

Julian Warrick
Architectural Design Consultant



  **in f**

Email: julian@jwarrick-design-cons.com
Tel: 01775 820123
Mob: 07849 652067

8 Beech Grove Donington Spalding Lincs PE11 4XQ

Date: 17/7/22
Ref: J126-ST2

Statement for

FOR
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
adj
23 FISHERGATE
SUTTON ST JAMES

FOR
MR J POWLEY

In response to the Lincolnshire County Council Head of Development Management letter dated 13th June 2022.

Please refer to these applications that recently have had footpath conditions removed from the original permission.

H23-0449-18

In the Officers Report in regard to the removal of the footpath it says

‘Discussions with highways (Jon Sharpe) he does not feel that an adopted footpath is necessarily appropriate in this rural location - David Gedney concurs’

There is no mention of any danger to pedestrians who might have to use this stretch of road which has a speed limit of 30mph and on a slow bend and no street lighting.

This road is within a village.

H05-0659-21

In the Officers Report in regard to the removal of the footpath it says

‘The Lincolnshire County Council Highways Authority have been made aware of quotation details from Vere Bros Ltd. which satisfactorily supports the claim that to build a footpath in this location would be unviable. The LCC Highways Authority were satisfied by this and have thus removed this requirement.’

There is no mention of any danger to pedestrians who might have to use this stretch of road which has a speed limit of 30mph and no street lighting.

This road is within a village.

H23-1101-21

In the Officers Report in regard to the removal of the footpath it says

‘Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has been consulted. It is understood that it has recently discussed with a Consultant, enquiring on behalf of the applicant, options for reducing the width of the footway required under condition 6 of the outline permission and for having a small residual verge area between the carriageway and the footway, into which surface water from the carriageway could infiltrate. However, it has indicated that experience elsewhere in the county has been that where this residual verge is very narrow, it can be vulnerable to damage by passing large agricultural vehicles. To make the verge wide enough to reduce the likelihood of this kind of damage, and to provide the required footway would, as the

agent has suggested, eat significantly into the area that is to be given to

the front gardens of the consented dwellings.

The existing footway further to the west along this road, to which the requested new footway would join, although shown on the highway authority's records as being maintainable at the public expense, is not a properly surfaced footway. This road has street lighting and both this consented development and the consented development on the adjacent site to the west provide driveways onto which anyone walking along the carriageway could step, in the event of there being a vehicle coming along the site side of the road.

Therefore, having given due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance (in particular the National Planning Policy Framework), Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has concluded that the removal of condition 6 from the outline permission granted under reference H23-0231-18 would not, in this situation, be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety. The Highway Authority therefore raises no objections.

Conclusion

The omission of a frontage footway would not, in this situation, be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP and advice within the Framework. It is therefore recommended that the application be approved under delegated powers.'

There is no mention of any danger to pedestrians who might have to use this stretch of road which is just inside the speed limit of 30mph (reducing from 60mph) with the nearest street light from the site 40m closer to the center of Saracens Head.

This removal is the closest to the application in question with it being just inside the speed limit of 30mph (reducing from 60mph) and there being virtually no street lighting, however there are more properties along the stretch of road in question at Saracens Head making it more dangerous for pedestrians.

One more point although I have had to address the outline in order to seek removing this condition, the application is no longer for 2 properties as the Reserved Matters was just for one property.

Conclusion

All these applications above have had the footpath condition removed for one

reason or another and the last application listed is similar to this one, but none have received this fear from Lincs County Council. If that's the case please can reasons be given why others did not receive this same concern for people's safety?

Regards

Julian Warrick