

From: Stephen Boyne
Sent: 15 August 2018 18:20
To: Alan Hunter
Cc: Tim Coyne
Subject: RE: Planning application 17/00685/MFUL

Hi Alan – re. this and your voicemail of yesterday :

The existing footway was put in along the stretch adjacent to and opposite the existing Vellco entrance as part of the glamping site development. The applicant owned the land beyond the highway boundary here but that and the verge were very overgrown at the time of the application. The idea of the footway was to give the occupants/visitors of the glamping site (and others) a refuge just in case their walking co-incided with an HGV exiting the site. I could have asked that the area just be cleared and kept as a grass verge but a kerbed footway gave better protection against the lorries going over the area and also it would prevent it getting rutted (I think the arrangement whereby it was un-cared for was also a deterrent against the trucks over-riding into it).

The Vellco proposals, as you are aware, widen their entrance in both directions by a considerable amount. I have checked the on-site dimensions against the scaled dimensions on submitted Drawing No. 1702 PL 03 L and both agree with each other. Therefore, this drawing, which shows the swept paths of the HGVs, is considered correct. As you can see from this drawing, the existing footway still covers the section where the trucks are turning out of the site. Any extension of the footway northwards would be useful in terms of continuing the refuge where two HGVs would happen to meet, as per the swept path diagrams shown, but would not be essential if it just happened to be a single HGV involved coming away from the site.

This length of Ropery Lane is next to the dwelling known as Meadowside. There are shrubs etc. within the highway outside the property, but it has a garden boundary wall within them. Consequently the shrubs etc could be cleared / cut-back to the wall position and a footway potentially installed between the dwelling's two vehicular accesses (the southern-most one appears un-used). Without narrowing the carriageway, a footway of 1.35 metres narrowing down to 1.1 metres (at the northern end) could be installed. This compares to the existing footway section widths of 1.45 metres narrowing down to 1.05 metres at its northern end. Technically therefore, this extra length could be put in and may be considered useful for vulnerable road users here.

There would be no point in continuing the footway further north than Meadowside, as the verge is too narrow. I would resist any narrowing of the existing carriageway to compensate, for obvious reasons given the vehicles involved. Also there would be a view that the lane would be 'suburbanised' by the addition of a kerbed footway, and also the road would require some form of drainage installing as the new kerbs would prevent surface water being helped away by what was grass etc.

In conclusion I consider an extra length of footway could be achieved. The owner of Meadowside may be upset at such proposals but it would seem works could be carried out within the public highway limit in the same manner as the county council would do its own improvements if called upon, although we would embark on a full neighbour / stakeholder consultation in advance as is standard.

Do I think it is essential to the application? No. The original intention of the footway is still being provided for in respect of the latest application. Although there is a stated increase in traffic, I believe the speed and frequency of vehicles likely to be involved will be such that pedestrians can

avail themselves of either staying on the existing footway or the carrying on to the widened section of Ropery Lane outside the public house / car park before any conflict could arise on the intervening approx. 20 metres length (and within which there are a further two vehicle crossing access points clear of the carriageway).

I trust this will help Members to determine the proposal.

Kind regards,

Steve