

C O M M I T T E E R E P O R T		
REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE
Chief Planning Officer	Planning Committee	Date: 12 April 2021

ADDENDUM

ITEM 3f - 20/01193/OUTMAJ - Land Adjacent Blainscough Hall, Blainscough Lane, Coppull

The recommendation remains as per the original report

The Environment Agency:

Have confirmed that they have received consultation requests from Chorley Borough Council for the [six] proposals on Safeguarded Land.

With regards to these sites, they are not planning any works or undertaking any appraisals that could conflict with these. They are aware of flooding in the vicinity of Tincklers Lane from Syd Brook but they would rely on Lancashire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority) to advise on this development as it is outside the scope of development proposals the Environment Agency is consulted on as a statutory consultee.

They state they have also looked through the comments from the drainage engineer and have no comments.

The Environment Agency is not resourced to comment on surface water drainage, sewer flooding and flooding from ordinary watercourses as these are outside our remit as a statutory consultee.

Lancashire County Council Highways

I refer to the above planning application and would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Lancashire County Council (LCC) as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) is responsible for providing and maintaining a safe and reliable highway network. With this in mind, the present and proposed highway systems have been considered and areas of concern that potentially could cause problems for the public, cyclists, public transport, motorists and other vehicles in and around the area have been identified.

LCC embraces appropriate development within Lancashire in line with local and national policies / frameworks and that which is emerging. This involves working closely with planning authorities, in this case officers of Chorley Council, developers and their representatives. This approach supports the delivery of high quality, sustainable development and an appropriate scale of development that can be accommodated both locally and strategically.

As submitted LCC CANNOT support this development, however, should the developer provide further analysis and where appropriate propose mitigation measures then this view could change.

The development proposal is in outline form, save for access, for 123 dwelling.

Vehicular access to the development is proposed from the existing adopted highway network by extending and modifying Grange Drive adjacent to number 14. The site currently has field gate accesses to Blainscough Lane, which is a privately maintained highway the carries PROW FP37. PROWs FP34 and FP35 run through the development site. It is not clear from the plans whether or not pedestrian access is proposed between the site and Blainscough Lane.

The developer has produced a Transport Assessment (TA) and Framework Travel Plan (FTP) in support of their proposal.

The TA concludes that the impact of the development on the local highway network should be acceptable to LCC as the Highway Authority.

There are elements of the TA which are not agreed and are as follows:

- **Traffic Generation:** The trip rate whilst derived from the TRICS database appear to be low. LCC encourage developers to adopt the trip rate used is northwest Preston when dealing with developments in the central Lancashire region.
- **Junction Assessment:** No capacity assessment has been undertaken and the TA appear to rely on observations of little queuing to conclude that highway capacity is not an issue. No future years assessment has been undertaken.
- **Road Safety Analysis:** The review of collision data does not cover the extent of the local highway network that LCC considers necessary. The TA includes "crashmap" data from 2015 – 2019, as 2020 data is now available this should be reviewed.

In assessing the development the TA looks at distances to amenities, however, this is only one element of why a particular route for walking and cycling may be used. The quality of that route is also an important factor and as such the provision of dropped kerbs and crossing points and desire lines need to be taken into consideration.

In terms of public transport the site is close to Spendmore Lane and Preston Road where the 362 service operates with a 20minute frequency. Whilst access to the bus stops on Spendmore Lane would be via a safe well lit route the potential access to the stops on Preston Road would be via Balinascough Lane which is unlit and without footways.

Spendmore Lane would be used by all vehicular traffic to the development and the vast majority of pedestrians, as such it is essential that this route is seen to be safe for all road users. From Preston Road to Grange Drive (approximately 300m) there are 4 recorded injury accidents (all slight) in a five year period. From Grange Drive eastwards along Spendmore Lane the road safety record is poorer with 5 injury accidents (3 severe and 2 slight) within 500m of Grange Drive.

The FTP will require additional work before it can be agreed. However, as the application is in outline form the statement of intent it provides is considered sufficient at this stage.

Summary.

The TA requires updating with;

1. Agreement on appropriate trip rates
2. Junction capacity assessment for Preston Road / Spendmore Lane and Spendmore Lane / Grange Drive, to include further years and committed development.
3. Review of road safety on Spendmore Lane and mitigation scheme.
4. Review of walking routes and improvements.
5. Access to Blainscough Lane and pedestrian improvements.

Conclusion.

As submitted LCC cannot support this proposal as based on the information provided there is insufficient evidence to show that the development will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

LCC are willing to work with the developer, their Transport Consultants and Chorley Planning Officers to see if the issues highlight can be resolved.

Reasons for refusal

The consultation response received from Lancashire County Council Highways objects to the proposed development and therefore it is recommended that a further reason for refusal is added as follows:

The application fails to demonstrate sufficient evidence to show that the development will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to policy BNE1 (d) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026.