

DELEGATED

AGENDA NO .

UPDATE REPORT

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10th May 2006

**REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR
OF DEVELOPMENT AND
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES.**

06/0816/FUL

6 SEAMER ROAD, HILTON, YARM

**ERECTION OF 2 NO. FIVE BEDROOM DETACHED DORMER BUNGALOWS
(DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING)**

EXPIRY DATE: 18TH MAY 2006

Summary:

Since the previous report to members of the planning committee, three further consultation responses and one further letter have been received in relation to the proposed development.

These comments are detailed below or are attached as an appendix to this report.

Consultations

1. The following Consultees were notified and any comments they made are below

Northumbrian Water

No objections but require the developer to contact them regarding connections to the water supply and the foul and surface water discharges

Environmental Health Unit

No objections in principle, however request that a planning condition be imposed on the development in relation to contaminated land.

Engineers And Transportation (see if they are to amend comments)

Following the applicant's letter dated 2 May 2006, it is noted that the access is located on a section of Seamer Road, which is subject to a 30 mph speed limit, however it is sited close to the national speed limit boundary, which may have an influence on vehicle speeds at the entrance.

The sight line distance for a junction of this type within the 30 mph speed limit is 2.4 x 90m; this may be relaxed to 2.4 x 70m if the actual speed of traffic on the priority road is known.

The applicant refers to achievable site lines of 2.4 x 70m but has not provided any information to substantiate this. Subject to the receipt of an acceptable drawing confirming achievable site lines, further consideration will then be given to the acceptable sight line distance, this may include a vehicle speed survey, to be undertaken at the applicant's expense.

Material Planning Considerations

Access and Highway safety

2. Having considered the applicants response, the Head of integrated Transport and Engineering department have commented the site does indeed lie within the 30 mph speed limit and therefore would require site lines of 2.4x 90m. However, this is close to the national speed limit boundary and concerns are raised over the speed of vehicles entering the village, therefore greater sitelines may be required.

In absence of any supporting information to allow for a relaxation of the site lines to 2.4 x 70m or any diagram to demonstrate they can be achieved it is considered that the required site lines cannot be achieved and therefore the reason for refusal of highway safety grounds remains.

Conclusion.

3. Whilst the applicants concerns are appreciated, it is considered that the statement provided does not alter the reasons for refusal outlined in the reason report to members.

Corporate Director of Development & Neighbourhood Services

Contact Officer: Simon Grundy

01642 528550

SG

Sample, Lindsay

From: Hornby, Rachel on behalf of Planning Administration
Sent: 02 May 2006 08:20
To: Sample, Lindsay
Subject: FW: 6 Seamer Road, Hilton

-----Original Message-----

From: Gordon Finch [mailto:gfinch@dsl.pipex.com]
Sent: 30 April 2006 13:16
To: DL Development Control
Subject: 6 Seamer Road, Hilton

F.A.O. Mr. Simon Grundy

Ref: 06/0816/FUL 6 Seamer Road, Hilton

Dear Mr. Simon Grundy,

With reference to Memorandum to you from Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy.

The comments therein do not reflect the true situation as my following comments will reveal.

1. The access is not located on a section of Seamer Road which is subject to the national speed limit of 60mph. Indeed it is well within the 30mph limit and should be treated as such. In this respect, a visibility splay of 2.4 mtrs x 70 mtrs would be adequate and can easily be achieved, even though as is pointed out, it is not shown on the drawing. I would also like to bring to your attention that a recent new access has been allowed to the adjacent property which is much closer to the national speed limit section of road, which could not possibly have achieved the visibility requirements that the above referenced memorandum is suggesting.
2. This highway is not a trunk road, nor is it an "A" Road. It is not even a "B" road but is classed as a local road. The amount of traffic is absolutely minimal and this can be borne out by a full traffic survey. To suggest a visibility splay of 2.4 x 215 metres is absolutely outrageous and out of all proportion.
3. It is clearly the highway users responsibility to enter any restricted speed zone at the appropriate speed which means slowing down on the approach to such a zone. Again, it is clearly the responsibility of the local authority, or the police, to make sure that this is achieved by monitoring the road in question and taking any action that is deemed necessary.
4. If highways are so concerned then I suggest that they consider moving the limit sign an appropriate distance away from the village.
5. It would be interesting to know the statistics of how many accidents have occurred at or near the proposed access. I suspect that it is zero.
6. The above matter will be further addressed by our planning consultant within the next few days.

Yours sincerely,

Gordon Finch

02/05/2006