

Thanks for that full reply and for explaining your thinking in much more detail. I do appreciate that.

On the right of way, I will obviously take your word for the legal advice you have received so I suppose it will be up to the committee to make the building of the second dwelling dependent on any such diversion of the right of way being agreed. They clearly shouldn't just grant permission for building on a right of way regardless. This may be one for our Head of Planning (copied in) to advise the committee on.

Likewise he may want to advise the committee on your very surprising suggestion that 'the principle of development.. has already been established under planning ref 20/01620/PIP' and that this adds 'significant weight' to your highways recommendation. This can't be right. I raised highways concerns at the outline stage and was told very clearly that they could not be considered then and had to be considered at this stage. So that outline permission cannot possibly have 'significant weight' in your highways advice.

And I'm afraid I still have to dispute the highways advice itself.

The traffic data you took is a single data set taken on one day over just half an hour which is never going to be reliable. The parish data is much more comprehensive, meets GCC's own standards using professional

monitors, was taken over time and is up to date as I will explain to the committee. I find it very hard to believe the average speed at this point is generally only slightly over 30mph when the speed limit at the edge of the site is still 40 and the robust parish data further down the road still shows significantly higher average speeds there.

Your accident data is also obviously incomplete. The idea that there has only been one accident there in the last 5 years goes against all the evidence of local people. And as I was once told by a medical research director, anecdotal evidence is still evidence. I actually included for you concrete video evidence of three accidents within five minutes in icy weather. Although this was from 2010, the road layout and usage hasn't changed materially since then. And your site visit took place on a Friday morning when traffic wouldn't have been particularly busy and there would have been few if any sports cyclists descending the hill which I've highlighted as a particular risk to life.

If I'm interpreting your visibility calculation correctly, it seems to be based on the visibility from the site exit into the road as if the road was flat and takes no account either of the lie of the land or the visibility towards the site which (again as shown in video evidence) is obscured for descending traffic by the lip of the hill road above and its twists and foliage.

In fact you do seem to be ignoring all the video evidence I gave you of accidents, fast cyclists and sharp braking and awkward manoeuvres by cars at this junction. And you discount as 'not relevant' the past use of banksmen by Severn Trent as dictated by their health & safety requirements without asking why they had such a requirement at this site. This is all evidence and cannot simply be ignored. I hope the committee will take it into account.

But thanks again for taking the time to reply in such detail.

I am copying in the chair and vice chair of the committee for their information as well as Cllr Oliver who mentioned this application to me earlier.