

District: Cherwell

Application No: 20/00307/DISC

Proposal: Discharge of Condition 12 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) of 19/00607/F

Location: Land At Skimmingdish Lane And Land And Roundabout At, Bicester Road, Launton

Transport Development Control

Recommendation:

Objection

Some amendments to the Plan are required to make it acceptable.

Comments:

It is noted that this CTMP covers the construction traffic generated by the construction of the compound and the use of the compound for enabling works, and not for the main works of the project. We are being consulted separately on the CTMP for the main works, as part of a pre-commencement condition on the TWAO.

I have the following comments on the document:

1.2 There is insufficient commitment to avoiding peak hour traffic. Deliveries must be planned to avoid peak hour traffic on the Bicester perimeter route, which is highly congested. Deliveries should be timed to arrive outside traffic sensitive times which are 7.30-9.00 and 15.30 onwards, when school children will be walking home.

3.4 We are unclear why the PRoW closures are necessary for the construction of this compound; however, our comments on the proposed closures are as follows:

- Footpath 272/7/10 – Before the closure can be implemented the agreed procedure will need to be followed for closing/temporarily diverting public rights of way. Locations for closure signs and alternative route signs will need to be agreed and these will need to be installed and maintained on site.
- Jarvis Lane – Footpath 129/18 runs to the southeast side of the Jarvis Lane level crossing. It's not mentioned but I assume that this will need to be closed and temporarily diverted to enable the bridge to be constructed. The project will need to follow the agreed procedure as above. Although the level crossing itself is not recorded as a public right of way advance warning signs should be provided stating that the level crossing is closed and an alternative route should be agreed. Consideration should be given to whether the section of Jarvis Lane that is recorded as unclassified unmetalled highway should be closed to prevent people walking up to the work site.

4.2 Stacking of vehicles on the highway must be eliminated, not minimised.

5.2 All signs should be 450mm back from the edge of carriageway, whether this is kerbed or not. This applies to the sign face and not the post.

The sentence regarding the height of the sign should read 'a minimum of 2.2m to the underside of the sign' – not 'about'.

5.3 Signs should be erected in accordance with the Traffic Signs Manual (relevant Chapter). They must be located so as not to interfere with vision splay. Permission granted by Authority is indicative of location and it will be the responsibility of EWR to site the sign in the safest position. All signs on stands should be weighed down with sandbags or equivalent

There is no Chapter 11 of Traffic Signs Manual - this should state Chapter 1

Figure 3, and para 6.1 Protection of highway assets: It is noted that Figure 3 shows an HGV route heading northwest along the A4421 from the Charbridge Lane roundabout. This does not correspond with the route to the compound described in 3.2, which is accepted. This point should be clarified, as the A4421 to the north must not be used to access this compound. Also, the construction route to compounds in Bucks off the A4421 is understood to be via Junction 10 and the B4100, so I am not clear what traffic would be using this section of the A4421.

This section of route gives us cause for concern because bridge assessment records for Launton Sluice (OCC ref. 0081), immediately NW of the roundabout, are poor, and there is a low risk that a weight restriction may need to be imposed.

6.4 Condition surveys – it is noted that A roads between the compound and the strategic road network have been excluded from condition surveys, although I am not clear on the description of the route, which does not involve the A34. Also none of these roads are trunk roads. However, we have not received any information on a condition survey for Bicester Road, Launton, which the compound takes access. Most of this will be covered by S278 works, although this needs clarification.

6.5 The method of noticing is incorrect. From 1/4/2020 Street Manager will be the platform for raising permits within Oxfordshire.

Appendix 1: We have significant concerns about the route proposed through Stratton Audley village for LGVs due to the environmental impact on this small village, which has properties very close to the road and no footways, lack of passing places along the route, and the constraints of the road layout. In relation to traffic associated with this compound, I note paragraph 3.2 which states 'There will be no construction traffic routed via Launton Village without prior agreement from the Local Authorities'. For the avoidance of doubt, OCC does not agree to any construction traffic, including LGVs, routing through Launton Village.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 16 March 2020
