

## **Technical Note**

**JON PEARSON FIHE**

APPLICATION BY: Mr Lowton (BT Jenkins)

PROPOSAL: Provision of temporary construction, demolition & excavation waste recycling facility; importation & landfilling of up to 700,000 cubic metres of inert waste materials; & associated works including installation of drainage infrastructure & alterations to existing vehicular access.

LOCATION: Lower Brenton Farm, Brenton Road,  
Kennford, Devon.

LPA REF: DCC/4337/2023

CLIENT: Kenn Parish Council

DATE: August 2023

**Ref. No. JP.12.22**

## Introduction

- 1.1 This Technical Note (TN) will examine the recently submitted Transport Statement (Document Reference: 0519.TA rev D) submitted by Horizon Consulting Engineers as part of the submission of a planning application (DCC/4337/2023) for the provision of temporary construction, demolition and excavation waste recycling facility; importation and landfilling of approximately 700,000 cubic metres of inert waste materials on land at Lower Brenton Farm, Brenton Road, Kennford, Devon.
- 1.2 This TN has been commissioned by Kenn parish council to respond to the submission of the application and to assess what, if any, highway issues have been addressed.
- 1.3 It is noted that the original and recently revised submitted Transport Statement has been prepared by a Chartered Civil Engineer rather than a Highway Engineer.

## Planning History

- 1.4 DCC/4268/2021 - Provision of temporary construction, demolition and excavation waste recycling facility; importation and landfilling of approximately 1.2 million cu.m of inert waste materials; and associated works including the installation of drainage infrastructure and alterations to existing vehicular accesses - Withdrawn.
  - 1.5 Devon County Council's (DCC) Development Management Highway Officer, Countryside Officer and Road Safety Officer all raised concerns and requested additional information before being able to formulate a recommendation.
  - 1.6 Pre-Application – 2023 – The applicant undertook a pre-application with DCC and the highway officer made the following observations - *'The visibility splays are both below standard for the speed limit. If the applicant were to undertake a speed survey then the design could be produced an actual 85th percentile speeds rather than the speed limit. Currently they are proposing 120m (suitable for 40mph) for Brenton Road and 22m (suitable for speeds less than 20mph) for the crossing of Shillingford Lane. The width of the access will also need to be designed*
-

*to allow two HGVs to pass, to prevent one having to reverse back onto Brenton Road. Concerns over increasing vehicles using Kennford to access the site from the south. They would be better going around the new roundabout at Peamore (once built, hopefully later this year) and approaching from the north – although timing of this new roundabout is uncertain. At the crossing of Shillingford Lane, the proposed hedge height of 1.8m, which is probably fine for HGV drivers but will be too high for ordinary vehicles, there will be site vehicles that will have drivers at standard height. The junction needs to be designed to a standard and the rights of way clearly marked.'*

## **Traffic Generation & Vehicular Impact**

- 1.7 The TS state that the proposed site will not increase the levels of HGV traffic over those already impacting upon the A379 and A38 by virtue of the Trood Lane landfill site, close to completion. This assumption is not challenged, subject to the proposed site not being commenced until closure of the Trood Lane site.
  - 1.8 However, the issues that raise the greatest concerns are the proposed main access/egress to/from Brenton Road and the extreme likelihood of additional HGV vehicles passing through the village of Kennford which are echoed by the local highway authority – see above.
  - 1.9 The main road through Kennford (Exeter Road) currently has a signed weight restriction of 7.5 ton 'except for access' and unfortunately as the restriction is not policed nor enforced many HGVs ignore the restriction especially when there are congestion issues on the A38. The abuse of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) causes congestion and air quality issues within the centre of the village.
  - 1.10 The TS only details the proposed access/egress as an existing farm access to/from Brenton Road – see Plate 1 overleaf. Reference is made within the TS that the access is acceptable as it is an '*...existing field access point which forms a junction with Brenton Road. Farm vehicles currently enter and leave the fields using the existing junction arrangement.*' but does not mention any widening of the access to facilitate two HGV vehicles meeting at the junction. Whilst the access is denoted as being 6m wide this will not be sufficient to allow one HGV
-

to enter as another waits to exit. The reference to use by farm vehicles is noted but those movements were very sporadic and unlikely to have had occasion to conflict ie one tractor meet another given the low level of use. The predicted, minimum number of HGV movements is stated to be 14 per hour, 7 'in' and 7 'out' rising to 9 each way at peak hours which is a massive increase and will lead to multiple conflicts.



**Plate 1 – Proposed Access/Egress to/From Site**

- 1.11 The constant reference to the closure of the Trood Lane site negating any impact does not consider HGV's routing through Kennford village to save time and mileage nor do the increased travel miles to turnaround been taken into account.
  - 1.12 The Highway Authority has also previously raised concerns regarding the likely impact of HGV's passing through the village of Kennford given the minor diversion rather than the approx. **6km round trip route** via travelling north to the roundabout at Matford. Whilst the TS and the highway officer refer to the approved roundabout at Peamore there is absolutely no guarantee of when this would be available plus of course HGV drivers would still prefer the quicker and shorter route from the south to pass through Kennford. Whilst the TS states that all the HGV's will turn left when exiting the site, any wishing to travel southbound will be greatly enticed to travel the much shorter route through the village.
-

- 1.13 The planning requirement for provision of the Peamore roundabout is also 'on occupation' so likely a number of years from now. Whilst the roundabout has funding it will not be provided without the employment site development which cannot be certain especially in the present and onward economic crisis.
- 1.14 The main issue with the route through Kennford is that the HGV traffic must pass the entrance to the primary school and navigate the extensive on-street parking, the latter leading to congestion whilst vehicles wait to pass and an associated increase in severe adverse air quality and noise. Any adverse increase impact on air quality is contrary to both the Devon & Torbay Local Transport Plan and Teignbridge Local Plan. Operational hours for Monday to Friday state 07.00 to 18.00 meaning vehicles would conflict with school drop off and pick-up times every day.
- 1.15 The TS does not clarify the likely direction that laden HGV traffic will be approaching from ie the likely geographical sources of the fill material. Clearly, the city of Plymouth to the south could be a major provider. The majority of the minor local lanes (Days Pottle Lane for example), without any posted weight limit, could effectively be routed by heavily laden vehicles. HGV traffic approaching from the south on the A38 currently will divert through Kennford to avoid stationery or congested traffic to access Exeter via the A379.
- 1.16 The other main issue with HGV traffic through the village is that the TRO is not policed nor enforced. Should the application be recommended for approval the Kenn Parish Council would urge that the highway authority ensure a more suitable and effective enforcement method be provided and paid for, by the applicant. This would, by necessity, be the provision of enforcement cameras at each end of the village.
- 1.17 Another area of concern regarding the proposed access/egress is that HGV's will be interacting with cyclists utilising the signed route to Exeter. Plate 3 overleaf shows the blue cycle advisory sign adjacent to the proposed access/egress. HGVs are disproportionately more likely to be involved in a pedal cyclist fatality. Between 2011 and 2016, collisions involving HGVs and cyclists accounted for 23 per cent of cycling fatalities from 2-vehicle collisions, despite HGVs comprising
-



just 5 per cent of traffic in Great Britain. DCC collision data reveals that a cyclist was involved in a collision at the junction of Exeter Road/Old Dawlish Road as recently as March 2021.

- 1.18 The proposed junction visibility improvements at the Shillingford Lane site crossing are not discussed in any detail within the TS but a junction layout is appended under Appendix H. This drawing demonstrates that the visibility splays are incorrectly drawn ie shown to the centre of the lane rather than edge thereby endangering cyclists and motorcyclists plus the height of the hedges within the splays does not comply with car driver eyeline (there are bound to be smaller site vehicles crossing) nor facilitate for pedestrians ie recommended 600mm above carriageway level.



**Plate 3 – Signed Cycle Route Past Proposed Exit Route**

- 1.19 Shillingford Lane is the type of track that off-road cyclists enjoy and can travel at higher speeds than recorded by the vehicles within the speed survey and it is clear that the cyclists speeds have not been recorded within the set survey period by either passing the pneumatic tubes or being too light to register. The lack of emerging visibility both the length of splay to nearside edge of carriageway plus
-

the drivers eye for exiting vehicles is likely to endanger passing cyclists, motorcyclists and pedestrians to the detriment of highway safety.

- 1.20 It should be noted that the TS freely accepts that the site will not be suitable for sustainable travel, stating in para 3.2.5 that *'Although a review of bus routes has been undertaken it is considered unlikely that staff operating the facility will utilise public transport to access the works.'*

## **Summary And Conclusion**

- 1.21 This TN submission has assessed the highway implications of planning application (DCC/4337/2023) for the provision of temporary construction, demolition and excavation waste recycling facility; importation and landfilling of approximately 700,000 cubic metres of inert waste materials. It has reviewed the resubmitted Transport Statement and found that there are major highway concerns regarding the impact of the HGV traffic within the village of Kennford, danger to cyclists, motorcyclists and pedestrians and recommends that the planning application be refused.
- 1.22 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 111 states that *'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.'* The severe impact on congestion, air quality and most importantly highway safety, specifically cyclists, through Kennford and the surrounding rural road network is contrary to National Policies. The traffic impacts of the proposal are **severe** and clearly cannot be mitigated.
- 1.23 It would appear that the Transport Statement submission has only considered, in a manner favourable to the developer, the likely traffic impact upon the A38 and A379. It has failed to consider the wider impact on the area, the villages, the inadequate rural highway network and the local communities.
- 1.24 For the reasons given above it is submitted that the proposed development fails to accord with central and local government guidance and policies and the
-

planning application should again be refused on highway impact and safety grounds.

Jon Pearson FIHE (On behalf of Kenn Parish Council)

Transport & Highway Consultant

