

From: MEAD, Chris [<mailto:Chris.Mead@gloucestershire.gov.uk>]
Sent: 07 May 2019 18:25
To: Deborah Smith
Cc: JEFFERIES, Richard; Andrew Moody; 'Andrew Uncles'
Subject: RE: Application 17/0458/FUL 26 dwellings Sandy Lane Court Upper Rissington

Deborah,

Thanks for your email. I can advise as follows:

Following a number of conversations relating to this scheme I was able to undertake a site visit to ensure that the application had given full consideration to highways matters.

As a result the site visit identified that safe and suitable access could not be achieved for. This is due to the new highway alignment from the development opposite the applicants. As such a new roundabout has been provided and within the site a gas governor. The placement of the gas governor was not known to the Highway Authority at the time of the construction of the roundabout. The result is that adequate visibility for pedestrians cannot be achieved from the roundabout looking to cross towards the proposed development.

As such the location does not currently provide suitable crossing opportunities for sustainable modes of travel. Therefore on a posted 40mph with inadequate crossing facilities, any intensification as a result of development that could lead to injury or serious harm.

Indeed GCC is mindful that the footway on the applicant's side is in poor condition and could not confer on this basis that any of the above is unreasonable to establish 26 dwellings where the nearest local facilities by foot require the crossing of the road in question.

In terms of the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF as you have requested:

54. The development would not be acceptable without the provision of the crossing as safe and suitable access for all would not be achieved at a site that is separated from the nearest facilities by a road, that does not currently provide a form of crossing that could be determined as safe. This is due to the fact that the existing crossing point provides inadequate visibility for the geometrical design speed and posted speed.

55. The request for a pedestrian crossing at a location that will otherwise be entirely car-reliant is considered to be reasonable, precise and acceptable.

56. The request is necessary to make the application safe in highways safety terms, is directly related to the development and is fair and reasonable for a development of 26 (crossings) regardless of the form of crossing that GCC will accept based on the required technical review being undertaken.

Regardless of the above GCC would want to secure these works under S278 agreement to ensure that, as has been the case recently, applications do not seek to vary conditions for necessary highways works post determination. I don't expect this would be the case here, but GCC must ensure it protects the safety of its highway users.

I would note though that S278 is our mechanism for resolving existing deficiencies 'A section 278 agreement (or S278) is a section of the Highways Act 1980 that allows developers to enter into a legal agreement with the council to make alterations or improvements to a public highway, as part of a planning application. It is an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without permission of the Highway Authority.'

Regards,

Chris Mead

Highways & Development Management (HDM) Consultant

Email: chris.mead@gloucestershire.gov.uk

Go to www.gloucestershire.gov.uk to find information on any County Council service. It couldn't be easier to find information instantly and in some cases apply for services online.

From: JEFFERIES, Richard

Sent: 07 May 2019 11:50

To: MEAD, Chris

Subject: FW: Application 17/0458/FUL 26 dwellings Sandy Lane Court Upper Rissington

Importance: High

FYI

From: Deborah Smith [<mailto:Deborah.Smith@cotswold.gov.uk>]

Sent: 07 May 2019 11:18

To: JEFFERIES, Richard; Andrew Moody; 'Andrew Uncles'

Cc: Edward Tyack (E.Tyack@tyackarchitects.com)

Subject: RE: Application 17/0458/FUL 26 dwellings Sandy Lane Court Upper Rissington

Importance: High

Dear Richard,

A crossing has not been required previously (neither when the outline application was considered or more recently in respect of this current application) and your formal response (dated 18th June) states no objection.

It is incredibly late in the application process to be requesting that the crossing is installed at the applicant's expense so can I seek some clarity on why GCC has done a u-turn on this issue please? What material change has occurred since you originally responded on the application and how is this request now justified?

Can you also please confirm how you consider the requirement for the crossing meets the tests for conditions/obligations set out in paragraphs 54-56 of the NPPF as I am concerned that you are now seeking improvements to the pedestrian network which aren't justified by the provision of an additional 26 dwellings? If these works are required to resolve existing deficiencies in the network, we cannot of course, reasonably expect the developer to meet the costs of those works.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks.

Regards,

Deborah Smith MA, MRTPI

Team Leader (Development Management) & Enforcement Team Manager

From: JEFFERIES, Richard [<mailto:Richard.Jefferies@gloucestershire.gov.uk>]
Sent: 07 May 2019 08:27
To: Andrew Moody; 'Andrew Uncles'
Cc: Deborah Smith
Subject: FW: Application 17/0458/FUL 26 dwellings Sandy Lane Court Upper Rissington

Dear All,

I refer to the above planning application in regards to the below email exchanges, the LHA will require an extension of time (14 days) from the date of this email.

I will require the information detailed below within the above time frame to address the stated issues below, if the information request is not received within the stated timeframe the LHA would be minded to object to the above planning application.

Kind regards

Rich Jefferies

From: MEAD, Chris
Sent: 18 April 2019 16:43
To: JEFFERIES, Richard; 'Andrew Uncles'
Subject: RE: Application 17/0458/FUL 26 dwellings Sandy Lane Court Upper Rissington

Andrew,

Further to Richard's email we have undertaken a site visit. I concur with Richard's comments below and would like to add some context.

The visibility on the 3 arm roundabout on the eastern side is severely restricted when looking north. The stone wall and the gas governor being the main elements that are impeding. We have already had the stone walls lowered and the governor location was not within the Stage 2 audit drawings for the works and as such has, latterly, created a visibility issue on this length of road.

Given the proposed development is likely to generate some 64 pedestrian movements daily and we consider the majority will cross Barrington Road we would want to see a crossing with adequate visibility come forward.

Our site visit identified the western side footway requires resurfacing, the need for an adequate crossing point and a length of new footway on the eastern side will be needed to satisfy this.

As we have brought to your attention there is a level of interest in seeing a controlled crossing coming forward at this location. We will give whatever work is presented our full consideration ahead of agreeing the essential S278 works that will be needed to enable development.

I am away now until 23 April, however should you wish to discuss I can be contacted on 07960084399.

Regards,

Chris Mead

Highways & Development Management (HDM) Consultant

Email: chris.mead@gloucestershire.gov.uk

Go to www.gloucestershire.gov.uk to find information on any County Council service. It couldn't be easier to find information instantly and in some cases apply for services online.

From: JEFFERIES, Richard

Sent: 25 February 2019 11:31

To: 'Andrew Uncles'

Subject: FW: Application 17/0458/FUL 26 dwellings Sandy Lane Court Upper Rissington

Good Morning Andrew,

FYI below email from Cllr Moor, this would require a LTN 1/95 assessment to be undertaken to identify the level of crossing required it may reveal that the informal crossing as proposed (tactile crossing point) is sufficient?

I would welcome your comments to the raised concerns from the parish and Cllr Moor.

Kind regards

Rich Jefferies

From: MOOR, Cllr Nigel

Sent: 24 February 2019 15:30

To: JEFFERIES, Richard

Cc: 'Declan Torris'

Subject: Application 17/0458/FUL 26 dwellings Sandy Lane Court Upper Rissington

Dear Richard

I am aware from the CDC website that you are looking to include in the s278 for this development dropped kerbs-and tactile paving on either side of Barrington Road opposite the stopped up Wellington Road

This is a welcome initiative but given the 40 mph speed limit along this length of the road the parish council have asked me to request that a pedestrian crossing be also included.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards

Cllr Nigel Moor

Sent with BlackBerry Work

(www.blackberry.com)

Think before you print - only print this email if absolutely necessary.

This email and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended for the addressee only.

If you are not the named addressee you must not disclose, copy or take any action in

reliance of this transmission and you should notify us as soon as possible.

This email and any attachments are believed to be free from viruses but it is your responsibility to carry out all necessary virus checks and Gloucestershire County Council accepts no liability in connection therewith.

Recipients should be aware that all e-mails and attachments sent and received by West Oxfordshire, Cotswold and/or Forest of Dean District Council may be accessible to others in the Council for business or litigation purposes, and/or disclosed to a third party under the Freedom of Information or Data Protection Legislation. If you have received this e-mail in error please inform the sender and delete it.

Think before you print - only print this email if absolutely necessary.

This email and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended for the addressee only.
If you are not the named addressee you must not disclose, copy or take any action in reliance of this transmission and you should notify us as soon as possible.

This email and any attachments are believed to be free from viruses but it is your responsibility to carry out all necessary virus checks and Gloucestershire County Council accepts no liability in connection therewith.