Bullock, Steph

Subject: FW: Cottam temporary access points
Attachments: 80061057-02-BET-MISCE-99-DR-W-00050 - Proposed Site Layout.pdf; 80061057-02-BET-MISCE-99-DR-W-00051 - Swept Path Analysis.pdf; 80061057-02-BET-MISCE-99-DR-W-00052 - Existing and Proposed Levels.pdf; 80061057-02-BET-MISCE-99-DR-W-00053 - Temporary Access Works.pdf; 80061057-02-BET-MISCE-99-DR-W-00054 - Construction Details.pdf

From: Eyres, Katie <Katie.Eyres@uuplc.co.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 10:53 AM
To: Ashworth, Helen <Helen.Ashworth@lancashire.gov.uk>; Haine, Jonathan <Jonathan.Haine@lancashire.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Cottam temporary access points

Good morning Helen and Jonathan,

Following receipt of the LCC Highways comments on the applications, we held a meeting with David Allen last week to clarify the queries raised.

Please see the below table which identifies our response to the points made and agreements as made with David.

The only revisions required to the drawings submitted are in relation to application LCC/2024/0003, to show provision of a drop crossing in place of radius kerbs at the Lea Road access. I would appreciate it if the attached drawings could be added to the application and provided to LCC Highways.

I trust that all matters on the planning applications have now been addressed to your satisfaction.

	Highways Comments	**Contractors Response**
Riversway App ref: LCC/2024/0001	The submitted proposed site layout and temporary access details shows a drop crossing, but the swept path clearly shows the access to be radius kerbs. The submissions should be consistent. Notwithstanding this, for this access on a unidirectional road the access should be designed to avoid right turns out the site. therefore the access should be designed for left in /left out only, and to achieve this radius kerbed junction	The swept path indicates the notional edge of the access as it passes over the footpath, it does not signify a kerb. The plans are therefore consistent. In order to facilitate an island, the access would need to be significantly wider. The same control can be more easily created using fencing and signage within the site to ensure left turns only upon exit. It is also proposed to use a Gateman to control the traffic during the most intensive period of construction activity

	would be appropriate with a splitter island to direct vehicles left out the site.	(mid-September 2024 to mid-March 2025). LCC were in agreement with this approach.
	I note that the plans indicate reducing the speed limit to 30mph, the extent of this reduction should be shown on plans.	Following discussion with LCC, the speed reduction to 30mph will be in place from the roundabout. It was agreed that a revision to plans was not required.
Darkinson Lane App ref: LCC/2024/0002	The submitted construction details show a drop crossing, but the 'TEMPORARY ACCESS WORKS' drawing 80061057-02-BET-MISCE-99-DR-W-00066 rev A01, indicates the formation of a radius junction. The plans also appears to show the radius kerb extending into the carriageway i.e. it does not tie in with the existing edge of carriageway. This also means that the vision splays from the access, are measured from a point forward of the kerb line.	The temporary access drawing does not indicate a radius kerb, it just shows the extent of the of the new accesses. PCC channels are proposed at the edge of the existing surfacing to tie in the new, temporary construction. The plans are therefore consistent. Additionally, the radii are shown correctly to tie into the edge of the carriageway, with the visibility splays measured from the correct point. It was clarified that the hedgerow and verge present along Darkinson Lane are accounted for on the drawings.
	Given that there is no vehicular access available from the west under the North West Distributor road, there is no reason for a radius to the west of the access points as all vehicle routing will be from the east.	The main vehicle movements are from the east, however there will be site traffic approaching from another working area (with existing an access point) further to the west and turning into these accesses, hence the need for radii on both sides.
	Further to access from the east, vehicles will have to cross the weak canal bridge (Quaker Bridge) on the Lancaster Canal, and the developer should confirm that all vehicles will satisfy the exiting 18 tonne weight restriction.	We are proposing the construction of the temporary haul road from Lea Road to Sidgreaves Lane precisely to ensure the weight limit on this bridge is not exceeded, as per planning application LCC/2024/0003.
	As the proposed access details includes kerbed radii for the junction, and relocation of highway road signs this will require a s278 agreement with LCC.	As radius kerbs are not proposed, it was agreed that a S171 agreement would be required for the temporary accesses.
Lea Road & Sidgreaves Lane South App ref: LCC/2024/0003	The submitted swept path clearly shows the vehicle sweeping over the opposing traffic lane on Lea Road, on this busy classified road this would not be acceptable. Therefore the access from Lea Road should be wider and/or have increased radii as to avoid the unacceptable manoeuvre.	Swept path analysis has been performed for the worst-case vehicular access (a low loader). This would only be required for the largest deliveries and collections (excavator and tunnelling equipment) which are a small proportion of the total number of accesses (maximum 10 No.). These movements will be planned in advance and traffic management will be in place (likely operatives with stop/go boards) to temporarily stop the traffic on Lea Road while they occur. LCC have confirmed that this approach is acceptable.

	The submissions also fail to include vision splays from the access and I request that the developer submit amended plans to address these points.	Visibility splays from the access are shown on drawing ref. 80061057-02-BET-MISCE-99-DR-W-00051. It was agreed with LCC that these were suitable.
	I note the proposed access details includes kerbed radii for the junction and this will require a s278 agreement with LCC.	Radius kerbs were proposed at the Lea Road access in order to facilitate the footpath crossing. However, following discussion with LCC, the proposals have been amended to replace radius kerbs with a drop crossing, with the footpath surface regraded to achieve a smooth ramped transition and provision of tactile paving. A suite of revised drawings have been produced to show the amended detail (drawing refs. 80061057-02-BET-MISCE-99-DR-W-00050 – 54 attached). As radius kerbs are no longer proposed, it was agreed that a S171 agreement would be required for the temporary accesses.
Sidgreaves Lane North App ref: LCC/2024/0004	I note the proposed access details includes kerbed radii for the junction and this will require a s278 agreement with LCC.	Radius kerbs are not proposed, therefore it was agreed that a S171 agreement would be required for the temporary access.

Kind regards,
Katie

United Utilities
Water for the North West

Katie Eyres
Environmental Planner
Planning, Landscape and Ecology
Asset Management
M: 07342 076660
unitedutilities.com