

# Test Pile Worksite 1 and 2: Harvil Road and Moorhall Road

**Schedule 17 Lorry Route request for approval: Written Statement – Additional Information**

**Worksite to the west of Harvil Road and North of Moorhall Road**

**Align JV Consent Ref: ALJ-TP-155**

**Document No: 1MC05-ALJ-TP-REP-CS01\_CL01-000008**

| Revision | Author         | Date          | Issued for/Revision details  |
|----------|----------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| C01      | John Woodhouse | February 2019 | London Borough of Hillingdon |

Security classification: OFFICIAL

**Handling Instructions:** Unsecured when printed

# Contents

|          |                                      |          |
|----------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Additional Information</b>        | <b>2</b> |
| 1.1      | Introduction                         | 2        |
| 1.2      | Information on Peak flow movements   | 2        |
| 1.3      | Site Safety Management               | 4        |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Local Traffic Management Plan</b> | <b>4</b> |

# 1 Additional Information

## 1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Following our meeting of the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2019 we agreed to provide further information in respect of the peak flow movements for the worksites; traffic management measures and the activities which generate the vehicle numbers.

1.1.2 The written submission prepared at the time of the consent submission was also optimistic in programme terms, by assuming a consent approval and consequently the commencement of works on site, particularly for the Harvil Road worksite.

1.1.3 A consent approval has not been forthcoming and as a direct consequence the programme for locations 1 and 2 has consequently slipped. Whilst it is still intended to stagger the worksites such that their peak durations do not occur at the same time, the peak movements for worksite 3, adjacent to the A412, will have occurred by the time worksite 1 can now mobilise.

## 1.2 Information on Peak flow movements

1.2.1 Both worksites have a similar, although staggered programme and these generate peak movements as follows:

- During the initial mobilization phase (import of hardcore (6F2) material to form a sturdy piling platform.
- During concrete pours individual test piles.

1.2.2 For the initial formation of the site platform, the sites likely to supply the material are very unlikely to be able to supply the sites at any greater than 60 vehicles per day (6 per hour). This is because:

- The capacity on each of the test pile worksites to receive the material, check the load, comply with Environmental Minimum Requirements and spread the material is likely to mean that a maximum of 5-7 loads per hour could be received. This would equate to approximately 60 vehicles per day as indicated in the original written statement (see tables 4 and 5 of document 1MC05-ALJ-TP-REP-CS01\_CL02-000001).
- The sites supplying the material and turnaround of vehicles once they have deposited a load, is unlikely to facilitate a quicker receipt of material.

1.2.3 Consideration was given to limiting the movements to off peak only. However, this would result in an extended programme and potentially, an extended period when the peak

vehicle movements would travel through South Harefield. A total of 1200 loads are likely to be required to create the piling platforms across the two sites. Each site was expected to take approximately 10 days, allowing for 60 loads per day which over a 10-hour day would result in 6 per hour which we consider, as stated, to be the limit manageable on site.

- 1.2.4 The concrete pouring activity required for the test piling will require between 90-120 cubic metres of concrete per pile. This would amount to approximately 15-20 concrete deliveries (assuming a 6 cubic metre lorry). It should be noted that 8 cubic metre concrete lorries are also available, so a reasonable worst case has been assumed.
- 1.2.5 Each concrete lorry is expected to take between 8-12 minutes to unload in the first instance, with this increasing gradually with each subsequent load. Consequently, it is expected that again, a maximum of 5-6 concrete deliveries per hour will be made.
- 1.2.6 Given the time that it will take on the day of each pour to set up the pile ready to receive concrete, it is likely that these will commence following the morning peak and because of the number of vehicles required for each pour, is likely to be complete by the evening peak. Additionally, at each location, there will be several days in between each concrete pour (there will not be multiple rigs at each test pile location and so consecutive days of concrete pours will not be necessary).
- 1.2.7 All other deliveries, following the initial site set up, will be incidental receipt of other materials required to support the site (welfare deliveries, bentonite delivery and disposal etc.) and these are not considered to significantly add to the peak movements highlighted above.
- 1.2.8 Considering all the above, the expectation is that during the AM or PM peak an additional 8 heavy goods vehicles per hour may use the highway network during the importation of hardcore, over a period of approximately 10 days, for worksite 2. This figure was considered a reasonable compromise between extending the infilling period and maximising the working day.
- 1.2.9 For worksite 1 on Harvil Road, both Thames Water and Cadent Gas will use the same access. Cadent Gas do not expect to exceed 12 vehicles a day on the site. Thames Water works consists solely of survey and whilst the incidental delivery of welfare or portacabins cannot be ruled out, the numbers predicted are very low. There is also now the real possibility that Thames Water will complete their survey by the time the peak movements for worksite 1 occur. Consequently, an AM and PM peak at Harvil Road of 10 heavy goods vehicles could be expected.

1.2.10 Notwithstanding the above, we wish to iterate that the Schedule 17 request for approval relates to the use of the route and is not an approval for a specific number of vehicle movements.

1.2.11 The forecast peak movements contained in the lorry route application tables 4, 5 and 6 will be reviewed with actual data from the site booking system and vehicles log recorded at the site gate and will be reported to the Traffic Liaison Group as reasonably requested. We would expect to report the flows recorded in association with both concrete pours and the creation of the piling platform.

### **1.3 Site Safety Management**

1.3.1 Consultations in accordance with Schedule 4 will be undertaken in due course once the sites are ready to mobilise, if traffic management, including signage, is to be provided in the highway.

1.3.2 The Local Traffic Management Plan is clear that the queueing of vehicles on the highway is not to be allowed and the site works manager will be instructed to move vehicles on and report contractors/delivery drivers to the principal contractor should multiple vehicles arrive on site at once.

1.3.3 To further mitigate the risk of vehicles conflicting, a vehicle booking system will be in place to ensure that conflicts in site deliveries do not occur.

1.3.4 In the instance that an incident on site occurs, or, two vehicles to arrive at once, drivers will be instructed to continue along the approved lorry route and to return to the site via the authorised route (in the case of both worksites this will mean returning to Junction 1/1A of the M40 and commencing the route again).

## **2 Local Traffic Management Plan**

2.1.1 The Local Traffic Management Plan (LTMP) to support the ALIGN JV early works is a coordinated document covering multiple activities that ALIGN are undertaking within the contract sector (from Harvil Road to South Heath in Chiltern District). It covers ground investigation, load test piles, site surveys, baseline monitoring and return visits to survey sites. ALIGN JV do not consider it prudent or necessary to require the submission and approval of a LTMP as a part of a planning condition to a Schedule 17. This is because the process is controlled by the Environmental Minimum Requirements under the HS2 Act and we have duly consulted with the London Borough of Hillingdon on the LTMP. The proposed condition would introduce matters for approval that are not subject to control under Schedule 17 of the HS2 Act and would therefore not meet the 6 tests of conditions as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We would be happy to

receive any comments you have and will respond to these and amend the LTMP as appropriate.

- 2.1.2 As the LTMP covers multiple worksites outside the authority boundary, it would not be appropriate for one consent to control a document that covers traffic management for a variety of sites. However, we would be satisfied if an informative were to be added to the decision notice requiring ALIGN to supply an updated LTMP and response to your comments, once they have been provided to us.
- 2.1.3 Additionally, we recognise that the concerns of the Authority relate, following our meeting, to ensuring vehicles do not queue on the highway. Therefore, we would be happy to, in accordance with Schedule 4, provide details of the traffic management measures required at each worksite to manage entrance and egress.
- 2.1.4 It is worth re-referencing information paper E1 which explains the Environmental Minimum Requirements and how they operate. Paragraph 2.8 deals with the protocols that can be used should it be considered that contractors are not meeting these.