



CONDITION REMOVAL REPORT

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

AT

LAND TO THE FRONT OF
SUTTON BRIDGE GOLF COURSE
NEW ROAD
SUTTON BRIDGE

FOR

McCURRY DEVELOPMENTS LTD

Job No. SE-687

March 2017

This condition removal report supports the removal of condition application, at land to the front of Sutton Bridge Golf Course, New Road, Sutton Bridge.

An earlier outline approval was achieved on the site under planning reference H18-0145-16; this was approved on the 1st April 2016. This approval was an outline application for four dwellings.

Following the purchase of the site by McCurry Developments, it was felt that a different layout was required along with a different access arrangement, so a new outline application was made under planning reference H18-1111-16; this was approved on 15th December 2016.

The second application had a condition added under condition 7, which reads:

No development shall take place before a scheme has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority for the construction of a 1.8 metre wide footway, together with arrangements for the disposal of surface water run-off from the highway at the New Road frontage of the site. The agreed works shall be fully implemented before the dwellings are occupied or in accordance with a phasing arrangement to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

It is this condition we are proposing to remove for a number of reasons. It was not required under the original approval H18-0145-16, which was all within the same calendar year, and could still be implemented.

If the applicant had been aware of the condition it would have altered the price he paid for the site as this will add a significant cost to the project.

The site whilst at the end of the village has no footpaths in close proximity, the nearest footpath is on the opposite side of the road and some 70m away and the nearest on the application side is approximately 275m away.

In addition this condition is not considered reasonable as the absence of this footpath will not increase the risk of accidents nor result in severe cumulative impacts as a result of the development as detailed in paragraph 32 of the NPPF and as such is unreasonable:

We note that paragraph 32 of the NPPF states:

- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts for the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

In light of the above it is clear that safe and suitable access exists and the absence of the footpath link will not result in severe cumulative impacts as a result of the development. This proposal in this location will not increase the risk of accidents nor result in severe cumulative impacts. As such the requested improvements would not be considered cost effective and the development without the requested works would meet this criteria of the NPPF.