

Minutes of the meeting of Planning and regulatory committee held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Wednesday 6 December 2017 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor PGH Cutter (Chairman)
Councillor J Hardwick (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: BA Baker, CR Butler, PJ Edwards, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, EPJ Harvey, EL Holton, TM James, JLV Kenyon, FM Norman, AJW Powers, EJ Swinglehurst and SD Williams

In attendance: Councillors CA Gandy, PC Jinman and D Summers

95. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors A Seldon and WC Skelton.

96. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor EPJ Harvey substituted for Councillor A Seldon and Councillor SD Williams for Councillor WC Skelton.

97. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

98. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meetings held on 15 November 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

99. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

100. APPEALS

The Planning Committee noted the report.

101. 172552 - ASHGROVE CROFT, MARDEN, HEREFORD, HR1 3HA

(Proposed two additional mobile homes, two touring caravans and the construction of a day room, associated hard standing drainage and re - aligned access track.)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

102. 172704 - LAND AT MIDDLE COMMON PIGGERY, LOWER MAESCOED, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed demolition of existing agricultural buildings and replacement with six dwellings with associated work space. Conversion of existing workshop to form single dwelling and associated works.)

The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr P Mason, of Vowchurch and Group Parish Council spoke in opposition to the scheme. Mr H Lewis, the applicant, spoke in support.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor PC Jinman, spoke on the application.

He commented that there was a consensus that work needed to be done to the site. However, Vowchurch and Group Parish Council had highlighted the key concerns about this particular application in its representations set out at paragraph 5.1 of the report. Preparing a neighbourhood development plan (NDP) involved considerable time and effort. A plan had been produced that was consistent with the core strategy. The plan had been made and could be afforded full weight in determining the application. The application was contrary to the NDP and approving the application would send a message across the county that NDPs had no value. He questioned whether the addition of 7 dwellings to a settlement of 8 dwellings was proportionate and in keeping with it.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The interrelationship between the core strategy and neighbourhood development plans required further consideration as part of the forthcoming review of the Core Strategy.

It was requested that, as a general practice, points made by the Committee on the operation of the new Core Strategy during its consideration of the various applications before it were taken into account at any review of the core strategy.

- It was regrettable that the applicant did not appear to have discussed the development proposals with the local community.
- It would be costly to develop the site and it was questionable whether it would be viable to develop it if fewer dwellings were permitted, unless these were particularly large properties.
- The council still had a housing shortfall.
- Live-work units would be suited to the site. The design illustrations included in the officer presentation were welcomed. It would, however, be important for the council and the developer to ensure that these designs were implemented as presented.
- The NDP said that proposals should "broadly be for no more than 1 to 3 homes on each site". This did not preclude a larger development.
- Weight should be given to the fact that the proposal would result in considerable betterment to the site.
- The development was acceptable in principle under both the core strategy and the NDP.
- The proposed design reflected the local character.

- The development contained a good housing mix and offered a degree of affordability.
- The Parish Council and the local ward member had put forward sound reasons why the application should not be approved. The Committee should respect the neighbourhood development plan.
- It was questioned whether the development was appropriate to the settlement pattern in the Parish area. The number of units proposed was too great.
- An assumption was being made that occupants of the dwellings would engage in home working and that wifi provision would be robust enough to support this lifestyle. If this assumption was incorrect this could mean more traffic movements were generated which could create problems on the rural road network.
- There were several grounds for refusing the application in that it was not in the right place and was contrary to policy.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the operation of the live-work units was controlled by condition 23 as set out in the report.

The Lead Development Manager commented as follows:

- No land was allocated for settlement in the NDP. Account therefore had to be taken of the council's lack of a 5 year housing land supply.
- He noted that the examiner's report on the NDP had not yet been received.
- The NDP said that proposals should "broadly be for no more than 1 to 3 homes on each site". The benefits of the scheme had to be weighed in the planning balance alongside this policy. These included: the provision of live-work units and a good housing mix. If the application were refused the applicant could propose a scheme for 3 large dwellings that could not be resisted under the NDP. The provision of smaller housing units was a benefit. It was for the Committee to decide whether the development was of a farmstead typology as considered by officers, or an urban type cul-de-sac as the parish council described it. The scheme was relatively small and could be considered organic growth.

In response to a question as to whether the possibility that the developers might submit an application for 3 large houses was a material consideration the LDM commented that the applicants themselves had not advanced viability as part of their application.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He commented that the scale of the development could not be considered to be in keeping with the wording in the NDP and this raised a question over the validity and worth of NDPs across the county. The site needed to be developed but any development should be proportionate. The applicant had not advanced economic viability as a reason for the size of the development proposed. If approved it would be important to ensure that the design shown to the committee was implemented.

Councillor Edwards proposed and Councillor Swinglehurst seconded a motion that the application be approved in accordance with the printed recommendation. The motion was carried with 10 votes in favour, 4 against and 1 abstention.)

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **B01 Development in accordance with the approved plans**

3. **C01 Samples of external materials**
4. **G09 Details of Boundary treatments**
5. **G10 Landscaping scheme**
6. **G11 Landscaping scheme - implementation**
7. **H06 Vehicular access construction**
8. **H09 Driveway gradient**
9. **H13 Access, turning area and parking**
10. **H11 Parking - estate development (more than one house)**
11. **H21 Wheel washing**
12. **H27 Parking for site operatives**
13. **H29 Secure covered cycle parking provision**
14. **I18 Scheme of foul drainage disposal**
15. **I32 Details of floodlighting/external lighting**
16. **I42 Scheme of refuse storage (residential)**
17. **K5 Habitat Enhancement Scheme**
18. **M09 Universal cond for development on land affected by contamination**
19. **M17 Water Efficiency - Residential**
20. **The ecological protection, mitigation and working methods scheme as recommended in the Ecological Report by Ecology Services dated July 2017 shall be implemented in full as stated and a relevant European Protected Species Licence obtained prior to any work commencing on site, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: To ensure that all species are protected and habitats enhanced having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended) and Policy LD2 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework, NERC 2006.

- 21 **In addition to any required bat roosting enhancements and agreed soft landscaping, prior to commencement of the development, a detailed habitat enhancement scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the scheme shall be implemented as approved.**

Reason: To ensure that all species are protected and habitats enhanced having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended) and

Policy LD2 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework, NERC 2006.

- 22. The work space within the live-work units hereby approved (Units A, B, C, D, E and F on the approved site layout drawing 2472 P(0) 01 shall be used solely for purposes falling within Class B1 of the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended).**

Reason: To control the use of the workspace areas in order to ensure that they remain compatible with the adjoining residential properties so as to comply with policies SD1 and RA6 of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031

INFORMATIVES:

- 1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. HN01 Mud on highway**
- 3. HN04 Private apparatus within highway**
- 4. HN05 Works within the highway**
- 5. HN08 Section 38 Agreement & Drainage details**
- 6. HN24 Drainage other than via highway system**
- 7. HN28 Highways Design Guide and Specification**
- 8. The enhancement plan should include details and locations of any proposed Biodiversity/Habitat enhancements as referred to in NPPF and HC Core Strategy. At a minimum we would be looking for proposals to enhance bird nesting and invertebrate/pollinator homes to be incorporated in to the new buildings as well as consideration for amphibian/reptile refugia and hedgehog houses within the landscaping/boundary features. No external lighting should illuminate any of the enhancements or boundary features beyond any existing illumination levels and all lighting on the development should support the Dark Skies initiative.**

- 103. 173692 - LAND ADJACENT TO VILLAGE HALL, AYMESTREY, LEOMINSTER.**

(Proposed 5 no dwellings with garages and treatment plant.)

The Development Manager as the case officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

He added that he had received an e-mail on Tuesday from the Parish Council regarding slab levels and the height of the proposed dwellings but this had not stated how the data had been collected. In addition he confirmed that the application considered by the Committee in April 2017 had been withdrawn and the Committee had to consider the application before it afresh as a new application.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr I Goddard of Aymestrey Parish Council spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mrs K Johnston, a local resident, spoke in objection.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor CA Gandy, spoke on the application.

She made the following principal comments:

- The proposal would jeopardise a much needed traffic calming scheme and its effectiveness.
- The church and its tower was the primary landmark in Aymestrey. The report stated at paragraph 1.3 that levels were proposed to ensure that the ridge line of the new dwellings did not project above the height of the village hall ridgeline. However, she questioned whether the applicant's measurement of the levels was correct. Three sets of measurements had been carried out by various parties in the past three days with different results. She requested a deferral to enable the facts to be established.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- It was proposed that the application should be approved but with a delegated authority to officers to agree matters relating to roof levels, the positioning of the hedgerow to accommodate the access and the location of the parish gateway, after consultation with the chairman and local ward member.
- It was observed that Historic England considered the proposal to create "less than substantial harm" as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The setting of Aymestrey church had not to date been harmed in the way that the setting of many other churches had been and should be preserved.
- The phrase "less than substantial harm" in the NPPF was unfortunate because it implied less detriment than was in fact the case. The proposal did involve harm to a grade 1 listed building. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF stated that great weight should be given to the conservation of such buildings and their setting. The harm should be weighed against the public benefits.
- The character of the setting was more linear than the proposal.
- The relative height of the dwellings to the village hall and the tower was crucial to ensure that the tower remained the dominant feature.
- A view was expressed that the development would not have an adverse impact on the setting.
- Some members indicated that they considered that the application should be refused.
- A member expressed concern about road safety and suggested that the 30mph speed limit should be extended to the south.
- Attention was drawn to the comments of the Transportation Manager at paragraph 6.14 of the report that a safe access arrangement was available.
- Clarification was sought on timescales for the development and whether there had been an archaeological assessment.
- Clarification was provided on the landscaping and the extent of hedgerow that would need to be removed.

The Development Manager commented that officers' view was that the benefits of the scheme outweighed the less than substantial harm that Historic England considered it would cause. The Committee could have a different opinion on the planning balance.

The Lead Development Manager commented that the Transportation Manager had indicated that an extension of the 30mph speed limit would not be beneficial.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She reiterated her concern about the varying measurements of the height of the development and the depth of any excavations that might be required to ensure the height did not exceed the village hall ridgeline and again requested that consideration of the application should be deferred until this was resolved.

Councillor Edwards proposed and Councillor Greenow seconded a motion that the application be approved in accordance with the printed recommendation with additional conditions as set out in the update sheet and with a delegated authority to officers to agree matters relating to roof levels, the positioning of the hedgerow to accommodate the access and the location of the parish gateway after consultation with the chairman and local ward member. The motion was carried with 9 votes in favour, 6 against and no abstentions.)

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and with officers named in the scheme of delegation to officer authorised to agree matters relating to roof levels, the positioning of the hedgerow to accommodate the access and the location of the parish gateway after consultation with the chairman and local ward member.

1. **A01 - Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **B01 - Development in accordance with the approved plans (1447/1C, 1447/2-8, 1447/10)**
- 3 **C01 - Samples of external materials**
4. **Recommendations set out in the ecologist's report from Protected Species dated October 2015 should be followed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Prior to commencement of the development, a habitat protection and enhancement scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the scheme shall be implemented as approved.**

An appropriately qualified and experienced ecological clerk of works should be appointed (or consultant engaged in that capacity) to oversee the ecological mitigation work.

Reasons:

To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (with amendments and as supplemented by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000), the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (and 2012 amendment).

To comply with Herefordshire Council's Policies LD2 Biodiversity and Geodiversity, LD3 Green Infrastructure of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 – 2031 and to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- 5 G10 - Landscaping scheme
- 6 G11 - Landscaping scheme – implementation
- 7 I51 - Details of slab levels - ridge heights not to exceed that of village hall
- 8 H03 - Visibility splays 2.4m x distance, 160m to the south.
- 9 H06 - Vehicular access construction
- 10 H09 - Driveway gradient
- 11 H13 - Access, turning area and parking - garage pd rights to be removed.
- 12 H17 - Junction improvement/off site works. S278 works to include revised scheme to accommodate the visibility splays and to incorporate the new verge, pedestrian crossing and relaying the 30mph roundels and any Gateway Features affected by the scheme and change to hedgerow / visibility splays.
- 13 H20 - Road completion in 2 years
- 14 H21 - Wheel washing
- 15 H27 - Parking for site operatives
- 16 H29 - Secure covered cycle parking provision
17. CAC (H04) visibility over site frontage 2.4m to the northern boundary
18. CAM (H14) turning, parking, domestic
19. CBB (I07) hours restriction operation of plant /machinery/ equipment condition 8am- 6pm mon – Friday 8-12noon sat, no time Sunday or bank holidays and any other conditions deemed necessary

INFORMATIVES

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 HN10 No drainage to discharge to highway
- 3 HN07 Section 278 Agreement
- 4 HN04 Private apparatus within highway
- 5 HN01 Mud on highway
- 6 HN28 Highways Design Guide and Specification

104. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Planning Committee noted the date of the next meeting.

Appendix - Schedule of Updates

The meeting ended at 12.07 pm

Chairman

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 6 December 2017

Schedule of Committee Updates/Additional Representations

Note: The following schedule represents a summary of the additional representations received following the publication of the agenda and received up to midday on the day before the Committee meeting where they raise new and relevant material planning considerations.

SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE UPDATES

172552 - PROPOSED TWO ADDITIONAL MOBILE HOMES, TWO TOURING CARAVANS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A DAY ROOM, ASSOCIATED HARD STANDING DRAINAGE AND RE - ALIGNED ACCESS TRACK. AT ASHGROVE CROFT, MARDEN, HEREFORD, HR1 3HA

For: Mr Harry Smith, Ashgrove Croft, Marden, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 3HA

Following a further representation, a decision has been taken to defer the determination of the item to enable the report to be updated.

173692 - PROPOSED 5 NO. DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES AND TREATMENT PLANT AT LAND ADJACENT TO VILLAGE HALL, AYMESTREY, LEOMINSTER,

For: G & J Probert per Mr John Needham, 22 Broad Street, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1NG

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Since the publication of the report the following comments have been received:

Question the judgement of impact in the absence of elevation showing proposed houses against church tower.

I question how this ridge height can be achieved given that the proposals are for two storey dwellings. You will be aware that the village hall is a single storey building. The field to the south is a little lower than the village hall. However as the applicant has not provided information on height of foundations, levels and height of dwellings, it is not reasonable to assert that the ridge heights of the proposed five dwellings will not exceed the ridge height of the village hall. The application does not show that it has restricted ridge height in this way.

Recommended condition 7 is a welcome recognition that it is necessary to control the height of the ridge line. The condition attempts to deal with the situation but it is clear that condition 7 is potentially incompatible with condition 2, for the following reason. This is a full application not an outline application, and the developer will have to comply with the application drawings (recommended condition 2), so there will be no opportunity to make adjustments of the buildings later to meet this necessary requirement regarding ridge height restriction. Accordingly this aspect needs to be thoroughly revisited prior to the Committee meeting to ensure that condition 7 is not, from its very inception, a sham condition incapable of fulfilment.

I may have further comments following the further response from highways (our emails yesterday refer). In the meantime I consider that there needs to be an additional condition to reduce traffic conflict in the vicinity of the village hall car park and adjoining public highway. Prior to commencement of development the current field access on the eastern boundary of the village hall car park needs to be permanently closed to prevent use by both construction

traffic and agricultural vehicles, whilst retaining and reopening the historic pedestrian access from this point (along the northern boundary of the field) to the river to the area known locally as the Beach. You will be aware that alternative agricultural access to the field is already available direct from the A4110, part way to Mortimers Cross. Further, there needs to be an additional condition that during construction the construction workers must not park work vehicles or personal vehicles on the village hall car park.

A condition in relation to noise attenuation measures is necessary, due to the proximity of the proposed development to the village hall.

As the parish council has pointed out in several objections, there is a fundamental conflict between this proposed development and the traffic calming scheme for the village, which is now awaiting only the conclusion of an agreement with Balfour Beatty.

The traffic calming scheme would include village gateway features to be installed at either end of the village and the removal of all road markings, including the roundels, and the painting of white lines on either side of the highway to make the road appear narrower.

This application would undermine the traffic calming scheme for the following reasons:

- 1) The requirement for a visibility splay would mean that the gateway to the south would have to be set back some 1.5 metres from its proposed location, losing the intended effect of making the road appear narrower.
- 2) The road would in fact appear wider over a distance of more than 160 m to the south because of the relocation of the hedge further back, the loss of several trees and the creation of the access and the splay.
- 3) The highways officer has recommended reinforcing the red roundels on the highway. The traffic calming scheme would include the removal of the roundels and their replacement with white lines to the edge of the highway.

The Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia visited Aymestrey and, recognising the detrimental impact of speeding traffic on the village, agreed a substantial financial contribution towards the traffic calming scheme. That funding should have been spent by November this year but, because of the delays caused by this planning application, the PCC agreed to extend the funding until March 2018. If this planning application is approved, the traffic calming scheme will not be implemented by that date and the money will have to be returned.

Breedon Group, which operates the quarry at Leinthall Earls, has also made a very substantial contribution to the traffic calming scheme. If this application is approved, the Parish Council will not be able to implement the agreed scheme and it is also unlikely the scheme could be delivered within an acceptable timeframe, bearing in mind that the applicant would have three years to commence the development.

Traffic calming is a major priority for the parish council. Some 80 percent of respondents in questionnaires for both the NDP and the Parish Plan identified speeding traffic through the village as the biggest problem in the parish. Average speeds through the village are well in excess of the 30 mph speed limit and this includes large numbers of HGVs serving the quarry.

Would you please also advise in any committee update that Aymestrey NDP is expected to enter Regulation 14 stage next month.

The NDP will over deliver on the 10 houses it now requires to meet its targets and defines a settlement boundary for Aymestrey village, which does not include the application site.

"The proposal requires visibility splays of 2.4m X distance and Y distance of 104m to the north and 160m to the south."

I would like to remind you that on a site visit carried out by Bruce Evans and the then planning officer with Parish Councillors in attendance, of which I was one, Mr Evans measured the site access splays and this clearly demonstrated that there was only a 70m splay achievable to the north well short of the required 104m. Nothing has changed since then the hedge, stone wall and telegraph pole both tucked into the hedge row are all still there and the development plans have not changed either. So I cannot see how a safe access can be achieved.

There is a further objection from Aymestrey Parish Council in respect of paragraphs 1.3 and 6.16 of the committee report and recommended condition 7.

These advise that the ridge heights of the new houses will not exceed those of the Village Hall.

Aymestrey Village Hall is 3.5m high to the ridge at its westernmost end and just under 3.7m high to the east. You can confirm this from the drawing submitted with planning application no. 111564.

The application plans (which must be complied with in accordance with recommended condition 2) show the proposed dwellings as 7m to 7.5m high, with chimneys taking their total height up to nearly 9m.

For the ridge heights not to exceed those of the Village Hall, the ground levels of the dwellings would have to be at least 4m below those of the Village Hall.

The agent advised in his email to you of 20th November that the application site is 1m below the road level. The longitudinal section provided by the applicant (Drawing 1447/SW/2A) shows the road level at the northern edge of the application site is 0.06m below the road level at the Village Hall, falling to 0.36m lower at the site entrance.

Thus to achieve condition 7, the site would have to be excavated to a depth well in excess of 3m. This will undoubtedly take the ground levels into the water table - bearing in mind the site is on the edge of the flood plain. The proposal would entail significant operational and engineering works, which have not been described or assessed as part of the planning application. The applicant would also need to explain how vehicles would reach the highway from this level.

Agent's response to levels

The levels on Tower Surveys drgs show the ridge height of the village hall at 110.66. They show the floor level at 106.05 which suggests to me a height of 4.61m and not 3.5m as she states. The road level at the entrance is 105.27 and our site below the village hall falls from 103.60 which is already over 7m below the ridge. The road is falling towards Mortimers Cross at 2.18m in 100m as is the site.

I have taken the levels on plots 1 2 &3 and these are. Plot1 102.98, Plot2 102.780 and Plot3 102.845

Plot1 is on a bit of a ridge and would need to be reduced by 200mm, 8 inches in old money. The other 2 plots would not need to be reduced at all.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The level of the site is at least 1.5 m lower than the village hall site and for the most part in excess of 2m lower. When comparing the level upon which the hall itself is sited and the locations of the plots, this is nearly 2.5m at least, and just over 3m at most.

Para 6.3 should read 5 committed, not 6

Para 6.16 should read dwellings not dwelling.

Condition 7 is not incompatible with condition 2 since slab levels are not currently indicated.

Condition 15 deals with site operative parking.

A condition requiring noise attenuation measures during construction would be unreasonable, though a working hours conditions could be imposed.

No weight can be attributed to the NDP even when it reaches Reg 14 stage in either Dec or Jan 2018.

The height of the village hall was checked manually on 4th December following the further comment of the parish council. The maximum height of the surveying measure is 3.9m. The rear of the building exceeded 4.9m, the front exceeded 3.9m. Photos illustrate this point.

Highway officer comments-

1) The requirement for a visibility splay would mean that the gateway to the south would have to be set back some 1.5 metres from its proposed location, losing the intended effect of making the road appear narrower.

The visibility splay will not require 1.5 clearance, the scheme will require about 800mm, the edge clearance for any feature will be 600mm, therefore the difference is minimal, setting back the hedgerow will enable the gate on the SE of the site to be larger and more effective. Currently there is minimal verge which prevents a significant feature on this side.

2) The road would in fact appear wider over a distance of more than 160 m to the south because of the relocation of the hedge further back, the loss of several trees and the creation of the access and the splay.

Moving the hedge will provide more verge area but will provide suitable visibility for the development and the village hall.

3) The highways officer has recommended reinforcing the red roundels on the highway. The traffic calming scheme would include the removal of the roundels and their replacement with white lines to the edge of the highway.

The condition is such that any works will complement Aymestry's scheme, if the PC final scheme is to remove the roundels then this can be accommodated, if not, the development will need to replace.

The development can be delivered post implementation of the Aymestry PC, the only change will be to incorporate the SE visibility splays which would not be significant. The splays to the south would also benefit the village hall.

In reviewing the comment of Mr Holland, he is correct, the visibility splay to the nearside verge to the North is 70m, but the achievable splay to the wheel track is 104m.

To secure the splay the conditions need to be amended to CAB 2.4m x distance, 160m to the South. CAC 2.4m to the Northern boundary, this will protect the visibility splay required.

Another condition as set out in the previous response is required though I have amended the S278 slightly to incorporate changes to any Gateway Features, The hedge boundary: the new centre for any hedge must be 1m behind the visibility splay and maintained as such.

The other conditions required are as set out in the response of the 22/11/17

CAE, CAH, CAL, CAP - S278 works to include revised scheme to accommodate the visibility splays and to incorporate the new verge, pedestrian crossing and relaying the 30mph roundels and any Gateway Features affected by the scheme and change to hedgerow / visibility splays.

CAS, CAT, CAZ, CB2.

Informatives: I05, I08, I09, I11, I35.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Add highway conditions CAC (H04) visibility over site frontage and CAM (H14) turning, parking, domestic

Add CBB (I07) hours restriction operation of plant /machinery/ equipment condition 8am-6pm mon – Friday 8-12noon sat , no time Sunday or bank holidays and any other conditions deemed necessary