

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

23 JAN 2013

SECTION OF

Martin Nugent
01254 828060
D3/12/0913

Drafted 22 January 2013

Dear Sir

**Outline Planning Application, Ribble Valley District
D3-12-0913 Waddow View, land off Waddington Road, Clitheroe**

I refer to your letter of October 2012 concerning the above application for a development of 345 residential dwellings and a 50 place nursery. The following comments relate to submissions made on behalf of the Huntroyde Estate; the Transport Assessment prepared by DTPC in October 2012 and a Design and Access Statement prepared by a client team led by MCK Associates Ltd.

Lancashire County Council is responsible for providing and maintaining a safe and reliable highway network. With this in mind the present and proposed traffic systems have been considered in and around the area of the proposed development.

I have no objection in principle to this application on highway safety grounds. I have the following comments regarding the arrangements for Access being considered at this time and as all other matters are reserved at this time, I will comment more fully on these implications and their impacts at the appropriate juncture.

A. Development

The Transport Assessment outlines the proposal for a residential development of 345 residential dwellings and a crèche on a 9.2 hectare site to the west of Clitheroe town centre on the south side of Waddington Road, Clitheroe.

B. Access Strategy

It is proposed that there will be two direct points of vehicular access to the site; from a new junction on Waddington Road and from a route leading off Kirkmoor Road.

The Transport Assessment does not identify any specific capacity issues in relation to the traffic generated on site and linking to the existing highway network from the proposed points of access. However, this is in respect of the applicant's view on the relative severity of the residual impacts of the development.

The Waddington Road junction will serve 220 residential dwellings and the 50 place nursery, while Castle View will accommodate access to 125 dwellings. This is identified on the TA as Phase 2, with a smaller site at Milton Avenue identified as Phase 1.

The Milton Avenue access is for a self-contained residential development and there will be no vehicular linkage to the remainder of the site.

C. Traffic Flows

The counts undertaken on behalf of the applicant carried out on Thursday 13th September and Tuesday 2nd October 2012. In addition, traffic data drawn from a recent application, 3/2010/0719 was also utilised.

I am satisfied that the survey information produced is representative day and provides an acceptable basis on which to develop future growth patterns.

D. Traffic Growth

With reference to the relevant Appendices, I would recommend the use of a robust growth scenario and note that this will impact on subsequent calculations relating to traffic generation and vehicle distribution to and from the site.

Any growth factors agreed will need to reflect the Core Strategy and the latest planning proposals with regard to housing allocations etc. I would be grateful if the Applicant's consultant would clarify the derivation of their growth rates and any assumptions made. This is necessary to ensure that the full impact of a planning proposal is being addressed.

It may be useful if further explanation is provided on the derivation of the original figures.

E. Trip Generation

The TA has utilised accepted trip rates for applications in Clitheroe that have been provided in evidence to recent appeals. These figures are produced as Table 1 below;

Table 1. Trip Rates

Peak	Arr	Dep	Total
AM	0.14 (0.173)	0.445 (0.331)	0.585 (0.504)
PM	0.437 (0.363)	0.228 (0.261)	0.663 (0.620)

From the rates provided above, an estimate of the peak hour movements to and from the points of vehicular access can be produced. This is shown below as Table2.

Table 2. Estimated Trip Numbers

Dev	Access	AM				PM			
		Arr		Dep		Arr		Dep	
125 Res	Castle View	18		56		55		28	
220 Res	Waddington Road	31	45	98	110	96	107	50	62
50 Nursery	Waddington Road	14		12		11		12	

This information can be examined further to show the range of peak hour impacts on specific movements to and from the proposed development site. Table 3 shows the increase in peak hour flows in relation to the Castle View and Waddington Road points of access.

Table 3. Increase in peak hour flows.

Access	AM	AM	PM	PM	AM	AM	PM	PM
	Left out	Right out	Left out	Right out	Right in	Left in	Right in	Left in

Waddow View	8	101	9	54	40	5	96	12
Castle View	11	45	8	21	7	11	20	34

For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the overall trip generation presented in the TA, on the immediate local network, for all elements of the proposed development is broadly acceptable, but may require revision with specific reference to the Traffic Growth element.

G. Trip Distribution

I will look at the distribution figures for each of the two accesses separately.

Waddington Road – The details provided in Figures 27 and 28 indicates the main focus of activity deriving from Clitheroe town centre and the well established routes to principal routes such as the A671 and A59. The impact of this increase in activity on nearby junction capacity and operation is examined elsewhere.

Castle View – The distribution details provided in Figures 25 and 26 shows that the majority of traffic utilising this access will approach from Bawdlands, with the most significant route being via Eshton Terrace. Once again, the impact of this increase in activity on nearby junction capacity and operation is examined elsewhere, with particular notice being given to the sensitivity at the junction of Woone Lane and Eshton Terrace.

H. Committed and Other Proposed Developments

There are no relevant committed developments in Clitheroe that should be considered in relation to the reserved matters of access to this site from the Waddington Road access. However, the route choices from the Castle View access will interact with traffic generated from developments on Henthorn Road, 3/10/0719, and Woone Lane and Primrose Road, 3/11/1064 and 3/08/0526.

I. Impact on Junctions and Junction Modelling

I am content with the approach to the preparation and development of the baseline surveys and that they are accurate and representative.

There has been a clear definition of the split in the vehicular movements between Waddington Road and Castle View and this is reflected in the subsequent modelling data.

While I have highlighted some concerns regarding the Traffic Growth figures, the impact of any potential discrepancies would appear to be marginal and while they should not be discounted I would suggest that the modelling data have a are not sufficient to recommend a review of the anticipated operation of these junctions.

i. Waddington Road

The PICADY assessments provided for the site access from B6478 Waddington Road confirms that there are no capacity issues with the proposed junction layouts, the interaction of the suggested site traffic and the existing traffic flows. There was some discrepancy between the site plan and Masterplan regarding the effect of local highway widening and the ability of the applicant to secure the necessary improvements. However, it was confirmed in subsequent discussions that all aspects of the junction layout falls within land under the direct control of the applicant.

As the base models appear to operate within capacity I have not carried out any detailed checks on the model input. However, this does not take away the ultimate responsibility of the Transport Consultant to ensure all modelling assumptions and inputs are correct. If any anomalies are identified at a later stage the models should be reviewed and the junction re-assessed as appropriate.

ii. Waddington Road and Railway View Road

The impact of the development on the volume of traffic travelling along Waddington Road has been recognised with the suggested introduction of various junction treatments and a change in junction design at Railway View Road.

Taking first the proposed mini-roundabout at Railway View Road, the decision to pursue this design may reflect changes in the balance of movements through the junction. There is sufficient width within the available highway to accommodate this design and there could be benefits in the improved circulation of vehicles and the potential capacity of the junction.

However, there remain physical limitations to such a design, most notably the positioning of the central dome and the restricted width of the approach from Waddington Road on account of the rail bridge structure.

That said, subject to further discussions on the detailed design of the junction and its immediate approaches, I have no objection on principle to the suggested junction arrangements.

The benefits of the proposed junction treatments at a number of minor roads off Waddington Road are less clear cut. As a 20mph Speed Limit now operates along this length of Waddington Road I would wish to prioritise measures that support improved compliance with this limit.

iii. Castle View and Kirkmoor Road

There are minimal potential benefits from the proposed junction treatments at minor roads off Castle View and Kirkmoor Road. There is a 20mph Speed Limit in operation on these roads and measures should be pursued that support improved compliance with this limit. There is the opportunity to review these proposals to provide improved engineering solutions rather than plateau or vertical alignment features.

There is a high demand for on street parking from residents of Castle View, Kirkmoor Road and the adjacent streets. By virtue of the general house-type and available curtilage there are very limited opportunities available for off street parking. As there are few waiting restrictions in place, there is also parking from commuters using the bus and rail interchange and employees from the town centre.

In order to better manage on street parking and to assist with the safe movement of traffic along these streets and into the proposed development, a system of permit parking that identified benefits for residents should be pursued. This could involve the introduction of extensive lengths of limited waiting but with exemptions for residents. The means of establishing such a scheme would involve extensive consultation with residents, the local Chamber of Trade, Clitheroe Town Council, Ribbles Valley Borough Council and Lancashire County Council. Following the recent introduction of a comparable permit parking scheme elsewhere within Clitheroe, it should be noted that there would be a large number of issues to be resolved, including those relating to the long-term funding of the scheme and the means of assigning permits.

However, as a starting point it should be agreed that the costs associated with the processing of any necessary TRO and the introduction of the necessary measures to establish the Order on site will be met by the Applicant. I would also suggest pursuing the feasibility of this measure before considering separately the introduction of junction protection measures at side roads.

On this basis, should the TRO not progress, for whatever reason, this would not of itself be sufficient to result in a specific highway safety concern and would not be viewed as a justification for raising an objection to the proposal on highway safety grounds.

The proposed priority working on the southerly approach to the site from between Swan Meadow and Back Commons is identified as providing satisfactory forward visibility to allow for the safe manoeuvring of vehicles. However, I would suggest that the specifications of this aspect of the layout will be scrutinised during subsequent detailed design discussions with LCC.

iv. Castle View and Bawdlands

The PICADY results for the existing junction do not highlight a queuing problem at this time or looking towards 2017, with the development. Furthermore, the Police records confirm that there have been no collisions involving personal injury at this location during the last three years.

Therefore, the intention to introduce signal control is based on addressing potential highway safety issues with conflicting movements at the junction and across the bridge.

With the signals, the OSCADY modelling anticipates that there will be in excess of 11 vehicles queuing on Parson Lane during the PM peak hour. At this level, the stationary traffic begins to impact on free flow movements due to the existing on street parking demands of residents at Wesleyan Row and movements to and from the service access to Booths supermarket.

This is a highly sensitive location as it is the main route out of Clitheroe for a number of villages to the west of the District and for a number of convenient highway links to the principal road network. I appreciate that the phasing and detailed software programmes may allow for effective revisions of the OSCADY projections and further discussions on this matter would be welcomed.

In addition to addressing issues relating to the impact of increased vehicular traffic, the footway along the north-west side of Parson Lane, and in particular across the bridge deck, would benefit from being improved. At present the footway width is significantly reduced by a series of bollards across the bridge and other items of street furniture as it heads north east towards Station Road.

I would suggest that suitable engineering measures could be introduced that would allow the full width of the footway to be available for pedestrians. I recognise that there is little prospect of utilising to any significant degree the kerbed area to the south east side of the road.

Furthermore, with the potential for queuing traffic to reach back to Wesleyan Row, there could be a temptation for motorists to run along the footway opposite in order to facilitate two-way movements as they pass parked vehicles. It would be unacceptable to have vehicles driving along the footway that fronts Parsonage Cottages and provides access to the service area to the rear of, what was previously the Qwik Save store.

Therefore, footway treatments should be considered that would secure the use of the footway for pedestrians, between Castle View and Station Road.

v. Shawbridge Street and Waterloo Road

The TA makes reference on several occasions to the impact of this development on the operation of the junction at Shawbridge Street with Waterloo Road and also brings in a number of assumptions relating to another active application on land at Higher Standen Farm, 3/12/0942.

However, the assumptions made in relation to the potential combined impacts of the application at Higher Standen Farm and those from Waddow View are premature and will not be considered at this time, in respect of this application.

From the information provided for this application, the anticipated impact of traffic generated from this site on the capacity and queuing at the mini-roundabout junction of Waterloo Road with Shawbridge Street is not significant.

J. Pedestrians and Cyclists Access

The site is located conveniently for the town centre and aspects of the accessibility score reflect this close proximity. However, I have detailed below and attached on an annotated plan, additional routes for cyclists within the development site that would enhance its accessibility:

1. Make the bus only road accessible to cyclists.
2. Provide 3metre wide shared use paths to link the site at two locations.
3. Modify the road closure on Corbridge Court, leading from Chester Avenue, to provide a 3metre wide cycle path. I have estimated the cost of this measure to be £10,000.
4. Close the unadopted underpass to through traffic at the north of the Interchange. I have estimated that this measure would cost in the region of £10,000.
5. Consider environmental improvements to Back King Street as this will form an increasingly significant pedestrian route to the town centre. This could include the provision of additional street lighting. The cost of these measures may well be dependent on the available services.
6. The provision of a secure cycle shelter at Whalley railway station should be considered. It would be necessary to determine if a suitable location could be achieved within the existing station grounds. This amenity would have an estimated cost of £20,000.

Public Rights of Way footpath No.20 runs within the site and is to be retained in full, supported by the internal layout of footways and carriageway.

In view of the increased pedestrian activity associated with the site, consideration should be given to the introduction of a pedestrian priority crossing at some point on Waddington Road. In these circumstances, I would suggest that a zebra crossing would be most appropriate form of crossing to consider.

As a guide, the introduction of a zebra crossing would cost in the region of £15,000 to £20,000, depending on the necessity for any servicing alteration and other associated highway works.

K. Public Transport

The Clitheroe bus and rail interchange is conveniently located for this development and falls within a 400m radius from the centre of the site. As good access to public transport services

will be an important factor in helping to reduce dependence on the private car for users of this development, this is to be welcomed and addresses a key requirement of the IHT "Guidelines for Public Transport in Developments" – with particular reference to pp 149/150 Annex B: "Public & Sustainable Transport Assessment".

The Applicant has identified two possible routes for bus services that would provide significant penetration into the development, linking both aspects of the site from Waddington Road through to Kirkmoor Road.

The route WV1 would be preferable, as WV2 would take the scheduled service via Milton Avenue, a road which supports on street residential parking to properties with no off street provisions.

The most effective and sustainable means of securing a viable service, either through the rerouting of an existing service or through the establishment of a new route, can be determined at a later date. It is relevant to note that where services are subsidised wholly or in part by Lancashire County Council, the continuing funding of these services cannot be guaranteed and alternative sources of funding may have to be pursued.

L. Road Safety

I would concur with the description given in the Site Description Summary (3.10), identifying that there have been a small number of dispersed collisions in the vicinity of the site over the last three years, but that they have not given rise to the promotion of any area-wide highway safety measures.

M. Parking Standards

The parking standards contained within The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) – North West of England Plan (2008) remain the County wide standard for parking provision. Until such time as a revised policy is available, the RSS must still remain a material consideration in assessing planning applications.

With consideration for the above, the Local Highway Authority will be guided by the Local Planning Authority on parking standards. The LPA/LHA will set the level of parking as appropriate, based on the local need and on a site specific basis and in doing so have regard for the need to promote sustainable development with sustainable transport outcomes.

The Planning Layout provides a degree of detail regarding the potential layout of the site that includes on street parking elements and reference to garaging facilities. I have every reason to anticipate that subsequent planning layouts will provide specific and detailed provisions for individual properties and communal sites.

N. Travel Plan

In my original feedback at Pre-Application stage, I was stated that as the proposed development would be large enough to exceed our threshold, an Interim Travel Plan would need to be submitted alongside the application for outline planning permission. I also requested that the development of a Full Travel Plan be made a condition of full planning approval.

I have assessed the Framework Travel Plan for application 3/2012/0913 against the minimum criteria required (see italicised comments). An Interim Travel Plan needs to include the following:

i. A time-frame for the development of the Full Travel Plan. (Including dates for the appointment of a coordinator, resident's survey and submission of the full travel plan to the planning authority)

The time-frame given in this Framework Travel Plan is insufficiently clear.

Although this development is mainly residential, there is now a small business element with the inclusion of the nursery. The nursery is below the travel plan threshold, but should be included in the residential travel plan, using the same co-ordinator; otherwise an opportunity will have been missed.

ii. Key stages in the time-frame are –

Travel Plan Co-ordinator appointed and LCC's Travel Plan Advisers informed of contact details – at least 1 month prior to 1st occupation of business and/or residential. This is to allow time for preparation of info packs.

a. *Welcome Packs prepared – prior to occupation – chiefly for residents but info should be shared with business, who can then make the info available to staff and customers, from occupation also.*

b. *1st Travel Survey undertaken;*

1 - Business – should be within 3 months of occupation, but may be best to wait until 1st residential survey is undertaken, so that in future they are both re-surveyed annually at the same time. Will need to ask rather different (origin rather than destination) questions.

2 – Residential - once the development reaches 100 houses occupied.

3 – Full Travel Plan produced - including updated SMART targets based on survey data and a detailed action plan of measures to be introduced – to be submitted to the Planning Authority within 3 months of the residential travel survey

4 – Annual monitoring and review of travel plan. Submit to Planning and Highway Authorities.

c. *Details of cycling, pedestrian and public transport links to and within the site – Information is provided.*

d. Details of the provision of cycle parking for those properties/units where suitable space is not available.

The Framework Travel Plan states that 'consideration will be given when forward planning to ... increase the provision of safe, secure parking for each unit'. I would like to see more details of this and a statement of definite intent.

e. Outline Objectives.

Information is provided.

f. Outline Targets.

Some information is provided. SMART targets will be required for the Full Travel Plan.

g. List of proposed measures to be introduced.

Some information is provided. The Full Travel Plan should contain a detailed action plan of measures to be introduced, including who, what and when. There will need to be a program of measures rolled out beyond providing information packs, and will need to address the needs of both residents and the business, which may vary slightly. For instance, the Nursery could consider installing a pram/cycle store to help facilitate parents who wish to drop off their children on foot/by cycle.

h. Details of arrangements for monitoring and review of the Travel Plan for a period of at least 5 years.

Information is provided.

As I do not feel there is sufficient commitment to carry out the first survey at an appropriate point and to use the results of this to produce and submit a more detailed Full Travel Plan, I believe this document **does not meet the required standard** for an Interim/Framework Travel Plan. Once this issue is addressed I will be happy to pass the Framework Travel Plan.

Looking ahead, I re-iterate that the development of a Full Travel Plan should be made a condition of full planning approval.

A contribution of £24,000 is requested to enable Lancashire County Council Travel Planning team to provide a range of services as described in 2.1.5.16 of the Planning Obligations in Lancashire paper dated September 2008.

O. Internal Site Layout

Referring to the Illustrative Masterplan, based on the limited level of detail provided to date I am satisfied that the appropriate measures to secure safe, continuous and accessible pedestrian and vehicular links can be achieved.

I would note that the internal road layout should be developed with consideration for LCC's Creating Civilised Streets policy and design guidance. I would also note the need to consider the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in line with latest government advice.

In accordance with the design principals set out in Manual for Streets 2, the internal site layout shall be designed to comply with a 20mph Speed Limit and should incorporate appropriate engineering features to secure a more sympathetic and robust means of managing vehicle speeds and enhancing highway safety.

However, in line with the present Lancashire County Council policies to improve highway safety in residential areas, it would be appropriate to introduce a 20mph Speed Limit within the site. The provision of the necessary Traffic Regulation Order would form part of an agreed programme of measures, should the application receive formal consent from your Planning and Development Committee.

P. Servicing, Delivery, Waste Collection, Emergency Access and Routing

The internal layout shown on the Planning Layout (presentation) provides areas for manoeuvring that would appear to present safe and convenient manoeuvring for servicing, delivery and waste collections.

It would be expected that a Service, Delivery, Waste Collection and Routing Strategy would be developed and agreed with Lancashire County Council and RVBC to ensure that all deliveries, servicing and waste collection can be undertaken safely without creating conflict with other vehicles, pedestrians or cyclists.

Q. Construction Period

The impact from construction traffic for any development in this location will be significant. Careful consideration would need to be given to the routing of construction traffic and phasing of the development should planning permission be granted.

I have included an appropriate Condition (5), requiring the submission of a Construction Method Statement.

R. Planning Obligations

Should the LPA be minded to approve this development, the County Council would seek planning obligation contributions from this development to fund measures that support sustainable transport. It is acknowledged that a number of measures provided under proposed s278 highway works support sustainable development. However, it is considered that further sustainable measures will be necessary to promote and support sustainable development, particularly in respect of public transport. Until agreement has been reached on the Transport Assessment the LHA is unable to provide full details on the request for planning obligations relating to highways and transport. The planning obligations are expected to cover:

- contribution for sustainable transport, walking, cycling and public transport, and
- request for contribution for advice and assistance with the Travel Plan.

As there was no accessibility score provided, there are no details available for the relevant individual values were not supplied. Therefore an approximated Accessibility score of 20 has been used for this initial assessment. As the breakdown of house types and the numbers of dwellings identified as affordable can be confirmed, it will be necessary to revise this figure.

Therefore, a Highways contribution of £552,000 will be sought, based on 345 dwellings of unknown room size, with 230 for open sale @ £1,800 (£414,000) and 115 affordable @ £1,200 (£138,000).

S. Planning Conditions

I have identified a number of Highway Conditions that I would welcome being applied should your Council be minded to approve the application. I also reserve the right to place additional conditions should these become relevant before a decision is reached.

T. Proposed Junction Treatments

i. Waddington Road, at the new entrance to the Waddow View development;

The design of this access will be subject to a S278 agreement and will require the approval of Lancashire County Council as the relevant Highway Authority. While an approach consistent with Manual for Streets is appropriate at this location it is essential to ensure safe operation for all users (motorised and non-motorised).

ii. Waddington Road and Railway View Road;

The design of the access junctions will be subject to a S278 agreement and will require the approval of Lancashire County Council as the relevant Highway Authority.

The change from a priority junction to a mini-roundabout is acceptable in principle based on the ARCADY modelling provided. However, a detailed scheme design will be required.

iii. Castle View and Bawdlands;

The TA provided details of traffic signal controls at this junction. While I am aware of the physical limitations at this junction and the sensitivity of some of the turning movements, I am not satisfied that the necessity for signal controls at this junction have been made in terms of highway safety, the efficient operation of the junction or the provision of additional capacity.

iv. Waterloo Road and Shawbridge Street;

I do not consider that this development places an undue burden of additional vehicular or pedestrian movements on the safe and efficient operation of the Shawbridge Street junction. I include in this assessment the operation of the existing signal controlled pedestrian crossing, immediately to the south of the junction.

v. Side road junction treatments on Waddington Road;

I am not requesting the introduction of junction treatments to side roads onto Waddington Road as a requirement of this application. The TA does not provide the detailed analysis of turning movements or reference to a highway safety record that would support the introduction of these supplementary measures.

The implementation of measures to support and improve compliance with the existing and proposed extension to the 20mph Speed Limit will be welcome.

U. Traffic Regulation Orders

1. As detailed above, a 20mph Speed Limit will operate within the site. While the design of the internal layout should include engineering features to manage vehicle speeds and enhance highway safety, it would be appropriate to introduce a 20mph Speed Limit within the site.

2. An extension of the existing 20mph Speed Limit on Waddington Road, from its present transition point to the north of Milton Avenue to a point north of the entrance to Clitheroe Cemetery.

3. A length of prohibition of waiting to both sides of Kirkmoor Road to the north west of Swan Meadow. This is to support the safe and efficient operation of a proposed section of priority working.

4. In order to better manage on street parking and to assist with the safe movement of traffic along Kirkmoor Road and Castle View and into the proposed development, a system of permit parking that identified benefits for residents should be pursued.

It should be acknowledged that there would be a large number of issues to be resolved, including those relating to the long-term funding of the scheme and the means of assigning permits.

5. The provision of additional TROs to be discussed in more detailed as the subsequent reserved matters are considered. The provision of the necessary Traffic Regulation Order would form part of an agreed programme of measures, should the application receive formal consent from your Planning and Development Committee.

V. Proposed Off-Site Highway Works.

The provision of the following off site highway works can be achieved without reference to an Order making process and their introduction will be agreed and scheduled by means of the Section 278 Agreement.

1. In view of the increased pedestrian activity associated with the site, consideration should be given to the introduction of a pedestrian priority crossing at some point on Waddington Road.

2. The proposed priority and right turn junction design from Waddington Road into the site.

3. The provision of improved footway provisions linking the site to Clitheroe town centre. This is to maximise pedestrian access between the proposed development site, the bus and rail interchange and the town centre.

4. The proposed mini-roundabout junction design at Railway View Road and Waddington Road.

5. The provision of traffic signal controls at the junction of Castle View and Bawdlands.

W. Items for inclusion in a S106 Agreement

1. Travel Plan

A contribution of £24,000 would be requested to enable Lancashire County Council Travel Planning team to provide a range of services as described in 2.1.5.16 of the Planning Obligations in Lancashire paper dated September 2008.

2. Bus Service Provision

The detailed Public Transport provisions will be resolved as part of a formal Section 106 Agreement, with the preferred route, WV1 or WV2 to be determined.

It should be noted that where services are subsidised wholly or in part by Lancashire County Council, the continuing funding of these services cannot be guaranteed and alternative sources of funding may have to be pursued.

3. Section J above identifies a number of cycling and pedestrian improvements that could be funded through a S106 Agreement. Costs of £40,000 have been identified but there are additional items that would require a more detailed assessment before a realistic estimate could be provided.

X. Highway Conditions

There are a number of Standard Conditions that will apply to this application:-

1. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme for the construction of the site access and the off-site works of highway improvement has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. This is in order to satisfy the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority that the final details of the highway scheme/works are acceptable before work commences on site.

2. The new estate roads between the site and Kirkmoor Road and Waddington Road shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level before any development takes place within the site. This is to ensure that satisfactory access is provided to the site before the development hereby permitted becomes operative.

3. The grant of planning permission will require the applicant to enter into an appropriate Legal Agreement, with the County Council as Highway Authority. The Highway Authority hereby reserved the right to provide the highway works within the highway associated with this proposal. Provision of the highway works includes design, procurement of the work by contract and supervision of the works. The applicant should be advised to contact Andy Ashcroft, Public Realm Manager (Ribble Valley and Lancaster), Lancashire County Council at customerserviceeast@lancashire.gov.uk

4. The grant of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a right of way and any proposed stopping-up or diversion of a right of way should be the subject of an Order under the appropriate Act.

5. In the interests of residential amenity and to enhance safe working practices on or near the highway, no development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

The Statement shall provide for:

- i. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors,
- ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials,
- iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development,
- iv. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate,
- v. wheel washing facilities,

- vi. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction, and
- vii. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.

Y. Conclusion

The proposed development will result in a significant increase in vehicle flows to and from the existing transport network from the proposed points of access to the site, on Waddington Road and Castle View, at peak hours and throughout the day. There will be increased vehicle turning movements and impacts on pedestrian movements at junctions in the vicinity of the development and at a number of other junctions in Clitheroe town centre.

In the summary for the TA, Section 9, it is stated that the data indicates that the scheme "does not give rise to any issues that can be deemed severe" and that no highway objections should be forthcoming on that basis.

The detail provided in the Transport Assessment is comprehensive and has been completed with a systematic approach consistent with the relevant local and national policies. While there are points where I have taken issue with specific items and assumptions, I am satisfied that the report provides a reasoned assessment of the likely highway impacts of the development on the operation of the local highway network.

However, I consider further information is required in respect of the TA to address specific issues highlighted above as the HA must be satisfied that the likely level of impact has been assessed before providing support for the development and where necessary, the appropriate mitigation provided.

In summary the key areas of concern I have highlighted relate to traffic growth, the impact of the anticipated trip distribution, junction modelling and elements of the site access design.

I would recommend that further discussions between LCC, your council and the developer are held in order to consider the additional information that is required. Lancashire County Council is more than willing to work with the developer's consultant to identify options that could address these concerns.

Martin Nugent

Public Realm, Ribble Valley
LCC Environmental Services East
01254 828060