

I would recommend that the proposed access provides pedestrian visibility splays of 2.4 x 3.3m in both directions measured from the back of the footway in which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 0.6m in height.

I would recommend any proposed shared access is a minimum of 4.8m wide for a minimum of 5m behind the adjoining highway and surfaced with hard bound materials for a minimum distance of 5m behind the adjoining highway. No gates shall be erected within 5m of the highway boundary. Any proposed access would require s.184 consent.

I would recommend that the existing access is reinstated to full height footway construction.

Parking & Turning Provision

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. SCP/18316 Rev A) indicates the provision of adequate parking and turning provision within the curtilage of the site but would appear to rely on communal use of the driveway behind the shared access. Any proposed dividing boundary fence at the front of the site separating the 2 properties would need to be removed to facilitate adequate access / turning..

I would normally therefore recommend that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reason:-

There is restricted visibility at the proposed access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.

However, if the applicant can obtain agreement (s.106 agreements required) from the adjoining landowners and satisfactorily demonstrate the provision of the required splays then I would have no objections to the proposed development.

Supplementary Notes

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



 Planning Control Manager