

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION**

DATE: 21st November 2013

**FROM: Dominic Smith TO: County Planning
FAO: James Neave**

SUBJECT: WSCC/083/13/KD

The installation of a well and associated infrastructure, including access road and soil bunds, for the drilling of a vertical borehole and contingent horizontal borehole from the same well for the exploration, testing and evaluation of hydrocarbons for a temporary period of three years.

Land south of Boxal Bridge, Northup Field, Kirdford Road, Wisborough Green, West Sussex, RH14 0DD

RECOMMENDATION:

Advice	<input type="checkbox"/>	Modification	<input type="checkbox"/>	More Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Objection	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Objection	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refusal	<input type="checkbox"/>

Summary

West Sussex County Council, in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority, has reviewed the technical information submitted in support of the application.

Further information is sought from the Applicant as set out in the following report.

Access

Evidence should be provided, by way of vehicle tracking, that the largest vehicle to access the site can cross the bridge without striking the structure.

In the vicinity of the access Kirdford Road is subject to a derestricted speed limit. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges would indicate visibility splays of 215m are required. Actual speeds were observed to be high but unlikely that the 85th percentile speeds were in the order of 60mph. Speed data should be collected on the east and westbound approaches, in accordance with DMRB guidance, to justify the visibility splays.

A Road Safety Audit: Stage 1 has been submitted alongside the access arrangements. A 'Designer Response' addressing the problems raised in accordance with Highway Directive 19/03 is also required.

Section 6.40 of the EIA indicates that railway sleepers will be incorporated in the access. The location should be identified on the access drawing to ensure that there is no conflict with vehicles accessing the site. The extent of the hard surfacing, which I understand to be 15m from the point of access, should also be included on the drawing.

Access Route

The requirement for no development to commence until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been approved by the Planning Authority should be secured as a condition should permission be granted. However, a draft management plan should be produced prior to determination outlining expected traffic management that may be required including, but not be limited to, the extent of any temporary parking restrictions and duration, addressing problems raised in the Road

Safety Review, restrictions to working hours, maintaining safety of other highway users, managing any internal site conflict (ie existing agricultural access) and wheel washing facilities. Should permission be granted it is likely that the Applicant will be required to enter into Section 59 Agreement in order to make good any damage caused to the road network as a consequence of the increase in HGV movement; a commitment should be included within the CMP.

The Applicant has indicated the presence of existing HGV movements on the access route and consideration should be given to the management of any potential conflict. Swept path tracking should be provided along the route to establish the extent to which parking restrictions may be required and whether management will be required to restrict large vehicles passing one another between the site and 'A' road etc. This should be undertaken for both the largest 'standard' HGV to access the site as well as for the largest movement that may require a Police escort.

Traffic Assessment

Existing vehicular movement counts have been included; collected data should be included to verify the findings.

Clarification is sought as to why HV threshold was set at 1.5t in assessment and referenced in table 10.4 as 7.5t. The DMRB indentifies large vehicles to be vehicles in excess of 3.5t (p1.19 of TD50/04). Data collected through the existing traffic counts should provide a more detailed analysis of vehicular type.

Two way totals in table 10.6 do not match with the individual LV/HV volumes. Clarification is sought by way of revision.

There are inconsistencies in the breakdown of movements demonstrated in Chapter 10 of the EIA and in appendix 10.3. It is unclear whether the figures provide an allowance for water tankers delivering to the site. A clear presentation of the movements should be provided and the following structure is recommended.

- Construction Phase – LGV/HGV – Daily/Total
- Mobilisation – LGV/HGV – Daily/Total
- Drilling – LGV/HGV – Daily/Total
- Testing (Oil & Gas) – LGV/HGV – Daily/Total
- Demobilisation – LGV/HGV – Daily/Total
- Testing (Extended) – LGV/HGV – Daily/Total
- Restoration – LGV/HGV – Daily/Total

A clear breakdown of which types of vehicles are being used during each phase should be provided including specification of length, height, width and weight.

Boxal Bridge

It is understood that Applicant has explored maximum carriage and load bearing of the bridge; this should be included in the assessment with any supporting evidence.

Dominic Smith
Strategic Planning