

## Officer Update Note

11 May 2016

### Item 6.1

APPLICATION NUMBER:	8/23/2P/PA 2015/1405/OUT	PARISH:	Camblesforth Parish Council
APPLICANT:	Treadstone Holdings	VALID DATE:	11 <sup>th</sup> January 2016
		EXPIRY DATE:	11 <sup>th</sup> April 2016
PROPOSAL:	Outline application including access for the erection of up to 45 dwellings		
LOCATION:	Selby Road, Camblesforth, Selby		

### 1.5 Publicity

Since the Officers Report was collated a further representation has been received which has raised the following concerns:

- There are concerns that the application has failed to be considered and advertised correctly by officers. Attention is bought to Policy SP2 which states that:

“Limited amounts of residential development may be absorbed inside Development Limits of Secondary Villages where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and which conform to the provisions of Policy SP4 and Policy SP10”. SP4 makes it clear what types of developments are acceptable stating

In order to ensure that development on non-allocated sites contributes to sustainable development and the continued evolution of viable communities, the following types of residential development will be acceptable in principle, within Development Limits in different settlement types, as follows: In Secondary Villages – conversions, replacement dwellings, redevelopment of previously developed land filling of small linear gaps in otherwise built up residential frontages and conversion/redevelopment of farmsteads”

- Concerns are raised that the proposal does not propose the conversion, replacement of an existing dwelling or the redevelopment of previously development land. Nor does the proposal comprise of the filling of a small linear gap or the redevelopment of a farmstead as such it is clearly contrary to policy SP4. This fact remains despite being allocated in 2005 under the old Selby District local Plan.
- In this regard under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that “if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be

resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published". In this case, the last document to be adopted is the Core Strategy adopted 22 October 2013 as such it is policy SP4 which takes precedence over Policy CAM/1 of the Local Plan. Therefore, it is clear that as the development is clearly in conflict with SP4 that the application should be refused in line with the most up to date policy." The act makes it very clear that this is the correct way of approaching planning policies which clearly conflict with each other. No assessment of these factors is provided within the committee report.

- In addition as the application fails to accord with SP4 and therefore SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy (the policy which takes precedence) it is a departure from the development plan and should be advertised as such. According to the documents available on the Council's website, this has not taken place. Any advertisement must highlight the fact that the development is a departure from the development plan.
- It is trusted that the above will be taken into account to ensure the decision is made in accordance with the correct policy and that members of planning committee are made aware of these concerns. Many of the villagers within Camblesforth are under the impression that this application cannot fail as it is an allocation, however, this is simply not true as set out above. Failing to properly assess the application would, of course, leave the Council open to a Judicial Review.

In response to the comments above Policy SP4 clearly stipulates that "In order to ensure that development on non-allocated sites contributes towards sustainable development....." This policy is used to assess development on non-allocated sites. The proposed application site is an allocated site and the principle of development has already been established. The Officer Report points out in paragraph 2.7.8:

"Policy SP2 states that limited amounts of development may be absorbed inside development limits of secondary villages. Policy SP4 states that sustainable development in Secondary Villages will consist of conversions, replacement dwellings, redevelopment of previously developed land, the filling of small linear gaps in otherwise built up residential frontages, and the conversion or redevelopment of farmstead. This gives a clear indication as to the scale of residential development that the spatial development strategy sets out for Secondary Villages. A proposal for 45 dwellings would therefore conflict with Policy SP4. Notwithstanding this, the Core Strategy did not specifically supersede Policy CAM/1 and it is therefore considered on balance that this scheme for 45 dwellings at this location would be acceptable."

The application site is a saved housing allocation (CAM/1) for the Selby District Local Plan and has not been superseded by the Core Strategy. Therefore the proposals are not a departure from the development plan and the proposals have been correctly advertised.

## Item 6.2

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2014/1125/COU 8/23/30D/PA	PARISH:	Camblesforth Parish Council
APPLICANT:	Mr J Doyle	VALID DATE:	29 October 2014
		EXPIRY DATE:	24 December 2014
PROPOSAL:	Resubmission for change of use of land to create a holiday park consisting of the siting of 10 log cabins and use of an existing cabin as manager's accommodation at		
LOCATION:	Land Adjacent Brickyard Farm Selby Road Camblesforth Selby North Yorkshire		

1.4 Since the compilation of the Officer Report 2 further representations have been received. It is considered that the comments made do not raise any further new issues that are not considered in the Officer Report and for reference they have been included in Appendix 1 and 2 of this Officer Update Note for Members attention. These letters have been sent to the Planning Inspectorate who are the determining body and will make the decision.

## 2.6 Conditions

A condition should be added to read:

01. The development for which permission is hereby granted shall be begun within a period of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to comply with the provisions of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

## Item 6.3

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2016/0060/OUT	PARISH:	Whitley Parish Council
APPLICANT:	Mr Raymond Wood	VALID DATE:	26th January 2016
		EXPIRY DATE:	22nd March 2016
PROPOSAL:	Outline consent for 8 No Affordable Housing Units		
LOCATION:	Gravelhill Lane Whitley Goole East Yorkshire		

Since the Officers Report was collated further comments have been received on the application.

### **Section 1.4 – Consultations**

1.4.1 Whitley Parish Council - restated comments made on the application and noted "real concern that this development will open up the rest of the plot for development".

1.4.5 Danvm Internal Drainage Board – commented on the application and noted that

"Detailed plans of surface water discharge could not be found within this application.

- If the surface water were to be disposed of via a soakaway system, the Board would have no objection in principle but would advise that the ground conditions in this area may not be suitable for soakaway drainage. It is therefore essential that percolation tests are undertaken to establish if the ground conditions are suitable for soakaway drainage throughout the year.
- If surface water is to be directed to a mains sewer system the Board would again have no objection in principle, providing that the Water Authority are satisfied that the existing system will accept this additional flow.
- If the surface water is to be discharged to any watercourse within the Drainage District, Consent from the Board would be required in addition to Planning Permission, and would be restricted to 1.4 litres per second per hectare or greenfield runoff.
- No obstructions within 7 metres of the edge of a watercourse are permitted without Consent from the Board."

### **Section 1.5 – Publicity**

Two further submissions have been made by Neighbours re-stating previous comments.

### **2.18 Recommendation**

No further conditions are required as a result of objections or the comments of the IDB. Conditions 2 and 4 as noted in the Agenda will cover the requirement for the details of surface water management to be agreed.

### **Item 6.4**

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2015/0969/OUT	PARISH:	Kellington Parish Council
APPLICANT:	Mrs Sharon Dickinson	VALID DATE:	25th August 2015
		EXPIRY DATE:	24th November 2015
PROPOSAL:	Outline application with all matters reserved for residential development on land to the east of		

LOCATION:	Manor Garth Kellington Goole East Yorkshire
-----------	--

The response from the Strategic Flood Authority has not been received therefore the recommendation should be amended to the following:

### Recommendation

**Officers be given delegated authority to APPROVE subject to completion of the Section 106 agreement to secure 40% on-site affordable housing provision and a waste and recycling contribution; no objections from the Strategic Flood Authority; any conditions received from the Strategic Flood Authority; and the conditions detailed at paragraph 3 of the report:**

### Item 6.5

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2015/1216/FUL 8/79/41E/PA	PARISH:	Appleton Roebuck
APPLICANT:	Mr Nigel Watson	VALID DATE:	28 January 2016
		EXPIRY DATE:	24 March 2016
PROPOSAL:	Section 73 application for the variation of condition 6 (drawings) of approval 2014/1262/FUL for the erection of a new bungalow and garage following demolition of existing bungalow and garage		
LOCATION:	Lynwade Church Lane Appleton Roebuck York YO23 7DF		

Since the Officers Report was collated further comments have been received on the application and further information has been provided by the Applicants in relation to the flue for the stove within the living room.

### Section 1.4 – Consultations

#### 1.4.1 Appleton Roebuck Parish Council – restate previous comments and note:

1. The Parish Council reiterates the objections previously made regarding the revised plans for the garage, in that it should be built in accordance with the original planning approval.
2. There are no observations regarding other items on the revised plans.

### Section 1.5 – Publicity

Two further submissions have been made by Neighbours re-stating previous comments.

### **Section 2.17 – Other Matters arising from Consultations and Condition 05.**

Members will note from the Officers Report that objectors have raised concerns in relation to the height of the chimney and the effectiveness of the flue in terms of ensuring smoke is taken away from adjoining occupiers. Since the collation of the Officers Report the agent has provided additional information on the installed flue and the stove. They have also confirmed that the stove and flue was installed by a HETAS registered company and that it will be checked by Building Control at final sign off of the development. HETAS is the official body recognised by Government to approve biomass and solid fuel heating appliances, fuels and services including the registration of competent installers and servicing businesses.

This position has been discussed with the Council's Environmental Health Officers, and they have raised no objections given that

- The chimney serves an approved appliance installed by an approved installer and complies with Building Regulations.
- The development is not in a smoke control area or in an area of known poor air quality.
- Planning consent is not required for the installation of such an appliance, therefore this case will be no worse than if other residents were to install similar appliances in the vicinity.
- Providing the appliance is operated in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions, including maintenance and fuel type the risk to amenity of the area should be low.

As such they have "objections to the proposals so far as this department's interests are concerned".

Members are therefore advised that Condition 05 is not appropriate as the details of the flue and its effectiveness will be considered by Building Control. Should there be any issues of statutory nuisance this would be considered at the appropriate stage.

### **2.20 Recommendation**

Condition 05 not required.

### **Appendix 1**

PLEASE ENSURE THIS DOCUMENT IS PLACED ON THE LPA WEBSITE AND INCLUDED IN THE OFFICER UPDATE TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE 11th MAY 2016 MEETING FOR THE BRICKYARD FARM 'WHAT IF' DISCUSSION 2014/1125/COU. IN PARTICULAR COULD WE DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO THE EMBOLDEN NEW INFORMATION CONTAINED IN POINTS 27 TO 31.

Date 16th February 2016

For consideration in any future appeal or court cases

**RESPONSE TO OFFICER UPDATE REPORT FOR 2014/1125/COU BRICKYARD FARM IN CONNECTION WITH THE 10th FEBRUARY 2016 PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING. The following comments and corrections require consideration**

For ease of reference, from the officer update note relating to 2014/1125/COU, we have numbered all the emboldened objector comments from 1-26.

1. The Officer response is exactly what the objector has said i.e 'material information' must be taken into consideration. We maintain that has not occurred. Highways issues relating to the interference of the free flow of traffic, and consequential safety issues to highways users has neither been addressed by the LPA or Highways after numerous times of raising the issue, until it became the subject of a formal complaint very recently.

2. We do not accept this application is being determined against all the relevant and up to date local and national planning policy. SP13 has been wrongly applied, part 4 only relates to small scale rural developments and tourism not large scale as in this case. 11 dwellings are NOT considered small scale in any planning definition. RT10 appears not to have been considered (tourist related development) which of course that is what it is described as. The proposal has not been considered against RT2 for Recreation and Tourism. There are 11 dwellings proposed so where are the provided recreation spaces within the site or elsewhere. The development will be proven as prejudicial to highways safety for certain, so how could it even be considered, however more to the point why has it not been considered against this, and where is the evidence? It DOES NOT COMPLY AT ALL WITH RT10. The nature and scale is not appropriate to the locality. The proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would create conditions prejudicial to highway safety. It would also be likely to have a significant adverse effect on the environment and disrupt local community life. WHERE IS THE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE LPA OFFICERS VIEWS? SHOW IT. RT11 claims to have been used against which to measure these proposals. Where is the evidence? The proposal is NOT located within defined development limits nor fulfilling any of the described criteria and certainly could not represent the use of AN EXISTING STRUCTURALLY SOUND BUILDING WHICH IS SUITABLE FOR ITS PROPOSED FUNCTION WITHOUT MAJOR REBUILDING OR ADAPTATION. Adding another 10 dwellings to justify this temporary cabin that was deemed illegal as 3 enforcement notices were served and ignored really would take the biscuit. The size and scale would also need to be of an appropriate size and scale appropriate to the locality. Clearly this is not as it is 11 dwellings outnumbering the neighbourhood in a ratio of almost 4:1 and the people in a ratio of 6:1. We need to see the LPA evidence to support such a claim.

3. The officer claims that the objector states the proposal is to discharge foul and clean water on to an area of flood zone 3. The area is certainly designated as HIGH RISK OF FLOODING at the exact point of discharge to the west of the A1041 on to Hollytree assets and that is proven by looking on the E.A interactive surface water flood map at any of the following coordinates X462458 Y428714, or X462451 Y428711, or X462456 Y428711. Furthermore the area immediately downstream is described on the E.A Sea and River Flood maps as Medium risk meaning a full flood risk assessment was required. Where is the evidence of that? The E.A and IDB have

NOT both confirmed they have no OBJECTIONS to the proposals, ONLY that they have NO Objections in PRINCIPLE TO THE APPROACH. The details have NOT been agreed to.

4. It is very disappointing as stated by the objectors that the NYCC highways have not engaged in relooking at the highways concerns as requested by Barlow Parish Council. The only relook was and is in response to the formal complaint now at stage 2 against them. We disagree with many of the points they claim to have addressed and the attachment here proves beyond doubt we were correct in challenging each and every point. If 3 levels of management right to the very top of Highways cannot distinguish between A class roads and minor roads after pointing this out on numerous occasions, it is hardly surprising there has been a loss of confidence in both competency and integrity.

5. The responses from Highways regarding issues raised in the various emails HAVE NOT been addressed appropriately as proven in the attachment.

6. The officer raises the issue of the matter of the agent 'Badgering' and 'Hassling' the consultees to remove their concerns. That is exactly what appears to be the case. These are the words of the agent. Material or not, it is relevant to why the consultees reluctantly removed concerns in principle to the approaches. The fact that applications should take 8 weeks, not 3 years surely indicates that the APPLICANT AND AGENT HAVE NOT PROVIDED SUFFICIENT DETAILS TO OVERCOME CONCERNS. THEY STILL HAVE NOT as there are NO details regarding drainage nor permissions from anyone regarding the outstanding highways concerns or details of any kind other than the access.

7. The IDB HAVE made clear on the 19th January 2016 that there are still unaddressed concerns! The evidence has not been provided to prove that the discharges from site will not exceed 0.9l/s in the 100 year event nor that the culvert will work at all as it requires a constant flow for it to operate correctly and must be discharged only to a watercourse that is not DRY. This is DRY for 3 months of the year as a result of limited catchment as explained by the IDB Chief Engineer. This must be looked into further.

8. We DO NOT accept that the concerns expressed by the consultees previously have been overcome to any satisfaction as there has been no evidence provided that proves anything claimed. They must provide the tangible evidence as complaints procedures have been launched in order to force evidence rather than rhetoric to come forward. The statement that all consultees have reviewed the concerns and raised no issues, will be further challenged, as no evidence that has been requested has been provided that would substantiate that these proposals will not pose serious harm both to people and the environment.

9. We confirm that there is NO DIRECT BENEFIT TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY. It is up to the applicant to provide that evidence and the LPA to show it. Where is it? We have not, to our recall, asked as to why local shops have not been consulted. However the agent and LPA have stated as fact that rural economies and shops would benefit. We restate that ALDIs may benefit a little but rural shops and the rural economy will not. Provide the evidence to prove otherwise or withdraw that implication.



10. We know it is not in any Designated Service Village, so what is the point of repeating what is an accepted fact. It is also in open countryside. Your point? Our point is clear that there are no justifications in policies that allow any consideration of this application.

11. It does not FALL WITHIN CATEGORY 4 of Policy SP13 as claimed as it is clear that SCALE is the condition in that category. The idea of rural tourism MUST be in APPROPRIATE locations and be of small scale. This is neither small scale or appropriate as fully explained.

12. We disagree totally that the officer has taken into account ALL material planning considerations from local people and Parish Councils hence why we are saying we have been ignored, and our safety concerns disregarded with no evidence provided other than the officer claiming that 'IT IS CONSIDERED TO BE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE.....' No it has not been considered at all as there is no verifying evidence of any kind.

13. The claims we make ARE CORRECT. The area is a HIGH RISK area of flooding from surface water at the exact point of discharge on to the property of Hollytree and FZ2 is 40m downstream as we have claimed. The E.A and IDB are WRONG not to hold concerns if that is what they are claiming. However we do not believe that is what they are claiming at all, it is only in 'PRINCIPLE and THE APPROACH' they have no objections to, which is totally different. There should have been a full flood risk assessment, where is it?

14. Flood risk should have been considered as a result of the evidence. The LPA officer failed to contact the LLFA in 8 months even though it was statutory to do so as a result of the application site clearly fulfilling all of the criteria. Why not? A formal complaint has been launched regarding this on Competency / integrity grounds.

15. We continue to support all that is in both the NPPF and the Selby adopted Core Strategy. However we have grave concerns of these being abused in this way. We also reassert that this application has NOT been assessed against all of the relevant policies, and MUST now be.

16. WE disagree that the officer has considered this application against all of the relevant policies. RT 11 has not been considered appropriately as SCALE quite clearly is relevant here and this is not SMALL SCALE. RT10 would appear to be very relevant. It actually states "It will not normally be appropriate to encourage tourism in rural areas on a large scale". This is large scale, 11 dwellings. It is described by the agent as a place to attract tourists as clearly there is NOTHING ELSE anywhere near to attract tourists which is easily accessible, therefore this must be the tourist attraction, otherwise it is just a site for transients, which the application is not for. Please explain.

17. We reaffirm that the Local Transport Plans do NOT support applications for developments that are UNSAFE, or UNSUSTAINABLE or that cause interference to the free flow of traffic.

18. As occurred with the previous officer's report for the 2013/0651/COU, the change from referring to cabins occurs a few pages in, then caravans are repeatedly

referred to. How can this possibly happen twice by accident from two different officers?

19. The closing off of the access to the site exactly opposite is EXTREMELY significant in consideration of that application opposite. That was on safety grounds as the application statement made abundantly clear and WAS NOT SOLELY BECAUSE IT DID NOT NEED TWO ACCESSES. We already know all applications must be assessed on their own merits, however precedents set certainly can and do affect other applications as in this case.

20. The P.A.L.O 'No Comments' for this application do not follow the guidance, exactly as we have claimed. The clear need to plan out crime here has NOT been carried out. It should have been according to the clear guidance on the LPA website.

21. We stand by our comments that Environmental Health should have had concerns and comments to make considering the mass of evidence available. Those responses in paragraph 1.4.10 do not reflect the concerns that still remain regarding the proximity of sewerage risks to potential occupants and neighbours and the risk from diseases outlined by WTE in their findings.

22. All relevant statutory consultees WERE NOT consulted. We had to ring the LLFA to discover the officer had made no contact or consultation even after 8 months even though they should have been involved due to the clear criteria being fulfilled. Equally so the Highways and Env Health have not been rigorously sought for appropriate advice considering the evidence available. It is clear that though many issues still remain regarding many material aspects of the application. It now appears manipulation took place in order to ONLY have drainage to address. That was as a result of the insistence in a bizarre fashion of a committee member on the 9th July 2014 PC meeting that this application 'Only be refused on drainage grounds', even though 3 people, including a very highly qualified and experienced Highways engineer had just explained how incredibly dangerous the highway situation really was. What made this very strange was the later discovery that the person insisting this was the managing director of a local auctioneers and estate agency who had recently sold the land directly opposite this proposed development site for well over the guide price.

23. We stand by our concern that the Policy Officer made no comments even though it is clear that we believe the appropriate policies have not all been considered, or indeed considered against appropriately.

24. A site visit SHOULD have taken place in such a dangerous position as this. The committee has changed since the last determination as a result of the elections. The slides do NOT SHOW CLEARLY the danger at all. That is FALSE to claim they do. The Highways Officer with the firm view that there was no need for a site visit was and is WRONG and will shortly be facing complaints procedures on competency grounds as a result of this.

25. The email regarding signs erected on the adjacent Reserve as requested by Network Rail are very relevant as it is clear that Network Rail are retaining their rights as land owner in order to possibly open lines along existing embankments in the future according to future rail needs. They also deny that there are public rights of way, or the prospect of. This impacts directly on this proposed development as

there is no automatic right of access from the site other than on to the A1041. The cabins may potentially be only 5m from a rail line in the future. Who on earth would buy such a cabin with that strong possibility existing in the future.

26. We stand by all things in the email that was sent/ received on the 10th February 2016. However the attached photos are not the ones sent in. We reattach those correct ones which show Mr Sunter and M.s Hardingham walking back to their parked car in the dip. Highways had claimed previously that parking in the dip was illegal but that is not so. The photo however emphasises the fact that there is nowhere else anywhere on this stretch of road to pull off the highway safely for whatever reason as ALL verges except in this dip are soft verges that risk turning over. Though they admit now that this is not illegal, that is not what they have said in all previous correspondence. We reiterate that Mr Sunter and M.s Hardingham acted safely in these circumstances however they nor highways can deny others the right also to safely leave the carriageway simply because they are fixated on trying to achieve a splay that is already proven to be unachievable.

27. The photo placed on the agenda regarding the above has still not been corrected by the LPA on the agenda notes for the 11th May 2016 planning committee meeting.

28. This document has also not been put on the LPA website though it was requested to do so on the 16th February 2016. The information contained herein is clearly new though the LPA have stated it is not. We disagree. Could this be added to the officer's report on the agenda for completeness and fairness.

29. The LLFA have made clear in response to the complaint against them for failing to address the concerns regarding the lack of professional advice not being provided as guidance in the SDC flood risk assessment document (Oct 2015) requires as being not the fault of themselves, but that those concerns must be addressed by the LPA in failing to carry out that which was required.

30. The LPA did not carry out the pre requisite assessments necessary as described very clearly in the document SDC FRA Update (Oct 2015) in the a) to q) guidance. They did not ensure the FRA nor sequential tests necessary in exactly these circumstances where a change of use is to the Highest Vulnerability classification and where harm was clearly going to occur to those immediately down stream.

31. The complaint against the LPA for failing to seek the appropriate advice from the LLFA will clearly be upheld as it is simply a fact, what should have occurred did not. The excuse given that this application is for 'Holiday Lets' not mobile park homes or holiday dwellings is simply nonsense and the LLFA have made clear they should have been consulted but were not. The description throughout from the applicant is for Holiday Homes on a large scale that the LLFA agree fulfil the criteria necessary for LLFA full involvement. They were never consulted until S.A.F.E phoned them 8 months after they should have been involved to enquire as to why they had not been. The IDB have also made clear they 'would expect a full Flood Risk Assessment to take place'. None has taken place clearly indicating that refusals must be given on the grounds of that deficiency. Therefore this is NEW information and should be emphasised in the officer update to committee.

Please could you ensure this document is put in the update and drawn to the attention of the Planning Committee for the meeting on the 11th May 2016.

Mr and Mrs Summerton S.A.F.E

**Item 6.10**

APPLICATION NUMBER:	2015/0995/FUL	PARISH:	South Milford
APPLICANT:	Mrs S Watson	VALID DATE: EXPIRY DATE:	8th September 2015 3rd November 2015
PROPOSAL:	Proposed replacement of existing double garage with a 4 bedroom detached dwelling		
LOCATION:	Lumby Court Butts Lane Lumby Leeds West Yorkshire LS25 5JA		

The response from the Council's contaminated land consultant has not been received therefore the recommendation should be amended to the following:

**Recommendation**

**Officers be given delegated authority to APPROVE subject to no objections from the Council's contaminated land consultant, conditions detailed in Paragraph 3.0 of the Report, any conditions recommended by the Council's contaminated land consultant, and the completion of a legal agreement to secure a contribution towards affordable housing.**

## Appendix 2

"In the consideration of the Brickyard Farm proposals (2014/1125/COU) could you please draw attention to the new evidence attached for the determination and Appeal.

The first photograph shows that the sight lines that have not been addressed, that are necessary, are crucial to the safety of highway users.

The photo 1 shows clearly that a driver going south cannot see the vehicles intentions in front should they be minded to turn into the new access. There are two vehicles actually in the dip, by zooming in you can just see the top of one, and the large van that is disappearing out of sight proves the brake lights and indicators cannot be seen at the exact time it is necessary to know the intention of other road users.

Photograph 2 is the view a driver has when driving north. By zooming in you can just see the top of the vehicle to the right. Again the indicators are actually on but cannot be seen at all by oncoming traffic.

The problem in this situation is not the verge but the profile of the carriageway itself. Hence why sight lines are so important. They have NOT been provided. The humps either side of the dip clearly affect safe vision necessary where a new major access is proposed to a main arterial 60mph road.

The photos were taken from approx. 120m either side of the dip at a height of 1.06m.

Also for consideration is the 5 min Talk to committee from S.A.F.E to be delivered on 11th May 2016 Planning Committee meeting."



