

## UPDATE SHEET

### PLANNING COMMITTEE – 12 September 2023

#### To be read in conjunction with the Report of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure to Planning Committee

- (a) Additional information received after the publication of the main reports;
- (b) Amendments to Conditions;
- (c) Changes to Recommendations

A1	23/00012/REMM	<b>Erection of 80 dwellings including temporary construction access, parking, pedestrian links and open space to parcel E (reserved matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to outline planning permission ref. 13/00956/OUTM)</b> Land South of Grange Road, Hugglescote
----	---------------	---

#### **Additional Representations**

Six further third party representations have been received, raising the following issues:

- Road Safety Audit (RSA) should be requested and should be undertaken prior to determination of the application
- RSA should be undertaken for pedestrian access implications as well as radii changes
- Queries what highways assessments have been undertaken at internal junctions within the existing estate
- Submitted pedestrian crossing assessment does not take into account location of nearby surgery and pharmacy
- Measures should be provided to ensure that users of the public right of way are able to cross Lovett Close safely
- Existing estate roads are already unsafe, and further traffic controls are required
- Proposed development would result in increased traffic in the existing estate
- Existing crossing is unsafe
- Originally proposed separate access should be provided instead
- Speed and traffic survey data not representative

- Speed limit is not complied with and should be reduced
- Existing phase (including traffic calming measures) has not been completed and, where it has been completed, is of poor quality
- Planning department should demonstrate that objections have been taken into account
- Departure from previous masterplan showing the Phase D1 development as part of a development markets as a scheme of 49 homes and with Phase E1 accessed separately
- Noise, dirt, pollution and traffic impacts to existing development

In response to some of the highways-related matters raised in the additional representations, the County Highway Authority comments as follows:

- Further to comments in respect of the location of the speed survey in the applicant's submitted PV<sup>2</sup> assessment, the County Highway Authority notes that this was simply a typo in the original report (i.e. the temporary construction access is approximately 200m (not 500m) west of the Hemsley Road access)
- From the Local Highway Authority's perspective, the RSA can be undertaken post determination, and will be required to have been undertaken prior to any physical works being carried out.
- An RSA is required where there are changes to the highway and, therefore, the RSA is required in connection with the proposed change to the junction radii; the pedestrian crossing is not proposed to change and therefore does not form part of the required RSA (and has already been through the RSA process as part of the earlier phase).
- Junction capacity assessments have been undertaken at the junction of Grange Road and Hemsley Road, and there is no requirement for internal junctions to be assessed.
- Further to comments in respect of the need to include pedestrian trips to the GP surgery within the submitted PV<sup>2</sup> assessment, in order to ensure the assessment is robust, the County Highway Authority has recalculated the relevant figure when taking into account the increased factorisation that identifying any medical facilities as being in the vicinity of the site would result in. This results in the overall score increasing from approximately 0.027 to 0.031 (and still, therefore, below the 0.4 threshold (and thus remaining in the "no action" category)).

### **Matters Arising from the Technical Briefing**

Further to queries raised regarding the collection and dissemination of speed data by the proposed Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS), the applicant's transport consultant defers to the views of Leicestershire County Council, but comments that, following improvements to technology, many signs and traffic lights are capable of transmitting data without requiring a manual visit to download it, and suggests that the applicant would be willing to provide whatever was deemed appropriate. However, the agent notes that, whilst the applicant would be willing to meet members' requests where possible, the purpose of the VAS is to reduce harm to road safety rather than be concerned with the provision of data and considers that such matters would more properly be a matter for a note to applicant than a planning condition.

For its part Leicestershire County Council comments that, as the sign would be licenced, the Parish and District Councils would have access to any data but, in order to enable this, the VAS selected would need to have a data logger which is usually offered as an add on. The County Highway Authority advises that it does not typically have this on Leicestershire County Council VAS equipment, as any data captured by a VAS is for information, not an actual reading of the speeds on the road (i.e. the data could not be

relied upon for any formal purposes as this would require a formal speed survey using calibrated equipment).

With regards to sending data automatically to the Police, the County Council advises that this is not a practice that takes place in Leicestershire.

The applicant's transport consultant and agent consider that some alterations to the existing entrance feature wall are likely to be required in order to accommodate the proposed alterations to the existing access and suggest attachment of a condition to address this.

Officers have measured the distance between the existing stopped up access (which is in the approximate location of the proposed construction access) and the former mineral railway bridge stanchions and can confirm that the position of the existing stopped up access accords with the distance between the proposed construction access and the former railway indicated on the submitted plans, and as referred to in the main report.

### **Officer Comment**

Further to the issues above regarding data collection and dissemination to the Police from the proposed VAS, whilst it is noted that the applicants are content to provide a sign with this additional functionality should it be required by Leicestershire County Council, the County Council advises that this is not an approach normally used in Leicestershire. From the applicant's point of view, the function of the proposed VAS is to be to encourage drivers in the vicinity of the site to comply with the speed limit (by drawing their attention to their speed when the VAS identifies that they are exceeding the limit). Whilst the desire for the proposed VAS to include data logging facilities is noted, it is not considered that this would affect the effectiveness of the feature in terms of its intended purpose (i.e. improving highway safety by encouraging drivers to reduce speed).

As such, in order to ensure that the tests set out in Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it remains the officer view that the proposed condition should remain as set out in the main report (i.e. securing the provision of a VAS prior to occupation); should the applicant and Leicestershire County Council wish to agree on the provision of a VAS incorporating additional functionality beyond this, then this would not reasonably, in officers' view, be a matter for the Local Planning Authority to be involved with.

### **Other Matters**

Attention is drawn to the publication of an updated NPPF on 6 September 2023; the relevant sections of the revised document as set out in the main report remain as per those referred to within the 2021 version.

### **RECOMMENDATION: ADD CONDITION**

- 25 Works to existing feature entrance walls (submission / approval of any associated works prior to their implementation)

This page is intentionally left blank