

Members' Site Visit

PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE: 17/1433/OUT

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: Construct seven dwellings and associated works, including the creation of a one-way system to serve the development

LOCATION: Land At Grid Ref 317269 196829 Coronation Road East Lane Blackwood

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 18th June 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: M Adams, W David, N Dix, K Etheridge and A Farina-Childs

The following points were raised by members, and the answers provided:

- Cllr Adams advised all present that any questions that could not be answered at the meeting would be answered at Planning Committee.
- Cllr Dix raised concerns about the loss of a green space and the likely implication for land drainage in the area.
- Cllr Farina-Childs echoed the concerns of Cllr Dix that the access leading to the proposed development was inadequate and would be detrimental to highway safety, particularly for pedestrian users of the lane.

- Cllr Dix queried whether the existing off street parking would be removed as result of the proposed layout. This was confirmed to members, however it was also noted that this parking area was created for Social Services staff and not for residents.

- Cllr Dix queried whether the existing users of the garages adjacent to the application site had been taken into consideration in relation to the proposed one way system. This was confirmed to members that vehicle users of the garages below Coronation Road would have to adhere to the one way system.

- Cllr Etheridge requested that the additional condition proposed relating to a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) after the report was prepared is unacceptable without seeing the specific wording of the condition prior to members making an informed decision. Members were informed that it is common for additional conditions to be reported at planning committee or members to consider when determining any application recommended for approval.

- Cllr Etheridge asked the following questions to be answered relating to the officer report:
 1. Why are the Highways Authority relying on allowed appeals for similar residential development with no formal footpath arrangements?
 2. Why are existing highway users allowed to cut the corner at the junction of the site and how will this be prevented in the future?
 3. Why do Officers considered that the highway safety situation will likely improve as a result of the development?

4. Why does the case officer incorrectly refer to privacy distances of 21 metres in the report when this is in fact not the case?

- Cllr Etheridge formally requested to the agent that the application is withdrawn and requests an email on behalf of the client with an intention of their reasonableness to do so. The agent confirmed that he will confirm the intentions of the applicant but that it is highly unlikely that the application will be withdrawn.
- Cllr Etheridge confirmed his intentions that he will be requesting the application to be deferred at planning committee.