



**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)**

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF  
RYAN DERBYSHIRE MCIHT**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RD Derbyshire'.

**TRANSPORT**

**LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**MYTAX FARM, 4 BOURBLES LANE, POULTON-LE-FYLDE, FY6 0PE**

**THE EXTRACTION AND PROCESSING OF SAND AND GRAVEL INCLUDING THE  
CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SITE ACCESS ROADS, LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING  
BUNDS, MINERALS WASHING PLANT AND OTHER ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
WITH RESTORATION TO LEISURE END-USES, AGRICULTURAL LAND AND  
BIODIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT, USING IMPORTED INERT FILL.**

**PLANNING INSPECTORATE REF: APP/Q2371/W/25/6002168**

**LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REF: LCC/2023/0030**



## 1. Introduction

- 1.1. I am the Team Lead for Wyre, Fylde and Chorley in the Highways Development Control Team of Lancashire County Council. I represent the Local Highway Authority with over 6 years of experience in Planning and Highways Development Control.
- 1.2. I am also a Member of the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation and I hold a BSc (Hons) in Human Geography and a Master of Science in City Futures, both awarded by Cardiff University.
- 1.3. The evidence which I have prepared and provided in my proof of evidence is correct and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true opinions.
- 1.4. Scope and Structure of the Evidence
- 1.5. My evidence has been produced specifically to address Reason for Refusal 1 as set out in the application's decision notice dated 20th October 2025.
- 1.6. The evidence that I present covers the following:
- Section 2 outlines the proposed development and its location.
  - Section 3 policy.

- Section 4 summarises my statutory consultation responses.
- Section 5 sets out my highway safety concerns associated with vehicular visibility at the proposed site access.
- Section 6 details the highway issues and impacts along the proposed route.
- Section 7 my conclusions.

## **2. Proposed Development**

- 2.1. This section provides an overview of the proposed development and the local highway network.

## **3. Planning Policy**

- 3.1. This section highlights national, the County Council's Minerals and Waste and Wyre Council's Local Plan policies that are relevant to the transport impacts of this proposal.

#### **4. Summary of Issues**

4.1. This section summarises my statutory consultation responses, which concluded that the proposal is unacceptable on the grounds of highway safety.

#### **5. Site Access**

5.1. In summary, the site access is unable to achieve vehicular visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 52 metres to the west of the site access, without the splays conflicting with third party land outside of the control of the Appellant and the Highway Authority.

5.2. It is concluded, therefore, that the development is unable to provide a safe and suitable access, which presents an unacceptable highway safety risk given that up to 120 two-way HGV and 22 operative movements will use the access each day.

#### **6. Highway Issues and Impacts**

6.1. I have demonstrated, in my evidence, that the proposed HGV routing strategy, via Lancaster Road and the A588, is fundamentally unsuitable to safely accommodate the significant increase of HGV movements along the route without conflict. This is because:

6.2. Lancaster Road

6.3. The Appellant has proposed to widen Lancaster Road by 0.6 metres to the east of the proposed site access, where achievable.

6.4. However, the widening proposals are unproven in terms of deliverability and, even if achievable, would not provide sufficient width to enable safe two-way HGV movements along the full length of Lancaster Road. The Appellant's own swept path drawings, even without door mirrors, demonstrate that HGVs would be forced along the edge of the carriageway, placing them in conflict with road users, hedges, street furniture, third-party land, and opposing vehicles.

6.5. My own swept path analysis (Appendix 17), which includes door mirrors of the HGVs as shown on drawing 1, highlights that there is a 100 metre conflict zone between the gated access to Hillfield House and the access serving Pointer Cottage, where opposing HGVs will conflict. This conflict zone is further exacerbated by poor forward visibility resulting from the horizontal alignment of Lancaster Road, and by the fact that HGVs would be required to encroach even further onto third-party land beyond the proposed new carriageway edge.

6.6. The Appellant has acknowledged that two-way HGV movements are not possible at the Vine House bend and so has provided a signage strategy to warn users of the highway constraints. However, there is a lack of highway

space to locate the proposed signs at a suitable setback distance of 0.5m from the edge of the carriageway, given the constraints associated with the available verge and third-party land, leading to prospective signs protruding into the carriageway, which will add an additional obstruction on both sides of Lancaster Road.

- 6.7. Even if the Traffic Signs and other street furniture could be placed within the highway extents, there is still an element of risk that two HGVs could meet along the bend, leading to one having to reverse to find a suitable passing location along the carriageway. This has highway safety implications not only for other vehicles but also for the most vulnerable road users including pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians who are known to travel in the area.
- 6.8. Having regard to pedestrian needs, there are no footways and following the proposed widening of Lancaster Road there will be no limited protection on the verge for pedestrians (or other vulnerable road users) to wait as a vehicle passes. Therefore, pedestrians will have to walk within the carriageway following the removal of the verge.
- 6.9. Pedestrians walking in the carriageway along with HGVs having to reverse along the carriageway to allow another to pass, reduces highway safety thus increases the likelihood of collisions. This can only be considered as resulting in a severe impact from a safety perspective to the local highway

- network, following the absence of a deliverable and suitable mitigation strategy.
- 6.10. Furthermore, the Servicing Management Plan fails to provide a credible mechanism for preventing HGV conflicts. The Site Manager cannot control other HGV movements, nor has the Appellant identified safe waiting locations for vehicles arriving during restricted periods or has identified how development related HGVs will be controlled to prevent them meeting along Lancaster Road.
- 6.11. A588
- 6.12. In two locations along the A588, namely at the access serving Fold House Farm (approximately 3.3 km east of the A588/B5270 Lancaster Road junction) and at the A588 Burned House Lane/B5377 Park Lane/U22436 Cemetery Lane junction (approximately 1.5 km south of the same junction), the locations lack the physical carriageway width to enable two-way vehicular movements to safely pass, when an HGV or bus is present. These are in locations, with the exception of the Fold House farm bend (although there is damage to third party land and existing signage), where collisions involving HGVs in the last five years have been recorded.
- 6.13. The Appellant has proposed signage in these locations to warn road users of the constrained carriageway width. However, similar to the signage proposed along Lancaster Road, there is a lack of suitable highway space

to locate the proposed signs and instead will provide additional roadside obstructions.

- 6.14. Providing traffic signage also does not mitigate the fundamental problem: HGVs will still meet at points where passing is not possible. This will lead to an increased frequency of reversing manoeuvres on a live highway with limited segregation for vulnerable users, and constrained visibility. Such manoeuvres present a clear and unacceptable risk to pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians, and other motorists and so would have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety.

## 7. Conclusion

- 7.1. To summarise, my evidence demonstrates that the proposed HGV routing strategy via Lancaster Road and the A588 is fundamentally unsuitable for the substantial increase in HGV movements associated with the development. The resulting impacts on highway safety would be severe, and no mitigation has been shown to be deliverable or capable of reducing these risks to an acceptable level.
- 7.2. Although the Appellant proposes widening Lancaster Road by 0.3 metres on both sides, this is considered undeliverable due to hedge root stock, land ownership constraints and insufficient verge width. Even if implemented, the road would still be too narrow to accommodate two-way HGV movements. Swept path analysis, which has been provided by the

- Appellant and myself, shows HGVs would be forced to the carriageway edge, creating conflicts with other vehicles, hedges, street furniture and third-party land. A 100-metre conflict zone would also be created between Hillfield House and Pointer Cottage, where two-way HGV movements are not possible, which would be exacerbated by poor forward visibility.
- 7.3. At the Vine House bend and at the two locations along the A588, signage has been proposed to warn road users of the constrained carriageway width. However, the signs cannot be safely accommodated within the available highway space and even if installed, signage would not resolve the underlying safety risks.
- 7.4. The development would also worsen conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. The affected routes lack footways, and verge space that currently offers limited refuge would be lost along Lancaster Road, forcing vulnerable users into the carriageway.
- 7.5. Taken together with the inability to achieve compliant visibility splays at the site access, it is my opinion that the development should be refused on transport grounds, with the development as stated within Reason for Refusal 1, having an unacceptable and severe impact on highway safety, which cannot be adequately mitigated and therefore conflicts with Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Policy CDMP6 of the Wyre Local Plan.