

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

11th March 2020

ADDITIONAL PAGES

ADDITIONAL PAGES - CIRCULATED TO MEMBERS BY POST

**AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Additional Representations on Schedule Items

Pages 1 – 4

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

11th March 2020

ADDITIONAL PAGES ON SCHEDULE ITEMS

Item	Ref. No	Content
------	---------	---------

01	19/03261/FUL	<p>Comments from Naunton Parish Council:</p> <p>‘Naunton Parish Council does not believe that this conversion would provide adequate space for even one person living on their own. It does not meet the national guideline of 35 m sq:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kitchen units reduce available ground floor space by around 2 m. sq.• Bathroom fittings reduce the shower room space• The staircase to the mezzanine reduces the floor space by a further• 1 m. sq.• The mezzanine space included is only around 1.5 m in height and 1.1 m wide so is not liveable space as it is impossible to stand up in it.• The storage includes both eaves, yet the bat loft requires external access through the eaves. <p>All of which leaves the property with less than 30 m. sq. of liveable space’.</p>
02	19/02113/FUL	<p>Update from the Highways Officer:</p> <p>With reference to the submissions from the member of the public there are some points that need to be made completely clear.</p> <p>At no point is the Highway Authority unwilling or ignoring highway safety. It is our legal duty to maintain the highway and to ensure that development brought forward under the Town and Country Planning Act under the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework is both acceptably safe and the cumulative impacts in capacity terms are not severe.</p> <p>Due to the nature of this application it has drawn the attention of the Highway Authority in its role as a statutory consultee and the Planning Authority has been diligent in obtaining the Highway Authority response at each stage. I could not see either party as not giving</p>

		<p>safety adequate consideration.</p> <p>There is, however, within this Highway Authority an absolute recognition of what is safe and what is unsafe. There is also an understanding of all the literature that is routinely utilised to validate positions relating to visibility, access arrangements, and so on. The use of Manual for Streets 1/2 to pursue position on highways matters is a constant source of nuisance to us where we have to take an acceptable paragraph and rebut the point that the use of certain positions relies on context and where that context does not apply.</p> <p>There are also statements that we will make that regularly draw the ire of various parties, especially those opposed to planning, where they consider the Highway Authority is not taking the matter seriously enough. There is never a circumstance where we are not taking highway safety seriously enough, as we would never knowingly accept an unsafe design. However, in highway design there is a more binary and straightforward way of doing this by applying and adhering to design standards and only accepting departures from standards with robust evidence and engineering discretion.</p> <p>In reality though, prior to the adoption of standards and latest guidance there were roads that were in place and were never designed to those standards. In fact, there are a vast number of private accesses and in some cases junctions on the highway which offer sub-standard geometry and visibility. Junctions that have 'STOP' signs and lines are a good example of junctions that are below standard in geometry/visibility terms and operate safely. Of course there are also junctions below standard which have little material difference to a well laid out junction but still they operate safely.</p> <p>As a Highway Authority we have to act reasonably and one area where that applies most is with the historic crossover rights that properties have. Our consistent position on accesses is that if there will be no increase in use then sub-standard arrangements that have no traceable collision history are acceptable. Otherwise, the contrary position would be, outside of planning, taking up with every crossover the lack of adherence to a standard. There are multiple examples of sub-standard accesses locally and this notable.</p> <p>In this instance, there is also a lot of onus on the 2010 application and it was materially easy for the applicant to point out the geometric shortcomings in seeking their alternative planning arrangement, but again the danger was only ever implied and not proven.</p> <p>The final matter continues to be that the access may have been closed, but the crossover was never taken up or stopped up. It has continued to be a highway feature.</p> <p>I am of the view that the reason the access operated safely historically, is exactly because of where it is cited but also that the use by turning traffic of the area outside the crossover is highly unlikely as a usual position of a vehicle. This is why we sought the white line to identify the radius that egress from Water Lane should take up.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>With full planning in front of us there is still a period of less than 10 years since the access was operating in planning terms 'dangerously' but in terms of general day to day use with no traceable collision history 'safely'. It is a balanced point of statement versus evidence.</p> <p>As a Highway Authority we will rely on evidence where it is available.</p>
04	19/03585/FUL	<p>Case Officer Update (spelling mistake):</p> <p>The first sentence, of paragraph five, on page 45 of the 'Schedule of Applications for Consideration and Decision (HP)' document (page 6 of Item No. 04) reads:</p> <p>'The scheme proposes to site seven shepherd huts, which owing to their mobility and lack of 'psychical' attachment to the ground, would be conditioned to be removed from the site for a specific period of time during the year (October-March inclusive)'.</p> <p>It should read 'The scheme proposes to site seven shepherd huts, which owing to their mobility and lack of 'physical' attachment to the ground, would be conditioned to be removed from the site for a specific period of time during the year (October-March inclusive)'.</p> <p>Further representations received -</p> <p>Three further third party objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i). Noise disturbance; ii). Loss of privacy; iii). Loss of agricultural land; iv). The scheme does not accord with policies EC3 and EC11; and v). Most support comments are from those who will not be impacted by the development. <p>Twenty four further third party support comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i). Economic benefits; ii). Appropriate design; iii). Little visual impact; iv). Positive environmental impact; v). Would allow farm to further diversify; vi). Creates sustainable tourism; vii). The existing gym is a community asset; viii). Noise and traffic impact would be minor; and ix). Would result in increased visitor numbers to the area. <p>Total number of representations received:</p> <p>23 Objection comments 44 Support comments</p>