

From: Planning Admin
Subject: FW: R/2021/0754/FFM ** REVISED THE MIN ALLOWABLE GRADIENT**

From: Helen Oakes <Helen.Oakes@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 December 2021 15:26
To: David Pedlow <David.Pedlow@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: R/2021/0754/FFM ** REVISED THE MIN ALLOWABLE GRADIENT**

From: Helen Oakes
Sent: 20 December 2021 15:25
To: David Pedlow <David.Pedlow@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk>
Subject: R/2021/0754/FFM

I refer to the application and would offer the following comments on highway grounds – the proposal is for a 1.1km length of road within the STDC site – the connection being from the new Smiths Dock Road roundabout. The plans show walking and cycling facilities within the site however the detail is missing as to how these connect into the existing highway network. We will require a footway and cycleway connection to link to the railway at the southern western end. Every road within the STDC site should have off-road cycle facilities on both sides, segregated footways and cycleways on the main roads and white line separated or shared footway / cycleways on all minor roads.

A key issue here is that they applied for outline permission on several sites without showing any road network that would connect them together. I consider it to be important that they provide an overall masterplan for the area, even if it is partially indicative, showing the sites and the road and cycle route networks that connect them together and through to the existing road network. There should be an east-west highway through route across the site connecting to Dockside Road so that all traffic has the option of travelling as far as they wish before choosing which junction they use to access the A66.

From the transport addendum - C5.3 construction traffic has not been addressed -this I expect to be predominately be HGV's on the highway network, although outline permission has already been granted for the GE site where the wind farm blades will be made.

C6.8 states that the A66/Tees Dock Road roundabout is approaching capacity without the addition of development traffic. Existing issues at the junction maybe exacerbated by this development and will need addressing as part of the wider STDC strategy. In the interim it is expected that traffic will be permitted to travel through the site on the internal road network and use Steel House roundabout at the eastern extent -what is there to prevent them using the existing highway network?

The A1053 is expected to be moderately adverse due to the potential for peds/cyclists activating their crossing button thereby affecting the traffic flows on the roundabout.
Some of the mitigation relies on Travel Planning which will come in the future. They acknowledge that they expect 82% to travel by car. Travel Plans will be appropriate for the individual sites rather than for this infrastructure element, however, it would be worth having them outline their approach to Travel Plans and sustainable transport provision as part of their Masterplan.

Currently the road design does not conform to the Design Guide in terms of its vertical alignment and road construction details, and therefore could not be considered for adoption.

The road is classified as an industrial estate road and therefore the road category is 3b or 4a. The road construction should therefore be Surface Course 40mm HRA; Binder 60mm Dense Macadam; Base Course 120mm Dense Macadam; Sub Base 250mm Type 1 and Capping if required.

The long section gradient for the road is in the main 1:250 with a small 75m length of 1:170. The Design Guide states that "A carriageway longitudinal gradient of 5.0% (1 in 20) should be taken as the maximum and 0.8% (1 in 125) as the minimum". Roads with a gradient slacker than 1:125 normally utilise concrete kerbs at the channel to help with surface water flow, however channels are not normally permitted in the construction of industrial estate roads. The minimum allowable gradient utilising channels is normally limited to 1:150. Beany blocks can be utilised over small lengths of road however not in this instance to become highway maintainable at public expense.

Should the application be granted then by way of conditions I would request by way of a Traffic Management Plan

1. Wheel and chassis underside washing facilities on site to ensure that mud and debris is not spread onto the adjacent public highway;
2. The parking of contractors' site operatives and visitor's vehicles;
3. Areas for storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development clear of the highway;
4. Measures to manage the delivery of materials and plant to the site including routing and timing of deliveries and loading and unloading areas; details of the routes to be used by HGV construction traffic and highway condition surveys on these routes;

The works should be constructed to adoptable standards in accordance with the Design guide & Specification. It is unclear whether this is to remain private or become highway maintainable at public expense therefore will need to be subject to a S38/278 Agreement if to become adoptable.

No part of the development to which this permission relates will be brought in to use until the carriageway and any footway from which it gains access is constructed to binder course level, kerbed and/or agreed hard-surfaced finish and is connected to the existing highway network with any required street lighting is installed and in operation.

REASON: To ensure safe and appropriate access and egress to the development, in the interests of highway safety and convenience of all highway users.

Do we need to condition anything relating to travel plans?

Thanks Helen