

From: Stephen Boyne
Sent: 25 June 2021 12:47
To: Alan Goforth Gary Housden >
Cc: Tim Coyne
Subject: RE: Sproxton Hall, Sproxton - 20/00695

Hi Alan,

I refer to the e-mail and attachments dated 11 June 2021, concerning the existing points of widening along the Village Street.

I undertook a further measured survey and inspection of the length of road under discussion and as shown on the submitted plan (Drawing Number 11547-005 Rev. B) yesterday.

I also studied on site the series of photographs submitted which detail a tele-porter passing a refuse vehicle within the same section of the village street. Notwithstanding the submitted information it would seem that the teleporter is driving partly over the verge in order to pass the refuse vehicle and this concurs with a measured carriageway width of 5.2 metres at the highlighted location, compared to a recommended minimum of 5.5 metres carriageway width advocated within Manual for Streets and as included in the applicants' Transport Statement at section 3.2.4.

Looking in detail at the two existing 'widening' on the plan, and the inter-visibility shown, the measured carriageway width along the length (inclusive) between the two existing 'widening' is at least 4.8 metres and generally in the range of 5.2 to 5.5 metres wide.

Consequently, dimensionally, this section would be capable of passing a car and larger vehicle based upon the table in section 3.2.4 as mentioned. It would not, however, be capable of passing two larger vehicles, which require a minimum width of 5.5 metres.

Based upon the above observations, and the submitted plan, there is a potential that further widening of the carriageway by up to 0.3 metres could be achieved within existing highway limits along these sections. Dimensionally this would offer the 5.5metres width required as a minimum to pass two larger vehicles. It should be observed that the alignment along this section is generally straight.

Given that I have previously expressed concerns that lack of existing carriageway width along this section in connection with the significant traffic generation likely to be associated with the proposed development could well lead to vehicles, including larger vehicles, meeting and having to reverse, cause a back-up in traffic or prevent reasonable free-flow conditions, it would seem that this additional off-site work would be necessary to present a reasonable approach to manage the shortfall to a reasonable degree, and to include the possibility of two larger vehicles being able to pass should that situation occur.

However, the effect of this would also give rise to the further loss of well-tended verge within the village, which could well be a material consideration. It would also not wholly prevent a situation whereby a delivery / service vehicle was standing in the carriageway outside of these widened lengths, as it may not coincide with the delivery address in question. Ultimately it is whether the overall level of mitigation measures that could be provided would be regarded as sufficient to enable the public highway to function to a reasonable degree given the anticipated traffic activity associated with the proposed development.

I would advise that, should the applicant be prepared to undertake these further off-site works, and taking a balanced view of the objections submitted, *in terms of highway capacity alone*, I would be minded to withdraw my previous recommendation of refusal.

The above comments follow my initial observations contained in my letter dated 1 April 2021, whereby I pointed out that further carriageway widening should be investigated. I shall be grateful if these observations could be taken into consideration and taken back to the applicant for a response.

Kind regards,

Steve