



**PLANNING COMMITTEE:
21 FEBRUARY 2019**

Report of: Director of Development and Regeneration

Contact: Mrs. C. Thomas (Extn.5134)
Email: catherine.thomas@westlancs.gov.uk

SUBJECT: LATE INFORMATION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The information below has been received since compilation of your Agenda. The following also includes suggested adjustments to the recommendations further to the receipt of late plans and/or information.

PUBLICATION OF REVISED NPPF

Since compilation of the agenda a revised version of the NPPF has been issued dated February 2019. The revised NPPF has been given due consideration and does not impact on the recommendations in the main agenda report.

3.0 ITEM 7 – PLANNING APPLICATIONS

REPORT NO. 3 – LAND TO THE WEST OF OASIS CLOSE, RUFFORD

The following information has now been received since compilation of the agenda:

Lancashire Constabulary (13.2.19) – Lancashire Constabulary cannot support Members request for a speed camera as they have a strict criteria on the installation of new safety cameras and the Partnership strategy is focused on average speed rather than adding to the number of spot speed camera sites in Lancashire. There are also associated costs for site inspections, repairs and camera calibrations which are currently borne by the Constabulary's Partnership revenue budget which is under increasing strain.

At present, Lancashire Constabulary circulate a small number of fixed cameras around the county's housing areas based on a grading related to casualties,

excessive speed detections and speed count data for each site. A grading would need to be performed at this location and this would either affect existing tasking (potentially reducing the amount of enforcement existing housings receive) or indeed the speeds noted may actually mean that site doesn't receive any or very little enforcement. Procurement is also a potential issue; only certain offences are supported in the Constabulary's back office and should another supplier be successful there are additional licences and resourcing to be identified, along with the necessary type approval.

Lancashire Constabulary suggest a permanent Speed activated sign (SPID) may be appropriate as an alternative as this would remind motorists of the 30 mph limit.

Rufford Parish Council (12.02.19) – An objection from highways consultant SCP on behalf of the Parish Council has been submitted raising the following concerns:

1. Visibility splay is not shown to scale on the plan;
2. Visibility splay to the south is shown measured to the outside of the nearside lane which would omit some vehicles, particularly motorcycles and should be shown to the nearside edge of vehicle paths. The splay is therefore shown incorrectly and should be shorter, below the stopping sight distance;
3. The proposed ghost island right turn lane does not comply with guidance;
4. No capacity assessment has been undertaken to determine the correct length of either the existing or the proposed the right turn lanes;
5. Details of where the traffic count was undertaken should be provided as this is important to determine whether the correct results have been applied. It appears the location and direction of traffic from the survey results are incorrect;
6. The visibility splay requirement is based on a predicted reduction in speed resulting from the proposed traffic calming measures. This is aspirational and not based on evidence. The effects on stopping sight distance and visibility splays could be significant if speed remained above the 37mph threshold;
7. LCC have ignored the increased deceleration rate required for HGV's and buses based on assumed reduced vehicle speeds. They may be subject to their own separate assessment;
8. No road safety audit has been provided.

Highway Authority (19.02.19) – Lancashire County Council have responded to the above objections and comment as follows:

With regards points 1 and 2 the visibility splays have been examined on site by officers of LCC and the Highway Authority remain satisfied that adequate visibility is achievable.

With regards points 3 and 4 all off-site highway works will be delivered through a section 278 (Highways Act) agreement. The detail of the design will require technical approval from LCC. The County Council does not believe there will be any detrimental impact in reducing the length of the right turn lane into Whitefield Close. SCP have provided no evidence to suggest this view is flawed.

With regards point 5 LCC is fully aware of the location that the automated traffic count was positioned and has been supplied with all the necessary data for officers to form a balanced view.

With regards point 6 LCC's view is that the proposed mitigation measures will have a positive effect in reducing vehicle speeds entering the village. SCP have provided no evidence which is contradictory to this view. LCC disagrees with SCP's view that an inability to reduce all vehicle speeds will result in a safety issue.

LCC have considered HGV and Bus traffic as part of its assessment of the development proposal.

LCC has not been provided with or requested a safety audit for the development proposal. It is not a requirement of an assessment to include a safety audit of a site access as part of a planning application. Highway officers have fully considered the access strategy and do not have any outstanding concerns.

A further representation has been received in response to the comments from the Highway Authority, explaining that the objector remains dissatisfied with the y axis of the south visibility splay. The objector queries use by the Highway Authority of Manual for Streets 1 rather than the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). The representation advises that using DMRB would indicate the y axis is insufficient. The effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures to reduce the speed of vehicles is questioned. The safety of the access is questioned for vehicles exiting the proposed development site against northbound traffic. The objection queries the reliability of TRICS software to model vehicular movements to and from the site and queries the distribution of vehicular movements over time. The objection queries whether an assessment of the safety of the site access takes into account the position of the sun. The representation indicates that highway safety risks associated with the development are unacceptable since the proposed safety measures cannot guarantee 100% compliance with a 30mph speed limit.

In the light of these comments a further response has been received from the Highway Authority

Highway Authority (20.02.19) – The default guidance for assessing highway design on the local highway network is Manual for Streets (MfS) which includes both MfS1 and MfS2. This guidance has been used by the Highway Authority to aid in the assessment of planning application 2018/0259/FUL. DMRB is specifically designed to provide guidance for the strategic road network, being trunk roads and motorways. The A59 Liverpool Road, which is subject to a 30mph speed limit, is neither of these.

Paragraph 2.7.11 of MfS2 states:- "In the past highway authorities may have chosen to apply national road standards through rural villages on the basis that the streets are on a classified route. Unless the streets are part of the trunk road network, there is no requirement to apply DMRB standards, and a more place-sensitive approach should be used."

Recommended visibility splays are provided by national guidance in MfS (and DMRB for trunk roads and motorways). MfS2 does not advocate visibility splays found within DMRB but gives useful guidance as to when DMRB may be considered. The recommended visibility splays are based upon 85%ile wet weather speeds and indicated as Stopping Sight Distance (SSD). Consequently

national guidance recognises that 15% of vehicles will be travelling faster than the 85%ile speeds visibility splays are proposed from, yet still considers this acceptable. Whilst the objector indicates this is unsafe, MfS1, paragraph 7.5.6 states "of the sites studied in the preparation of this manual, no relationship was found between SSDs and casualties, regardless of whether the sites complied with Design Bulletin 32 or not."

MfS2 paragraph 10.4.2 states "It has often been assumed that a failure to provide visibility at priority junctions in accordance with the values recommended in MfS1 or DMRB (as appropriate) will result in an increased risk of injury collisions. Research carried out by TMS Consultancy has found no evidence of this."

TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System) is a database of trip rates for developments used in the United Kingdom for transport planning purposes, specifically to quantify the trip generation of new developments. It is the nationally recognised software for assessing trip generation. The County Council has no concern regarding queueing on the new estate road during the am peak or trip generation in general.

There is no record of highway related injury collisions within the vicinity of the site. It is not considered that the position of the sun would be likely to influence highway safety in the area.

In conclusion this additional objection does not alter the County Council's comment or views with regard the development site examined as part of application 2018/0259/FUL.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

Members will note that the developer has already agreed to install a Speed Indicator Display Sign at this location, which will be required via condition 24. Lancashire County Council as Highway Authority have fully considered the proposed highway impacts of the development and remain satisfied that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

REPORT No.6 – LAND TO THE REAR OF 29 THE GRAVEL, MERE BROW

Paragraph 11.10 of the agenda report should refer to paragraph 197 of the revised NPPF.

REPORT NO. 7 – BRIAR DENE NURSERY SCHOOL, 2 FULWOOD AVENUE

An additional representation has been received highlighting objections stated and addressed within the main agenda report. The submission also highlights that impeding the pedestrian access to the nursery would also prevent disabled access to and from the facility.

The Council has received a landscaping plan since compilation of the agenda. The plan conflicts with other plans submitted as part of the application as it introduces a gravel surface to the proposed hard standing, conflicting with the proposed tarmac surface referred to on other drawings.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

Due to the conflict between the proposed landscaping plans and other drawings, I do not propose to accept the plan for consideration at this time. Should the applicant wish the Council to consider a proposal for a graveled driveway, a further planning application would be required.

Notwithstanding this issue I do not consider the proposed landscaping would overcome the Council's objections to the proposed scheme.