

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a parcel of land forming part of Manor Farm, which is located within the Swindon Village Conservation Area.
- 1.2 The site itself is generally hidden from public view from the main village street, known as Church Lane, albeit the site is visible from the churchyard and the adjacent footpath alongside the western boundary of the site.
- 1.3 Planning permission has been approved for two houses and six bungalows which are to be accessed using an existing access road which adjoins Church Lane. As part of this approval, the applicant entered into a legal agreement following the request of the Planning Committee to ensure that the land to the south of the Church and north of the application site remained undeveloped.
- 1.4 The current proposal seeks to vary condition two of this approval, to enable alterations to the proposed access road and some amendments to the design of the approved dwellings.
- 1.5 The application is before Planning Committee following an objection from the Parish Council.

2. CONSTRAINTS AND RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Constraints:

250 Metre Land Fill Boundary
Conservation Area
Flood Zone 2

Relevant Planning History:

14/00569/PREAPP 28th April 2014 CLO

Residential development on unused area of Manor Farm, 2 no. three bedroom bungalows and 5 no. three bedroom detached houses

81/00961/PF 24th April 1981 PER

Continued use of land for the storage of caravans

83/00947/PF 22nd December 1983 PER

Use of land for storage of caravans. (Renewal)

86/01628/PF 28th October 1986 PER

Use of land for storage of touring caravans. (Renewal)

90/01510/PF 11th October 1990 PER

Use of land for the storage of touring caravans

14/01823/FUL 25th August 2015 OBL106

Erection of 2no. bungalows and 6no. houses

3. POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Adopted Local Plan Policies

CP 4 Safe and sustainable living

CP 7 Design

BE 1 Open space in conservation areas
GE 2 Private green space
GE 6 Trees and development
HS 1 Housing development
RC 6 Play space in residential development
UI 3 Sustainable Drainage Systems
TP 1 Development and highway safety
TP 6 Parking provision in development

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Development on garden land and infill sites in Cheltenham (2009)
Swindon Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan (February 2007)

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

4. CONSULTATIONS

GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer

23rd January 2017

The application is for the variation of condition 2 the Site Access Arrangement & Visibility as shown on approved site plan W1331150/SK/01H. Amended plan received on 15th December 2016, plan number SK02 revision A, demonstrates suitable forward visibility and the transition from footway to shared service via a ramp, pedestrian provision will be continued a further 2m beyond the ramp, 50m forward visibility has been provided from the passing place to the public highway at Church Road, to which, I raise no highway objection subject to the following condition:

CONDITION

Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the vehicular access shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the submitted plan [drawing no.SK02]

Reason: - To reduce potential highway impact by ensuring that a safe and secure access is laid out and constructed that minimises the conflict between traffic and cyclists and pedestrians in accordance with paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTE:

The proposed development will involve works to be carried out on the public highway and the Applicant/Developer is required to enter into a legally binding Highway Works Agreement (including an appropriate bond) with the County Council before commencing those works.

Statement of Due Regard

Consideration has been given as to whether any inequality and community impact will be created by the transport and highway impacts of the proposed development. It is considered that no inequality is caused to those people who had previously utilised those sections of the existing transport network that are likely to be impacted on by the proposed development.

It is considered that the following protected groups will not be affected by the transport impacts of the proposed development: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, other groups (such as long term unemployed), social-economically deprived groups, community cohesion, and human rights.

Heritage And Conservation

8th November 2016

Analysis of Site: The site is situated within the Swindon Village Conservation Area and within the setting of the grade II* listed St Lawrence's Church.

Comments:

1. The main point that was raised with regards to heritage issues during the original application in 2014 related to the setting of the grade II* listed St Lawrence's Church. This issue was addressed by the provision of a 'Proposed Graveyard Extension' and a scheme for the planting of a new band of trees, which in combination were felt to reduce the impact on the setting of the listed building to an acceptable level.
2. Although the site layout and detailed design of the proposed dwellings were considered to be acceptable, to ensure the success of the scheme, a range of conditions related to conservation and heritage matters were suggested.
3. The revised scheme remains similar in some ways to that which was given permission; however the appearance of the proposed dwellings has been altered by the changes to the fenestration, changes to some doors, alterations to details and the reorientation of chimneys.
4. The alterations to the fenestration, both the placement of the windows as well as their design, are a disappointment. With the original scheme there appeared to be a degree of regularity and symmetry in the placement of the windows, which created a pleasing and welcoming visual impression. This was complemented by the style of the windows, which appeared to be of a sash design. What is now proposed is quite different. The windows in many cases are considerably smaller and of a casement design, and, from the impression given by the elevations, there appears to be little clear rationale behind the window placement and design. Instead of an attractive and open visual impression, the elevations now look 'mean' and in many cases irregular and unconsidered. The reduction in the size of some of the glazed doors further exacerbates this. The overall impression of a welcoming new community, one which could make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area has been lost, which is not acceptable.
5. As well as the negative impact of the changes to the fenestration, the removal of external details is also of concern. Architectural details, for example the string course across the front and rear elevations of house type B, that was proposed in the original scheme, are details that make an important contribution to the appearance of a development. The loss of features such as these weakens the design, reducing it to mediocre and diminishing the character of the proposed development. A development of unexceptional design and lacking in appropriate architectural features will not preserve and enhance the character of the conservation area and is not acceptable.
6. The proposed changes to the chimneys also needs reconsideration. The removal of the chimney stack on the side elevations of house type B, again diminishes the character of the building, whilst the relocation of the chimney on house type D, does little for the appearance of the dwelling.

Conservation and Heritage summary:

It is unfortunate that the changes proposed in this application are ones that will reduce the quality of the development. The revised drawings are for a scheme which will do little to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and as such are not acceptable. Please ask the applicant to address the concerns raised and re consult.

Tree Officer

28th October 2016

The Tree Section has no objections with the variation of condition 2.

If this application is approved please use conditions 7 Landscaping Scheme, 20 Protective Fencing and 21 Ground Protection Mats from planning permission 14/01823/FUL.

Historic England

17th October 2016

Thank you for your letter of 17 October 2016 notifying Historic England of the scheme for planning permission relating to the above site. Our specialist staff have considered the information received and we do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion.

Recommendation

The application(s) should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted again on this application. However, if you would like further advice, please contact us to explain your request. We can then let you know if we are able to help further and agree a timetable with you.

County Archaeology

17th October 2016

Thank you for consulting me concerning the above planning application. I wish to make the following observations regarding the archaeological implications of this scheme.

I advise that the application site is archaeologically sensitive since it is located in close proximity to Swindon's medieval church, and it is therefore in an area where medieval settlement associated with the church is likely to have been present. I am therefore concerned that archaeological remains relating to medieval settlement may be present at this location and that any such remains would be adversely affected by construction ground works required for this scheme.

In connection with a previous planning application made on this site some archaeological evaluation was undertaken. Unfortunately, the presence of badger setts meant that the majority of the application site was not available for investigation.

I therefore recommend that, should planning permission be granted for this revised scheme, further archaeological investigation and any necessary mitigation recording should be undertaken.

In order to facilitate this I recommend that a condition based on model condition 55 from Appendix A of Circular 11/95 is attached to any planning permission which may be given for this development, ie:

'No development shall take place within the application site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority'.

Reason: It is important to agree and implement a programme of archaeological work in advance of the commencement of development, so as to make provision for the investigation and recording of any archaeological remains that may be destroyed by ground works required for the scheme. The archaeological programme will advance

understanding of any heritage assets which will be lost, in accordance with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework

I have no further observations.

Parish Council

23rd November 2016

We have reviewed the proposals and documents submitted by applicant to request a relaxation of condition 2 of the original consent. We have also read the responses that have been included.

A. The Conclusion of Swindon Parish Council regarding the proposed reduction in the width of the access

- In the text that follows we have outlined our reasons and provided references to extracts from the relevant documents to support our decision.
- We have also inserted questions where confirmation is required that consultations have taken place with relevant bodies.

The following is a simplified list of objections to the proposed reduction of the width of the access:

i. We object to the proposed reduction of the width of the access that has been requested.

ii. We object to the proposed reduction in the width of the footpath to 1m as this would be inadequate and would not be in accordance with the documents referenced in the text that follows. The route is over an existing Public Right of Way that forms an important and well used link. The reduction in the footpath width could compromise the safety of people particularly young children with adults and the elderly.

The access was consented originally with a single footpath which is already a reduction in the standards contained in the Manual for Gloucestershire Streets - 4th Edition which suggests that there should be a footpath on both sides.

iii. We object to the proposed reduction in the width of the carriageway. The reasons for this are partly contained in the main body of the text that follows.

However we also wish to add next two bullet-pointed reasons for objecting:

- Should The Homestead which is the existing property, also known locally as the Old Post Office, require works or maintenance to be carried out to it, particularly to their gable end, the erection of scaffolding would effectively create a barrier to all traffic movements including service and emergency vehicles. There should be sufficient width to accommodate a 2.5m scaffold margin plus a vehicle plus a footpath.

As this would be an infrequent occurrence it is most likely that the use of the footpath could be shared by domestic vehicles. However whilst this could be achieved with a 4.8m wide carriageway plus footpath it will not be achieved with a 3.1m wide carriageway plus 1.0m footpath.

- We do not believe that the proposed reduction in the width of the road takes into account the impact that the increase that internet and on-line shopping has had on the increase in the number of deliveries that are made to homes using vehicles of variable sizes.

Gone are the days when a large lorry only appeared when moving house or occasionally when a new piece of furniture was acquired. Amazon, Argos, John Lewis, Waitrose, M&S, Tesco, Sainsbury, are only a few of the companies who provide home delivery services and own or hire vehicles of varying sizes to suit the number of deliveries to be made on any particular day. Local stores encourage on-line shopping for home deliveries of groceries and commodities. Individual house in any development, no matter how small, could be served by different companies at different times by vehicles across a range of sizes.

If access is restricted or difficult this would force the vehicles to park in Church Road which would create dangers for pedestrians, cyclists and other drivers.

iv. We do not support the statement that the length of the access, which we have measured from the drawings as being 58m from its junction with Church Road, is a short distance.

v. We object on the grounds that Condition 11 of the original consent has not yet been dealt with and will influence the width of the access.

The reason given for condition 11 is - To minimise hazards and inconvenience for users of the development by ensuring that there is a safe, suitable and secure means of access for all people that minimises the conflict between traffic and cyclists and pedestrians in accordance with the paragraph 35 of the NPPF and CBC LP Policy TP1.

vi. We should be grateful if we could be provided us with copies of the documents and details issued to satisfy conditions 10 and 11 of the original consent. If these conditions have not yet been dealt with we request that any decision relating to the width and detailing of the access is delayed until information for conditions 10 and 11 have been submitted for consideration as we believe that it would be unsafe to consider the access in parts

vii. We are concerned about the access for fire and ambulance services.

viii. We are concerned that the reduced access width will be too narrow and difficult for the size of refuse vehicles being used by the current contractor.

The added concern is that the driver would decide to leave the vehicle in Church Road and collect the bins from a point within the access. This would considerably increase the time that the vehicle is stationary in Church Road which would impact on the traffic flow and would create a safety hazard due to the proximity of the development access to the bend in Church Road and the cul-de-sac opposite.

ix. The 4.8m is the minimum recommended width for two vehicles being able to pass each other and is referred to in the street design guide.

x. A car entering from Church Road will not be in a position to be able to see a car coming down from the development until they have entered the road. Reversing back into Church Road will not be an option because Church Road has bends in close proximity to the junction which means that visibility is poor and it is hard enough for drivers exiting from the access to be certain that they will not collide with other vehicles, particularly at peak times. It would be dangerous for drivers

who decide that they have to reverse into the Church Road.

Similarly any vehicle exiting the small close of new houses will have committed themselves before they would see the oncoming car and would have the option of reversing but could not be certain that someone else was not about to exit the development and prevent them from going backwards.

xi. The 4.8m was conditioned by the Planning officer in the original consent as the officer felt that the length of the road was short and the 4.8m width would allow two slow moving cars to pass each other. We do not believe that this has changed and for the reasons given above I believe that for the purposes of safety the argument is still valid.

xii. We believe that the width consented with the original application should not be further reduced. The original width was conditioned by the Planning officer in the original consent as it was felt that the length of the road was short and the 4.8m width would allow two slow moving cars to pass each other.

Clearly the original condition was attached to the consent because of concerns regarding safety and we do not believe that there have been any revisions to the proposal that provide a strong enough argument for the width of the access to be further reduced. Particularly as there is a possibility that the number of vehicles using the access could increase.

Number of Properties that will be served by the Access

Simple Overview of the Original Application

The original application 14/01823/FUL was for the construction of 2no. bungalows and 6no. houses on the land outlined in red on the submitted drawings. In addition to this there are two existing properties which are the existing farm house and the garages at the rear of the property known locally as the old post office. Therefore, this road will serve 10 properties.

Land Edged in Blue which must be taken into account

The land outlined in blue on the supplied Site Layout plan has potential, subject to planning, to accommodate more properties which would be served from the same access. The detailed survey of the adjoining land which is clear on the submitted drawings suggests that this is clearly in the mind of the developer. Whilst there have not been any development proposals submitted for that area and whilst we would not be in favour of a development that would result in the destruction of what remains in the conservation area of Manor Farm building, its setting and the historic buildings around it. It must be recognised that there is the potential for it to occur.

The Old Post Office in Church Road does have a parking space off Church Road, this space was originally created by the then owner of the property as a location to keep a skip when the property was being refurbished. To do this they removed part of the railings with the promise that they would reinstate it on the completion of the work. The Parish Council have written to Cheltenham Borough Council on a number of occasions to request enforcement to have the panel reinstated. The reason for mentioning this in our report to this application is to highlight that we firmly believe that the parking provision for the property is at its rear and therefore it will need to retain its access to the rear of the property.

We do not believe that the consented road width will be adequate to serve more than the 10 properties.

B. We wish to object to the proposed revisions to House Type C

House Type C: The section of the original Type C house P21B shows a vertical dimension of 8.5m from finished ground floor level to the ridge. The revised drawing PL21C on the current application shows an increase in this height of 504mm to 9.004m.

We object to this increase in the height.

The external dimensions of the floor plan of the revised building have been reduced from 6.6m x 8.9m in the original application to 6.350m x 8.650m in the proposed application. We can see that the second floor plan now contains a proposal for a full sized double bedroom with en-suite.

The proposed variation to House Type C will strengthen its 3 storey appearance which we strongly object to. This will give the new building greater prominence in the Conservation Area and would emphasise the character of the new development which is at odds with any of the existing and historic buildings in the Conservation Area and which will not enhance or be in harmony with the simpler rural appearance of the existing buildings. We do not agree that placing a storey in a roof space results in the property being 2 or 2.5 storeys high. The massing of the building should remain as originally consented.

We are also concerned that this will be seen as an acceptable format for any additional properties or any extension and improvement works to the original properties of the consented scheme.

C. Conditions 10 and 11 of the original consent

We should be grateful if we could be provided us with copies of the documents and details issued to satisfy conditions 10 and 11 of the original consent.

If these conditions have not yet been dealt with we request that any decision relating to the width and detailing of the access is delayed until information form conditions 10 and 11 have been submitted for consideration.

Below are Conditions 10 and 11 from the original consent.

Condition 10 No works shall commence on site until details of the improvements to the existing access road from Church Road to the development have been submitted in writing to the LPA. The improvements shall be completed in all respects with the approved details, prior to the commencement on the development.

Reason: To reduce potential highway impact by ensuring a safe and suitable access, in accordance with paragraphs 32 and 35 of the NPPF, and CBC LP Policy TP1.

Condition 11 No works shall commence on development until the road layout has been laid out in accordance with the submitted drawings, with first 20m of the proposed layout with the junction with the existing highway has been completed to at least binder course level and the works shall be maintained as such thereafter unless and until adopted as highway maintainable at public expense.

Reason: - To minimise hazards and inconvenience for users of the development by ensuring that there is a safe, suitable and secure means of access for all people that minimises the conflict between traffic and cyclists and pedestrians in accordance with the paragraph 35 of the NPPF and CBC LP Policy TP1.

D. References to extracts from the relevant documents to support our decision.

Proposed Access Way

We particularly object to the proposed reduction in the width of the access road. We also disagree with the comment from the applicant that the proposed reduction in width of the access way can be considered to be minor. We believe that greater justification is required regarding the reduction of the width of the proposed access way. We also believe that confirmation of the number of dwellings that a reduced access of this type can serve.

The reason for our objection and requests for clarification are laid out in the foregoing and because we believe that the reduced width of the access road does not conform to and guidance contained in the Manual for Gloucestershire Streets - 4th Edition or with the Department for Transport Manual for Streets.

Length of The Access

We have not been provided with hard copies of the proposed amended drawings for consideration and have used the facilities on the Cheltenham Borough Council planning portal to measure the distance between Church Road and the gated access to the proposed development. This dimension scales 58m as the length of the access road and our comments are based on that distance. We disagree that 58m is a short distance.

The Access is more than a road serving a development

The access road is over the route of a much used public footpath that connects Church Road with a Village public space along the side of the River Swilgate, this space is known locally as the Amenity Area and contains a footpath that links with Dog Bark Lane and is likely to be one of the routes that will link the Village with the proposed development.

The same public footpath also links to a bridge and stile over the River Swilgate and from here it connects to a public footpath that is routed down the side of Spirax Sarco.

We object to the lack of consideration that has been given to the importance of this pedestrian link and are concerned that the safety of pedestrians using this route has not been fully considered.

E. References contained in the document 'The Department for Transport Manual for Streets

- Page 18 states under the heading Access in paragraph 2.3.7 Access to buildings and public spaces is another important function of streets. Pedestrian access should be designed for people of all ages and abilities

Comment - We are concerned that the 1m wide kerbed footway will not be sufficient to accommodate pedestrians with buggies and those with limited mobility. This would be true not only for those people wishing to use the public footpath as link but also for those pedestrians wishing to access the development on foot.

- Page 21 the Section 2.7 headed Disability. The document also contains on Discrimination

Comment: Consideration should be given to the complete contents of this section as the access way will also include the existing public footpath.

- Page 68 Illustrations

Comment: The illustrations on this page clearly show that a minimum of 1200mm is required for an adult with a child and that two adults pushing a buggy will require a minimum width of 1500mm. This suggests that the minimum width of a footpath should not be less than 1200mm but ideally should not be less than 1500mm.

- Page 68 Paragraph 6.3.22 states that the minimum unobstructed width for pedestrians should generally be 2.0m.
- Page 74 - The illustrations in figure 6.18 at the top of the page show average vehicle widths and include a minimum width for a lorry of 3.0m.

Comment: If the access route is reduced to 3.1m and 1.0m kerbed footway this would leave no safety margin for an adult with a child and would certainly fail to provide sufficient clearance between a cyclist and a lorry that is 3.0m wide.

- Page 74 - Paragraph 6.6.1 contains the statement that However meeting the needs of drivers in residential areas should not be to the detriment of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.

Comment: We appreciate that public transport will not need to be accommodated.

- Page 75 - Section 6.7 Emergency Vehicles

Comment: The entirety of this section should be taken into account.

- Paragraph 6.72 states that the Building Regulations require a minimum carriageway width between kerbs of 3.7m

'There should be vehicle access for a pumped appliance within 45m of every dwelling. The proposal shows a road length to the gate of 52m and it will be further to the dwelling.'

- Paragraph 6.73 states that Simply to reach a fire the access route could be reduced to 2.75m over short distances provided the pump appliance can get to within 45m of dwelling entrances. If an authority or developer wishes to reduce the running carriageway width to below 3.7m, they should consult the local Fire Safety Officer.

Question: Please confirm that such a consultation has taken place?

- Page 75 Section 6.8 - Service Vehicles - Paragraph 6.8.1 states that On streets with low traffic flows and speeds, it may be assumed that they will be able to use the full width of a carriageway to manoeuvre.

Comment: A manoeuvre is not the same as using the full width as a single lane to drive through.

- Paragraph 6.8.3 states that For cul-de-sacs longer than 20m, a turning area should be provided to cater for vehicles that will regularly need to enter the street.

Comment: We believe that the turning area has been included within the close of houses. We also believe that it implies that 20m is an acceptable 'short' distance for the proposed access road. The access road is 58m in length and is therefore not short.

- Page 76 - Waste collection vehicles paragraph 6.8.5 makes reference to Planning Policy Statement 10 and paragraph 6.8.7 provides information on the size of refuse vehicles and the minimum street width of 5.0m which can be reduced where, as in this case, there isn't on-street parking. However guidance is not given on the required width in such instances.
- Paragraph 6.8.8 confirms a maximum reversing distances of 12.0m.

Question: We realise that the aforementioned dimensions will need to be confirmed by the authority responsible for managing the waste collection in the area and we should like to

receive confirmation that a consultation has taken place regarding the proposed reduction in width?

F. References contained in the Manual for Gloucestershire Streets - 4th Edition

Having searched through this Manual it is evident that it does not contain clear guidance for this particular development. Design standards overviews are provided, three of them are abbreviated in the following:

1. The Street design detailed in Table 5.5 on page 59 is inappropriate and
2. The Shared Surface Street that is detailed in Table 5.6 on page 60 has been made inappropriate as the Planning Officer has said that Shared Surfaces are not suitable for this location.
3. Page 61 - The Cul-de-Sac detailed in Table 5.7 would appear to be the final remaining category by which to consider this development. The carriageway width required here is 4.8m minimum subject to swept path analysis with 2m wide footpaths on all sides.

Comment

We accept a reduction in the Table 5.7 requirements to one path on one side of the road. The 58m length of the proposed access is too long for a footpath that is only 1.0m wide and for a vehicular route that is only 3.1m wide.

We object to the proposed reduction of the single footpath to a width of 1.0m for reasons of safety and for the need to provide this important link with a pedestrian footpath width that can be used by anyone whether there are vehicles using the access or not and where a parent can push a child in a buggy/pushchair or where they can walk side-by-side.

We object to the proposed reduction in the width of the road. As it is most likely that drivers will use the footpath as part of the road particularly if they encounter a second vehicle.

Page 55 - Table 5.1 Highway Types shows categories other than those identified on pages 56 to 61 of the document. This table states Non-street types - Roads (see Section 4.5 - Road Character Types) but Section 4 on page 46 only contains sections 4.1 and 4.2, page 47 has been deliberately left blank and page 48 is the beginning of Section B. The heading Road Character Types is on page 62 Section 5.45. The category of Road Character Types described in section 5.45 is inappropriate for this development.

Page 70 - Waste and Recycling Collection Activities

Unlike the sections for waste management within the document 'Manual for Streets' produced by The Department for Transport this section lacks detail regarding the widths of streets and sizes of vehicles. Paragraph 6.25 does require that New streets need to be designed to accommodate 26tonne refuse collection vehicle, assuming that resident' parked cars are in situ. We believe that the dimensions of a typical small refuse lorry is 9.95m long x 2.49m wide x 3.75m high. The track width allowed for these vehicles is 2.49m and they require a wall-to wall turning radius of 9.25m. The dimensions of a 26 tonne vehicle could be more.

Prior to making any decision regarding the reduction in width we should like to ensure that the Planning Officer has consulted with the department for responsible for the supply of vehicles for waste collection to obtain confirmation the vehicles can be accommodated safely in the proposed reduced width access road and still maintain a safe pedestrian width.

Page 73

Pedestrians.

This sections cross references paragraphs of the MfS1 and MfS2.

Paragraph 7.3 states that a 2.0m minimum width footpath is required for footpaths/footways in residential areas. A narrower width may be permitted over a shorter distance to avoid an important existing feature where there is no simple alternative.

Page 75

Public Rights of Way

Paragraph 7.17 states that it is important that the implications that any development may have for the existing PROW network are fully considered. Not only will some PROW need improvements to be properly incorporated into a development, but others may require stopping up or diversion. Developers should take into account the existing function and character of a PROW and should not assume that it will be acceptable to divert it along a new road.

Paragraph 7.21 states that Until such time as an Order has been made and subsequently confirmed, the legal line of the PROW remains unaltered. Even where a development does not directly affect a PROW it may be that ancillary works such as the storage of materials and plant, or vehicle access routes, may do so. Where the route of a PROW may be temporarily affected by your development, it is possible to apply to the Council for a temporary closure. When work is complete the path should be fully reinstated to the appropriate condition so that it is fit for public use.

Pages 87 -90

These pages provide information relating to the widths of access

- Figure 8.1 illustrates a Standard private access for one dwelling. Which from a width of 10.4m at the junction with the carriageway tapers to 3.5m at the rear of the footpath and further tapers to 2.4m at a 5.0m distance back from the carriageway edge.
- Figure 8.2 illustrates an alternative private access for one dwelling. Which from a width of 10.4m at the junction with the carriageway tapers to 3.5m at the rear of the footpath.
- Figure 8.3 illustrates a Standard private access for more than one dwelling in an urban area.

Which from a width of 12.1m at the junction with the carriageway tapers to 5.2m at the rear of the footpath and further tapers to 4.1m. There is an overall width of 6.9m between any obstruction at this point.

Figure 8.4 illustrates a Standard private access for one dwelling in non-urban areas. Which from a width of 13.0m at the junction with the carriageway reduces via 6.0m radii to a width of 5.0m.

Comment

Based on the above details from the Manual for Gloucestershire Streets - 4th Edition we are completely against the proposed reduction in the width of the access which would result in providing an inadequate access road width of 3.1m which is less than the width of 3.5m that is required by Gloucestershire County Council for a single dwelling.

G. This Section Contains Some of the Relevant Information Copied from Cheltenham Borough Council's Planning Portal.

Below is the request made in respect of Condition 2 of the original consent:

Condition 2 - Variation

As noted above, various revised plans have been prepared to replace the approved plans submitted as part of application 14/01823/FUL, along with some additional plans to add further detail.

The main amendments to the scheme are as follows:

- Alterations to location of door and fenestration on elevations, including amended design
- Other amendments to external elevational detailing
- Reorientation of chimneys to some plots

Amendment to the width of the access road from a minimum of 4.8m to a minimum of 4.1m (3.1m wide road, plus 1m wide kerbed footway). The key alteration with this scheme is the amendment to the access road arrangement. The applicant has already sought the opinion of Gloucestershire County Council, as the Highway Authority, through pre-application discussion. Their response dated 28th July 2016 (Ref - B/2016/036628) is included within this submission. Ultimately they have confirmed that, in principle, the amendment to a 4.1m wide access (3.1m wide road, plus 1m wide kerbed footway) would be acceptable.

The amendments proposed to the design of the dwellings are minor in appearance and would not have any significant impact on the overall visual perception of the scheme, when considered against the approved scheme. Importantly, the built form, location and scale will be the same as approved.

As before, it is therefore considered that these amendments would accord with relevant local and national policy in this regard. Therefore, we would respectfully request that Condition 2 is varied to take account of these amended plans.

Summary

It is considered that these amendments are minor in overall impact and we respectfully request that Condition 2 is varied as necessary and permission granted.

b. Pre-application enquiry

Pre-application enquiry, decision notice and drawing refs. W131150/SK/01H and SK_01A.

Proposal

- To serve the development site via a 4.1m shared surface access road.
- Access road
- The County Council would not support a shared surface access road of this width in this location as it fails to minimise conflict between traffic, cyclists or pedestrians contrary to Section 4, Paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- However, more favourable consideration may be given if the applicant were to design the access road to a standard of 3.1m wide single working with a 1m wide kerbed footway parallel.

Recommendation

In principle, the development is considered acceptable. This would be subject to the above details being achieved and provided

c. Below are extracts from the Planning Officers report for the original application which lays out the reasoning behind the originally requested width for the access road.

Proposed Access from Church Road

It is proposed to widen the existing road to 4.8m from Church road to the access with the internal layout. Whereupon the internal site layout is serviced by a shared surface street 6.8m in width with localised narrowing's of 5.1m at the turning area out to 7m width. The proposed widening of the existing road will allow for a medium sized car and refuse vehicle to pass in opposite direction. I have considered the shared surface street is a short distance and how it currently operates today as a lightly trafficked street with low vehicle speeds and a mix of vehicle & pedestrian use. Furthermore with the volume of traffic proposed from the site and visibility available, I consider the proposed carriageway width of 4.8m to be acceptable in relation to the proposed development.

Internal Shared Space Street

The internal layout shared surface street as shown on drawing no W131150/SK/01 H, is 6.8m in width with localised narrowing's of 5.1m at the turning area widening out to 7m. I consider the proposed carriageway width(s) to be acceptable in relation to the proposed development

Refuse Collection & Swept Path Analysis

The access swept path analysis submitted on drawings no W131150/AT/B06 B, W131150/AT/B08 B and W131150/AT/B10 B demonstrates that a medium sized car and large refuse vehicle (11.510m) can pass in opposite directions along the existing access road and internal layout shared surface street.

Condition 10 - No works shall commence on site until details of the improvements to the existing access road from Church Road to the development have been submitted in writing to the LPA. The improvements shall be completed in all respects with the approved details, prior to the commencement on the development.

Reason: To reduce potential highway impact by ensuring a safe and suitable access, in accordance with paragraphs 32 and 35 of the NPPF, and CBC LP Policy

Contaminated Land Officer

29th November 2016

No objection to the variations proposed in this application, thank-you.

5. PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

Number of letters sent	27
Total comments received	5
Number of objections	4
Number of supporting	0
General comment	1

5.1 Twenty seven letters have been sent to neighbouring properties and five responses have been received, four of which raise an objection and one in support. A site notice has also been displayed at the site and an advertisement placed within the local newspaper.

5.2 Summary of matters raised;

- Highway safety – both vehicular and pedestrian
- Refuse and Recycling access
- The submitted drawings

6. OFFICER COMMENTS

- 6.1** Officer comments to follow by way of an update, along with an additional consultation response from Heritage and Conservation.