

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 16th July 2015

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01107/FUL Cross Lane, Bayston Hill	Highways Officer

The [private] road improvement works required of the developer in the Unilateral Undertaking (UU) for Planning Permission reference 10/02833/FUL were completed on site and the developer was required to give notice to the council that the works had been completed so that the UU could be cancelled. Records imply that the UU (and the land charge) appear to be still in place.

The UU required some localised widening plus kerbing works and the filling of pot holes in stone sub-base material. The track is considered to be in a fair condition and in planning terms the question needs to be asked how much difference an extra two dwellings make over the three previously submitted, particularly given there does not appear to be any further land that could be developed off this road.

Maintenance responsibility issues aside, the access arrangement to this site are far from ideal but being as the speed of vehicles using this access road and Cross Lane are controlled by the width and surfaces of these routes, the increase in traffic from the development does not give cause for concern on safety grounds.

As regards this application as a minimum it is suggested that a further UU is requested which commits the developer to make good any damage arising from construction traffic.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01107/FUL Cross Lane, Bayston Hill	Planning Officer

There is a local aspiration to see the track surfaced in tarmac, however planning obligations can only be sought if they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010. It is accepted that without an obligation for the developer to make good any damage arising from the construction traffic, the development would not be appropriately mitigated. However, it would be beyond the test of reasonableness to see a contribution to obligate the developer to surface the track in tarmac.

Proposed amendment to the Recommendation:

Include the requirement 'for the developer to make good any damage arising from construction traffic'.