

Planning Manager  
South Ribble Borough Council  
Planning Team  
Civic Centre  
Leyland  
Lancashire  
PR25 1DH

Tel 01772 534057  
Fax  
Email neil.stevens@lancashire.gov.uk

Your ref LCC/D7/2022/0048  
Our ref LCC/D7/2022/0048/NJS1  
Date 6<sup>th</sup> February 2023

Dear Sir

**APPLICATION: LCC/D7/2022/0048 Amend -**

**LOCATION: Cricket Facility Woodcock Estate Farington**

**Description:**

**PROPOSED CRICKET FACILITY COMPRISING 2NO. CRICKET OVALS AND ASSOCIATED PAVILION BUILDING AND SPECTATOR SEATING, COVERED CRICKET NETS, ACCESS, PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS (INCLUDING TEMPORARY EVENT OVERLAY FACILITIES ON TICKETED MATCH DAYS), REALIGNMENT OF PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY REF 9-12-FP 1, 7-4-FP 6 AND PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY REF**

**Summary**

**I have considered this proposal and whilst the impact on the highway and transport network does vary significantly; whether it is day to day operation or a ticketed event, its impacts during the weekday generally outside typical highway network peaks and traffic flows at the weekend are much lower than weekday.**

**I can confirm the Local Highway Authority is able support the principles of this proposal subject to all access matters be satisfied (as identified), internal changes be made (as identified), mitigation (as identified) be supported and delivered, and other matters be controlled by suitably worded planning conditions including every event be managed by a specific management plan.**

## **Development**

The development proposal includes 2 full-sized cricket ovals with natural sloping terraces, training facilities, club pavilion, changing rooms and a gym. The car park is 500 spaces of which 100 (20%) is for staff and players). The main impacts will be from:

### **General use**

- Net usage and building usage (including Gym) all year
- Cricket oval use between April to September: training/games  
Weekday and weekend (session duration): morning 9:30-12:30, afternoon 13:00-15:30 and evening 16:30-20:00.  
Non ticketed games attract circa 250 spectators.

### **Ticket events**

- Up to 500 spectators + teams + staff + ancillary provision: 6 days
- Up to 2,000 spectators + teams + staff + ancillary provision: 8 days
- Up to 5,000 spectators + teams + staff + ancillary provision: 6 days  
Weekday and weekend: start times vary: 11:00, 14:30, 15:00, 18:30

## **General**

The Transport Assessment dated July 2022 was drafted by WSP transport consultants and submitted with the planning application, followed preapplication discussions. A subsequent note (including some revisions to layout) dated 21<sup>st</sup> December 2022 was provided to the Local Highway Authority by WSP as well as several emails regarding Stanifield signalised roundabout. These statutory comments have regard to all provided information.

The note dated 21<sup>st</sup> December stated in the introduction section '*The TA concluded that it demonstrated that.....there are no overriding reasons to preclude LCC from recognising that the proposals are acceptable in transport terms*'. The Local Highway Authority does not support this statement, as the original presented layout in highway terms was unacceptable from an operational or sustainable perspective.

However, the note dated 21<sup>st</sup> December does in principle go some way in overcoming concerns as highlighted and referenced but does require the use of suitably worded planning conditions that align to these statutory comments.

## **Access Strategy (General)**

The access arrangements as presented on drawings for the proposed cricket facility does includes the:

1. Main vehicular access onto Stanifield Lane.
2. Separate ped/cycle access north and south of the vehicular access.
3. The proposal includes an access to the southwest of the site onto Fowler Ave and is suggested to be used for site maintenance/secondary logistical access but also for events.

#### 4. Emergency vehicle access onto the A582 at a location of an existing gate.

The access locations in principle are supported and do have regard to existing and other committed development accesses i.e. that proposed as part of Cuerden (residential site), however I am concerned that access number 3 (above) could be exploited and undermine the local and wider parking strategy with spectators parking on nearby lanes / verges / on public / private highway which is not appropriate. This is likely to occur when parking demand exceeds supply (within the site / external secured locations) or where spectators are not willing to pay a charge. The generic site management strategy (controlled by a planning condition) will aim to manage all aspects associated with the operation of the facility and event management plan for each ticketed event (controlled by planning condition). Even with these controls in place some operational matter regarding access to the facility are outside their control. This issue is likely to be more prevalent at the limited number of major ticket events (equates up to 20 days).

With this it is important that all ticketed or large events the impacts are monitored at and beyond the site and controlled through imposed planning conditions (irrespective of site access used). If issues of traffic, safety, disturbance are observed (evidence based) as a consequence of the event these matters must be investigated and resolved in the updated event management plan and if issues occur at access number 3 this must include the prevention in the use of this access. See '*Event Day Operations*' section below for further comments.

Existing PROW's 7-4-FP5, 9-12-FP 2, 9-12-FP1 to be diverted. It appears that 7-4-FP6 does not need to be diverted. It is important that the access locations and strategy for day-to-day usage and all events is not compromised with ad-hoc access locations being formed resulting in issues not expected or fully controlled without continuous manual influence (with potential limited impact). This is a concern.

*Note: PROW diversions need to satisfy its own process not controlled by planning.*

#### 1 Access onto Stanifield Lane General)

The General Access Arrangement is provided within Drawing FCR-WSP-ZZ-XX-DR-C-0011 Rev B. I must highlight that this plan does not fully include all points from the note as listed under 'Junction layout' in particular; provision of a foot/cycleway on the western side of Stanifield Lane that provides a continuous sustainable route between Fowler Lane and Stanifield signalised roundabout. In line with LTN1/20 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), this continuous route on Stanifield Lane is considered necessary to satisfy the needs of both pedestrians and cyclists.

The new public footway on Stanifield Lane to continue into the site or as a minimum beyond the radii of the junction onto the verge into the site.

To reduce the significance of the appearance of the junction (and to support sustainable movement along Stanifield Lane) with the proposed 2 lane exit a splitter

island is required with bollards/dropped kerbs. This provision to be included during the detailed design stage, as will the required continuous foot/cycleway (as referenced in the 21<sup>st</sup> Dec note).

The location of the site access junction has been moved further south which is supported, this change enables greater right turn vehicle storage to be provided on Stanifield Lane. The exact location of the junction to be determined at detail design stage. Unlike other junctions demand at the site access will be very high for short durations of time whether entering or exiting (during ticketed events).

*Note: It is critical that capacity within the site and to support right turners entering is maximised. Junction modelling as presented underestimate queue lengths.*

The existing Stanifield Lane signalised junction includes 3 approach lanes from the south. However as presented the length of carriageway from the approach to the 3 lanes is shorter than the existing, notwithstanding the on-carriageway cycle way which will be compromised (from a safety perspective). With this the northbound carriageway will need to be widened further than that proposed. This matter can be determined at the detailed design stage as will the inclusion of the necessary foot/cycleway and location of both the northbound and southbound bus stop provision.

Stanifield Lane to the north of the site access also includes a splitter island providing simple provision, this is supported and links to the southbound bus stop provision.

*Notes:*

*Changes highlighted do not alter the access principles or strategy, and I am satisfied that highlighted above is deliverable in land controlled by applicant/LCC and these matters with other detail matters not referenced would typically be drawn up at the S278 stage.*

*In addition, the layout principles at the time of Stanifield Lane signalised junction detailed design will need to have regard to a scenario to:*

- I. Current committed Cuerden development; or*
- II. That currently proposed in other applications being progressed or being considered; or*
- III. Other changes as may be proposed and delivered as part of the future A582 works*

*As it is important that works are coordinated minimising network disruption.*

## 2 Separate pedestrian/cycle access north and south of the vehicular access

No additional comments.

### 3 Access to the southwest of the site

No detail has been provided, however the General Arrangement drawing UG\_1016\_LAN\_GA DRW\_01 Rev P32, highlights access is controlled by a field gate. It is important that the gate is lockable and security at this location is suitably enhanced which may include improved physical provision to stop its use. The drawing suggests that the access to be used for site maintenance/secondary logistical access but also for events.

Notwithstanding my concern (as highlighted above) with this access being used for events (by spectators), the route into the site has been described on the drawing as 'rich grassland' which will be in keeping with the rural nature of the area, however the route may not be usable when needed if no special attention is given to local drainage and ground levels. According to Lancashire County Council's mapping system (LCC Mapzone), the area could be susceptible to surface water flooding. This matter will need further attention, the detail and layout of the access to be controlled by a suitable worded planning condition including visibility splays (in line with standards for motorised vehicles) and swept paths.

This access connects to the adjoining network on Fowler Avenue which is privately maintained serving a small number of private dwellings.

In addition to the points raised above the existing private road to be protected from debris/mud/water from the site and its 'rich grassland' by having a hard standing area within the site to satisfy a waiting tractor and trailer (materials to be agreed) prior to the location of the gate. This detail can be suitably conditioned.

### 4 Access Emergency

The location is acceptable. The note accepts that the existing ground levels within the site will need to be amended (raised) to satisfy its use by emergency vehicles (as the field is much lower than the A582). The 21<sup>st</sup> December note suggests that the route to be constructed using crushed stone which is acceptable as long as the crushed stone can be fully constrained in its location (detail to be agreed and to be conditioned).

According to LCC Mapzone, the emergency route could be susceptible to surface water flooding - the design and construction of the route needs to satisfy this issue whilst not acting as a barrier to the flow of water. This access does join the A582, its use will be under emergency control, however the A582 must be protected from debris by having a solid hard standing area between the gate and footway. The detail can be suitably conditioned.

### Other Necessary Highway Changes

The Transport Assessment (Table 7.2) and note suggests the likely levels of demand per mode. I have taken this information for the largest event (5,000 attendees) and considered it from a primary and a secondary modal use, this is to understand the

- maximum number of pedestrians in the vicinity of the site or
- those that use of the car.

The largest events of 5,000 max occurs 6 days per year. I have used 2.5 attendees per car, which I consider appropriate and not that used in the TA which applies 2.7-3.125 attendee's per car, which is higher than what I consider reasonable.

Primary mode	Secondary mode	%	Attendee's by mode
Parking on site	none	24%	1,000 (400space*2.5)
Parking off site	bus or walk	26%*	1,368
Rail (Preston, Leyland & Lostock Hall)	bus or walk	20%*	1,053
Local(walk, cycle bus taxi and drop off)	as primary	20%*	1,053
Off site P&R and coaches	bus/coach	10%*	526
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>5,000</b>

Notes:

\*factor of 1.3158 applied to equate to 5,000 tickets

the TA factor of 2.7 observed at Sedbergh, 3 observed at Southampton

the car park is 500 spaces of which 100 (20%) are for staff and players

Applying the above for the large events equates to circa 3,474 (1,368+1,053+1,053) potential uses that will be accessing the site at least for part journey by foot/cycle. Excluding staff and players for the largest event arriving by car the demand from spectators will be 1,158 cars of which a minimum of 400 will be using the site car park.

*Note: the above demands are attracted to the site of which most will arrive in the hour preceding the game. The TA only attracts 233vehicles (258 vehicles 2way) for a T20 event game. It is recognised that large event games will be supported by an event management plan.*

Whilst the event management strategy will be in place to assist all movements irrespective of mode, network infrastructure needs to satisfy the large events. Unfortunately, some of the existing infrastructure is constrained limiting its ability to satisfy sustainable demand during peaks as required by this proposal. Additional surrounding mitigation is necessary (between Lostock Hall railway station and Lydiate Lane and also on local lanes to the site) to better manage on highway impacts whether to support sustainable movement or control additional on street parking or short high peaks of vehicle demand.

### **Other Necessary Mitigation to be Delivered Under a S278 Agreement:**

- Hedges to be cut back and edge of footways to be defined
- Dropped kerbs to be provided where missing on pedestrian desire lines
- Marker posts to protect public highway verges from parking
- Signing strategy to extend to Leyland and Lostock Hall for peds/cyclists and further afield for motorised modes.
- Existing road markings to be refreshed (where necessary)

- Traffic Regulation Orders Review, with necessary changes to the local and wider road network (including side roads/lanes).
- Review and update the MOVA technology/operation at Stanifield Lane signalised roundabout, with ability to flush vehicles from any approach (existing layout)
- CCTV monitoring operation of the Stanifield Lane signalised roundabout, links to flushing and junction operation (existing layout) improving efficiency under short peaks of high local demand.
- Review and update the MOVA technology/operation at Sainsburys roundabout

## **Internal Layout**

### Drop off/pick up

Prior to the main car park there is a drop off and pick up area, which is supported and now incorporates a permanent simple canopy. This is supported as it strengthens the purpose of the area and provides shelter when waiting for transport in inclement weather for both the able and mobility impaired.

### Car Park (main)

The main car park to include several electric charging points with additional ducting to expand from that initially provided. The overall provision to include parking for mobility impaired and cyclists as a minimum in line with parking standards.

Parking provision, car charging facilities, expansion of the car charging facilities, mobility parking, cycle parking all to be suitably conditioned as well as conditions of use including duration of stay, its management and any parking charges.

### Overflow car park access

The latest layout now includes an access into the overflow car park, this principle is fully supported, as it separates internal movement whether to the overflow car park or access the drop off facility limiting internal delay and unnecessary queuing that would influence traffic on Stanifield Lane.

However, the detail presented requires change, as would not be efficient nor effective. The radii from the spine road into the overflow car park needs amending to better support a vehicle desire line and traffic flow management (including marshalling of traffic). The internal spine road needs to include a short section of widened road prior to the overflow access separating the straight on to those turning right. This internal detail can be suitably conditioned.

### Internal pedestrian routes

Internal routeing is constructed using self-binding material. It is important that all surfacing is suitable for those with mobility impairments or do not hinder those with wheeled aids. It is suggested that internal matters is conditioned and needs to satisfy the Local Planning Authority.

### Event Day Operations and Site security

As highlighted in the WSP note and above, I am concerned with events that non permitted routes will be made into the site from south and west (access No 3). Whilst stewards and martials will have some impact will not discourage people from attempting access by foot or some by motorised vehicle. If this occurs will result in higher levels of people using narrow lanes (adopted and unadopted) potentially impeding access/egress for existing dwellings (whether on the public or private highway), notwithstanding some non-local cars parking on the lane potentially blocking the lane for other local vehicle types. The issue therefore is of traffic management, safety, and negative impact on amenity to local residents (prior and post some ticketed events) in the use of access No 3 / suitable boundary treatment (permanent security).

Dense foliage once established will assist in management however would still require suitable wire fencing (that provides security, easy to install, is visually unobtrusive) to manage access into a site (to that permitted) otherwise will not prevent a person entering even with stewards/marshals, as a result will in greater use of minor lanes to the south and west of the site and establish none permitted routes to the site.

To overcome the security aspect of my concern, I suggested that permanent wire fencing is supported and delivered and controlled by a suitably worded planning condition, this provision to be in place prior to any paid event.

The Technical Note includes Figure 1 'Possible Event Day Parking Location' including a number that are future employment and residential site, whilst this is interesting does not provide any certainty and excludes the P&R which is included in the Transport Assessment. The supporting note states that those highlighted are *'not considered to be exhaustive No detailed consideration of site technical suitability, such as availability, landowner availability, landowner willingness, access etc have been undertaken at this stage, and would be considered once event and its likely parking requirements are greater understood'* This lack of certainty for any event where internal parking is not sufficient is a significant concern.

Notwithstanding this concern (as presented by WSP), I have spoken directly to LCC public transport colleagues who manage the P&R site at the Capital Centre and through agreement (and funding) could provide several hundred parking spaces with buses linking the P&R and the site available for events (but is dependent on weekday/weekend availability). This provides some certainty.

The note offers an example of a Transport Event plan for the site. The information is useful and provides some simple car park detail and suggest access to the site but



does not include suitability of the route to the site (for those where walking is required) i.e., continuous footway of a suitable width, safe crossing points, illuminated etc. As presented this example is not detailed enough to be considered suitable. However, through further work could be made acceptable.

*Note: I am concerned that a number of the suggested parking sites will not be suitable.*

Based on site usage as per paragraph 4.2.1 of the TA, I don't have concerns with the following:

- Day to day operation
- Cricket ovals during April to September
- Covered cricket nets and pavilion buildings (and ancillary uses)
- The following ticketed events
  - Lancashire Men's first team (4day fixtures) of up to 2,000 spectators per day
  - White ball matches Lancashire's Women first team of up to 500 spectators per day

All ticketed events will have a plan, for those events of up to 2000 spectators can be accommodated using onsite parking, public transport, walk and drop off. However, those all-ticketed events of up to 5,000 spectators, white ball matches Lancashire Men's first team, is a concern. The assessment does not provide any network analysis for major events, nor does it include access to the site from remote locations. To overcome this concern and to support proper management of the site will require specific agreed parking strategy for all event days with supporting network analysis (that has regard to junctions and links) for both motorised and non-motorised users. This to be controlled by a suitably worded planning condition to ensure that the surrounding network remains reliable and safe.

## **Travel Plan**

Sufficient funding is required to be available to the Applicant's Travel Plan/Event Management Team to make any necessary changes within the site or enable LCC as Local Highway Authority deliver other unexpected minor traffic management changes to the network in the manage movement as a direct consequence of development.

Currently the TA and its sustainable offer to staff isn't as supportive to staff as it could be with 100 parking spaces available for staff and players. The travel plan to follow the traditional approach as would be expected from any development and be linked to a suitable worded planning condition. As a minimum the Travel Plan to include targets set for staff and incentives for players and spectators all being monitored. The TP to be monitored for 5 years with full reporting which is shared with the LPA on an annual basis included for all day-to-day operation/events and ticketed events. The Travel Plan to be kept live and have strong links to event management.

LCC does offer a paid for Travel Plan Support which is usually funded through a S106, but I happy to consider other funding mechanisms if the applicant wishes to take up this service. In this case as the Travel Plan and Event Management is intrinsically linked, it is strongly suggested that a paid for service is taken up with the LCC Travel Planning team. This optional service would be provided for 5 years post opening based on the current day to day programme with 20 days of ticket events at a cost of £4,000 per annum + VAT (index linked). This service is to provide technical support to the Applicant with their Travel Plan, its delivery, monitoring and Event Management (but not deliver Event Management).

## **Traffic Data (Traffic Flow and Speeds)**

### **Traffic Flows**

The TA notes that the traffic in 2016 is higher than observed in 2022 on Stanifield Lane.

However, this doesn't necessarily result in lesser congestion in the area such as at Stanifield Lane signalised roundabout which continues to suffer from significant levels of congestion for several hours of the day that extends beyond traditional peak hours. The compact constrained junction with its high level of turning movement influences its operation and levels of delay that are experienced.

It is clear from observation that significant daily congestion (Mon-Fri) still occurs on the local network and this is confirmed in the original Cuerden application which considers many local junctions. The A582 corridor was also subject to examination at the Pickering's farm public inquiry in 2022.

It is noted that modelling results from traditional propriety software at this signalised junction the results do not fully reflect existing conditions but can be used as a guide for net change with development and mitigation. Again, this was examination at the Pickering's Farm Public Inquiry in 2022.

### **Traffic Speeds**

The WSP note includes both average and 85%iles however only reports on the 50%iles (averages), this is misleading (Note: Highway and transport industry considers and applies 85%ile observations). However, notwithstanding this TA reporting issue the junction design can satisfy the 85%ile in terms of DMRB.

*Note: MfS with its lower visibility requirements are not appropriate based on the existing environment.*

## Collision Review

The December note updates the collision data. The location of the development and the local junctions do unfortunately include some collisions. Considering the causation factors this development will not exacerbate these on the assumption that all provision requested is delivered. As highlighted above, with development the number of pedestrians in the area will increase significantly.

*Note: Table 3 of the note includes an anomaly as 1 serious collision is not referenced (however is included in the total).*

## Analysis

### Distribution and traffic flows

The trip distribution has been amended in the December note to take on board my concerns and is suitable.

*Note: Figure 2 title in the note is incorrect, as the revised distribution is presented on right (of the page) and not as described on the left.*

As highlighted above traffic flows for the ticketed events are different to that which is likely, as part of my own review, having regard to the uncertainty of the locations for the parking to support the large events i have considered the worst case.

## Modelling

As highlighted above within the section titled 'Traffic Flows' modelling results from traditional propriety software at Stanifield Lane signalised junction the results do not fully reflect existing conditions but can be used as a guide.

The modelled results that were presented at the Pickering's Farm Public Inquiry (weekday peaks) in 2022 do suggest limited congestion issue at the junction, which is not the case. The reason for why the modelling is underestimating the queuing is due to a number of factors such as:

- driver behaviour within the roundabout
- speed of vehicles manoeuvring for certain movements
- inclusion of cycle lanes within the roundabout and on approaches
- inefficient limited lane usage
- lane starvation on approaches and
- lane starvation within the internal circulating lanes of the roundabout

However, for this application whilst Stanifield Lane signalised roundabout will be used to access the site (and surrounding car parks) the weekday AM (Peak) and PM (Peak)

impacts will be negligible. Traffic flows on a Saturday are much lower than weekday with the inclusion of development related traffic will still be lower.

The WSP note includes junction modelling at this location with development for a Saturday 13:00-14:00 (T20 game) with results provided for both 2024 and additional growth to 2029.

Whilst the results highlight better operation than what would occur the 2029 results suggest that the model has slightly greater level of spare capacity when compared to 2024, which is not the case. The reason for these results is that the westbound flows into Stanifield Lane junction whilst the total is greater than 2024, the not assign in the same way as 2024.

The day-to-day impacts of this development during the weekday as per the TA are limited and the site should not have an impact during these periods that is a concern of significance. The impacts are generally post or prior traditional weekday peaks or at the weekend (thus as highlighting the importance of the mitigation as requested during the short high peaks of vehicle demand (but more importantly at ticketed events. However, the use of the site start/finish times of ticket events must be conditioned as per that proposed (weekday).

This condition is necessary until a wider scheme is delivered or clearer information regarding the event background changes are sufficient to allow variation in start/finish times linked to event management (including locations of external parking).

I also note VISSIM modelling has been undertaken using the model which supported the consented planning application at the Cuerden Strategic Site. I note the TA makes reference to 258 two-way trips for a T20 event game (up to 5,000 spectators). Whilst my analysis highlights different levels of attraction as indicated above with the mitigation and agreed event management (including start of play), when controlled by suitably worded planning condition these issues are overcome.

Upon request I can provide suggestions as to planning conditions.

## **Conclusion and Recommendation**

Lancashire County Council takes its responsibilities seriously with respect to the current and future use of the highway network whilst also giving a high priority to supporting economic growth, the creation of jobs and access to employment, education, training and leisure.

I have considered this proposal and whilst the impact on the highway and transport network does vary significantly; whether it is day to day operation or a ticketed event, its impacts during the weekday generally outside typical highway network peaks and traffic flows at the weekend are much lower than weekday.

I can confirm the Local Highway Authority is able support the principles of this proposal subject to all access matters be satisfied (as identified), internal changes be made (as

identified), mitigation (as identified) be supported and delivered, and other matters be controlled by suitably worded planning conditions including every event being managed by a specific management plan.

I hope the above is of assistance in your Council's determination of the application, if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Yours faithfully



Neil Stevens  
Highways Development Control Manager  
Community Services, Lancashire County Council