

MEMORANDUM



From: Infrastructure and Planning Manager

To: Chief Planning Officer

Our Ref: TH/DC/PD/2011/0328

Your Ref: P/2011/0328

Date: 08 August 2011

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990.

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995.

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 2830 4170 Tally Ho Inn, Newbridge Road, Newbridge

Development: Change of use of part of ground floor to form bric a brac / antique / curio's shop

I refer to the supplementary information report dated 22 July 2011 in respect of the above.

Dealing with each of the points made in the letter regarding the highway issues:

It appears that the information given in the original application regarding the floor area to be converted was incorrect. On that basis I am prepared to accept that 3 parking spaces will be adequate for the 44.51sq m proposed.

I do however still question the safety of the proposed parallel parking bays. Any vehicle approaching the site from the south will have to travel along the footpath and reverse back into the chosen parking bay. This is not deemed to be a safe manoeuvre. Furthermore the angle at which any vehicle would have to leave the parking bay is such that to head back south they would only be able to do so by making a potentially dangerous slow speed turning manoeuvre crossing both lanes of the highway near a bend with inadequate visibility.

The pictures presented in the report of the footway terminating to the north of the site are misleading. Prior to this application being submitted there was a picket fence along the site boundary which clearly showed the extent of the footway across the site frontage. The fence and footway layout is shown on plan drawing no. 1008 – 03 submitted with the original application.

A full assessment of forward visibility has been undertaken at the site which determined that visibility of vehicles waiting to turn right into the site from an easterly direction was restricted to just 26m. Whilst it is acknowledged that the road has a 30mph speed limit vehicles are considered to be travelling up to this limit despite the geometry of the road.

The photographs contained within the report are misrepresentative of the site visibility. Firstly the forward visibility is restricted by the height of the retaining wall which is more than 1.05m above the level of the carriageway. Visibility should be measured from 1.05 m height to an object height of 0.6m above carriageway level. Consequently forward visibility is well below recommended standards.

The trees behind the wall do not form part of the highways argument that the splay is inadequate - the height of the wall and the geometry of the road are the issues.

Given the concerns over visibility and parking my recommendation remains that the application be refused for the following reasons:

REASONS

- There is restricted forward visibility at the access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.
- The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles clear of the public highway.
- The dimensions of the site are insufficient to accommodate feasible turning facilities within the curtilage of the site.



Infrastructure and Planning Manager