

Harrison, Liz

From: Jamie Loxley <j.loxley@msa-architects.co.uk>
Sent: 01 April 2026 17:04
To: Harrison, Liz
Cc: Matthew Thomas; Adam Connor
Subject: RE: O/25/99506 - Navigator Quarter - Consultation responses and drawing register

Hi Liz,

Further to points we flagged this morning regarding the response from Sustainable Transport, we have discussed these with both Steer (transport consultants) and Burrows Graham (engineers), and our comments are as follows:

Point 1. Cycleway width

Steer have determined the cycle trips from the development to be 23 cycles/hour at peak, based on Table 7.22 of their Transport Assessment (see below), and LTN 1/20 (Table 5-2 also below) states that two-way cycle tracks for up to 300 cycles/hour should be in the region of 2.0m – 3.0m.

Steer note that given cycle flows are expected to be low, an '*absolute minimum*' cycleway width of 2.0m is adequate, however they point out that since the cycleway has been designed at a width of 3.0m, a barrier/railing and additional 500mm buffer could be incorporated within the proposed 3.0m width.

-

Table 7.22: Proposed Development Scenario 1: Multi-modal Trips

Mode	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak (17:00 - 18:00)			Daily		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Train	34	7	41	6	27	33	163	166	329
Bus, minibus or coach	17	3	20	3	14	17	81	83	164
Taxi	5	1	6	1	4	5	23	24	47
Motorcycle, scooter/ moped	2	0	3	0	2	2	12	12	23
Driving a car or van	304	62	366	53	246	300	1,465	1,495	2,960
Passenger in a car or van	29	6	35	5	23	29	139	142	282
Bicycle	19	4	23	3	16	19	93	95	188
On foot	72	15	87	13	59	71	349	356	705
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vehicles	483	98	581	85	391	476	2,325	2,373	4,698

Table 5-2: Cycle lane and track widths

Cycle Route Type	Direction	Peak hour cycle flow (either one way or two-way depending on cycle route type)	Desirable minimum width* (m)	Absolute minimum at constraints (m)
Protected space for cycling (including light segregation, stepped cycle track, kerbed cycle track)	1 way	<200	2.0	1.5
		200-800	2.2	2.0
		>800	2.5	2.0
	2 way	<300	3.0	2.0
		>300-1000	3.0	2.5
		>1000	4.0	3.0
Cycle lane	1 way	All – cyclists able to use carriageway to overtake	2.0	1.5

Point 2. Details of covered cycleway / footway

We have reviewed this point with Burrows Graham and they have stated that while these details can be provided, the structure will be of a more specialist design, requiring input from the Airport. As this information will take longer to prepare, can we please agree that a Planning Condition is included requiring full details of the covered cycleway / footway to be provided prior to the commencement of the road's development?

For reference, I have attached a Jet Blast analysis plan, showing that the Applicant and airport understand and have considered the blast impact that will need to be mitigated, leading to the conclusion that a more specialist structure will be required at this location north of the runway.

We trust that the above is acceptable. Please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

In terms of the actions relating to Ecology and Landscape, we are aiming to provide these documents tomorrow.

Kind regards,

Jamie Loxley
BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Planner

Michael Sparks Associates

Chartered Architects

11 Plato Place, St. Dionis Road, London SW6 4TU

j.loxley@msa-architects.co.uk

www.msa-architects.co.uk

+44 (0)20 7736 6162



PlanetMark **LandAid**

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS EMAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS MAY BE PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL AND IS INTENDED FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE(S) DESIGNATED ABOVE. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this information in error please notify the sender by telephone or e-mail and delete the message from your system immediately.