

Director of Development Services
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe BB7 2RA

Martin Nugent
01254 828060
D3/11/1064

Drafted 31 May 2012

Dear Sir

**Outline Planning Application, Ribble Valley District
3/11/1064 Primrose Mill (second phase) and Woone Lane, Clitheroe**

I refer to the amended plans for the junction of Whalley Road and Primrose Road, Clitheroe submitted on 14 May 2012 as part of the detailed drawings in support of the above outline application. Confirmation of the dimensions for the proposed carriageway markings were provided on 30 May 2012.

In my initial response of 2 April 2012, I confirmed that I had no objections in principle to this outline proposal on highway grounds and specified that the highway improvement shown on Drawing N01951/06 indicated that appropriate provisions were being made to accommodate the additional traffic generated as a consequence of the application. This included the provision of a ghost island, right-turn lane and local widening on Whalley Road and Primrose Road. All land required for this improvement is indicated as being in the control of the applicant and can, therefore, be achieved under a subsequent Section 278 Agreement.

One issue raised in my April response concerned the impact of Committed Developments and the need to ensure that any relevant traffic generation details were included in the Transport Assessment for this application. As a result Tim Russell of Savell Bird and Axon, acting on behalf of Beck Developments, provided a Technical Note on 26 April 2012 that included the appropriate traffic inputs. The capacity and volume outcomes remain consistent with the previously agreed highway improvements detailed in Drawing N01951/06.

In email correspondence of 13 February 2012 with John Seager of Beck Developments, I confirmed that limits of the adopted highway along the easterly boundary of Whalley Road were consistent with the red edge shown on the site plans. A copy of this correspondence is attached.

However, on 14 May 2012, Mr Russell provided details of PICADY analysis in support of two proposed junction design that sought to accommodate the necessary highway improvements within a layout that did not impinge directly on the boundary limits of the access road to the south of "Millersdene".

The layout shown in Dwg N01951/07 does not provide any right turn provision from Whalley Road and will result in additional delay for both through traffic and turning traffic. While the alternative layout, Dwg N01951/08 includes a right turn lane, this is substandard and does not include a corresponding right turn access to the south of "Millersdene".

Further to this, a revised highway layout was submitted by the applicant on 17 May 2012. The most significant impact of this revision is that there would be no local widening of the highway and no setting back of the footway along the east side of Whalley Road.

I have no objection to such a revision in principle, but the subsequent highway design must be consistent with basic criteria for the operation of the junction that allows it to function safely and efficiently for all road users. The layout shown in Drawing BD/SL/100 Rev A does not comply with basic design principles, as set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 6 (most recently updated November 2011). The preferred width for the right turn lane would be 3.0m, but the minimum acceptable width for this location would be 2.5m.

I would request that a further drawing is provided that establishes a junction layout that corresponds to the essential highway design criteria for a right-turn ghost-island.

It should be noted that contributions and Conditions outlined in previous responses concerning this application still apply.

Yours sincerely,

Martin Nugent

Senior Engineer (Traffic & Development)
Environmental Services, East
Lancashire County Council
01254 828060
martin.nugent@lancashire.gov.uk