended to the TA.

The targets of the FTP are realistic.

The measures included are fairly standard for a residential Travel Plan. There are three specific measures identified as the main strengths of the TP, a Residential Travel Pack, a £120 Green Travel Voucher and three-year funding for an Electric Car Club.

Funding the operation of the Electric Car Club for a three-year period would only have genuine value if it were to be commercially viable to operate once the funding ceases. The catchment for this car club would be very limited, as the site is peripheral to Backwell, which itself is not highly or densely populated.

The applicant should provide evidence to demonstrate that a commercial operator would be genuinely interested in providing this service on an ongoing basis. To demonstrate that commitment, it is suggested that the operator should actually have some financial commitment to providing and operating the service.

If this is not achievable, this measure should be replaced with alternate relatives that would deliver modal shift on a permanent basis.

Provide details of a commercial partner to operate the Car Club, with details of the funding arrangement that would ensure the service operates commercially at the end of the funding period.

2.5 Conclusion

The modelling undertaken has been done to an acceptable standard, however sensitivity testing of the Backwell crossroads signals is considered necessary. This is due to the lack of reserve capacity at the junction which already generates at times significant queueing and the lack of deliverable schemes to increase junction capacity.

It is considered essential that the potential impact of the site, should the trip generation and distribution differ from that put forward by PFA, be understood. Given that the 2017 appeal decision did not (according to PFA) identify highway reasons for being dismissed, if NSC were minded to refuse, the case would need to be very robust.

In addition, as conditions worsen and queues extend, with the associated additional noise and emissions, a highway scheme of improvement for the signals may be able to be identified and represent value for money given the scale of the benefit that may be achieved.

3.0 Sustainable Travel & Road Safety

The STARS team have been consulted on these proposals.

4.0 Integrated Transport Unit; Home to School Transport and Public Transport

S106 agreement

4.1 Home to School Transport

The site is within the statutory walking distances of the primary and secondary schools. However, this may be an issue if these school become full and the pupils need to be transported to a different school, which is not currently envisaged.

4.2 Public Transport

Replacement bus shelters at Leisure Centre east and westbound stops and Fairfield Way east and westbound stops (four in total) all requiring a new shelter with RTI installation. The shelters need to be modernised as they are nearing end of life and are required to provide a better public transport service and improve awareness from the proposed site to their relevant destination by bus, to such destinations as employment, retail or education. The necessity is the move away from car travel to bus to aid in moving to carbon neutral by 2030 in North Somerset.

The cost of a new shelter with new RTI is £25K (including installation of cabling and electrical costs). A total of £100K is required for 4 shelters. This is in line with the draft Enhanced Partnership and BSIP documentation for a shift to decarbonising North Somerset by reducing car travel and increasing bus travel. This is something that could be reviewed as part of the Travel Plan and making the targets more ambitious to aid in reducing car travel and increasing the use of the bus network as it currently looks as if the targets in the Travel Plan are no ambitious enough.

5.0 Street lighting

Further consultation required

Street lighting on this stretch of the A370 is currently part-night. For formal crossings that are provided, street lighting will be required to be made permanent throughout the hours of darkness. A review of all street lighting within the extents of the proposed highway improvements including where any reconfigured changes in speed limit may apply should be provided by the applicant. A commuted sum maybe required for lighting to be changed from part night to permanent. The applicant will need to contact the NSC Streetlighting team (email streetlighting@n-somerset.gov.uk).

6.0 Waste servicing

No concerns (subject to below comments)

As this is an outline application only waste management will be considered during the RM application stage in a Waste & Recycling Plan for consideration by the NSC Waste & Recycling Officer.

The applicant is required to adhere to the Residential Design Guide (Section 4: Recycling and Waste) should the site require servicing by refuse vehicles twice a week for recycling and waste. In addition, Policy CS7 of the NSC Core Strategy (p45) states that “new housing, retail, industrial and commercial development should be designed to facilitate easy and efficient waste collection, incorporating appropriate facilities such as collection points for recyclable material.”

A 5.5m road width is required to allow the standard size recycling, waste and garden waste vehicles to get unhindered access. NSC Waste Team will not service an area with smaller vehicles which are less efficient, more costly and have a bigger impact on carbon emissions.

The applicant to provide a refuse collection point which should be accessible no more than 30 metres from each dwelling and no more than 15 metres from adoptable highway where a refuse vehicle can manoeuvre.

7.0 Parking Assessment

No concerns (subject to below comments)

As this is an outline application only, a comprehensive parking plan has not been submitted and, as such, parking provision will be considered at any subsequent reserved matters application.

Standards for both vehicle and cycle parking are set out in the North Somerset Parking Standards SPD (currently under review) which must be adhered to at any subsequent Reserved Matters application

It is noted, however, that at section 4.14 of the submitted Transport Assessment, the applicant notes that 'car and cycle parking including the provision of EV charging will be provided in accordance with the relevant local authority's adopted standards and/or appropriate guidance, at the time of the reserved matters application(s)'. This is welcomed and, as such, the Highway Authority would attach the following guidance to be adhered to at any subsequent reserved matters application:

In line with the government's Clean Growth Strategy, and pledge to ban the sale of new petrol and diesel cars by 2030, it is essential that a suitable level of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging provision be provided at new development. The National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2018 to ensure that new developments 'be designed to enable charging of other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations'. On this basis, and in line with the Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency in 2019 and ambition to become Carbon Neutral by 2030, **the Highway Authority would expect the applicant to provide a suitable level of Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure at the site:**

- For allocated parking (both on and off plot) the Council requires a minimum of 100% passive provision. This should take the form of cabling and Residual Current Device (RCD) sufficient to enable the subsequent installation of 7kW 32amp Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) compliant wall or ground mounted charge point.
- For unallocated parking, the Council requires a minimum of 90% passive provision, as well as 10% active provision. Active provision should take the form of cabling, RCD and 7kw 32amp OLEV compliant wall or ground mounted charge point.

All charge points should use 'smart' technology to allow balancing of electricity supply and demand. Both the active and passive provision should be shown on a plan as part of the planning application and developers should specify what passive/active provision is to be provided.

8.0 Network Management Team

Further action by developer

Any works carried out by or for a developer which affects the public highway in any way must be co-ordinated in accordance with the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic management Act 2004 to minimize disruption to users. Developers are required to inform undertakers of their proposed works, to jointly identify any affected apparatus, and to agree diversion or protection measures and corresponding payment. Developers are also required to liaise/seek authorisation from the NSC's Network Management Team (01934 888802 or streetworks@n-somerset.gov.uk) at least one month in advance of the works and this must be in line with the requirements of the NRSWA 1991 and TMA 2004. The developer must endeavour to ensure that undertaker connections/supplies are coordinated to take place whenever possible at the same times using the same traffic management.

Should any scaffolding, hoarding & fencing, mobile elevating work platforms (MEWPs) or builders materials be required on the highway the applicant should contact the Network Management Team to make arrangements at least 5 working days beforehand to apply for a licence (application form

and fee applies). NSC does not accept roll on roll off skips on the highway. Contact via email; streetworks@n-somerset.gov.uk or call 01934 888802.

9.0 Section 38

Developer action

This development includes highways and street lighting which may be offered for adoption as public highways. The developer's attention is drawn to the need for a Section 38 agreement under the Highway Act 1980 and that no works of construction of the affected roads should be carried out prior to the agreement being in place. Failure to have the agreement in place prior to the commencement of works may prejudice the adoption or result in additional expense in relation to the confirmation of the construction details of the works.

10.0 Section 278

Developer action

The works within the highway in association with this development will require the developer to enter into a S278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980). The developer is advised to make early contact with the highways officer (Mr. W Hole 01934 426707) so that the processing of the order does not impede the implementation of planning consent. The developer will be required to agree to the specification of the works, meet the Council's costs in the drawing up of the order, provide a bond or cash equivalent and meet the Council's inspection charges.

11.0 Construction Management Plan

Condition

Taking into account the busy and strategic local highway network and the volume of material that may need to be removed/brought to site, the Highway Authority would request that a site appropriate level Construction Management Statement is submitted to the Highway Authority for approval prior to the commencement of works on site. It is likely that the caravans will be transported to the site and the plan should include HGV delivery times/routing information and volumes. Please provide further information if these deliveries will be abnormal loads and ensure the routing to the site is suitable. The plan should also include details of site deliveries and storage of materials, timings of deliveries, managing any complaints arising from the works, maintaining access to neighbouring properties, communication to neighbouring properties before works begin, car parking for operatives/visitors to site, times of site operation and highway safety measures such as wheel washing facilities to prevent mud/detritus entering the highway. **This is to be conditioned.**