

## **ID.39 Additional Information from Andrew Webber**

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Webber < >

Sent: 07 March 2023 15:34

To: Skinner, Helen <[HELEN.SKINNER@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:HELEN.SKINNER@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

Subject: Supplementary information in support of my verbal evidence at today's public enquiry, Lea castle Quarry.

Sir(s),

Please find attached some brief notes as requested following the public enquiry that I was asked to provide, which can be viewed in addition to my original objection to the application. (Copy at the bottom).

The main point was concerns I have with missing data from the report, ES volume 2, Technical appendices F- transport movement and access.

The report refers to a 2018 manual traffic survey as attached in appendix B. The next page refers to a diagram of the A449 traffic light junction with the B4189. This diagram shows a total of 12 possible vehicle movements across the junction, numbered 1-12 and states it was conducted over a 12 hr period, 07.00 to 19:00 on 5th June 2018. There is only one other page to the appendix B, which shows only data for a 6 hr period for only two movements (1&2), and neither involve vehicle movements along the B4189, the pertinent points.

10 out of the 12 movements are absent. We are only provided with 1/12th of the total data, and arguably the least relevant data. This full data would show a more accurate picture of the movement of pedal cycles, a vulnerable group.

The other points I raised was that the 2 other road surveys, were conducted in the winter and early spring. (March 2016 and January 2019). Why were these conducted in the quietest times of the year for our most vulnerable road users (motorcycles, pedal cycles and pedestrians). Was it intentional? At the very least it failed to accurately show a true picture of traffic flows which change significantly between January and June. A good example of this is the number of motorcycles recorded in January was 125 compared to 577 in March, a five fold increase in 2 months. What would it be in the summer?

Another point I raised was regarding the issue of the site entrance which was 'claimed' to prevent HGV's exiting the site turning west. The report stated that the system would be backed up by the use of CCTV. If it can't be done, why would you need CCTV?

Appendix E shows the junction design and the intended use of the vehicles approaching and exiting to the east.

It also appears to show that vehicles, could exit west and enter from the west should they choose to swing out into the opposing carriageway.

This concern is corroborated by the document "road safety audit- Lea castle' which is listed in CD3.15 Appendix K.

This corroborates that "the layout of the junction is such that the left turn is discouraged, drivers may still attempt the manoeuvre".

If it is possible, then it will happen.

In my opinion the report takes very little account for road safety, more compliance with transport policy.

There is no account for the significant descent down to the traffic lights. There is no account for the impact that descent will have on fully laden HGV's. Neither is there any mention on the negative impact on the coefficient of friction of the excess mud and water from 'attempts to clean vehicles on site' on the exit road down to these lights.

The combination of a wet and muddy road surface on a downhill descent to lights where cars may stop suddenly, is significant.

Here is a copy of my original objection. Please note it makes reference to an automated survey in 2018, it should read 2019.

To whom it may concern,

Please find my personal written objection to the proposed quarry under planning reference 19/000053/CM

There are many grounds under which I want to object but the main one which I want considered under this letter of objection surrounds the issues and concerns I have with the technical Appendices ES Volume 2- F Transport, Movement and Access.

Whilst I am not an expert in the field of planning applications, I can offer some experience and considered opinion in the world of transport having spent the over whelming majority of my 25 year policing career in the field of roads policing.

I am a trained roads policing officer, a trained senior investigating officer, a City and Guilds qualified forensic collision investigator, an advanced vehicle examiner and trained family liaison officer. A significant proportion of my career has been spent attending serious and fatal collisions and investigating those. Sadly I have seen first-hand more times than I care to recall, the devastating effects of collisions involving Heavy Goods Vehicles and vulnerable road users. These experiences and concerns form part of my objection to this proposed quarry as detailed below.

Traffic flow surveys. (Section 3).

The first traffic flow survey was conducted in mid-March 2016 with a second set of surveys taking place in late January 2018 and an addition one in early February 2018. These surveys didn't seem to take any account of vulnerable road users, more specifically pedal cyclists or pedestrians. The narrow footpaths are well used by pedestrians and likely to be more used by school children walking from the Lea Castle estate to the Wolverley

Secondary school. These pedestrians will be required to cross the entrance of the quarry and also be passed by vehicles travelling down towards the traffic lights.

The traffic surveys were conducted in winter and very early spring. Did these take into account arguably the most vulnerable of road users, the pedal cyclist? Were the number of pedal cyclists recorded? If so, why were the surveys conducted in January-March when there would be a significant increase in pedal cyclists in the months of June-September. As a resident and pedal cyclist, it is reasonable that the number of pedal cyclist's in summer riding past the site in August could be 1000% more than in January owing to weather. The section of hill down to the traffic signals at the A449 which is narrow is of particular concern with the increased flow of HGV's in the summer v pedal cyclists, especially when considering other factors that the quarry will bring in the form of mud and wet road surfaces.

Is the planning authority satisfied that sufficient consideration had been given by the applicants to the safety of vulnerable road users?

#### Deterioration of road conditions

Having read the transport plan I have not seen anything within it that discusses the increased risks associated with the excess mud and material that inevitably gets carried out by the HGV's as they leave the site. You only have to drive past any quarry, large construction site, land fill, or anywhere where HGV's drive on muddy sites and tracks to see how much of that mud is carried out by the large tyres. This mud is deposited onto the road surface, more so within the first few hundred metres of the site entrance. Whilst much of this additional mud is then cleared up by road sweepers as contracted by the site, this is never 100% cleaned up and the mere process of cleaning the road surface with sweeper's( and vehicles before they leave site) leaves the road surfaces wet and slippery.

Mud and wet road surfaces are two of the most common phenomena's which impact the coefficient of friction of a road surface. Anything which negatively effects a road surfaces friction increases the stopping distances of vehicles.

Another significant factor which increases the stopping distances of vehicles is the sheer size. A 30 tonne HGV has a greater stopping distance than a family car.

Finally another significant factor for increasing stopping distances is incline. The proposals suggest that all the vehicles leaving the site turn left and drive down a significant incline towards the A449 traffic lights. I don't have the ability to measure the extent of the incline but page 45 suggests that there is a 20 metre elevation drop from the proposed exit to the A449 traffic lights, only 2-300 metres from the proposed exits. By any description, this is a significant hill with significant impact on stopping distances, especially when considering at the bottom of the hill is set of traffic lights which will mean motorists having to brake to a halt when the lights change to red.

My fear is that the proposed plan will mean in excess of 60 lorries leaving the site a day, depositing mud and water from cleaning onto a significant hill leading to a set of traffic lights. Despite any cleaning regimes put in place, HGV's leaving that site will still have significant

mud lodged in their tyres which will reduce their ability to brake, just as they drive down a significant incline into the face of braking traffic.

Not only does the deposit of mud and a wet road surface on this significant hill create the potential for reduced braking abilities of fully laden HGV's leaving the site, but will also impact on the braking ability of the nearly 10,000 other road users travelling down the incline to the lights.

I can see no consideration in this document and have genuine concerns for safety of us all on this point.

### Construction of Entrance exit (Section 5.3)

The plan seems to seek to reduce the impact of HGV's on the village and narrow roads by forcing all traffic to and from the site to utilise the A449 as oppose to travelling west towards the village.

The plan states that a raised curb will be constructed to 'prevent' HGV's turning right. Page 72 clearly shows that despite their designs, HGV's are still clearly capable of turning right out of the quarry away from the A449 and turning left into the quarry, contrary to the plans. There is nothing to physically stop them, so in fact the claims that HGV's are prevented from turning right is incorrect. I appreciate they have discussed having CCTV to enforce this but quite simply having evidence from CCTV that they are ignoring the proposed direction of traffic is little comfort to those enduring the HGV's entering the village. HGV's are clearly still able to turn right out of the site and turn left into the site.

### Development figures (Section 5.11-16)

5.16 states that allowing for Back haul factor of 25%, it is anticipated that there will be 126 HGV movement per working day. This is based on 300k tonnes out and 60k tonnes in. What I am struggling to understand is that 3 million tonnes is planned to be removed at a rate of 300,000 tonnes per annum for 10 years. We are also told that the site will be fully restored but yet we are told that only 102,000 tonnes of overburden will be returned per year, equating to 1,020,000 tonnes over 10 years. I appreciate they are different materials (gravel v overburden) but there is a 2 million tonne discrepancy!

So is it a case that only 1 million tonnes will be returned in total? Or is it a case that 3 million tonnes will be returned but it will take closer to 30 years at the rate of 1 million tonnes per decade? Or more worryingly, is it a case that a significant higher number of HGV's will be required each year to bring in sufficient overburden to match what is being removed? If the

latter is the case then all the figures that the assessments are based on are incorrect. More HGV movements equates to increased risk.

If the amount of overburden is increased to 300,000 tonnes to match what is being removed in terms of gravel then I calculate that instead of their being 22 loads of overburden a day entering it would need to triple to 66 loads. I seek clarity on this matter as the HGV movement figures feature in every strand of this assessment and I am not convinced the figure used is accurate.

Noise Pollution.

In addition to these road safety concerns I fear for the noise pollution that would disrupt my everyday life and negatively impact on my health as a night worker. The topography of this location means that sound will travel easily between the site and my address in the same way the off road bikes do from a very similar distance and location. The difference is that the bikes are a few weekends a year as opposed to all day, six days a week, every week of the year.

Regards

Andy Webber