

PLANNING COMMITTEE
5 October 2020

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE
PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA**

Item No. 8/1(c) **Page No.** Late Pages

Third Party: A letter was sent to Darren Mortimer at NCC Highways raising the following query:

After you visited the site which is the subject of planning applications 19/02063/F and 20/01083/F you reported “visibility to the north measured approximately 43m to the nearest verge”.

Unless the “existing TPO tree to remain” has been moved since your site visit, I fail to see how the visibility splay detailed on the proposal plan (drawing 1049.01 Revision E) can be achieved.

NCC Highways: Darren Mortimer at NCC Highways responded to the third party query as follows:

When we assess visibility it is based upon various guidance, dependent upon road type, speed and volume of traffic.

We are also mindful of planning appeal decisions which can affect the weight attached to certain considerations.

In this instance, the setback position for assessing visibility splays has seen some cases permitted by the Planning Inspectorate with a 2.0m setback, rather than our usual 2.4m, as such I had steered away from a refusal as the applicant had achieved an acceptable level of visibility at a 2.2m setback (which would put the nose of a vehicle @200mm into the carriageway) as such, it was not considered appropriate to recommend refusal, where an appeal Inspector may overturn that decision.

CORRECTION

Within the Planning History section of the Officer report on p5 of late pages, in relation to application ref: 18/00666/O it should read as follows:

18/00666/O: Application Refused: 11/09/18 – Outline Application: Proposed Replacement Dwelling (Delegated). Dismissed at appeal: 10/04/19.

A copy of the Inspector’s decision is enclosed with late correspondence.

Assistant Director’s comments: The previous appeal decision relates to an outline application for a proposed replacement dwelling on the site with all matters reserved except for access (18/00666/O). Highway safety issues did not form part of the reason for refusal or the Inspector’s reason for dismissing the appeal. The Inspector considered that the proposal for a dwelling would cause harm to the rural character and appearance of the area and would not be an appropriate location for housing.

Item No. 8/1(d) **Page No.** 34

Local Highway Authority: Provides clarification on LHA comment as follows:

I have also discussed this application with my Line Manager and we are and remain of the view that this application would generate traffic that is off peak and will be infrequent i.e. I / we would

not foresee daily associated traffic being generated due to the nature of the application being associated with weddings . The impact of the application in our view on the network and the A134 – Brandon Road Junction, which I anticipate is the main concern, is that additional traffic flows are not considered to be significant when assessed against the average daily flow. It is our view therefore that it would be difficult to substantiate an objection particularly when patrons would have options in respect of their direction of travel.