

James Neave

From: Dominic Smith
Sent: 17 February 2014 16:04
To: James Neave
Subject: RE: WSCC/083/13/KD

James,

In response to your email I can advise the following.

The relevant policy information is as follows;

Local Transport Plan 1.4.9

- maintaining and promoting lorry route network for main lorry movements in the County
- identifying and assessing lorry routes for construction traffic and site which require high levels of HGV movements, such as mineral extraction and waste sites

Lorry Route Network

- 2. 'Local Lorry Routes'; used for starting or final leg of longer distance lorry trips or for travelling between built up areas in West Sussex.
- 3. Local access trips using roads not shown on the map must be made in accordance with traffic signing and these roads should be avoided as far as possible

The LHA approach is to minimise travel distances on local roads by identifying the most direct route that is not considered to detrimentally impact highway safety or service.

Putting aside the policy considerations and looking purely from a technical perspective there is insufficient information provided as part of the Applicant's assessment to determine whether the alternative route would be considered safe. A similar process to that undertaken for 'Route 1' would be required, including an assessment of the haul route from the primary road carried out by a independent Road Safety Auditor. However, I would concur that there are several locations where there are safety concerns.

Vehicles approaching from the south along the B2133 would be required to undertake a very tight turn and would result large vehicles entering the opposing traffic flow or failing to make the turn. This could lead to rear shunt accidents by vehicles suddenly slowing, or head on and side impact collisions where large vehicles are struck by oncoming traffic mid turn. Junction improvements could be sought to mitigate and would require the provision of temporary or permanent widening to the junction. However, this could lead to smaller vehicles leaving the B2133 and entering Skiff Lane at much higher speeds.

There is sub-standard visibility at the A272/B2133 junction due to the alignment of the road and the presence of vegetation; this could lead to side impact collisions from vehicles pulling into the carriageway, or rear shunt accidents from sudden emergency braking.

A couple of things that are not mentioned in the 'Route 2' assessment that I observed on-site;

- Visibility at the Skiff Lane/Kirdford Road junction is sub-standard due to the road alignment

- There is a narrow bridge half way along Skiff Lane, however, this could be overcome through traffic management measures

Without the full assessment, including view of a Road Safety Auditor, it is difficult to conclude whether the route could be considered acceptable after measures of mitigation. However, I have concern given the constraints to visibility where large, slow moving vehicles would be expected to enter a derestricted flow of traffic of relatively high volume. While mitigation such as junction widening and vegetation clearing is practical, other factors such as road alignment are more difficult to overcome. Signing could be used to alert other road users to the presence of large vehicles but this would not enhance the visibility. Visibility could be enhanced to a degree by clearing as much vegetation as possible from the side of the carriageway but is likely to make only a minor enhancement and unlikely to bring visibility up to suggested levels.

The Road Safety Audit of the proposed 'Route 1' indicated that the route was generally considered acceptable with some intervention required in respect of overgrown vegetation. Junctions are onto roads with slower speed limits and therefore reduced visibility requirements. The length of the route 1 minimises the amount of time large vehicles spend away from the network; route 2 results in longer journeys on a route that is likely to retain sub-standard elements with higher speed limits and therefore increasing the likelihood of conflict. If route 2 is pursued I would recommend further assessment of the route is undertaken with proposals to mitigate identified issues prior to determination.

Neither route is considered to have operating capacity constraints.

I trust this assists but if you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Dominic

[Dominic Smith](#) | Planner, Strategic Planning, [West Sussex County Council](#) | Location: 2nd Floor, Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH
Internal: 25711 | External: 0330 222 5711 | E-mail: dominic.smith@westsussex.gov.uk

From: James Neave
Sent: 06 February 2014 14:13
To: Dominic Smith
Subject: WSCC/083/13/KD

Dominic,

As discussed earlier today, I would like a Highways view with regard to the applicants alternative routes assessment (within ES chapter 10). Please could your review include an assessment of the acceptability of the two additional traffic routes considered (via Kirdford road to the A272 at Petworth/via Skiff Lane and the B2133) in terms of highways safety and capacity. In particular;

- Whether either route is likely to be acceptable (subject to improvements or otherwise);
- Whether you agree with the constraints identified;
- What scale/nature of potential junction improvements might be likely to be required (a number are identified for route 2);
- Whether you agree that the proposed option (via Wisborough Green) is the best in terms of highways safety and capacity.

In addition to that above, I would be grateful if you could set out the highways policy context for determining appropriate routing of HGVs to the highways network from rural location.

Many thanks in advance,

James Neave

James Neave | Planner, Communities & Infrastructure, [West Sussex County Council](https://www.westsussex.gov.uk) | Location: Strategic Planning Business Unit,
2nd Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH
Internal: 25571 | External: (+44) 033022 25571 | E-mail: james.neave@westsussex.gov.uk