

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

Meeting held in Spirella Ballroom, Letchworth Garden City on
Thursday, 25 May 2017 at 7.30p.m.

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES

7. **17/00335/1DOC - LAND ADJACENT TO ELM TREE FARM, HAMBRIDGE WAY, PIRTON**
Details reserved by Condition 6 (Construction Management Plan) of planning permission reference no. 15/01618/1 granted on 27 May 2016.

The Development and Conservation Manager introduced the report, supported by a visual presentation that included plans demonstrating the routes for construction traffic.

He advised that there were a lot of updates to report as follows:

A Construction Traffic Access Appraisal submitted on behalf of Pirton Parish Council

- The CALA Homes proposed Construction Traffic Management Plan suggested that up to 30 construction vehicles per day of various sizes would access the site. However, this would not occur throughout the whole construction period.
Construction traffic should be restricted to weekday off-peak hours 09.30 to 15.00 resulting in, on average, 5 two-way construction vehicles an hour or 1 vehicle every 12 minutes spread across the off-peak period.
- Baseline traffic flows on Holwell Road indicated less than 1 vehicle per minute in each direction in 2020 in the peak periods.
- The shortest route from the site to the 'A' road network was via Holwell, being approximately 2 miles or 5 minutes by motor vehicle.
- Routes via Pirton to the nearest 'A' road would be 3.5 miles or 7 minutes to the A505, Hitchin, 5.5 miles or 13 minutes via Shillington to the A600 or 5.2 miles or 10 minutes to the A6 at Barton-le-Clay.
- Traffic calming in Holwell village appeared to already manage traffic effectively and only one slight personal injury accident (PIA) had been recorded in 18 years (1999-2016).
During the same period, the route via Pirton to the A505 had experienced over 50 PIAs including 7 in Pirton, the route via Shillington had experienced over 40 PIAs including 4 in Pirton and the route to the A6 has experienced just under 40 PIAs.
- All routes to the site were constrained in some form. The route via Holwell was traffic calmed in the village. There was no traffic calming on any of the Pirton routes.
- The route via Holwell had narrow sections, especially at Waterloo Lane. Localised widening could be provided to improve passing space, temporary warning signs could be installed and vegetation management would improve visibility.
- There was sufficient space for construction vehicles to wait at the eastern end of Holwell Road (outside Holwell village) and be in contact with the site manager to ensure construction traffic vehicles did not need to pass others travelling to and from the site.
- In total, 13 properties in Holwell on the route had no off-street parking, and 3 had no access to a footway (in Waterloo Lane).
- Any construction traffic route via Pirton would need to pass a row of 10 properties that have no footway and front doors that open onto the carriageway. These properties also relied on using the carriageway for parking and waste bin collection.

- Routing through Pirton to the A505 via Royal Oak Lane and Walnut Tree Road would pass over 50 properties that had no access to any footway.
- Routing in Pirton to either A600 or A6 via West Lane would pass 15 properties with no off-street parking and forward visibility on approach to the junction with Shillington Road was restricted by parked cars.

In conclusion, no route to the site is ideal but with careful management of construction traffic and some minor improvements to the highway, the route via Holwell provided the shortest route to the 'A' road network.

The route via Holwell also offered a lower impact, especially to vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Off peak traffic flows on this road were also relatively light.

Split construction traffic routing would increase the potential impact in terms of the numbers of residents affected and would also be more difficult to manage so was not recommended.

Objection from Holwell Parish Council

Holwell Parish Council objects strongly to this application and urge you to take notice of this and of the huge number of residents who had also raised their objections.

We note with alarm and deep concern the fact that CALA Homes, Watermans and Highways all recommend that Holwell should shoulder the entire burden of construction traffic for the housing development in a neighbouring village. This would have a huge negative impact on our village, totally altering the aesthetics and rural aspect, not to mention the disruption, damage and noise it would create. This is especially true with the proposed Saturday delivery hours.

Absolutely no thought or consideration had been taken for the safety and convenience of Holwell residents and the fact that the proposed route would run the entire length of the village affecting the majority of homes in the village.

It included passing 4 working farm entrances, a popular farm shop, the recreation ground which was used throughout the whole year by many people including members of the bowls club, 2 youth football teams and both adult and youth cricket teams. We have a church that holds a number of additional services including weddings and funerals, stables and a village hall where children's parties are sometimes held. There are, in addition, a number of footpaths and bridle paths that opened onto the road.

Then, we need to consider the groups of pedestrians, walkers, cyclists, horse riders, children and residents spilling out onto the highway, more so on Saturdays and school holidays. Some houses in Pirton Road, opposite the village hall opened directly out on to the highway with no footpath to access and having to negotiate the road with prams, pushchairs and young children. This would become even more dangerous than at present with the increased traffic and HGV's.

No report had taken into account the factors about the lack of control CALA Homes would have over these people, the general public or agricultural, refuse, delivery or any other vehicles that used this road on a day to day basis. What about emergency vehicles trying to get to an incident?

The proposed lay-bys along Waterloo Lane and Holwell Road would ruin the most rural and picturesque entrance to our village, not to mention the destruction of natural habitats for a wide range of wildlife. Parts of Waterloo Lane followed a Hollow Lane aspect which was an unusual and interesting feature entering the village and we are extremely concerned that this may be destroyed. These lay-bys would not stop traffic jams and reversing would still be needed as other vehicles would use them when necessary. There were still sections where vehicles would need to mount pavements and verges when passing each other. Furthermore, if these lay-bys were created, it would make it easier for traffic to speed if they have a greater line of sight.

Objection from Holwell Against Traffic Group

We are submitting these summary comments as a follow-up to the comprehensive pack that was circulated before the Planning Control Meeting of 16 March 2017. We hope that you were able to study the summary before the meeting as we feel that the views of Holwell Villagers and independent experts had not been fully taken into consideration in NHDC's recommendation to route all construction traffic at a rate of 50-60 HGVs per day through Holwell for a minimum of 3 years.

If you have not already done so, we trust that you will visit the development site and travel the construction routes to get an idea of the impact.

Firstly it is worth revisiting Condition 6 of the Outline Planning Permission.

The Key issues are therefore Efficiency and Safety together with Loss of Amenity in Holwell.

Efficiency

1. In recommending the Holwell route with the provision of two lay-bys, the fact that other road users will use the lay-bys is ignored. These include other HGVs and delivery vehicles, the many large agricultural vehicles, emergency vehicles, refuse trucks and the village bus together with the many cars and vans using the village road.
Traffic jams and delays would occur with this level of HGV traffic introduced into the village.
Not efficient.
2. The recommendation also ignored the fact that there were other narrow areas and chicanes on much of the route and no passing places particularly in Pirton Road and in Holwell Road where there were usually many parked cars. The lay-bys will make no difference to this situation.
Not efficient.
3. At the rate of 50-60 HGVs per day (including cranes, artics and other vehicles over a 5 - 5.5 hour period Mondays-Saturdays inclusive every week, HGVs would be coming through the village at the rate of 10 HGVS per hour or one every 6 minutes.
It would not be possible to manage this flow of traffic remotely from the building site nor would it be possible take account of all the other road users.
Not Efficient.
4. Because it is a narrow route through a village with tight and blind bends and no passing places, smaller (but still large) 12metre vehicles would be used so the build would take longer.
Not Efficient.

Safety

1. The Waterman's Route Options Document on page 4 stated that there were more pedestrians and parked cars in Pirton. There was no evidence for this. No competent quantitative surveys had been done! There were no figures! The judgements were subjective, value judgements and prone to bias.
Not safe.
2. The report stated that because Pirton was a larger village it had more pedestrians but what it ignored was that the Pirton route selected by CALA homes runs along the edge of Pirton with a smaller number of homes than on the Holwell route, which runs directly through the centre of the village, with the vast majority of homes (90) on it plus the church, farm shop, village hall and recreation ground used by football, cricket and bowls clubs on Saturdays and school holidays plus the entrances to 4 busy working farms with large farm vehicles regularly entering and exiting the entrances particularly at the blind bend on Pirton Road/Waterloo Lane.
Not safe
3. There was no segregation of road users on large sections of this 2 mile route. The road was regularly used by walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders with more on Saturday mornings when deliveries were also to be made (8am-1pm).
Not safe.

Amenity

1. The provision of a very large lay-by for HGVs in steep-sided Waterloo Lane and the removal of vegetation would significantly degrade the quality of the environment and ecology on the approach to the village along this ancient Hollow Lane
Loss of amenity.
2. The continual rumbling of construction HGVs through Holwell Mondays-Saturdays would disrupt the life of the village, cause blighting of property and significantly affecting the character of the village over 3 years with the prospect of more to follow, if permission was granted for more housing in Pirton, which was already in the pipeline.
Loss of amenity.
3. While CALA Homes have offered to pay for damage to the carriageway, verges, kerbs and embankments of the route it would not be possible to keep up with the damage caused at this rate of HGV traffic – one HGV every 6 minutes.
Loss of Amenity.
4. Whilst Section106 monies were not intended to be a bribe, but were often seen as such, it was ironic that Holwell Village would not be compensated for any loss of amenity as the housing development would in Pirton.
Loss of amenity.

The 4 route options selected by the developer are all unsuitable, which was a view backed up by truly independent consultants as well as residents.

The impact of a seemingly mad rush to build as many homes as possible to meet notional NHDC housing targets in a relatively inaccessible location in Pirton had resulted in the amenity, environment, character, road safety and the smooth flow of traffic through Holwell being seriously threatened.

This proposal was unsustainable. Please refuse the application.

Local Residents

Many further objections had been received to both any route through Pirton or through Holwell, stating largely the same points already included in the report, but also critical of the proposed mitigation measure of passing places to be installed along Waterloo Lane on the Holwell route, as required by the Highway Authority in their preferred option.

The Development and Conservation Manager advised that, from consideration of the comments received, it was acknowledged that none of the four route options were ideal and this was the unfortunate consequence of any housing development in villages. However, the route of arrival and departure via Holwell was considered to be the more favoured option by the Highway Authority. The mitigation measures and highway improvement works, including the installation of passing places in Waterloo Lane, would be secured via a Section 278 agreement by the Highway Authority. There was therefore no change to the overall officer opinion that, the details of the construction management plan, including the routing to be arrival and departure via Holwell, be approved.

The Chairman commented that a large amount of information had been received in the last 2 days and advised that, following the presentations, Members may wish to consider the option of taking time to consider all of this information.

Parish Councillor Diane Burleigh (Pirton Parish Council) and Mr John Burden (Holwell Against CALA Traffic) addressed the Committee in objection to application 17/00335/1DOC.

Parish Councillor Burleigh thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee and advised that she was talking purely from the Pirton point of view.

She informed Members that no rural road route either through Pirton or Holwell was suitable for the construction traffic relating to 78 dwellings.

The officer had previously outlined some of the issues from the objections but from Pirton's perspective the major consideration was to use the shortest route and this related to disturbance and environmental considerations and the shortest route was undoubtedly through Holwell.

The Holwell route was approximate 2 miles or 5 minutes away from an A road, whereas the Pirton route was 3.5 miles or 7 minutes away from the A505.

The second consideration was traffic calming and accidents. The route via Holwell was traffic calmed in the village whereas there was no traffic calming measures in Pirton to date.

The traffic calming measures in Holwell appeared to be effective, with only one personal injury accident in 18 years. During the same period the route via Pirton to the A505 had experienced over 50 personal injury accidents including 7 in Pirton itself.

There were 13 properties in Holwell had no off-street parking and 5 had no access to a footway, principally in Waterloo Lane. Any route through Pirton would have to pass 10 properties in Holwell Road that had no footpaths and front doors that opened onto the carriageway and a further 4 properties that had no footway access.

Routing through Pirton to the A505 would pass a total of 93 properties of which 58 had no access to any footway as well as the entrances to the Sports and Social Club and the recreation ground.

The Pirton Route, although relatively straight, had blind summits and dips and most importantly the verges were classed by Hertfordshire County Council Countryside Management as Heritage Verges, with only one other Heritage Verge in Hertfordshire, they were very proud of this.

This meant that the verges were particularly valued for their bio-diversity and the expected levels of construction traffic over 3 years would create an unacceptable level of pollution and risk to the very valuable, bio-diverse areas.

Holwell Road, Royal Oak Lane and Walnut Tree Road all had narrow sections and Walnut Tree Road had two completely blind bends.

The main route through Pirton to the A505 passed further properties that included a nursing care home, with staff and patients using the road via a narrow footpath.

There were no passing places or waiting areas on this route and none could be created without destroying a significant part of the Heritage Verges.

In summary Parish Councillor Burleigh stated that, in light of the facts as stated in the report and the opinion of three organisations with relevant expertise, it would be perverse to have the construction route through Pirton, whether two way or one way.

It would also be more dangerous to route traffic through Pirton, placing many more people at risk of accident than the route through Holwell.

Sharing the pain would only be an option where each route was equally safe, environmentally OK and affected equal numbers of dwellings and residents.

Safety had to be a major consideration and the facts and expert opinion leads you to the conclusion to reject any construction route through Pirton.

Mr Burden thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee and, as a way of introduction, advised that Holwell residents were in the process of making official complaints about the inadequate process of consultation, whereby the NHDC Planning Portal had been unavailable for receipt of comments on the application and key documents had appeared very late, for example the revised construction management plan appeared on 15 May. So there were serious concerns about the legality and fairness of the process and questioned whether it was prudent for the Committee to make a decision in these circumstances.

All four options that routed construction traffic through Holwell and Pirton were unsafe and inefficient and did not meet the requirements of Condition 6 of the original outline planning permission.

The construction route should not have been judged by Highways as deliverable at an earlier stage and the sensible option would be to construct a temporary access route the short distance from the Hitchin Road to the building site so as to avoid both villages, however this was deemed to expensive by a multi-national company.

The recommended Holwell only route was, as described by Richard Cox in his objection, so absurd and not worth spending time writing about, as any intelligent person would reject it out of hand. Heavy goods vehicle and other drivers, Highways, freight managers and logistic experts agree with him.

The only significant mitigation measure was of two lay-bys in imprecise locations.

One Lay-by would be in the narrow Waterloo Lane, where there were several properties and more to be built. Residents were concerned that a very long HGV lay-by would be placed in an ancient hollow lane, which was very much part of the character of the village, as the approach to Holwell, and the consequent destruction of habitat.

The second lay-by was proposed to be in Holwell Road, there were two Holwell Roads and the precise location was not clear and no detailed drawings or impact studies had been presented and therefore no intelligent decision could be made about the lay-bys.

CALA would have no control over these lay-bys or the remote lay-bys planned as holding bays and therefore other vehicles would use them.

The average number of HGVs serving the development would be one vehicle every six minutes for 3 years or more, including Saturday mornings, which was a very unsociable hour.

There was the prospect of more large scale housing to follow in adjacent field in Pirton, making the temporary period very long.

The lay-bys did not overcome the inherent problems of the two mile route. Their consultant, Brian Clamp, an experienced highways and civil engineer, stated that there were many other HGVs that used this route during weekdays, usually avoiding rush hour and weekends.

Very large agricultural vehicles, delivery vehicles and busses used the whole route and much of the Holwell route was less than 5 metres and frequently less than 4 meters. HGVs are 2.5 metres wide yet no opposing tracking of two HGVs had been done. It was as though CALA trucks would be the only road users and they would only travel one way.

Forward visibility was unacceptable on blind bends, even if the overhanging vegetation was cut back.

Where are the proposals to keep vulnerable road users safe, particularly on Saturday morning and school holidays when pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders were using the roads.

Watermans provided no quantitative data to back up their conclusion that Holwell was the most appropriate route.

The Chairman thanked Parish Councillor Burleigh and Mr Burden for their presentations.

District Councillor Claire Strong addressed the Committee as a Member Advocate in objection to application 17/00335/1DOC.

Councillor Strong thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee and informed them that she represented Pirton and Lived in Holwell.

She drew attention to comment made by the Planning Officer that there was no ideal route and stated that neither of the routes through Pirton or Holwell met any safety standards that NHDC Councillors should respect.

The length of the route was irrelevant, the important criteria was what was found on the route.

The route through both villages consisted of restrictions of the carriageway, which may be overcome by lay-bys, but the blind bends could not be overcome, particularly in Waterloo Lane, as demonstrated in the pack sent to Councillors. A lay-by may enable passing in the middle of the lane, but what would happen at the top or the bottom of the lane where there were blind corners.

No consideration had been given to how construction traffic would approach and deal with this and it is unsafe.

Exactly the same issues applied to the route through Pirton in Royal Oak Lane which made the route through Pirton totally unsuitable for construction site traffic.

There were difficulties for the construction traffic related to just three houses previously developed and this was for 78 houses, which would create a large number of additional movements.

In terms of looking at a safe option, you could demand that a temporary route was developed across the fields as was the case when mineral extraction took place. In that case a road was built from Bedford Road to the extraction site and this road was again used when the landfill site was developed.

There was plenty of opportunity for a separate road to be put in for construction traffic to access the site. And it was very short sighted to think that the two roads in and out of the two villages were the solution. Out of the box thinking was needed in order to devise a way to bring construction traffic onto and off of the site, whilst avoiding both villages.

It was clear that the road system through the villages was totally unsafe and totally inadequate.

Councillor Strong asked the Committee to consider if it had enough information to make a decision and urged Members to defer the item to allow further discussions regarding what other options could be used.

This would blight both villages, with neither having footpaths or pavements and whose residents already had difficulties with the road system and it would be a grave injustice to both villages.

She urged Members to keep both villages safe.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Strong for her presentation.

Mr Philip Wright (CALA Homes) and Mr Ian Wharton (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of application 17/00335/1DOC.

Mr Wright thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee and acknowledged that this was a difficult decision for Members and acknowledged that a lot of concerns had been raised by speakers.

He advised that it was very unusual for a construction condition to be referred to a Planning Committee, something that he had not experienced in 15 years as a planner.

He outlined the approach that CALA took in considering the routes and addressing the concerns raised.

CALA employed Watermans to independently assess the construction routes and propose four options, which were clearly outlined in the report, being arrival and departure via Holwell, arrival and departure via Pirton, arrival via Holwell and departure via Pirton and arrival via Pirton and departure via Holwell,

The proposed routes were very clear using the adopted highways that no had no width or height restrictions.

The Watermans report and recommendations was presented to Hertfordshire County Council for consideration as part of the consultation process relating to the construction management plan.

Hertfordshire County Council had made their recommendation, which was supported by the North Hertfordshire Planning Officers.

CALA had undertaken extensive discussions with the Planning and Highways Authorities to meet the concerns of the Officers in consideration of this application and had considered that no other options provided the best access to the site.

The Highway Authority were satisfied that the route selected was the most appropriate to support the outline planning application and subsequent reserved matters approval in relation to the site.

It was inappropriate to attempt to use the approval of a planning condition as a means to make amendments or modifications to the development of a site where permission had already been granted.

The approval of details of a condition must have regard to material planning considerations including the statutory duties, planning legislation and planning policy.

This application could not be used as what would amount to a revocation of permission already given. This was sited in a High Court judgment between Kings Road Investments and Kent County Council.

The question for a Planning Authority considering this level of detail was whether the scheme approved was the best scheme in terms of the planning permission already granted. The consideration in regard to the condition was whether this was the best means to provide access.

The District Planning Authority and the County Council had been extensively consulted in relation to the construction and had exercised their independent decision in selecting the route.

Officers had provided clear information to Members in relation to the discharge of this condition and in the absence of good reason why the proposals were no longer satisfactory it was unreasonable to delay determination of this application.

Mr Wright advised that he wished to address some of the mitigation measures, agreed with Hertfordshire County Council that would make the route acceptable in planning terms.

The delivery timescales were restricted until after 9.30 in order to avoid peak network flows.

A two strike system would be adopted in relation to timescales that would be monitored closely by the construction department and by contractors, with any deviation given prior approval by NHDC.

A photographic survey of the road would be undertaken before and after construction works and repairs made to any damage caused by construction activity, with the cost born by CALA Homes as detailed in the construction management plan.

CALA Homes had agreed to install two lay-bys on Hertfordshire County Council Land, with the locations to be approved by HCC.

They had introduced a booking system, which be managed by the site manager, to ensure that deliveries did not arrive outside of the delivery slot timetable.

They had also agreed with Hertfordshire County Council that, where possible, they would cut back trees that would restrict visibility on bends.

Mr Wright concluded by advising there were 78 mitigation measures taken by CALA Homes in conjunction with this route that had been considered by NHDC and Hertfordshire County Council as the most suitable route for construction traffic.

He acknowledged that there would be a lot of construction traffic for a two year period, but this was needed to provide the development that would go towards the 5 year land supply and the proposed route for access and egress was the safest it could possibly be for both residents and construction vehicles.

Mr Wharton thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee and advised that he had been employed by CALA Homes to look at construction routes.

He had been present at the Planning meeting where this item was deferred without discussion and understood from both that meeting and this the strength of feeling of the local population.

CALA Homes were seeking to develop the proposed site in the safest way possible.

The outline planning permission and subsequent reserved matters application deemed the site as deliverable and therefore construction traffic to the site had to be accepted.

There were a limited number of routes on the local highway network that could be used to bring deliveries to and from the site.

He acknowledged the suggestion that a direct route from the A 600 or Hitchin Road would be preferable. But CALA Homes did not have control over the land that would be required to provide this and this option would involve crossing a number of footpaths and bridleways as well as incurring significant engineering and construction costs in order to provide a suitable road for construction traffic therefore neither of these options were viable.

Since the previous Planning Committee they had tabled four potential options for access to and from the site and routes through Pirton or Holwell were viable subject to the mitigation measures being put in place,

The amount of mitigation being considered was over and above that required for the construction management plan

The construction management plan was a live document that was under constant review and had feedback from stakeholders and the local community. CALA Homes, as a responsible developer, considered that feedback and addressed issues where it was at all possible.

Following some questions and answers, the Chairman thanked Mr Wright and Mr Wharton for their presentations.

The Chairman referred to a comment by Mr Wharton that, as planning permission had been granted the construction management plan had to be accepted and advised that the Committee was not bound to accept a construction management plan if it was not acceptable.

The Development and Conservation Manager, in response to the presentations, referred to the mitigation measure of lay-bys on the Holwell Road and the concern that the exact placement of these was uncertain asked the Highways Officer to outline how this would work.

The Highways Officer advised that following the deferral of this application at a previous Planning Control meeting he had held meetings with CALA Homes in order to provide more information in the construction management plan.

There were now four construction route options and Highways had indicated their preference for Route 1.

Colleagues considered many applications, over 5,000 each year, many with construction management plans, and in this case many colleagues had looked at this application and considered the various options, including looking at the assets along the routes, the road widths, the accident records and the structures along the routes.

In respect of the passing places, these should not be referred to as lay-bys, as this term implied that there would be vehicles parked in them and this was not their purpose,

It was not possible to advise the agreed locations of the passing places although they had started to look at the detailed design and were seeking to identify locations within the existing highway and it may be that areas currently being used for this purpose become more formal or that new locations, away from houses could be identified.

The Chairman asked Members whether, in view of the irregular access to the planning portal and the possibility that this had restricted the democratic opportunity for the public to respond, as well as the amount of information received in the last 24 hours, Members wished to determine the application at this meeting or defer it in order to consider the late information and allow more time for people to make further representations on the application.

Members debated the application including whether or not the application should be determined at this meeting or deferred. There was some concern expressed about access to the planning portal

Members noted that table top exercises had been carried out in regard to the routes and asked the Highways Officer whether officer had visited the area and queried how the passing places would be controlled to prevent misuse such as other road users using them to park in and thereby prevent use by construction vehicles or HGVs using the passing places or local roads to park up overnight or whilst awaiting their allotted delivery time. They queried whether safety audits had been undertaken.

The Highways Officer advised that the construction management plan would be in place as part of the planning legislation and that enforcement would be under highways enforcement, however, depending upon what infringements took place, it was possible to invoke sections of the Highways Act or planning enforcement measures, vehicles parking overnight or not adhering to clearways was a Police matter.

In respect of safety audits, these had been undertaken on all of the proposed permanent changes to the highway. Temporary routes and changes to the highway were dealt with via the construction management plan and existing routes had not been subject to road safety audits.

A Member referred to another development in the area where a similar construction management plan was in place, yet when HGVs were lining up along the road to gain entry to that site, the police, highways and planning were all unable to act and the problems remained throughout the build.

The Highways Officer advised that he was not familiar with the case being referred to, but in this case there would be a detailed construction management plan and the A600 already had lay-bys where vehicles could park up or wait if required.

Members who expressed concern regarding the construction management plan and supported the view that the application should be deferred stated that much more detail should be included in the contraction management plan including:

- which Holwell Road would have passing places installed;
- a passing place was considered unsuitable to be installed in a hollow lane that would destroy the nature of the area;
- more investigation into the temporary track option, which although stated as unviable should be considered when all of the suggested routes were unsafe.

Some Members acknowledged that alternative routes to those proposed may be difficult to identify and made the following points:

- There were two options regarding the route, one was to use existing highways the other was to build a new highway. The second option would have to be costed and the owners of the land may not wish this to happen;
- If a decision was taken that there was no access to this site part of the Local Plan could be put in jeopardy;
- It was unusual for a construction management plan to come to Committee. This aspect was usually decided by officers who were professionals.

In response to a question the Development and Conservation Manager confirmed that, of the application was deferred, all aspects discussed at this meeting would then be discussed with the developer and Highways colleagues.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to enable further time to interrogate recently submitted information, the applicant to submit more detailed information regarding mitigation measures and the suggested direct cross country route to be explored in more detail.

RESOLVED: That, the determination of planning application 17/00335/1DOC be **DEFERRED**, to enable further time to interrogate recently submitted information, the applicant to submit more detailed information regarding mitigation measures and the suggested direct cross country route to be explored in more detail.

Councillor Henry and Shanley left the meeting.

The Chairman announced that there would be a 10 minute recess.