

From: Tookey-Williams, Jill
Sent: 08 May 2017 13:01
To: 'Carl Tonks'
Cc: Brace, Carl
Subject: RE: Lea Drawing

Carl,

Thank you for your e-mail dated 26th April, unfortunately I have been on leave recently, therefore this is the first time I have had chance to response, and however I now note that an appeal for non-determination has been submitted to the Planning Department. I have been asked to respond to this e-mail. This will be the last e-mail response which is outside the appeal process.

The recently submitted plan shows the position of the crossing in the original position and not as discussed by moving the crossing further south to give a greater distance for vehicles coming from Ross to see the crossing. Whilst the distance shown for the visibility splay west of the crossing meets Mfs2 guidance for 85thtile speeds under 60kph, this is a minimum distance with little margin for error. Given the nature of the road (ex. Trunk), and type of likely users (school children), if the crossing was moved further east it would give a greater distance to vehicles coming from Ross direction and allow for vehicles to stop if the crossing is being used. It should also be noted that the visibility splay on the north western side runs very close to the hedge line and will required significant hedge cutting to keep the visibility splay to the crossing clear.

Having attended site recently, far more visibility is afforded to the south of the crossing. A small area is lost on the tangent of the bend due to 3rd party land, but at 1m out (as stated in Mfs2) from the channel the visibility to/from oncoming traffic is beyond DMRB requirements. Due to the alignment of the approach, it is extremely unlikely that a fast moving two wheeled vehicle would be in the channel, and it is our considered opinion that this offers the safer option.

The issue of the south visibility splay was not brought up in the previous applications stage 1 - Road safety audit (which I note was requested to be submitted as part of this application and is yet to be received)

The true position of the crossing can be determined at the S278 process however for clarity for the highway authority, LPA and local residents this should be submitted on a plan

Kind regards
Jill

Jill Tookey-Williams
Area Engineer (Development Control)

Highways and Transportation
Herefordshire Council
P.O. Box 236
Plough Lane,
Hereford
HR4 0WZ

Tel: - 01432 383607
E-mail Jill.Tookey-Williams@Herefordshire.gov.uk

"Any opinion expressed in this e mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council"

From: Carl Tonks [<mailto:carl@tonks-consulting.co.uk>]
Sent: 26 April 2017 08:43
To: Tookey-Williams, Jill
Cc: John Kendrick; 'Ed Pope'
Subject: FW: Lea Drawing

Jill,

Further to our discussions of yesterday, please see attached a revised plan showing the crossing relocated further north.

The benefits of this are;

- Visibility to the north is provided to 2.0m x 65.5m, which complies with the MfS2 requirement. Speeds for southbound traffic from our latest ATC remain below 60kph, hence the preferred vs absolute minimum point does **not** apply;
- Visibility to the south is achieved to 91.5m, which complies with the preferred minimum as identified in Table 10.1. This reflects the observed 85th %ile speed of 61.9kph.

If you could please confirm that the attached is acceptable to highways, I will ensure this is formally worked up and submitted as an amendment.

Given where we are with this application I must identify **today**, if we have agreement concerning this option. As discussed yesterday, I am very confident of our position at Appeal and this latest option merely serves to further increase that confidence. However, I believe it would be better for both my client and the County if an Appeal could at this late stage be avoided. My client has agreed to give me **today only** to confirm that this option would be unobjectionable to Highways.

For the avoidance of doubt, my position is that this is **not** a Trunk Road, hence DMRB is not appropriate. I do not accept that a recorded speed of 1.9kph over 60kph justifies a broadly 50% increase in SSD as that is wholly counter-intuitive. I have previously argued this point successfully at Appeal. Our previous scheme meets the requirements of MfS2, hence should be acceptable to the LHA. Notwithstanding this, if we can agree that the attached amendment is acceptable we may (hopefully) still avoid an Appeal. I will give you a call this morning to discuss the attached, which I trust offers us an agreed solution.

Kind regards,

Carl

Carl J Tonks BSc MSc MCIHT FIHE

DIRECTOR

carl TONKS consulting

Transport Planning, Traffic Engineering and Infrastructure Design Consultancy



523 Horizon
Broad Weir
Bristol
BS1 3DJ

T- 0117 382 0507

M- 07866 543939

e- carl@tonks-consulting.co.uk

w- www.tonks-consulting.co.uk

cTc also has offices in
Monmouthshire and Preston.

cTc is a strategic alliance between **carl TONKS consulting**, **cTc Transport Planning** and **cTc Infrastructure**.

This email is intended for the named addressee. It is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. If you are not the named recipient and have received this message in error, please destroy the message and contact the sender. Although all emails to and from this account are scanned using Norton virus protection, **cTc** takes no responsibility for issues which may arise in transmission and you remain responsible for your own virus and malware protection for all internet traffic, including the contents of this message and any attachments thereto.