

MEMORANDUM



From: Network and Infrastructure Manager **To:** Chief Planning Officer

Our Ref: PD/2012/0259

Your Ref: P/2012/0259

Date: 14 December 2012

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 78 Appeal at Black Horse Inn, Top Road, Summerhill

I am satisfied with the original response made to this application and wish to inform you that I have no further comments to add.

A copy of that response is attached for your information.

[Redacted Signature]

PP

Network and Infrastructure Manager

MEMORANDUM



From: Network and Infrastructure Manager To: Chief Planning Officer

Our Ref: PD/2012/0259

Your Ref: P/2012/0259

Date: 11 May 2012

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990.

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995.

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 3090 5380 Black Horse Inn, Top Road, Summerhill
Development: Conversion and alterations to public house and residential accommodation to form 5 no. 2 bedroom dwellings, ancillary works and parking.

I refer to your consultation dated 12 April 2012 in respect of the above.

The development site is located on a classified highway subject to a 30 mph speed limit although vehicular speed is considered to be no more than 25 mph due to the geometry of the road.

The existing pub car park on the opposite side of Top Road suffers from substandard visibility in a northerly direction; I would not wish to support a proposal that would increase traffic generation using a substandard access.

The development site currently consists of a public house on the ground floor with 2 flats/dwellings on the first floor. The proposed development changes the use of the public house into 3 dwellings, in addition to the 2 already existing at the site.

It is considered that the traffic generated by the three proposed dwellings will be no more onerous than that potentially generated by its current use a public house.

The pub car park is well used by the local residents who presumably suffer from lack of parking at their own residences. If this application is granted then these cars will be displaced and possibly cause parking issues in the area. Given that the car park is in private ownership I presume these residents have no rights to park there and could be prevented from doing so anyway.

There appears to be adequate room within the car park for approximately 12 parking spaces. The applicant has suggested that 10 spaces (2 per dwelling) will be dedicated for use by the development. Whilst the ratio of 2 spaces per dwelling is concurrent with LPGN 16 recommendations, it should be noted that this is a maximum requirement. It may therefore be possible to reduce this requirement given that the road is well served by public transport. If the developer proposed to dedicate 6 parking spaces to the development (1 per dwelling and 1 visitor space) it could

potentially leave 6 spaces for local residents who currently park at the site, and who will be displaced if the whole of the car park is dedicated to the development.

Whilst I have no highway objection to the proposed scheme I would request that the applicant considers if there is any scope to dedicate 6 parking spaces to the development (1 per dwelling and 1 visitor space) and leave 6 spaces for local residents.

[Redacted Signature]

pp

Network and Infrastructure Manager