

DORSET COUNCIL

Position Statement

**SECTION 78 APPEAL BY CICERO
ESTATES**

**LAND NORTH OF CROWN ROAD,
MARNHULL**

LPA REF:2018/1124/OUT

PINS REF:APP/D1265/W/21/3289314

Date 12 April 2022

Comments on the submission of detailed access plans

1. The following is a summary of Council's, Mr Williamson, and Highway Engineer, Mr Savage, response to late submission of detailed access plans:

- Drw No. SK03 - Preliminary Access Road Levels Plan
- Drw No. SK04 - Access Road Preliminary Longitudinal Sections
- Drw No. SK05 - ROAD 2 PRELIMINARY CROSS SECTIONS
- Drw No. SK06 - ROAD 3 PRELIMINARY CROSS SECTIONS

2. Mr Williamson notes:

- a) Whilst the new plans do provide some additional information on existing and proposed levels they also raise a number of new questions.
- b) Much of the access works appear to fall outside the proposed development site (red line boundary).
- c) We have been provided with longitudinal sections for "Road 2" (the internal site access road) and "Road 3" (realigned Tanzey Lane), but the cross sections plans are inadequate for the purposes of understanding the environmental implications of the proposed access arrangements, i.e. their effect on character and appearance.
- d) The plans still do not show any existing vegetation so do not help in clarifying how it would be affected.
- e) The cross sections (proposed) stop at the edge of the carriageway and do not show how the proposed new works will be tied back into the existing ground levels (this is especially apparent on the "Road 2" cross section plan where the new road can be seen 'floating in mid air'.
- f) The Appellant's Highways Consultant states that the proposed levels are "around 300mm higher than the existing road" but this can only be an estimate since it was confirmed in earlier correspondence that detailed engineering design work on the accesses has not so far been undertaken.
- g) The access illustrated is a very unusual junction arrangement, in that on leaving the site in the direction of Crown Road you first go down a 1:12 incline into a dip, then immediately go up an incline also at 1:12 to reach Crown Road. Presumably in the bottom of the dip you would have very restricted visibility. A dip like this would be prone to flooding in heavy rain. The Hwy Eng would want to know what the drainage arrangements were – conventional piped surface water drains? SUDS?

3. Highway Engineer, Mr Savage, comments:

We assessed the development proposal on the basis of the submitted information at the time of the application and agreed that the proposed geometry for the southern access works, including the changes to the junction with Tanzey Lane, were acceptable. This recommendation was, of course, subject to an appropriate detailed design being submitted as part of the s278 process, where the necessary audit procedure and design checks would confirm and agree the actual construction required.

Unfortunately, I cannot personally advise you on the suitability or otherwise of the drawings that you attached today (11/04/2022). I would normally ask Neil Turner for his general comments on such matters but he is currently off work with Covid. I would also add that it is my understanding that

design checks as part of the necessary s278 process incur a fee and that there is a normal response time of a number of six weeks, allowing for work load, plan analysis, site visits, etc.

Having talked with one of Neil's team who knows the site, he has confirmed that through the s278 process a satisfactory solution to the engineering problems that you've suggested would be found, reinforced by the necessary road safety audit process.

4. Mr Williamson comments further that in his opinion there remains an unacceptable lack of clarity as to how the accesses are proposed to be constructed, especially given the topography of the site and the acknowledged importance of the existing boundary hedgerows.
5. He goes on to state that the absence of a highways objection to the scheme, and the fact that the Council's Highways Engineer considers that any technical and engineering and drainage issues could be addressed at a later stage, does not change his view that the level of information currently available on proposed accesses remains inadequate, and that the construction of the accesses would be likely to result in harm to the character and appearance of the locality.
6. The Highway Project Engineer comments (received 12/04/21 and copied below) confirm that the scheme would require a retaining wall and would need to be designed with very careful attention to drainage in the potential ponding area.

Plan SK06 –

- o Details cross sections for the widening of Tanzey Lane. Details present a footway extending to CH10 but no further (footway to nowhere?), we would expect an uncontrolled crossing point to achieve pedestrian continuity.
- o Details a considerable embankment on the Eastern Extent. Dorset Council would expect at very least a 0.5m safety margin adjacent to the running carriageway on the eastern side (no margin shown). This would need to be 1:40 falling towards to the carriageway.
- o The embankment itself will require retention. Unless the bank is proven to be self supporting by way of a 1:1 gradient (45 degree stress line/line of influence) suitable retaining features should be proposed. Looking at the sections, if a 0.5m margin is introduced, I would suspect the entire longitudinal extent shown would require a retaining wall/feature.

Plan SK04 –

- o Whilst internal developments should seek to achieve a desirable maximum longitudinal gradient of 1:20, existing topography and the need for retaining features must be considered. I would suggest an absolute maximum long-fall of 1:12 is sought /achieved, this would ensure footway/ped provisions are adhered to in terms of DC's public sector equality duty.
- o Crest and sag 'K' values must be appropriate for the design speed of the road and visibility requirements, as shown seems adequate at a quick glance.
- o The considerable 'sag' must have an appropriate drainage strategy, SW will likely be a key consideration, the depth of proposed pipes and maintenance of must be considered when designing a suitable drainage system. Please note overland exceedance routing for surface water run-off will not be accepted if shown as being stored in the Highway, the system must be able to accommodate the required design criteria, 1:100 + 40%, summer and winter profiles up to 1440 min storm durations (surcharge will be accepted, flooding and flood risk will not).

Plan SK05 –

- o Any 'fill' areas concerning Highway extent must be achieved using engineering fill, with the top soil having been removed prior to.