

## NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

01<sup>st</sup> November 2017

This is information that has been received since the committee report was written. This could include additional comments or representation, new information relating to the site, changes to plans etc.

### **7a 17/03035/REM - Land at Former Blounts Court Nursery, Studley Lane, Studley, Calne, SN11 9NQ**

#### Late Representation

**Calne Without Parish Council-** Calne Without Parish Council support the revised application for 17/03035/REM, and look forward to engaging in the forthcoming consultation, associated with the TRO and Toucan crossing.

**Mr I Rees-** I wish to object.

Whilst I very much welcome the changes made by Crest which improve the design and layout of the proposals, I consider that the application still does not meet the policies of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and Wiltshire Core Strategy particularly in terms of house type, the lack of variation in ridge heights and its wider compatibility with the village of Studley.

There are also two serious highway safety issues raised in my previous objections that still apply. Firstly regarding the siting of the proposed Toucan Crossing on the A4 which results the reduction in the length of right turn and deceleration lane to below the standards required, even for a 50 mph speed limit. Secondly the proposals for a crossing in this position also fails to provide a safe 3m pedestrian/cycle route between the development and the village facilities in Derry Hill. These safety issues could be resolved by relocating the crossing to the west of the bus lay-by however that will require changes to the housing layout to provide the most direct access to the crossing.

I have also previously highlighted that the proposals do not meet the Council car parking strategy in that 20 or so, of the four bed houses in the development require three parking spaces each, to prevent casual parking on the road. The plans show three spaces by way of a single garage with two spaces in tandem in front of the garage.

You indicated in the Area Planning Committee report that the Councils parking standard allow tandem parking and it also allows an accessible garage to count as a parking space However I am sure that the standards do not allow three cars to be parked nose to tail in the form of a garage and 2 tandem spaces, clearly the rearmost space is very unlikely to be used when it requires two other cars to be moved to allow egress from the rear space, the result will be undesirable on-street parking. The parking standards accept two spaces nose to tail in a tandem arrangement which clearly implies that 3 or more "nose to tail "spaces are not acceptable. The allowability of a parking space to be in a garage is only intended to be the rear space in a tandem arrangement not the third nose to tail space

**A Cleverly-** The changes made to this Reserved Matters application are greatly appreciated and go a long way towards alleviating local concerns regarding the urban nature of the original plans. My main concerns now are regarding the positioning of the crossing on the A4, as this cuts across the safety lane for cars turning into Derry Hill. This will make this, already lethal, junction even more hazardous. Crest say this cannot be altered as the

position is set by the 106 agreement, which I would refute, as the 106 is actually quite woolly as to what should be provided. In this position the proposed Toucan crossing for cyclists would end up on a path too narrow to cycle on.

I was also hoping that the footpath along Studley Lane could be re-positioned behind the wall as per the Neighbourhood Plan, but again Crest say this does not comply with the aforementioned, again woolly, 106 agreement.

One more smaller point is that I would like more indigenous planting of shrubs to attract butterflies and bees especially. Some of the suggested shrubs are definitely not English or local and seem rather an unusual choice.

**Mr T Marshall-** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 'further amended plans' notified in your letter dated 09 October 2017. Like the last issue of amended plans, it was disappointing that the presentation of the document-set made difficult the identification of the proposed changes and their impact – the inclusion of a summary of changes with individual changes highlighted in the relevant document would significantly aid comprehension and understanding for all stakeholders.

I object to the current plan. My principal objection is that the plan is incomplete given that the status of the crossing over the A4 remains "proposed". The proposed crossing is an integral part of the application and fundamental to safety. The Planning Authority should not consider the case for approval before all highways considerations are complete. This should include completion and scrutiny of the current proposed traffic studies and other impact assessments that may be deemed necessary.

On the latter, given the known and growing congestion and safety concerns at Studley Crossroads (well documented in the Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan (CCNP) and Feedback at Consensus), other material highways shortcomings evident against the policy objectives in the CCNP for which the Planning Authority should seek further revised plans and provide appropriate assurance are ensuring no detriment in terms of congestion or safety conditions (Policy GA2), accesses achieving good vision for drivers and facilitating access onto the strategic road network (Policy BE1), facilitating traffic flow and accessibility for service and emergency vehicles (Policy BE3) and not adversely affecting linkages into and out of Studley (Policy NE3).

More widely, the scope of the application remains too narrow by continuing to overlook the impact of the proposed development on its setting. To address this major shortcoming, the Planning Authority should broaden the approval criteria to encompass measures that mitigate the impact of the development on the local environment. Two key considerations for inclusion in the approval criteria are the provision of measures to mitigate the impact of the development on:

- Traffic flows and road safety in Studley Lane. That this was not considered at the Outline Planning Stage is insufficient justification for continuing to ignore the issues raised in submissions by numerous local residents. The development increases safety risk for users of Studley Lane due to 'rat-running' - requiring the provision of safety measures, including speed restrictions, signage and road markings, to mitigate the risk (measures such as those in Old Road, Studley provide a local template for a possible solution). Derry Hill provides a local precedent of the unintended consequences of rat-running arising from insufficient consideration by a planning authority at the application stage.

- The local drainage system – issues coping with current demand are well documented.

Finally, I ask that the Planning Authority seek tauter safeguards and controls in the Construction Management Plan to minimise site traffic on Studley Lane 'to by exception and agreement in advance' during the build phase. The current proposal carries considerable risk of disruption to the local community that can be mitigated through making the proposed temporary access point off the A4 the primary access point.

### Highway Comments

I note that I previously provided highway observations dated 23 August.

Amended drawing 13245/500 H has been submitted. I understand that this submission responds to comments made at Planning Committee with regard to removing block paving, reducing kerb heights, removing straight sections and removing traffic calming features. Whilst I understand it is a preference of the Parish / Planning Committee that a streetlighting scheme is omitted. After further review, highways consider a streetlighting scheme is an essential requirement.

The design of the highway layout now largely includes shared surface design, with soft service margin verges and no footway provision. In combination, lack of footways and no streetlighting scheme provision will be likely to lead to safety issues in the hours of darkness. Historically sites in Wiltshire villages with no streetlighting would have had footway provision. A streetlighting scheme will be required within the development at occupation.

I would like to note condition 6 of the reserved matters application 15/10457/OUT, "No development shall commence on site until details of the..... streetlighting...have been submitted and approved by LPA. Development shall not be first occupied until.....streetlighting .... Have been all been constructed and laid out in accordance with the approved details".

I can confirm that if the developer is not prepared to provide a streetlighting scheme or the planning committee do not require its provision, a highway objection will be raised on the following basis:

- The scheme does not include provision of a streetlighting scheme. The lack of street lighting in combination with a lack of footway due to a shared surface scheme is likely to lead to increase the risk of hazards to all users of the road.

I would like to note that if planning consent is issued without provision of a streetlighting scheme, I can confirm that the highway officer guidance will be that the Highway Authority should **NOT** adopt the Blounts Court development as Public Highway and the developer will have to privately manage and maintain these roads.

The proposal removes the footway on both sides and creates a varied alignment. This introduces a shared surface with a black top surface. For a development of this scale I am prepared to accept due to considerations of NPPF paragraph 32 (severity) and Manual for Streets considerations. I do not consider that there are significant grounds to object to the proposal put forward. However please note that my highway judgement is that a footway should be provided on the northern side of the carriageway. I also have concerns that during inclement weather that the service strips will become damaged and visually an issue if not maintained to a high standard. I note it now includes 'Landscaping Planting' within what will be the adoptable Public Highway. This will not be acceptable. Therefore these areas will need to be laid to grass strips and prior to adoption. I note that trees have now

been reduced within the adoptable highway. Please note that this does not preclude the developer providing similar within the private areas – to aid the streetscene.

With regard to outline consent 15/10457, I note that following highway conditions cover:

- 6 - S38 details
- 7 – base course provision
- 14 – pedestrian crossing
- 18 – footway widening in Studley
- 20 – footway and crossing

**On the basis that the Planning committee are prepared to issue a consent. I recommend the following highway conditions:**

- (WD26) No development shall commence on site until a Residential Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall include details of implementation and monitoring and shall be implemented in accordance with these agreed details. The results of the implementation and monitoring shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority on request, together with any changes to the plan arising from those results.

REASON: In the interests of road safety and reducing vehicular traffic to the development.

- (WD19) No dwelling on the development hereby approved shall be occupied until sufficient space for the parking of vehicles in accordance with the Parking Schedule and Planning Layout together with a vehicular access thereto has been provided in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The said space shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles or for the purpose of access.

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision is made for parking within the site in the interests of highway safety.

#### **7b 17/07485/FUL- Flats 49 to 60, Woodroffe Square, Calne, SN11 8PW**

##### Officer comment

Condition 5 should be amended to read as follows:

*The tree protective fencing shall be erected in accordance with the details set out on Pg 16 and Appendix 5 (dwg BHA\_052\_04) of Arboricultural Survey, Impact Assessment, Protection Plan and Method Statement.. The protective fencing shall remain in place for the entire development phase and until all equipment, machinery*

*and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Such fencing shall not be removed or breached during construction operations.*

*No retained tree/s shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree/s be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars. Any topping or lopping approval shall be carried out in accordance British Standard 3998: 2010 "Tree Work - Recommendations" or arboricultural techniques where it can be demonstrated to be in the interest of good arboricultural practise.*

*If any retained tree is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place, at a size and species and planted at such time, that must be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.*

*No fires shall be lit within 15 metres of the furthest extent of the canopy of any retained trees or hedgerows or adjoining land and no concrete, oil, cement, bitumen or other chemicals shall be mixed or stored within 10 metres of the trunk of any tree or group of trees to be retained on the site or adjoining land.*

Condition 7 should be deleted

Condition 10 should read as follows:

*No dwelling shall be occupied until details of the Stopping up of the public highway/ re-allocation of car parking provision, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That stopping up shall take place in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling within the development.*

*REASON: In the interests of highway safety.*

Condition 12 should read as follows:

*No development, other than demolition and site clearance, shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the site (including surface water from the access/driveway), incorporating sustainable drainage details, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first brought into use/first occupied until surface water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.*

Condition 13 should read as follows:

*No development, other than demolition and site clearance, shall commence on site until details of the works for the disposal of sewerage including the point of connection to the existing public sewer have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be first occupied until the approved sewerage details have been fully implemented in accordance with the approved plans.*

Condition 14 should read as follows:

*The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:*

<i>P_WR SITLOC</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Site Location Plan</i>
<i>P_WR 001</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Existing Site Plan</i>
<i>P_WR 100</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>Site Layout Plan</i>
<i>P_WR 101</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Site Layout Block Plan (COLOUR)</i>
<i>P_WR 230</i>		<i>Proposed Street Elevations</i>
<i>P_WR 231</i>		<i>Proposed Street Elevations</i>
<i>P_CY 130</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Ground Floor Plan</i>
<i>P_CY 200</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Elevations</i>
<i>P_CY 201</i>		<i>Elevations</i>
<i>P_EN(R) 125</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>GF &amp; FF Block Plan _ Plt 7-8</i>
<i>P_EN(R) 126</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>GF &amp; FF Block Plan _ Plt 10-11</i>
<i>P_EN(R) 200</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Elevations _ Plt 7-8</i>
<i>P_EN(R) 201</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Elevations _ Plt 7-8</i>
<i>P_EN(R) 202</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Elevations _ Plt 7-8</i>
<i>P_EN(R) 203</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Elevations _ Plt 10-11</i>
<i>P_EN(R) 204</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Elevations _ Plt 10-11</i>
<i>P_EN(R) 205</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Elevations _ Plt 10-11</i>
<i>P_CE(R) 125</i>		<i>GF &amp; FF Block Plan _ Plt 1-6</i>
<i>P_CE(R) 126</i>		<i>GF &amp; FF Block Plan _ Plt 12-15</i>
<i>P_CE(R) 200</i>		<i>Elevations _ Plt 1-6</i>
<i>P_CE(R) 201</i>		<i>Elevations _ Plt 1-6</i>
<i>P_CE(R) 202</i>		<i>Elevations _ Plt 1-6</i>
<i>P_CE(R) 203</i>		<i>Elevations _ Plt 12-15</i>
<i>P_CE(R) 204</i>		<i>Elevations _ Plt 12-15</i>
<i>P_CE(R) 205</i>		<i>Elevations _ Plt 12-15</i>
<i>P_FL 125</i>	<i>B.</i>	<i>GF &amp; FF Block Plan _ Plt 16-24</i>

<i>P_FL 200</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Elevations _ Plt 16-24</i>
<i>P_FL 201</i>	<i>B.</i>	<i>Elevations _ Plt 16-24</i>
<i>P_BD 130</i>		<i>Boundary Treatments</i>
<i>P_BN 130</i>		<i>Bin Store Plans and Elevations</i>
<i>5622:P01</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Proposed Level and Drainage Strategy</i>
<i>5622:P02</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Existing Services Layout with Adoptable Drainage Overlay</i>
<i>5622:P10</i>		<i>Typical Sections Through Site</i>
<i>5622:P90</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Large Refuse Vehicle Swept Path Analysis</i>
<i>5622:P91</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Fire Tender Vehicle Swept Path Analysis</i>
<i>5622:500</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Section 247 Highway Stopping Up Layout</i>
<i>GRE21048-11 C</i>		<i>Landscape Proposals</i>
		<i>Topographic Survey</i>

*REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

Additional condition should read as follows:

Prior to the first occupation of unit 9 an Electric Vehicle Charging point shall be installed in accordance with the details shown on plan numbers 16-018\_P\_CY130A, 16-018\_P\_CY200A, 16-018\_P\_WR100C and thereafter retained.

*REASON: For the avoidance of doubt, in the interests of proper planning and to ensure compliance with the Council's policies on local air quality and climate change.*