

Everton Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018 – 2034

Agenda for the Public Hearing – Response to Questions posed by Independent Examiner JOHN SLATER BA(Hons), DMS, MRTPI

My name is Roger Simon Eyre and I represent Mrs J Gomez the owner of Site 3

I have a degree in Civil Engineering and I am a Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers and a member of the Institution of Royal Engineers. In the past I have also been a member of the Institution of Highways and Transport but have allowed this to lapse when I moved into semi-retirement. During my local Government Career, I have worked for District Councils, Nottinghamshire County Council and a large Metropolitan District Council where I was a Director. In this latter appointment I headed, amongst other things, the Highways Department including Highways Development Control.

Since leaving Local Government Service I have spent four years as a Consultant Inspector with the Planning Inspectorate and have also been the Interim Head of Planning at a District Council. In parallel with this I was in partnership with a Fellow of the RTPI when we ran a Planning and Engineering Consultancy. I am also the Company Secretary for the Gainsborough Development Trust Ltd. I still take on the occasional private client who seeks my advice. It is in this capacity that I was asked to advise the Mrs Gomez.

I am also a resident of Everton, where I have lived for some 35 years, and where I have built 3 houses within the village.

I shall accompany Mrs Gomez to the hearing on the 10th of January. My response to the following questions will include:-

[Question 1 Can a safe access be provided to serve the allocation site 2 and 3 with the necessary visibility, for the scale of development proposed in Policy E9 and/or is it necessary for the capacity of the sites to be reduced.](#)

At the request of my client I submitted a pre-application enquiry to the BDC in respect of a development proposal for site 3. Their response is attached.

This included a reply from the LHA (Nottinghamshire County Council) questioning the available sight lines at any new access into this site.

Informal discussions with NCC staff indicated that whilst the site lay within the 30 mph limits, they believed the 85thtile traffic speed exceeded this limit. This is borne out by a speed survey on close to site 3 on the other side of Gainsborough Road at Hall Farm House, where traffic speeds were found to be in the region of 31.80 and 32.43 mph. On this site sightlines of 52m and 57m have been found to be acceptable (Council Planning reference 17/00702/FUL).

The LHA have indicated that they would want a site-specific speed survey for site 3 and would not accept the speeds found at Hall Farm House.

My client has obtained quotations for a site-specific speed survey but has not yet commissioned it until the outcome of this hearing is known.

In my experience I would accept that Site 3 the speed of traffic exceeds 30mph and would anticipate a speed in the region of 34-35 mph. I have also had a look at the sight lines available along the frontage of site 3 and noted that the available sight lines appear to be well in excess of 70m x 2.4m and with the benefit of an accurate survey may well be closer to 2.4m x 90m, which would be required to meet the standards for a 40mph limit as set out in Government Guidance.

[Should there be a requirement to provide a pedestrian route for residents of the two allocation sites, to the south of Gainsborough Road? Invitation to participate to be sent to - Qualifying Body - LPA - Local Highway Authority - Grace Machin - Representative of the owner of Site 3](#)

Land availability within the Highway would not allow of the provision of a footpath along the whole length of Gainsborough Road. However, there are already a significant number of dwellings on this side of the road who do not enjoy footpath access to the village without first crossing the road.

It would be reasonable for the provision of a footpath along sections of Gainsborough Road (South) such that pedestrians could cross at a safe point. This would benefit not only future new residents but also existing residents on this part of the road.

[What was the rationale for extending the allocation Site 3 beyond the site shown on Map 13- Preferred Option Site Allocation](#)

Although this question has not been directly aimed at the site owner it is believed that the Councils Pre-Application reply has some bearing. The various adopted policies combined with the sight lines already discussed suggest that a limited development of up to 5 houses would be appropriate for this site. Any more would require an adopted site access road and a greater number of houses may well conflict with the ability to design a layout that would be compatible with the Character and Appearance of this part of The Everton Conservation Area. I will happily expand on this at the hearing is so asked.