

APPLICATION NO: 16/01755/CONDIT		OFFICER: Miss Chloe Smart
DATE REGISTERED: 29th September 2016		DATE OF EXPIRY : 24th November 2016
WARD: Swindon Village		PARISH: SWIND
APPLICANT:	Centaur Homes Ltd	
LOCATION:	Land At Manor Farm, Manor Road, Swindon Village	
PROPOSAL:	Variation of condition 2 (approved drawings) for application no. 14/01823/FUL to include alterations to fenestration and detailing of dwellings and an amendment to the width of the access road.	

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	5
Number of objections	4
Number of representations	1
Number of supporting	0

69 Church Road
Swindon Village
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 9RE

Comments: 16th December 2016

I have seen the changes made to the amend the width of the access road and it is still dangerous due to the blind bend. The changes will make no difference to the dangers cars will encounter when turning in to dwellings access. We have had 2 collisions in the last year where drivers have come around the corner in Church Road - one admitted to driving at 40 miles an hour - and hit a parked car outside the thatched cottage next to the church. The car was pushed onto the pavement and someone could have been seriously injured. Both cars were written off.

The traffic driving through the village has increased greatly over the last year, as people are trying to avoid congestion on the surrounding roads. The village simply is not designed to take the volumes of traffic. These dwellings will add to the dangers of driving through the village as cars will need to slow down or come to complete stop to navigate this access and if someone is coming out, will have to reverse onto Church Road.

It is simply not acceptable to expect this to be safe for residents surrounding this development either walking or driving.

Green Lodge
Church Road
Swindon Village
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 9QX

Comments: 29th October 2016

Regarding access to the proposed development from Church Road, I would like to point out that 4.8 meters is the minimum recommended width for two vehicles being able to pass each other. This is referred to in the street design guide.

Therefore having an access road of less than 4.8 meters is not a safe option for the following reasons:

- A car entering the proposed site access road from Church Road will not be in a position to see a vehicle coming down from the development until they have entered the access road.
- Reversing back into Church Road is not a safe option, in fact it is a contravention of the Highway Code to reverse out onto a main carriageway.
- Church Road also has bends in close proximity to this junction which restrict the visibility of the motorists approaching the junction from along Church Road.
- Similarly any vehicle leaving the proposed site access has restricted vision of vehicles in both directions travelling on Church Road especially to the right where Church Road bends sharply to the left.
- Any vehicle exiting the proposed site access road will have committed to entering Church Road before seeing any oncoming vehicle. They would have the option of reversing back into the access road but could not be certain that there was not another vehicle intent on exiting onto Church Road straight behind them.

I also believe that no consideration for adequate emergency vehicle access has been taken into account and I find that most local fire department pumping appliances require a minimum 3.7 meter wide access road for their vehicles to be able to attend a fire. Reducing the road width to 3.1 meters will not satisfy this requirement.

The 4.8 meter width was conditioned by the Planning officer in the original consent as the officer felt that the road was short and a 4.8 meter width would allow two slow moving cars to pass each other.

I do not believe that this has changed and for the reasons we have given above we believe that for the purposes of safety this argument is still valid.

Would you also please note that there were concerns raised in the original planning consent that this junction with Church Road was inadequate and that the developer needed to provide more details to prove that the junction would work before proceeding with the development.

This was conditioned on the original planning consent in paragraph 10 and I am not aware this condition has yet been satisfied.

25 Manor Court
Swindon Village
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 9SD

Comments: 19th October 2016

The revised application is not displaying the revised D7 and D8 plan. The plan was altered to move the roof windows to the front of the property. Please refer to the revised plan. Please can you confirm when this has been done

Comments: 19th October 2016

There is not a copy of :-

Proposed first floor plan house type d1 - Plot 8

There are copies of Plot 7 first and second floor.

Would like a copy of this, as it overlooks our garden.

Comments: 20th December 2016

The revised plans of Type D7 and D8 have now been amended to place roof windows back to the rear of the property, on the objection of 27th November 2014 the windows were relocated to the front of the property due to a privacy issue of our adjacent property. I strongly object to the revised roof windows plans of D7 and D8.

Homestead
53 Church Road
Swindon Village
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 9RA

Comments: 6th November 2016

It seems abundantly clear that making access for this development to/from Church Road is neither safe nor practical. The lane is simply too narrow, whether defined as two way or one way this lane is clearly not a correct access route for this development.

Fortunately however, this development already has a (pre designated and obvious) safe and appropriate TWO WAY access road through Manor Court. Access through Manor Court avoids and eliminates all of the safety and practical issues that blight the current application. Indeed Manor Court was originally intended many years ago to be the access route at the end of the cul-de-sac and Manor Court is already laid out to accommodate the entrance to this proposed development. Surely the correct action would be to revisit the Manor Court access as this would offer ample TWO WAY access that is both safe and clear for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians. Accessing via Manor Court provides ample width for Two Way Vehicular Traffic along with safe and predesignated space for Pedestrians. This seems such a simple solution it is really quite strange that the access onto Church Road via such an inappropriate narrow lane is even being considered.

Furthermore:

- 1.) Regarding access to the proposed development from Church Road, we would like to point out that 4.8 meters is the minimum recommended width for two vehicles being able to pass each other. This is referred to in the street design guide. Therefore having an access road of less than 4.8 meters is not a safe option.
- 2.) A car entering the proposed site access road from Church Road will not be in a position to see a vehicle or vehicles coming down from the development until they have already entered the access road. At that point reversing back into Church Road is not a safe option, in fact it is a contravention of the Highway Code to reverse out onto a main carriageway.
- 3.) Church Road also has bends in close proximity to this junction which restrict the visibility of the motorists approaching the junction from along Church Road. Similarly any vehicle leaving the proposed site access has restricted vision of vehicles in both directions travelling on Church Road especially to the right where Church Road bends sharply to the left.

- 4.) The entrance onto Church Road sits directly after a blind hairpin bend.0 Even though at present the lane only serves one house there are already regular traffic accidents and incidents at this spot. For example, in the last few months there have been 4 separate traffic accidents at the entrance to the lane onto Church Road, two of which were serious - Incident number 39 5/4/2016 Incident number 208 23/9/2016).
- 5.) Any vehicle exiting the proposed site access road will have committed to entering Church Road before seeing any oncoming vehicle. They would have the option of reversing back into the access road but could not be certain that there was not another vehicle intent on exiting onto Church Road straight behind them.
- 6.) As far as we can see no consideration for adequate emergency vehicle access has been taken into account and I find that most local fire department pumping appliances require a minimum 3.7 meter wide access road for their vehicles to be able to attend a fire. Reducing the road width to 3.1 meters will not satisfy this requirement.

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

Would you also please note that there were concerns raised in the original planning consent that this junction with Church Road was inadequate and that the developer needed to provide more details to prove that the junction would work before proceeding with the development. This was conditioned on the original planning consent in paragraph 10 and this condition has not yet been satisfied.

Therefore we propose that the application for the development should be rejected and that a re-application should be made which provides SAFE TWO WAY VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN ACCESS to the development through Manor Court.