

Powys County Council

Departure from Standards Submission Form

DP112

1.0	Basic Details	
1.1	Developer / Client	Welsh Government
1.2	Planning Application No.	
1.3	Scheme Name	A483/A489 Newtown Bypass
1.4	Road / Location / Grid Reference	Newtown link from Kerry Road Roundabout
1.5	Design Organisation	Atkins (Swansea) as designer to Alun Griffiths Contractors Ltd
2.0	Overall Justification	
2.1	Design Speed and method of assessment	70A kph TD9/93 – Highway Link Design (Para 1.8)
2.2	Speed limit	40mph
2.3	Options / Alternatives Rejected (constraints)	Options were constrained by the following considerations:- • Vertical alignment of the existing road. • Buildability and the need to maintain operation of the existing road during construction. • The location of the existing accesses.
2.4	Relevant Standard	TD 41/95 Vehicular Access to All Purpose Trunk Roads
2.5	Relevant Clause	Clause 2.22 - 'Y' Visibility Distances Required Clause 2.24 – Desirable Minimum Stopping Sight Distance on the approaches to the access
2.6	Existing Departures at the site	Unknown but likely to be similar in nature to those applied for in this submission.
2.7	Full Details of Proposed Departure	Two existing accesses are located along this proposed link and it is proposed that the gate positions are set back to suit the scheme fencelines. These accesses are currently located in a de-restricted section of carriageway but under the scheme proposals a 40mph speed limit will be added to this link road. Both existing accesses 112A and 112B do not comply with the standard TD 41/95 Para 2.22 which for a Design Speed of 85 kph states 'The sightline requirement at X = 2.4m the

	Y distance from the access looking upstream and downstream to the edge of the carriageway shall be 160m. <u>Access 112A</u> The visibility standard achieved ‘for X’ = 2.4m To the north – ‘Y’ = 40m (unchanged from existing and restricted by existing vertical alignment) To the south – ‘Y’ = 70m (when measured as tangent to centreline) and 120m (when visibility extends into opposing lane) In addition the sight lines from the carriageway to the access do not comply with TD 41/95 Para 2.24 which refers to TD 9/93 Para 1.26 ‘Relaxations below Desirable Minimum Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) are not permitted on the immediate approaches to junctions and shall apply to direct accesses.’ The Table below outlines details of the proposed and compliant SSD for the departure, along with the corresponding constraints. <table><tr><th>SSD (m)</th><th>Constraints</th></tr><tr><td><u>Proposed</u> 90m (1 design step – N/B approach)</td><td rowspan="2">Existing road alignment, buildability and the existing access position.</td></tr><tr><td>40m (>3 design steps – S/B approach)</td></tr><tr><td><u>Compliant</u> 120m (DMSSD)</td><td></td></tr></table> <u>Access 112B</u> The visibility standard achieved ‘for X’ = 2.4m To the north – ‘Y’ = 40m (unchanged from existing and restricted by existing hedgebank) To the south – ‘Y’ = 75m In addition the sight lines from the carriageway to the access do not comply with TD 41/95 Para 2.24 which refers to TD 9/93 Para 1.26 ‘Relaxations below Desirable Minimum Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) are not permitted on the immediate approaches to junctions and shall apply to direct accesses.’	SSD (m)	Constraints	<u>Proposed</u> 90m (1 design step – N/B approach)	Existing road alignment, buildability and the existing access position.	40m (>3 design steps – S/B approach)	<u>Compliant</u> 120m (DMSSD)	
SSD (m)	Constraints							
<u>Proposed</u> 90m (1 design step – N/B approach)	Existing road alignment, buildability and the existing access position.							
40m (>3 design steps – S/B approach)								
<u>Compliant</u> 120m (DMSSD)								

		The Table below outlines details of the proposed and compliant SSD for the departure, along with the corresponding constraints.						
		<table><tr><th>SSD (m)</th><th>Constraints</th></tr><tr><td><u>Proposed</u> 90m (1 design step – N/B approach) 40m (>3 design steps – S/B approach)</td><td rowspan="2">Existing road alignment, buildability and the existing access position.</td></tr><tr><td><u>Compliant</u> 120m (DMSSD)</td></tr></table>	SSD (m)	Constraints	<u>Proposed</u> 90m (1 design step – N/B approach) 40m (>3 design steps – S/B approach)	Existing road alignment, buildability and the existing access position.	<u>Compliant</u> 120m (DMSSD)	
SSD (m)	Constraints							
<u>Proposed</u> 90m (1 design step – N/B approach) 40m (>3 design steps – S/B approach)	Existing road alignment, buildability and the existing access position.							
<u>Compliant</u> 120m (DMSSD)								
2.8	Associated Departures & Relaxations	DP110 – Newtown Link – Vertical Alignment DP111 – Newtown Link – Horizontal Alignment and SSD DP113 – Newtown Link – Road Lighting						
3.0	Other Information							
3.1	Non-motorised users considerations (eg Active Travel (Wales) Act)	Existing connectivity for non-motorised users will be maintained by the re-provision/diversion of any public rights of way bisected by the proposed scheme.						
3.2	Street Lighting provision: Existing and Proposed	There is no existing street lighting at this location. The proposed street lighting scheme at this location will illuminate the circulatory carriageway of the roundabout only. This proposal will be subject to approval of a Departure from Standards						
3.3	Other relevant technical information such as vehicle restraint systems, proximity to junctions etc.	None						
3.4	Supporting Documentation associated with the departure.		Supplied (Y/N)					
	Documentation to include:							
	• Location plan typically at 1:10000 showing the scheme extent and existing/associated departures.		Y					
	• Layout plans, including road markings typically 1:2500 for links and 1:500 for junctions		Y					
	• Junction Capacity Checks where relevant including design year queue lengths		Y					
	• Visibility Graphs for SSD departures.		N					
	• Swept Path Plots where relevant		N					

	- Risk Assessment associated with the proposed departure when compared with a fully compliant design (including a designer's risk assessment) - Road Safety Audit	Y Y
4.0	Summary	
4.1	Summary of mitigation measures proposed as part of the design solution	Retroreflective signs would be used on approach to the proposed roundabout and vehicle speeds are anticipated to be low at the access locations. Vehicles are likely to either slow on approach to the existing low standard crest curve north of the accesses or already be travelling at a reduced speed on exit from the roundabout.
4.2	Overall Justification. Summarise how the benefits of the proposal outweigh the disbenefits when compared with a fully compliant design.	Both of these are existing accesses and their locations will not change other than gate positions being set-back to suit the proposed fencelines. The accesses are currently located in a de-restricted section of carriageway however with the introduction of the proposed Kerry Road Roundabout and a 40mph speed limit on this link road it is anticipated that vehicle speeds will be reduced on approach to these accesses compared to the existing conditions. Additionally, these accesses are used very infrequently by one landowner to access land north of the proposed bypass. It would not be possible to provide a fully compliant design due to the existing road alignment and topography north of these accesses.
5.0	Declarations	
5.1	Name of Designer Proposing Departure Submission.	N.J.R Bebb
5.2	Title of Designer Proposing Departure Submission.	Divisional Director
5.3	Declaration of Designer Proposing Departure Submission.	I confirm that in completing the attached departure submission I have used reasonable professional skill and care. I hereby recommend approval of the attached departure from standard submission

		 Signed: Date: 27 th March 2015
5.4	Declaration of Welsh Government - Overseeing Organisation	Additional Comments from Welsh Government: Name: Signed: Date:
5.5	Powys County Council Comments	Additional Comments from Powys County Council: Name: Date:
5.6	Declaration of Powys County Council - Departure Owner.	I hereby recommend approval of the attached departure from standard submission Name: Position/Responsibility : Signed: Date:
6.0	Departure Endorsement	
6.1	Endorsement of Head of Service	Comments: Name: Signed: Date:

7.0	Technical Review Panel Recommendations	
7.1	Recommendations of Infrastructure Delivery Project Director	Recommendations: Name: Signed: Date:
7.2	Recommendations of Network Management Delivery Team Leader	Recommendations: Name: Signed: Date:
7.3	Recommendations of Standards, DC & Streetworks Team Leader (Chair)	Recommendations: Name: Signed: Date:
7.4	Endorsement of Deputy Director (Infrastructure Delivery) or Head of Asset Management & Standards (Network Management)	Comments: Name: Signed: Date: