

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2024 14:20
To: South West Road Safety; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Request for advice by 8 March: A30 Treguddick Manor - application for holiday lodges (PA24/00879)

Importance: High

All

I'd welcome your comments please with regards to further development at Treguddick Manor, South Petherwin which proposes 7 holiday lodges immediately to the west of the distillery.

Most of you will be well aware of the history with regards the gin distillery development which was consented in 2019. National Highways advised the planning authority at that time that, whilst we had safety concerns about the adequacy of the access arrangements, given the traffic generation that could arise from the extant uses on site, the lack of collision history and the scale of development/method of operation proposed, we did not consider we had sufficient grounds to sustain an objection to the development. However, we advised that we would be unlikely to support any further development of the site which would intensify use of the A30 junction.

I therefore need to understand our current position with regards to what I think we could reasonably consider to be an additional use on site which will intensify movements at the A30 junction. From a check of crashmap there don't appear to any collisions in proximity to the junction over the last 5 years which would include a period when the distillery has been in operation. No transport statement has been provided, but the planning statement makes a number of assertions which I think we would challenge.

- They state that visibility is good – we have previously stated that visibility to the east is not compliant with current standards and I'd welcome confirmation. I would envisage reiterating the comments we made at the time which were that:

The A30 at this location is a dual carriageway and subject to the national speed limit. The Treguddick junction is located on the westbound carriageway and is of a very compact nature, at grade, located just below the brow of the hill and on the inside of a curve in the road. Due to the nature of the junction, we are concerned that an increase in turning movements has the potential to impact on highway safety. These concerns were set out in detail in response to an earlier application reference PA17/09449, now withdrawn, and for completeness these are also included here:

- *westbound traffic approaching from Launceston will need to slow in lane 1 to then make the manoeuvre into the side road as this is not a full length off slip with a dedicated lane for traffic to use;*
- *eastbound traffic will be required to cross over 2 lanes of the westbound main line carriageway to then enter the side road, with visibility for this manoeuvre reduced due to the location on a downward gradient;*
- *traffic leaving the side road and then wishing to travel westbound to Launceston has to immediately manoeuvre into lane 2 of the westbound carriageway upon exiting the side road as the central reserve crossover for westbound traffic is located only 320m to the west and could therefore result in slow moving traffic entering lane 2;*
- *the compact nature of the junction may result in two large vehicles being unable to pass one another at the junction location, or not being able to make the sweep into the side*

road should a vehicle be exiting, which could lead to lane 1 becoming blocked leading to a risk of collision.

- That the site has brown tourism signs – I understand that previous advice was that the site would not qualify for brown signing under current requirements. Google streetview is from August 2023 and no signs appear to be visible then – can [REDACTED] or the third party team please confirm whether signs have indeed be approved and erected. If brown signs have been approved that could undermine any grounds for objection. Similarly, if there is a current request for signing under consideration and pending approval can you also please advise whether the signs are likely to be approved or not and the reasoning for any decision.
- They state that the main mode of transport will not be the car – however they provide no evidence to support that or demonstrate that the site is a sustainable location in terms of alternative travel modes to the car and that there is realistic travel choice. The travel plan contradicts this statement by saying that visitors will arrive by car. The travel plan seems pretty meaningless.
- The planning statement also suggests that the current operation of the distillery may not reflect that previously outlined in the original distillery application, and that they are now catering for larger numbers of visitors (tours of 12 rather than 6, and potentially open more than the previous 3 days for tours).

I have put the relevant planning documents on share here:

<https://share.highwaysengland.co.uk/share/llisapi.dll/link/109234405>

My initial view (subject to your comments) is that we probably issue a holding recommendation in the first instance and request further information/clarification and a transport statement which should include an up to date analysis of trips associated with current distillery operation which should better equip us in making a decision whether the increase in trips associated with the lodges is material and sufficient for us to refuse. The matter of the brown signs also needs to be resolved.

Can you please let me have your views by close of play on 8 March.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

South West Operations – Assistant Spatial Planner (Highways Development Management)

National Highways | Ash House | Falcon Road, Sowton Ind. Estate | Exeter | EX2 7LB

Tel: [REDACTED]

Web: <http://www.nationalhighways.co.uk>