

Seems likely that my original email may not have got to you. I have removed an attachment to facilitate resending.

From: N Stead

Sent: 11 March 2021 21:58

To: Cllr Noland; Cllr Madeley

Subject: FW: 2020/21878/FUL Deferred decision on Application for conversion of joiners workshop to create two houses BD23 3DJ

From: N Stead

Sent: 11 March 2021 21:36

To: Councillors; 'planning@cravenc.gov.uk'

Subject: 2020/21878/FUL Deferred decision on Application for conversion of joiners workshop to create two houses BD23 3DJ

Dear Councillors and Planning Officers,

I have studied the visibility diagram submitted by agents of the applicant and reviewed the revised recommendation by NYCC. It seems that NYCC by their admission on their latest 'Considerations and Recommendation' Statement have not undertaken their own review following the last meeting, as was requested, but have merely considered the additional splay plan as submitted by the applicant's agent.

I have made my own assessment of this Visibility plan and can only conclude this is a larger scale drawing of that previously shown on the drawings supporting the original application. There is no evidence of revisiting / adjusting as appropriate. There were misgivings about its accuracy at the last meeting and the resulting deferral was an opportunity for the visibility question to be reappraised.

I have made my own visit to the site in the absence of any by the 'experts'. I measured 2m back from the edge of the existing road at a point 9m south of the gable wall from the existing double garage. This from my interpretation of the drawing is the point at which the splay needs to be assessed and is 2m back along the centreline of the minor arm at the proposed junction. I should mention that the normal requirement is for a 2.4m distance as per the Manual for Streets (MfS). Please refer to my photo taken looking south in front of the double garage towards that point 2m back from the main carriageway (identified by a red post highlighted on the image). This does raise certain questions about the orientation of the double garage as shown on the agents plan as the actual visibility seems to be rather less than purported by their drawing.



The Y distance represents the distance that a driver who is about to exit from the minor arm can see to the right (and left) along the main road. Conventionally this has been measured along the nearside kerb line of the main road and by its nature would ensure full sight of pedestrians and cyclists moving along the edge of the main road. One can see in that instance the splays would be to a point somewhere in front of the garage door, 15m in length and considerably less than the 25m as cited. Even if you took a more lenient approach and recognised that vehicles travel at a distance from the kerb line and measured the splay to the nearside edge of the vehicle track you would still fall somewhat short of the 25m minimum requirement, probably the maximum one could justify would be to a point adjacent to the telegraph pole sited immediately north of the garage, a splay of 19m maximum and less than the required standard.

The conclusion can only be that too much reliance has been placed on information supplied by the applicant and their agents without independently verifying this and trust that members of the planning committee can either seek some external review of the visibility splay issue or conclude that the application cannot be approved in its present format. The double garage seemingly poses a block to the required splay requirement in the plans present format.



Parking adjacent to the proposed site entrance at 4pm today. As previously raised parking is an existing problem on Park Lane. The gap between the vehicles was 2.4m, which is not adequate for access by emergency vehicles and would probably not be accessible for refuse wagons, delivery vehicles domestic fuel oil tankers etc. The site entrance as currently proposed can only lead to further (anti-social) parking problems.

Yours faithfully,

N P Clayton-Stead

(Park Lane Resident)