

**RE-CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO  
PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION**

<b>Comments provided by</b>	Roads Planning Service	<b>Contact e-mail/number:</b>		
<b>Officer Name and Post:</b>	Keith Patterson Roads Planning Officer	<a href="mailto:kpatterson@scotborders.gov.uk">kpatterson@scotborders.gov.uk</a> <b>01835 826637</b>		
<b>Date of reply</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2021	<b>Consultee reference:</b>		
<b>Planning Application Reference</b>	20/01327/FUL	<b>Case Officer:</b> Euan Calvert		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Mark Graham			
<b>Agent</b>	PD Architecture			
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Erection of dwellinghouse			
<b>Site Location</b>	Land Adjacent Carnlea Main Street Heiton Scottish Borders			
<b><i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i></b>				
<b>Background and Site description</b>	This is a reconsultation following the submission of amended drawings.			
<b>Key Issues (Bullet points)</b>				
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>I refer to the amended site layout plan. I appreciate the effort to include a turning area for the private access, the lack of which was one of the reasons for refusal in my original consultation response. The location of the turning area will rely upon the use of the driveway for Hillcrest being used when reversing out of the turning area, should gates or other obstruction be placed on the driveway for Hillcrest, then the turning area would no longer function. A solution to this would be to move the turning area East to approximately the midpoint of the site frontage, space could be freed up within the site by removing the internal turning area and simply having two nose-in parking spaces either side by side or nose to tail.</p> <p>The above solution would remove my concerns with regards to the ability of vehicles to enter and exit the private access in a forward gear, however I would still be unable to support the proposal given the sub-standard access onto the public road. The access would have to be widened to 5.5m wide with 6m radii and visibility splays of 2.4m by 43m in either direction as well as being surfaced to my specification before I would be able to support this proposal. The land required to implement these improvements would appear to be out with the control of the applicant and as such I must continue to object.</p>			
<b>Recommendation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Object</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required
<b>Reason for refusal</b>	The proposal does not comply with policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that it would be result in extra vehicular traffic on a sub-standard access to the detriment of road safety.			

AJS