

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>

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.

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-6 (o)10.6 (ads C /P <</MCID 20 >

mud lodged in their tyres which will reduce their ability to brake, just as they drive down a

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.