

SK Transport Planning Ltd
Albion Wharf
19 Albion Street
Manchester
M1 5LN

Greg Archer
Major Projects Officer
Planning Services
Municipal Buildings
Church Road
Stockton on Tees
TS18 1LD

0161 234 6509
sktransport.co.uk
inmail@sktransport.co.uk

4th May 2017

Dear Mr Archer

RE: PLANNING APPLICATION 16/1904/FUL – ERECTION OF WOODEN PEDESTRIAN & CYCLE BRIDGE & FLOATING PONTOON

You may recall that SK Transport Planning Limited has previously represented the Egglecliffe Area Residents Association (EARA) on traffic engineering and transport planning matters on planning applications in the Egglecliffe Village area. One of the applications that we previously commented on was planning application 12/1595/EIS for new sports pitches, pavilion and pedestrian access across the River Tees via a new footbridge. As part of this development proposal vehicular access was proposed via Egglecliffe village.

At the time we made detailed representations on this and subsequent planning applications, which included consideration of construction access matters relating to the proposed new pitches, pavilion and footbridge. This latest planning application is clearly a scaled-down version of the original application, and concentrates on the delivery of the foot and cycle bridge over the River Tees.

One could easily arrive at the conclusion that the delivery of this first piece of infrastructure is part of wider redevelopment plans for the land to the east of the river by the school. You have on file our previous detailed comments on the traffic and transport matters relating to the full development proposals, and nothing has materially changed to require us to alter our position of objection on this. For now we have given further consideration to this latest planning application, in particular construction traffic matters relating to the delivery of the new bridge.

For clarity the group's current position regarding this latest planning application remains one of 'objection'.

Our previous submissions confirmed that any proposed construction access through Egglecliffe village would need to route through this compact hamlet which benefits from being within a

Conservation Area. The village has 30 listed buildings, including the Grade 1 listed church. As would be expected in such a historic location access by vehicular traffic is constrained by the street pattern and carriageway widths. Motorists have to carefully negotiate their way through the village and around the village green to minimise their impact on the surrounding area.

Previous submissions made by Yarm School to development on the eastern side of the river have stated in their Design & Access Statements and Construction Management Plans that:

*'Access onto the site, both vehicular and pedestrian is severely constrained due to its location adjacent to the River Tees'*¹

and;

*'Parts of Butts Lane within Egglecliffe are of sub-standard width'*²

We have previously agreed with the school's comments that access to the site is severely constrained and their access routes within Egglecliffe are of sub-standard width.

As with the school's previous submissions we note from the "CLS Sports River Tees Footbrige Crossing" Report that all construction traffic associated with the planning application for the new bridge will have to route through the village and negotiate parked vehicles, narrow carriageways, the village green and overhanging trees (which would be expected to be protected by Tree Preservation Orders as they are located within the Conservation Area).

Contrary to previous planning submission the document referenced above is somewhat hazy in terms of the construction of the proposed overbridge. The document states:

"Due to the nature of the existing access through the village it would be CLS's intentions to reduce and mitigate as reasonably possible construction traffic via this route.

In order to minimise the amount of traffic and type of traffic using this route it is CLS's intention to have all materials delivered to the school in the first instance."

Clearly the EARA supports in principle the applicant's efforts to 'reduce and mitigate' the impacts of construction traffic through the village. However, their approach presented in their submission appears to contradict the scale of the development proposals they are seeking permission for. Their submission states that once materials are delivered to the school site they will then:

"...be sorted and loaded on to a smaller agricultural tractor and trailer and transported to the works area on the eastern embankment via this access."

The report goes on to confirm:

"By using this method of construction we would estimate around 10-15 vehicle movements through the village using agricultural tractor and trailer in order to deliver materials and allow construction."

Based on the applicant confirming that the build programme (including civil engineering works) is estimated to take 14 to 18 weeks the suggestion of a single tractor and trailer delivery on average less than once a week with all construction materials sounds a significant under-estimation when the works proposed are a significant engineering project. In addition the estimation of vehicle movements do not make any reference to contractor vehicles, parking areas, storage compounds or other associated construction works.

¹ Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners, June 2012, Page 5, Land North of the River Tees, Yarm D&A Statement

² Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners, October 2012, Page 4, Living Draft Construction Management Plan

The submission does make reference to the need to create build areas and access upgrades to the access at a later stage of the project. The applicant has stated:

"There will be a requirement to construct a build area and upgrade the access at the later stage of the project to allow access for crainage to lift the structure into place."

We draw your attention to the tightly drawn red line boundary for the planning application, which excludes the access through Eggescliffe village and down to the eastern side of the river where the proposed crossing is proposed. If the access is required to be upgraded this should be included in the red line boundary and the upgrade works confirmed so that the Council and interested parties are aware of the impact of the proposed development. We would be grateful if you could request this information from the applicant as soon as practically possible.

With the applicant confirming that a crane will be required to lift the bridge section from the eastern side of the river into position we remind you of previous technical submissions which confirmed that large construction traffic (including a crane) cannot negotiate the vehicular access past Village Farm (to the west of the access route) and St Anne's House (to the east of the access route) without conflicting with third party land.

I also remind you that the access for construction vehicles (including a crane) would have to pass through a defined pinch point between the Grade 2 Listed stable building (which forms part of Village Farm) and the wall and driveway that forms part of Grade 2 Listed property known as St Anne's House. The measurements shown below confirm that access width has a minimum width of **3.37m** between the third party wall owned by the occupiers of St Anne's House and the outer face of the listed stable building.



Figure 1 – Proposed Vehicular Access Dimensions

The proposed vehicular access route is shown in **photograph 1**.



Photograph 1 – Looking South towards Proposed Vehicular Access (Shown Between Two Yellow Arrows)

Previously submitted swept path analysis has confirmed that construction traffic routing through the village will have an unacceptable impact on the Conservation Area. The combination of narrow streets, limited access width between the listed buildings and third party land, as well as the need to negotiate other listed structures (including the telephone box adjacent to the Village Farm curtilage) leads to vehicles overrunning footways, the Village Green and third party land adjacent to the private access past Village Farm.

As confirmed by the applicant if a large crane is required to lift the pedestrian bridge into position the previously submitted swept path analysis demonstrated the vehicle has to overrun the Village Green, potentially impacting on existing mature trees. In addition a mobile crane cannot route past the listed stables at Village Farm without encroaching onto third party land.

Based on previously submitted information presented to the Council on the school's development proposals for new overbridges and playing fields/pavilion the latest planning application has not appropriately addressed matters relating to construction access, vehicle movements and access for construction vehicles (including cranes) as part of the proposals.

In summary this response has identified:

- that the application red line boundary is incorrect, as if works are required to the access this should be included in the red line boundary
- a 3.37 metre narrowing on the vehicular access from Egglecliffe village restricts access for construction vehicles, including a crane, potentially impacting on an adjacent listed building
- previous submissions on the school applications confirmed this vehicular access to the eastern side of the river through Egglecliffe Village has to cross unregistered land – accordingly the applicant has failed to demonstrate that they control this land by excluding this from the red or blue edged site plans
- the construction management plan has not adequately demonstrated that construction traffic can access the site without conflicting with listed buildings or crossing third party land

With all the above points having been previously submitted to the Council as part of previous technical reviews we request the Council considers all the factual evidence contained within this letter when considering the planning application put before them.

We hope the applicant will take the opportunity to provide more detailed information than currently presented in their submission regarding construction traffic matters. Until this information is presented the EARA will maintain its formal position of objecting to the development proposals.

We would be pleased to discuss the content of this letter with Council Officers, and hope to have the opportunity to speak at the planning committee when the application is considered. We look forward to your comments on the points made in this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss any element of this letter, or if you have any questions or queries.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Kitching', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael Kitching

SK Transport Planning Ltd