

# ARGYLL AND BUTE COUNCIL ROADS REVIEW

LOCAL REVIEW BOARD  
REFERENCE NUMBER 24/0005/LRB

PLANNING APPLICATION  
REFERENCE NUMBER 23/01046/PP

LOCATION: 50 CHARLOTTE ST, HELENSBURGH, G84  
7SR

PROPOSED: ALTERATIONS TO WIDEN DRIVEWAY  
ENTRANCE

JUNE 2024



## **Contents**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>History</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Roads Comment</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Roads Response to Appeal Comments</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>6</b>



## 2. History

### Charlotte Street between 2022& 2024)

Date	Applicant	Application for	Roads Response
16 June 2022	Mrs Dawn Anderson	formation of additional parking	<p><b>Refuse:</b></p> <p>The visibility splay of 42 x 2.4 x 1.05 metres for a 30mph is not achievable.</p> <p>Due to the close proximity with a corner and insufficient visibility splay, vehicle parking and turning should be achieved within the curtilage of the dwelling with adequate manoeuvring space within the site for a vehicle to enter and leave in a forward gear.</p> <p>The removal of carriage illumination assets to increase private parking provision, will not be supported.</p>
1 August 2022	Mrs Dawn Anderson	formation of additional parking	<p><b>Refuse:</b></p> <p>The visibility splay of 42 x 2.4 x 1.05 metres for a 30mph is not achievable.</p>

### 3. Roads Comments

In response to 23/01046/PP, proposed alterations to widen driveway, Roads note the following comments/ concerns:

Visibility splays protect all road users, where a vehicle is required to reverse the operator does not achieve the unimpeded visibility as that of a vehicle travelling in a forward gear. The driveway in question is located on a main rural secondary distributor road, connecting the A818 of Sinclair Street with East Abercromby Street. The visibility splay requirements for Charlotte Street are 42 x 2.4 x 1.05 metres for a 30mph. At the access to 50 Charlotte Street this is not achievable in the improved operator position of forward gear. Parking in this location or manoeuvring in this location therefore represents a significant Health and Safety concern to the road safety of all road users. **As noted in the response of Modus Transport Solutions, and as noted per the recent submissions made in planning application 22/00017/PP, the 85<sup>th</sup> % speeds at this location are 17-18mph and therefore the application of such a visibility splay is demonstrably not appropriate.**

All new, and alterations to existing accesses must give cognisance to the hierarchy of road users, and that those in charge of vehicles represent the greatest cause of harm in the event of a collision and thus bear the greatest responsibility. Where alterations to an existing vehicle access do not improve the intervisibility of manoeuvring vehicles this represents a significant Health and Safety concern to all road users, but more specifically the most vulnerable of the hierarchy, pedestrians. **The alterations provide for a neutral position as to the driveway. As has been explained in previous submissions, insofar as vehicular access is concerned, the alterations do not change the position because the alterations are, in essence, to resurface the existing driveway. To be clear, this is not the installation of a new driveway that was not there before. The driveway already exists**



## 4. Roads Response to Appeal Comments

**Appeal comment:** 3.6. *This reason for refusal represents a misunderstanding of the nature of the proposed alterations to the driveway. As noted at section 2 above, the widening of the driveway is not to accommodate further vehicles but rather to accommodate a more direct route for pedestrian access to/egress from the Property.*

**Roads Response:** Roads determine the width of the proposed widening (6.0m) excessive for the proposed use, as this represents the width of a bi-directional carriageway. At the proposed width, Roads conclude the ability for intensification of the provision, for the parking of vehicles, is greatly increased and thus represents an increased potential roads hazard. Roads consider the proposed widening of 6.0m without any hard segregation for pedestrians to represent a significant Health and Safety concern to the road safety of all road users.

The additional hard surfacing is principally to accommodate a more direct pedestrian access/egress from the property.

**Appeal comment:** 3.11 *The Council could also introduce signage regarding the bend if considered appropriate, or a convex traffic mirror.*

**Roads Response:** Road hazards should be managed at source through effective design and not







for intensification of use and controlling the associated Health and Safety concern identified and ensuring access for all.

The appellant noted in discussions on this aspect of the appeal that should a person in a wheelchair wish to gain access to the property, in the absence of the widening of the driveway to install a more direct and dedicated pedestrian path, such access would be exceedingly difficult. The appellant urges the members of the LRB to undertake a site visit where they can see for themselves the relationship of the proposed development to the property, the fact that the proposed alterations are so incredibly modest, and the basic

## 5. Summary

For the reasons noted above and in the submission of Modus Transport Solutions, the conclusions below are disputed.

The visibility splay requirements for Charlotte Street are 42 x 2.4 x 1.05 metres for a 30mph. In its existing form, the access of 50 Charlotte Street does not achieve this.

Widening of the existing access to the proposed width of 6.0m represents a potential for the intensification of vehicle parking at a location. A location that does not achieve minimum visibility requirements. Therefore, any potential intensification of this eref 5(oa)3(t)-(m)-3(um)9