COMMITTEE ITEM	3.10 & 3.11
APPLICATION NO	LA03/2019/0411/F & LA03/2019/0361/F
DEA	AIRPORT
COMMITTEE INTEREST	REFUSAL RECOMMENDED
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION
PROPOSAL	Residential development comprising 11no 3 bedroom townhouses with associated car parking and landscaping (change of house types to that approved under application ref LA03/2015/0601/F) and Variation of Condition 14 from approval LA03/2015/0601/F regarding visibility splays.
SITE/LOCATION	The Old Mill, 53 Mill Road, Crumlin
APPLICANT	Firestone Construction Ltd
AGENT	NI Planning Consultants
LAST SITE VISIT	02.09.2020
CASE OFFICER	Sairead de Brún Tel: 028 903 40406 Email: <u>sairead.debrun@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk</u>

Full details of these applications, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations received are available to view at the Planning Portal www.planningni.gov.uk

ASSESSMENT

Since the preparation of the Committee Reports one of the letters of objection to application LA03/2019/0361/F has been withdrawn and further information has been received from the applicant on both applications which attempts to establish that a safe sight splay can be achieved without third party land which should be acceptable in road safety terms.

A report which analysed the sight splays and an addendum to that report appears to consider the traffic survey undertaken by TJK, on behalf of the applicant. The report states that the survey was not disputed by Dfl Roads and the author appears to be unaware that Dfl Roads did dispute the survey and carried out their own survey with significantly different results from those reached by the applicant's consultant. In addition to the assessment of the traffic speeds on the road, the author of the report proposes additional mitigation measures such as extra signage to indicate the 30 mile an hour restriction and the provisions of rumble strips/ speed humps.

Development Control Advice Note 15, Vehicular Access Standards (DCAN 15) includes a table (see below) which sets out the visibility splay requirements for different forms of accesses based upon the speed of traffic using the priority road and the volume of traffic using that road.

Dfl Roads have assessed the information provided and considered the additional mitigation. In their response they have indicated that in their view it may be possible to reduce the sight splay requirement to 57.5 metres. Upon clarification with Dfl

Roads it is apparent that the reduction to 60metres and belatedly to 57.5 metres is based on the Council accepting that exceptional circumstances exist in this case and the lesser visibility splay is acceptable, a term commonly referred to in the assessment of visibility splays as the bracketed figure.

Type of Access		Traffic Speed on the Priority Road kph (mph)						
		100 (62)	85 (53)	70 (44)	60 (37)	50 (31)	40 (25)	30 (19)
Access other than those listed below		215 [160]	160 [120]	120 [90]	90 [70]	70 [45]	45 [33]	33
Access flow up to 60 vpd onto priority road > 3000 vpd		160	120	90	70	60	45	33
Access flow up to 60 vpd onto priority road < 3000 vpd		160 [120]	120 [90]	90 [70]	70 [45]	60 [33]	45 [33]	33

The Dfl Roads traffic survey of the adjoining priority road (Mill Road) was taken over a period of 7 days at the end of January 2020. The survey indicated that the average volume of traffic on the road daily was 5,703 vehicles and the 85 percentile speed was 33.5 miles per hour.

The table above is taken from DCAN 15, the left hand side of the table makes an assessment of the vehicles using the proposed access and the volume of traffic on the priority road. In this case 11 residential units are proposed which would equate to some 110 vehicle movements per day, or vpd as referred to in the table. The traffic on the priority road is in excess of 3000 vehicles per day so therefore it is the top line of the table which is applicable, i.e. 'Access other than those listed below'. The horizontal line along the top of the table relates to the speed of the traffic on the priority road. In this case it is known that the 85percentile speed is 33.5mph which falls somewhere between the two figures shown in blue on the table above. This means that the sightline requirement for the road in normal circumstances is somewhere between 70 and 90 metres as indicated in yellow on the table.

DCAN 15, permits the use of the bracketed figures, those immediately below those highlighted in yellow on the table. The use of the bracketed, or lower figure, is permitted if the planning authority considers that there are exceptional circumstances in a particular case and that danger to road users is unlikely to be caused. No exceptional circumstances have been presented by the applicant. DCAN 15 indicates that reductions in visibility standards are not permitted simply because the applicant does not own or have control over the land required to form the visibility splays.

It has been stated by the applicant's consultants that they can achieve a sightline of 55.4 metres. In contrast, one of the objectors states that a sightline of only 45 metres

can be achieved, while a basic measurement exercise at the Planning Committee site visit indicated a sight splay of only 47 metres was achievable.

Dfl Roads have indicated that the minimum visibility splay should be 57.5 metres, however, this assumes that the Council accepts that exceptional circumstances exist, there is no danger to road users so the reduced visibility splay in brackets can be used. If the lower (bracketed) figure cannot be used the standard visibility splay would be somewhere between 70 and 90 metres.

The visibility splays of 90 metres in both directions for the previously approved scheme were a pre-commencement condition required to be put in place prior to the commencement of any other form of development. No exceptional circumstances have been presented, nor are any apparent which would allow the reduction in the visibility spay to the lesser (bracketed) figure. Even if the lesser (bracketed) figure is accepted the applicant's consultants have indicated that they cannot meet that requirement and DCAN 15 states that it would be highly unlikely that a visibility splay less than the bracketed figure would be accepted. This of course assumes that the applicant's plan and roadside geometry is entirely accurate (a matter disputed by an objector).

In the circumstances outlined above, it is considered that the reduced visibility splays proposed for the access to a development of 11 residential units is not acceptable, would impact on road safety and the flow of traffic and should, as a consequence be refused.

RECOMMENDATION | REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

PROPOSED REASON OF REFUSAL

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy AMP 2 of Planning Policy Statement 3: Access, Movement and Parking in that, it would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users since it proposes to use an access at which visibility cannot be provided to an adequate standard.

