

Graeme Thorpe

From: Colin Sharpe
Sent: 22 July 2011 11:43
To: Graeme Thorpe
Subject: FW: Planning Application No: 3/2011/0444P - Unit 6 Lincoln Way

FOR THE
ATTENTION OF

- 2 AUG 2011

From: Nugent, Martin [mailto:Martin.Nugent@lancashire.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 July 2011 11:35
To: Colin Sharpe
Subject: RE: Planning Application No: 3/2011/0444P - Unit 6 Lincoln Way

Colin,

I would have no objections to the applications 404 and 444, as set out on the most recent plan from 20 July 2011, subject to the removal of the "red route".

The only Conditions I would require would be for the vehicle manoeuvring areas to be kept clear at all times, this is to include the storage of materials, parked vehicles and any other items that could restrict the free movement of vehicles to and within the site.

Also, that there is direct access to Unit 5b and 6 during the operating hours of these sites. This is to insure that vehicles are not delayed from turning off from Lincoln Way to the site, causing a potential hazard to other road users. As there is an existing security barrier in place at Unit 6, a means of managing a safe entry system needs to be identified and retained as an operating Condition.

Martin

From: Colin Sharpe [mailto:Colin.Sharpe@ribblevalley.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 July 2011 11:17
To: Nugent, Martin
Cc: Graeme Thorpe
Subject: RE: Planning Application No: 3/2011/0444P - Unit 6 Lincoln Way

Martin,

I am almost prepared to accept this as your formal reply. If I go back to Verity and get the red route deleted from the plans, can you confirm that you would have no objections to either of the applications to be approved independantly of each other. If so, please state, for both any required conditions

Colin

From: Nugent, Martin [mailto:Martin.Nugent@lancashire.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 July 2011 10:02
To: Colin Sharpe
Subject: RE: Planning Application No: 3/2011/0444P - Unit 6 Lincoln Way

Morning Colin,

The revised plans (20/7) show direct access to Unit 5b from Lincoln Way. I am satisfied that the dimensions and swept paths shown on Sarah Verity's plans are correct and that the proposed vehicle movements can be achieved. What I am not clear about, and what

02/08/2011

you raise in your email, is the relationship between the adjacent units and why this "red" link is still included on the plans?

I have no objection to the sites are accessed independently. There is no indication that the level of use and the required manoeuvring cannot be achieved safely within the limits of the separate sites.

However, I remain concerned that the plans persist with the direct vehicular link between Units 6 and 5b. This adds an unnecessary opportunity for potentially confusing manoeuvres between the three sites, to the detriment of highway safety. As Unit 5b can also be accessed directly from Lincoln Way, there does not appear to be any logistical or operational benefit in retaining the link across the front of Unit 5a.

The staff parking is adequate and does not interfere with other vehicle manoeuvres. These turning areas will have to be kept clear of all storage of materials and vehicles for the sole purpose of vehicle accessibility, by means of an appropriate Condition.

I'd be grateful for your comments before replying formally

Martin