

## Development Management

---

**Subject:** FW: LCC/2019/0028 Re-consultation FORMER PARBOLD HILL QUARRY

---

**From:** Allen, David <[David.Allen@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:David.Allen@lancashire.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 17 January 2020 15:17

**To:** Haine, Jonathan <[Jonathan.Haine@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:Jonathan.Haine@lancashire.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** LHS Customer Service <[lhscustomerservice@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:lhscustomerservice@lancashire.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** LCC/2019/0028 Re-consultation FORMER PARBOLD HILL QUARRY

APPLICATION: LCC/2019/0028

PROPOSED LAND RESTORATION AND REGRADING WORKS USING INERT MATERIAL,  
ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY WORKS INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION OF A TEMPORARY PUBLIC  
CAR PARK

FORMER PARBOLD HILL QUARRY PARBOLD HILL PARBOLD

Hello Jonathan

I write with reference to the above application, your re-consultation of 6 December July 2019, and offer the following highway comments.

I am disappointed that the developer still hasn't provided any transport assessment, and my comments are based on the documents/ drawings submitted by the developer on 02 December July 2019.

I note from the cover letter from Peter Dickinsons (20th November 2019) that the proposed restorations works have reduced the levels of filling materials from 200,014m<sup>3</sup> to 88,000m<sup>3</sup>. But, there is no transport assessment with a breakdown of haulage movements, proposed traffic management, or the basis of the access considerations and proposals.

With regard to site access, a new temporary site access is proposed to the west of the existing lay-by which will now be retained. The access proposal is shown on drawing no. P19034-001B, with a long section P19034-002B. The applicants have now proposed a simple priority junction on the western slope of Parbold Hill down to Parbold. This location has reduced visibility for vehicles over the original access and the applicant has recorded traffic speeds to justify the reduced vision splays. However, there is a fundamental flaw with the proposed access in that it is located on a slope with haulage vehicles required to stop on an incline before turning right into the site and also starting on an incline when turning right to the east.

Given the volume of traffic on the A5209 (over 13,000 AADT) I would require any junction to have as a minimum a right turn ghost island in accordance with the Design manual for roads and Bridges – Road layout design CD123 Geometric design of at grade priority and signal-controlled junctions. Visibility splays have not been demonstrated form an acceptable access location/design.

With regard to the detail of the submitted access, the drawing indicates large radii on both sides of the access. This would imply that HGV movements are proposed in both directions. There has been talk of restricting haulage traffic to routing from and to the east (M6), but this is not supported by the submission.

The proposed access location also effects the highway footway which is located within the wide verge. To form the proposed access would require substantially excavation of the existing earth bank to provide a level access with 7.4m width and 12m radii. This excavation/cut in the embankment would sever the existing footway. The application submission does not address the footway, and I would not be in favour of the introduction of any steps to maintain the footway route. As submitted the proposals would have a severe safety impact on existing highway users.

The document PHASE 1 – LAND LEVEL RESTORATION – REVISED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL, states; *Notwithstanding the above, the existing lay by has been identified by Lancashire County Council as hazardous as it is an informal parking facility located on a national speed limit highway. On busy days cars can be seen to be parked perpendicular to the highway requiring them to reverse onto a highway with a speed limit of 60mph. The applicant is willing to cover the costs associated with lowering the speed limit over Parbold Hill to improve the safe use of the lay-by.*

Please can the applicant clarify the reference for the statement; *'the existing lay by has been identified by Lancashire County Council as hazardous'*. There are benefits to reducing the speed limit if an acceptable access can be achieved and with introduction of HGV turning movements at this location. I note that *'the applicant is willing to cover the costs associated with lowering the speed limit over Parbold Hill'*. Any change in speed limit could not be simply over *'over Parbold Hill'*, I suggest that LCC/Police would be looking at extending the 40mph speed limit from the 30mph zone in Parbold village to the existing 40mph speed limit west of the site on Hall Lane. If an acceptable access solution can be achieved I would require the reduction of the speed limit, but it would need to be considered with suitable measures to enforce the speed limit and should form part of a comprehensive scheme including an appropriate safe and suitable site access.

As submitted the applicant has failed to demonstrate a safe and suitable means of access, and the proposals would have a severe safety impact on existing highway users.

Regards  
Dave

David Allen  
Team Lead Preston, South Ribble and West Lancashire  
Highways Development Support  
Highways & Transport  
Lancashire County Council  
Tel: (01772) 533855  
[www.lancashire.gov.uk](http://www.lancashire.gov.uk)