

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Development Control

Tel 0300 123 6780
Email developeras@lancashire.gov.uk

Your ref 3/2019/0999
Our ref 11th March 2020
Date

Dear Sir / Madam

Application no: 3/2019/0999
Address: Henthorn Road Clitheroe
Proposal: Outline Application for up to 160 Residential Units

Unfortunately the applicant did not seek pre application advice for this application although it is noted that the applicants transport consultant has the benefit of previous involvement in this area, nevertheless the opportunity to question, amend or clarify the previously agreed parameters such as trip generation and distribution has not been possible.

The following executive summary provides the current position based on the submitted documentation. I would welcome dialogue with the applicant's transport consultant to allow matters to be suitably concluded

Executive summary

There are concerns that the analysis as presented has utilised previously used parameters such as trip generation and distribution which may not be representative of the situation currently experienced along Henthorn Road in light of the intervening development that is either completed or extant. The opportunity to review these assumptions in light of the evidence offered by the adjacent housing estates provided by Taylor Wimpey and Story Homes has, based on my review, been missed and casting doubt on the validity and veracity of the evidence presented within the submitted transport assessment.

Without a thorough review (by AHA) and suitable evidence based update of the analysis and parameter adopted within the transport assessment the view is that the information presented does not provide a representative view of the prevailing

Phil Durnell

Director of Highways and Transport
Lancashire County Council
Cuerden Mill • Cuerden Way • Bamber Bridge • Preston • PR5 6BS

conditions at all the junctions under review nor a clear understanding of the operation of the impact of this and previous developments in an area that has seen a number of residential developments coming forward. As a consequence of the lack of evidence based information on the impact of the development on the local network, the Highway Authority are unable to support this application as presented at this time.

Notwithstanding the highway authorities current position on the application as presented we are willing to have dialogue with the developer and his transport consultant to secure an evidence based conclusion to this ~~proposal~~ proposal.

1.0 Site Location

The site is located on land adjacent to Henthorn Road to the south west of Clitheroe Town centre.

2.0 Development Description

The application is for outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for a residential development of up to 160 units and comprises of 2 phases with Phase 2 (as referred to in the submitted documents) sited to the north of Henthorn Road and comprising of 35 residential units and Phase 3 sited to the south of Henthorn Road and comprising 125 residential units.

Phase 1 of the sequence is represented by a previous application (app 2018/0688) for 110 residential units which was granted approval on appeal.

2.0 Access

Vehicular access to Phase 2 (to the north of Henthorn Road) will be gained via the adjacent Phase 1 development whilst access to Phase 3 (to the south) will be via a new access point. Vehicle speed surveys have been carried out and the phase 3 access will have visibility splays appropriate to the prevailing 85thile speeds on Henthorn Road which in this instance will be 2.4m x 42m to the left on exit and 46m to the right. I am therefore satisfied that the appropriate local access visibility requirements can be achieved.

In addition to the vehicular access points, the applicant also proposes a 3.75m wide pedestrian / cycle link on to Henthorn Road to the south westerly of the corner of the site with the option of this being available as a secondary emergency access route and a separate pedestrian access point further east along the site frontage. Although the internal layout of the development will be subject to reserved matters, it is noted that within the submitted documents (Dwg 1677/01) that it is intended that the latter pedestrian access will connect to an internal footway at the expense of providing a footway directly adjacent to Henthorn Road. This layout is not supported by the highway authority.

Other than facilities at the vehicular access there are no separate pedestrian or cycle facilities to Phase 3

3.0 Layout

With the exception of the proposed vehicular access points and the drawing referred to in para 2.0 above (Dwg 1677/01) there is no information provided in respect of the internal layout of the proposed development. It is

recommended that should planning permission be granted and the development subsequently proceeds to reserved matters stage, the applicant engages in pre application discussions in respect of the internal road layout, parking, electric charging points, etc. to ensure that the final layout is of a suitable standard to be put forward for adoption and future maintenance by the highway authority.

3.0 Sustainability.

The recent appeal decision for the adjacent Phase 1 element of the proposed development (app2018/0688) has provided some insight into the perceived accessibility of the site to the wider area in respect of sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport. In conclusion the planning inspector was satisfied the walking distances to the local convenience store, school and town centre were acceptable in the context of the site. Taking this into consideration the existing infrastructure has been deemed acceptable. It is however noted that the provision of the local bus service is the subject of a level of developer contribution to ensure that it remains commercially viable. The appeal site decision resulted in a developer contribution of £200,000 payable over 5 years at £40,000 per annum. Notwithstanding the wider highway issues and the county councils current position in respect of this application, if all matters could be and are subsequently resolved, taking this sum on a pro rata basis, a contribution of £291,000 would be sought to maintain and improve the existing bus service payable in instalments over a 5 year period commencing with the occupation of the 100th dwelling. I must note that this trigger point has not been discussed nor agreed with the applicant since the opportunity for the highway authority to discuss this and other matters at a pre-application stage was not available.

Public Rights of Way

Both phase 2 and 3 have a public right of way running through them, these will need to be taken into consideration when the internal layouts are being planned. Ideally there should be opportunities for the residents to access these routes from within the site. Contributions for potential upgrading to a shared pedestrian / cycle facility may be sought

4.0 Collision Data Review

The collision data submitted with the transport assessment has been reviewed, taking into account the updated data available since the report was produced and there are no indications that there has been a deterioration of the safety record for the various junctions, indeed there has been a slight reduction in the overall number of accidents as the 5 year period of review has rolled forward from April 2018 to December 2018.

5.0 Traffic Growth.

I have noted in the submitted TA (para 8.5.2) that the applicant has discounted a 24 house development (17/0433) presenting an argument that the traffic generation is covered in the TEMPRO growth figures. Whilst this may not seem inappropriate there is always a level of uncertainty with regard to future traffic levels. Growth is based on a number of combined parameters projected forward. Its aim is to provide a best indication of future traffic levels for an area i.e. it is not specific to an individual road. The approach adopted in the submitted TA is not robust. Its reasonableness can only be considered when other influencing factors are considered. In the area where this development has an impact, the issues extend beyond that of simple traffic levels used in junction modelling.

6.0 Committed Development

The applicant has identified a number of committed developments in the area which have been constructed, partially constructed and have extant planning permission. Of these, the Taylor Wimpey development of 270 dwellings has been completed and the traffic generation would have been evident in the traffic counts undertaken in 2018. The Story Homes development of 140 dwellings was registered as 60% complete and occupied in the TA. In order to fully assess the impact of the remaining development on the road network revised traffic counts would have been expected as it is anticipated that in the intervening period the site would be substantially completed. This is currently an issue that would need to be addressed.

8.0 Traffic Generation

As noted above the Taylor Wimpey Development of 270 dwellings has now been completed and a comparison count has been undertaken to assess the veracity of the TRICS assumptions in terms of traffic generation from this site.

The peak hour surveys were undertaken on Wednesday 8th January during the am / pm peaks as defined in the TA for the application 3/2010/0719.

The results are presented below in comparison to the trip rates obtained from TRICS

Peak	TRICS rates			Observed Rates		
	Arr	Dep	2 way	Arr	Dep	2 way
Am	0.140	0.445	0.585	0.159	0.577	0.736
Pm	0.437	0.226	0.663	0.522	0.248	0.770

For a development of 270 dwellings these figures represent an increase in traffic flows from the predicted figure of 158 2 way trips in the am peak to an observed flow of 199 vehicles, similarly the pm peak flows rise from 179 to 208.

Whilst TRICS represents a way of predicting traffic flows associated with development it has its limitations and the surveys undertaken show that the TRICS rates previously

agreed have underestimated the traffic generation for this particular development. If this exercise was repeated for the 2018 application it would equate to an additional 17 vehicles on the network over and above the level predicted by TRICS and similarly 12 vehicles in the pm peak. In percentage terms, the traffic generation from the 2010 application has underestimated the traffic impact by 26% in the am peak and 16% in the pm peak.

On the basis of these figures it is considered necessary to revisit the previously adopted trip rates which have historically been used since the 2010 application and substitute them for the trip rates observed from the Taylor Wimpey development. This would give a clearer indication of the traffic impact on the highway network. I would expect this approach to be adopted by the developer with a comparison with my data. Any variance would need to be agreed with me before being used in any modelling processes. Note all models will need to be validated having regard to influences both up and down stream.

7.0 Distribution.

The distribution of the development traffic on the network has been carried through from the initial 2010 application. It is not considered prudent, in light of the level of development that has already occurred in this area, to revisit the distribution of traffic on the network. In previous applications there has been a concern that the operation of the Henthorn Road / Thorn Street junction was becoming problematic with RFC values exceeding theoretical capacity. With this in mind, there may be an element of traffic diverting away from routes through this junction and favouring routes such as Garnett Rd/ Lancaster Drive, Seedall Avenue and Faraday Avenue. The submitted Transport Assessment only suggests Garnett Rd and Lancaster Drive as the alternative route to access Edisford Road. The use of these side roads should be evaluated perhaps looking at all opportunities for alternative route choices and what changes will be required to assist, promote or discourage their use

8.0 Highway Improvements

Further information has been requested to assess the impact of the development on the network. Until that information is fully reviewed it is not possible to determine what mitigation measures may be required.

In respect of the site access and works considered necessary for Henthorn Road the following works will be required.

- Localised widening of Henthorn Road to a minimum of 5.5m from Blakewater Road to the western boundary of the development frontage onto Henthorn Road.
- Provision of a 2m footway along the northern side of Henthorn Road for the full extent of the Phase 2 site frontage onto Henthorn Road. To its junction with Blakewater Road Provision of a 2m footway along the southern side of Henthorn Road from the proposed vehicular access to its junction with Blakewater Road

9.0 Planning Contributions

Notwithstanding the wider highway issues and the county councils current position in respect of this application, if all matters could be and are subsequently resolved, a contribution of £291,000 would be sought to maintain and improve the existing bus service payable in instalments over a 5 year period commencing with the occupation of the 100th dwelling. I must note that this trigger point has not been discussed nor agreed with the applicant since the opportunity for the highway authority to discuss this and other matters at a pre-application stage was not available.

For development of this scale Lancashire County Council (LCC) highways can provide a facility to the developer to enable the highway authority to provide a range of Travel Plan services as outlined below. An application of the scale proposed would incur a cost of £6,000. Please note: This is an LCC service offer to the developer and not a requirement. Appraise initial Travel Plan(s) submitted to the Planning Authority and provide constructive feedback. Oversee the progression from the Interim Travel Plan to the Full Travel Plan/s in line with agreed timescales. Monitor and support the development, implementation and review of the Full Travel Plan. This will include reviewing:

- o Annual surveys
- o Progression of initiatives / actions plan
- o Targets"

Conclusion

As highlighted previously it is unfortunate that the opportunity to have a pre-application discussion on this proposal was not pursued. This has resulted in the position that the highway authority could not support the application on the basis of the information provided within the submitted application documents. Nevertheless there is a willingness on the part of the highway authority to meet with the applicant and their traffic consultant for discussions.

Yours faithfully

Dave Bloomer
Highways & Transport
Lancashire County Council