

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

2<sup>nd</sup> March 2011

## Observations and recommendations made since preparation of agenda

| Item                         | Comments   |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Planning Applications</b> |  |
| 01                           | <p><b>W/10/03336/FUL Aroona Church Lane Limpley Stoke</b></p> <p><b>Additional information received:</b></p> <p>Members are advised that revised plans have been received from the agent for the proposed Crowe Hill entrance. The superseded plans proposed to use gabion walls which have now been replaced as part of the proposal by natural Cotswold stone walls flanking the entrance.</p> <p>A petition signed by 184 people has been received objecting to the proposal stating that it will harm the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the rural ambience of Crowe Hill and the scenic view from Murhill and Winsley and will have a negative impact on traffic flow and pedestrian safety.</p>  |
| 02                           | <p><b>W/10/04066/FUL Land Adjoining Railway Line, Court Lane, Bratton, Wiltshire</b></p> <p><b>Additional information received:</b></p> <p>The applicant has made further representations for clarification on the access. She is of the view that the proposed entrance to the site conforms with Highway Code stopping distances and, having been "...constructed by a Council-approved contractor..." has the necessary visibility splays. It was previously used for a skip-lorry and a horse-and-cart access. Reference is also made to other accesses in the vicinity which are considered to be more dangerous. The applicant further states that there have been no incidents at this access, but there have been near misses at other points in the vicinity, including the Bonnie Park entrance.</p> <p>The applicant says that there have been further discussions with highway officers.</p> <p><b>Planning Officer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Highway Officer has in turn confirmed this, but advises that there is an alternative site access location, 13m north of the small field access, where adequate visibility can be achieved with the loss of some 15m of hedgerow. This would overcome the grounds for refusal of the access shown in the application.</p> <p>However, your planning officers would have some concern over the loss of this length of native hedgerow. Furthermore, under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 any opening over the maximum length of 9 metres would require a formal application under these regulations.</p> |