

ARGUMENT SAFE PEDESTRIAN HIGHWAY USE

SEE attached APPEAL DECISION dated 19th November 2020 where only reason for dismissal was that pedestrian use of highway was not safe, and therefore, as of this lack of safety for highway pedestrian use the proposed development was not the best use of land.

This DOCUMENT and the attached VIDEO EVIDENCE is an argument disputing that and why this Application is re-submitted.

In the APPEAL DECISION Items 7, 8, 9 and 10 the Appeal Inspector explains this. PLEASE READ THOSE ITEMS ALONG WITH THE FOLLOWING:-

The RELEVANT POINTS ARE FOR:

Item 7 That residential users would have different needs to those for the industrial use, that pedestrian use of the highway would not be problematic for the industrial use as of the limited need or demand for access on foot for industrial users, but that as there are no crossing facilities or separate footways residential users would likely to be very reliant on the private vehicle to serve their daily needs regarding shopping and recreational activities and that ideal development is to promote walking, public transport, and cycling.

ARGUMENT:

Basically the Inspector is saying as there is no crossing facility

it is not safe for residential users to walk across to the Nursery which can provide their daily shopping needs,

BUT it is ok for industrial users to do so for snacks / lunch etc.

BUT they wouldn't want to visit the Nursery so often;

and that residential users would want to walk elsewhere for their recreational activities

and as there are no separate footways they cannot do so safely.

OUR REPLY: Is that the highway is safe for all pedestrian users to cross, industrial and residential, and further argue that industrial users are likely to use the highway more to get their nourishment, in particular, mid-morning, mid-day and afternoon.

See attached VIDEO EVIDENCE which shows with normal road crossing procedure the road is as safe as walking across any other highway, be it Countryside

or Town Centre (where there are more distractions), in fact it is more likely someone crossing the road to get to the Nursery will be more careful, therefore, more safe.

Also VIDEO EVIDENCE shows that waiting to cross safely between traffic time is usually less than a minute, on average less than a minute, which is not a length of time that would make someone impatient and rush, so safe.

It has taken longer to cross the road in the Saltash Town Centre, be it at a crossing or not.

In todays world workers tend to ignore the benefits of a 'packed lunch' and use the nearest and most convenient fast food or shop for their mid-morning snack, lunch, mid-afternoon snack and even breakfast before all that;

at home residents tend to use what they have in house, not go to the trouble of shopping for their nourishment, usually having bought supplies on a weekly shop to a large store, where they need transport for the cartage of the usually large weekly (or monthly) household shop;

SO the Inspector is wrong, residential users are not likely to cross the highway more than industrial workers, the industrial workers demand to cross the road is likely to be higher, the industrial users need or demand for access on foot to cross the road is not limited, and they would not have the time to walk elsewhere.

As far as being reliant on the private vehicle,

the bus stop is directly outside the entrance of this development site, so PUBLIC TRANSPORT is available,

being that close how much more encouragement do you need to use it.

As far as recreational facilities go, there are none within 2 kilometres, how often would or do people walk that far for such, even if they should;

add to this most recreational facilities are miles away,

Carkeel has none, Saltash has limited.

Item 8 Basically the Inspector is repeating Item 7
adding that the highway is relatively busy and that the 40mph speed limit
is a problem for crossing and walking along, and would be unsafe for pedestrians.

OUR REPLY: As above, is that the highway is safe for all pedestrian users to cross,
and further argue that it is only 270 metres to where it is definitely safe
for pedestrian users to walk along the highway on tarmac surfaces,
and that it is fair to say with care that the 270 metres can be safely walked,
but it is not ideal, BUT it is unlikely any residential user would want to walk
along that 270 metre length of highway.

In reality the first 100 metres from this development site entrance to Carkeel is safe
as of the drive / visibility splays to the entrances to the neighbouring two properties.
So 170 metres of not ideal length of highway.

Also, ignoring the Nursery where all daily household needs are available
which is directly and safely across the road from the Site,
the nearest industrial estate (for want of a better word 'domestic' estate
See Design & Access Statement) is 1500 metres, a kilometre and 1/2 away;
and these shops Waitrose and Lidl's are where you would do your
weekly / monthly shop, and you wouldn't walk 1500 metres, a kilometre and a 1/2,
carrying that amount of shopping, and you would not get the car out and drive
that kilometre and a 1/2 just to get the odd household supply you could safely
get quicker across the road (next door). Its a busy life nowadays !

Furthermore, in 2013,

and we appreciate that was 8 years ago,
but Planning and Highway (safety ?) policies haven't changed in that time,
although the need to provide housing has increased,
and the fact that agricultural buildings (in the Countryside / miles from facilities)
and industrial buildings (workshops) can get Planning Approval
has been made easier, and the increased need to use redundant buildings,
a Planning Application for the development at Pill Saltash was Refused and
then Dismissed at Appeal, see attached Appeal Decision APP/D0840/A/12/2184613;
the Reason for Dismissal basically was that although highway use by pedestrians
was deemed safe, even though no footways for about 500 metres, the fact that
the nearest bus stop was 1000 metres away and that the development would
not maximise use of public transport, and that public facilities (shopping) were
basically, not within usual walking distance, then no one would walk
even though they could;

this Dismissal Reason in reality was based just on two basic points,

one, 1000 metres from development site to bus stop

is too far to encourage use of Public Transport,

two, the Inspector states that no one usually walks over 1000 metres

to carry shopping, and too far to accept;

SO in effect the Pill Dismissal Reason conflicts with this Two Hoots Dismissal,

as this Two Hoots Proposed Development

one, has a bus stopping directly outside the site (available Public Transport),

two, is being Dismissed because of pedestrian safety

to walk 1500 metres (a kilometre and a 1/2)

to the second available shopping facility

when it is safe for pedestrians to cross the highway to the Nursery

for probably most of a households daily needs.

SO we submit that walking 1500 metres for shopping is not a reason to Refuse,

and that safe walking across a highway for shopping is a reason for Approval.

OR the development at Pill should be APPROVED.

Item 9 Basically the Inspector is repeating Items 7 and 8

adding that the Nursery and Carkeel are the locations providing local services and facilities
that residential users would wish to walk to.

OUR REPLY: See argument immediately above.

Plus we repeat no one will walk to Carkeel Industrial Estates,

it is too far for cartage, they would always use a car,
unless there is a bus conveniently available.

And no one would, even get in a car, when safe pedestrian access
to a convenient and very good shopping facility at the neighbouring Nursery.
One could argue why was the Nursery allowed as it is
when almost everyone has to drive there.

Item 10 Basically the Inspector is repeating Items 7, 8 and 9

adding that the development does not promote walking, cycling and public transport

OUR REPLY: Well, there is Public Transport;

cycling for recreation in reality you would drive to the location first,
cycling to work, should the provision of one house be stopped for this reason,
how many people want to cycle to work,
if so they would live where they could safely cycle,
cycle paths in the countryside, absurd;
walking for everyday needs,
people are only prepared to walk short distances for same,
and it is safe to cross the road to the Nursery for same;
walking to work, again you would live where you safely could;
walking for shopping, only short distances as of cartage,
no one would carry heavy shopping;
walking in countryside, people tend to drive to favourite places then walk.
There are no facilities in villages or hamlets (like Hatt)
and they are also too far away to walk for shopping (have to drive),
there are bus services to villages and hamlets (there is for this Development),
but there is no way villages and hamlets (like Hatt) provides
for walking for shopping, work or recreation, yet development is allowed there.

FURTHERMORE:

Barns miles from anywhere are converted to houses and always have to use vehicles
as no facilities near, or bus available;

same can be said for holiday chalet accommodation:

Planning Policies regarding highways are written more for multiple house developments,
small conversions, of which this is, should not have same stringent 'so called rules' applied,
common sense should prevail.

Furthermore, shops deliver now, people don't use their own vehicles for shopping as much,
or for other purchase of other goods, internet purchases with delivery are the norm.

IN CONCLUSION:

It is unreasonable not to allow gain of a small dwelling just for probably never needing to walk 270
metres, in reality only 170 metres, of not ideal length of highway, to shops you would never walk
to, when other allowed developments have similar or worse conditions, when this is the best use
of the land, especially in today's circumstance, the need for housing of all kinds.

SEE ATTACHED VIDEO EVIDENCE: