

# MEMORANDUM



---

**From:** Chief Officer, Environment & Technical    **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory  
**Our Ref:** ET/DC/PP/P/2022/0759    **Your Ref:** LP/P/2022/0759  
**Date:** 1<sup>st</sup> September 2022

---

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**  
**TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995**

**Location:** O. S Grid Ref: 460 359 1 Station Cottages, Bettisfield, Whitchurch.

**Development:** Erection of outbuilding for use as dog grooming (partially in retrospect).

I refer to your consultation / email dated 25/08/2022 in respect of the above.

## **Access**

The development site is located on a rural, classified road (Back Station Road) which is subject to a 60mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph along this section given the geometry of the road.

Any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 33m in the south easterly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway and 2.4 x 33m in the north westerly direction measured to the centerline of the adjoining highway. Visibility can be relaxed to the centerline of the highway in the north westerly direction given the restricted carriageway width.

In response to the previous application at the site (ref: P/2018/0884) which included the re-location of the access, I previously requested a revised plan indicating the proposed access details including proposed visibility splays. It would appear that this information was not requested / provided.

The relocated access is in the process of being constructed but is being used for parking. Visibility from the new access is currently inadequate providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 11m measured to the centerline of the adjoining highway to the north west and 2.4 x 9m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway to the south east. Visibility is impeded in the south easterly direction by the existing boundary hedge. In the north westerly direction it would appear that visibility is limited in that the required splays may need to cut across 3<sup>rd</sup> party land. **I would recommend that the applicant submits a revised plan on a suitably scaled layout indicating the full extent of the proposed visibility splays as previously requested.** It may be difficult to support the proposed development if it is likely to result in any significant increase in vehicle movements at the site if adequate visibility cannot be provided.

The existing access is still to be closed up as required by previous planning consent ref: P/2018/0884. I would recommend that the existing access is closed up, topsoiled and re-seeded.

The new access is approximately 7.9m wide reducing to 3.6m wide at approximately 5m behind the adjoining highway including brick pillars 1.2 – 1.3m in height. The brick pillars may need reducing in height should they impede visibility. I would recommend any gates are setback a minimum distance of 5m behind the adjoining highway and open into the development site. Ideally, no gates would be considered preferable.

The access will require hard bound surfacing for a minimum distance of 5m behind the adjoining highway.

No private surface water shall be permitted to flow onto the adjoining highway. An Aco drain or similar shall be installed across the proposed access to intercept any private surface water run-off.

### **Traffic Generation**

It is not clear from the submitted information as to how many clients / dogs will typically be attending the site each day ie/ additional daily vehicle movements. **I would recommend that this information is provided.**

### **Parking and Turning Provision**

In terms of parking provision, I comment as follows:-

If the application is supported, I would recommend that parking provision is provided in accordance with LPGN 16 requirements. The provision of 3 no. spaces would be considered adequate providing a suitable condition can be imposed which requires visitors by appointment only, with treatments being staggered and only one client being permitted on site at any one time. However, the proposed space next to the boundary hedge does not appear easily accessible. **I would request a more detailed scaled layout plan which meets the requirements of LPGN 16.**

Although the site fronts a classified road and would normally require turning provision, Back Station Road would appear to be a lightly trafficked lane where speeds are relatively low. It may therefore in this instance be considered acceptable to relax this requirement.

### **Supplementary Notes**

The applicant's attention should be drawn to item nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 of the supplementary notes.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. O.', written in a cursive style.

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical