

Kelly, Pauline

From: inskip pc <pc@inskip-with-sowerby.uk>
Sent: 28 December 2017 12:18
To: ENV Development Control
Subject: Objection to Cuadrilla revised transport route strategy with regard to application to frack at Roseacre Wood (LCC/2014/0101)

Dear Sirs

Objection to Planning Appeal Under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by Cuadrilla Elswick Limited.
LCC Ref: LCC/2014/0101
Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/Q2731/W/15/3134385

1. Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council object to the Revised Transport Route Strategy being submitted by Cuadrilla Elswick Limited.

2. The proposed strategy is unsound and unsafe. It would result in an increase in traffic particularly HGV and OGV2 movements – up to 50 x 16.5 metre 44 tonne OGV2 vehicle movements per day together with an unspecified number of OGV2's in convoy on 3 specified routes. All three routes traverse poorly maintained unclassified rural roads of insufficient width to deliver and remove materials from the proposed fracking site at Roseacre Wood. These roads have several 90 degree bends with poor sight lines and very few footpaths.

3. This strategy, if approved, will avoidably bring these unsuitable OGV2 into conflict with school children, pedestrians, cyclists, horses, agricultural tractors & machinery, PSV's, emergency services vehicles and other vulnerable road users. As the submitted Traffic Addendum shows, in many locations these OGV2 will have to manoeuvre dangerously at bends and junctions into the path of oncoming traffic by using the opposing carriageway to execute the turn.

4. This would have a material impact on existing road users, particularly vulnerable road users, leading to an overall impact on highway safety which is considered to be severe. It is entirely foreseeable that, if this strategy is approved, it will result in serious injury and death to road users that could easily be avoided. Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council assert that:

5. • insufficient weight has been attributed to the numbers and nature of anticipated traffic and that the variables and their potential impact on highway safety have been underestimated;
6. • there is inadequate consideration of the length and condition of all routes and the consequences of the adverse impacts of the traffic proposed;
7. • the use of OGV2 on narrow roads with acute bends and limited forward visibility present on all routes would lead to an increased risk compared to current traffic on the rural road network. There would be increased traffic conflict, especially where 'HGV' site traffic meets on-coming vehicles, including HGVs, or when overtaking or approaching pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders;
8. • it will be shown, that the severe impact on highway safety could not be adequately ameliorated by the mitigation proposed by the Appellant;
9. • some of the mitigation measures proposed by the Appellant have the potential to increase the safety risks associated with the Proposed Development.

Kind regards,

Mike Ainsworth



Virus-free. www.avast.com