

COMMITTEE UPDATE SHEET

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE PLANNING MANAGER

This sheet is to be read in conjunction with the main report.

Agenda Item No: 6 Planning Applications to be determined

Planning Site Visits held on 1 June 2018 commencing at 10:00hours.

PRESENT:-

Members: Councillors T Alexander, PM Bowmer, J Clifton, P Cooper, T Munro (Chair), R Turner (Vice Chair), KF Walker, and D Watson.

Officer: Chris Fridlington

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors P. Cooper, D McGregor, K Reid, S. Peake, P. Smith, J Wilson.

SITES VISITED

1) Buttermilk Lane, Bolsover (18/00178/FUL)

The meeting concluded at 11:00hours

Summary of representations received after the preparation of the main Committee Report and any recommendation based thereon.

Agenda item No: 6.1

18/00178/FUL: Additional Access and Amendments to the Bridge Improvement Measures (removal of the bridge) on Buttermilk Lane, Bolsover.

Since the officer report was published, the applicant has submitted a safety report.

The report notes that no road traffic accidents have been recorded on Buttermilk Lane at the location of the proposed highway improvements, or the approaches to the disused railway bridge over the last 5 years, although historically serious accidents have occurred. The following table provides the evidence for the report's conclusion that: *The removal of the underpass and provision of safe crossing facilities with good forward visibility has been concluded to be a safe solution, whilst maximising cost effective use of potential green routes for all users.*

User	Do Nothing (Disused railway bridge remains as existing)	Implementation of shuttle system	Infill bridge and provision of standard road carriageway
Pedestrians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No pedestrian facility or passing places (areas of refuge) resulting in a significant safety risk. • Vertical alignment create forward visibility stopping sight distance and emergency breaking issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of segregated pedestrian facilities from motorised road users, although conflict is created for a short length with cyclists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrians segregated from cyclists. No safety issues foreseen.
Cyclists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow route for cyclists which increases the likelihood of conflict with vehicles. • Vertical alignment create forward visibility stopping sight distance and emergency breaking issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangement segregates cyclists from the road carriageway, although would require them to leave and re-join the road carriageway creating two new conflict points. • Confident riders are likely to remain on road and use the shuttle system, although the potential delay may create a decision for them to ride through in any event, with possible conflicts with oncoming vehicles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening of the carriageway improves road space provision for cyclists to use road carriageway as opposed to footway, along with reducing likelihood of side swipe incidents occurring. • Conflict between pedestrians and cyclists are also removed.
Vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road narrowing leading to side swipe and strike incidents, which could impact other road users along with infrastructure such as the bridge parapets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay caused to drivers, although due to the tidal nature of traffic, this is likely to be minimum. • No significant safety issues identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No safety implications identified

In summary, the above table shows that the proposed improvements offer the safest solution compared to leaving Buttermilk Lane as it is, or carrying out the previously approved shuttle system. Notably, the County Council are more insistent that the proposed solution is a better solution than the previously approved shuttle system and are satisfied the highway

improvements proposed in this application offer a significant enhancement in road safety terms compared to the existing situation.

The County Council have also provided a further explanation of why an underpass is proposed at the A632:

The background to the A632 bridge is as follows:

- *Fundamentally the footbridge that carries the footway of the A632 is close to being life expired.*
- *The adjacent Highway Bridge that was formerly a Network Rail structure is in a fair / poor condition.*
- *As DCC have bought the section of the line under the structures at Station road, the option to look at other structural solutions than a straight like for like replacement was available.*
- *By far the most economical solution for these structures is an under filling scheme.*
- *DCC Highway Structures also considered whether a culverted under filling scheme, that would give sufficient head room for a multi user trail including equestrian use would be a viable option. It is.*
- *The culvert solution is cheaper than the estimated cost of a replacement footbridge and repairs to the adjacent road bridge.*
- *The final solution also significantly reduces the ongoing network maintenance liability.*

However, in selecting the culvert option at the A632 location and why an at grade crossing of the A632 with a 1 in 20 approach ramps are not the right solution at this location. DCC took the following factors in to account:

- *There is a high pressure water main that crosses under the ex-rail line that would be under any prospective approach embankment, STWA have stated they do not want any additional loading from any earth works on this. It may be possible to engineer this out however this would induce significant costs.*
- *There are also other significant statutory undertakers issues within both existing structures that guide us towards the under fill solution.*
- *DCC only own the track bed on one side of the bridge, so currently could not construct the embankment even if this was a solution.*
- *Our traffic section advise that an assessment of the site for a controlled crossing would need to be carried out, if installed it's estimated cost would be in the region of £50k.*
- *These signal controlled crossings have a lifecycle of approximate 20 years before complete refurbishment is required, the whole life costs of this as opposed to a safer culverted underpass favour the underpass option. If it failed to meet the criteria for a controlled crossing would we want an uncontrolled crossing of the A632 part of DCC's resilient network at this location? The consensus was no.*

In summary, these comments were made solely in response to enquiries received by the County Council as to why an underpass was feasible at the A632 (and not Buttermilk Lane) given that the County were seemingly advocating different approaches to safeguarding the line of the proposed greenway on different parts of the Bolsover Branch Line. However, the

County Council's view remains that the ramped solution is appropriate Buttermilk Lane and the as the local highways authority remain adamant that the ramps could be provided with a safe crossing over Buttermilk Lane for users of the greenway if it were to come forward in the future.

Therefore, the officer recommendation in the original report remains unchanged.

Agenda item No: 6.2

18/00026/FUL: Change of use to showman's site on land adjoining 7 Brookhill Road, Pinxton.

No further representations have been received.