

**S.73 APPLICATION FOR THE VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 ON NP/HPK/0719/0820 FOR 'THE DEMOLITION OF FORMER RISING SUN HOTEL AND ERECTION OF HOTEL (CLASS C1) INCORPORATING GROUND FLOOR FLOORSPACE WITH FLEXIBILITY TO BE USED FOR RESTAURANT/BAR (CLASS A3/A4 USES) AND FUNCTION FACILITIES, ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SITE ACCESS, CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS' TO PROVIDE A PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITY WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN ISLAND AT THE BIKE AND BOOT HOTEL, HOPE ROAD, BAMFORD (NP/HPK/0924/0929, JK)**

**APPLICANT: GIGI DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

**Summary**

1. Condition 6 on the 2020 Hotel permission sought to prevent the hotel opening until 'a scheme for the provision of a safe pedestrian crossing point over the A6187 Hope Road and improved public transport facilities' was fully implemented following approval of the details by the Authority.
2. The approved plans and the reason for the condition seek to secure a crossing incorporating a pedestrian refuge island.
3. The condition has not been discharged and the hotel has now opened.
4. The developer has reviewed the condition requirement and seeks a variation to provide the pedestrian crossing without the central refuge island.
5. The key issue is highway and pedestrian safety. Supporting technical information demonstrates the revised scheme would have the required visibility splays and coupled with advance warning signs, new road markings and a relocated bus stop, would deliver a safe crossing.
6. Subject to final confirmation from DCC as Local Highway Authority that it meets the required safety standard, this simpler form of crossing would accord with adopted policy.
7. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

**Site and Surroundings**

8. The Bike and Boot Hotel, which replaced the former Rising Sun Hotel, is located on the north side of A6187 Hope Road in the open countryside between Bamford village (1.5 km to the north east) and Hope village (2.4kms to the west) with the smaller hamlet of Thornhill some 0.75km to the north.
9. The replacement hotel increased the number of beds on site from 12 to 60 within a larger contemporary building which faces the main road with parking to the rear. The western site boundary has a high conifer hedge screening the hotel from the adjacent detached house, Rowan Lodge. Beyond Rowan Lodge is a further bungalow, Icarus Close, and beyond that open fields. The east side of the site is bounded by a hedgerow and trees and the northern boundary by further planting. Immediately to the east and north of the site are agricultural grazing fields. a paddock.
10. There is a bus stop immediately outside the hotel and the main footway is located on the south side of the road opposite the hotel.

## **Proposal**

11. The application proposes to vary condition 6 of the planning permission for the hotel NP/HPK/0719/0820 which states;

*6. The hotel premises hereby approved shall not be taken into use until a scheme for the provision of a safe crossing point over the A6187 Hope Road and improved public transport facilities has been fully implemented in accordance with a detailed plans and specifications that shall first have been submitted to the National Park Authority for approval in writing.*

The Reason was;

*6. To secure the provision of the pedestrian refuge and improved bus stop facility in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety before the hotel opens for guests and visiting members of the public.*

12. The application form states it seeks to vary this condition to provide a pedestrian crossing facility without the central pedestrian refuge island shown on the approved site plan.
13. The application is supported by a Highway Technical Statement and a Road Safety Audit.
14. Plans within the technical statement detail the revised crossing with the achievable visibility splays, associated advance warning signage and road markings together with the alteration to the bus stop position.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

15. That, subject to prior entry into a S106 deed of variation, the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the following approved plans and documents;

Plan Issue No 2 dated 3 July 2019, BSG Ecology Report dated May 2018 ref 9537\_R\_APPR\_20117, BSG Bat Mitigation and Compensation Strategy dated October 2018 ref P18-850, The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment dated 2nd July 2019 Ref JC/124/190702, the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and Historic Buildings Appraisal Report by ARS Ltd ref 2019/88 – Oasis archaeol5-30460 dated May 2019, and amended plans numbered:

020033-AAD-01-GF-DR-A-0001A- C01\_GA - Ground Floor Plan - Revised,  
-AAD-01-01- DR-A-0002A- C01\_GA - First Floor Plan - Revised,  
020033-AAD-01-02-DR-A-0003A- C01\_GA - Second Floor Plan - Revised,  
020033-AAD-01-03-DR-A-0004A- C01\_GA - Roof Plan - Revised,  
020033-AAD-01-GF-DR-A-0102A- C01\_Proposed Car Parking and Building Siting,

020033-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-0005A- C107\_GA - Elevations - Revised,  
020033-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-0005C- C01\_GA - Elevations – Revised - Comparative Study,  
020033-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A0006A- C107\_GA - Elevations - Revised,  
020033-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-0006C- C01\_GA - Elevations - Revised-Comparative Study,  
020033- AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-0007A- C111 \_GA - Elevations - Revised,  
020033-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-0007C- C01\_GA - Elevations - Revised Comparative Study,  
020033-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-3000A-C 01\_Substation Proposed GA Floor Plans and Elevations  
020033-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-801-C24 – External Perimeter Details,  
020033-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-800-C51 – External Perimeter Details, and  
020033-AAD-02-ZZ-DR-A-1000-RO1 Wadobi GA Plans and Elevations.  
Revised Landscape General Arrangement drawing No 531-1002 N, Amended Planting Plan Drawing No 531-2001C and Amended Landscape Hard Works and Street furniture Plan ref 531-2003 rev C

subject to the following conditions and/or modifications

- 2 The premises shall be used solely as a 60 bed Class C1 hotel with ancillary restaurant and bar open to non-residents with function capability only and for no other purposes (including any other purpose in Class C1 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or in any order revoking and re-enacting that order).
- 3 The hotel premises hereby approved shall not be taken into use until the existing accesses to Hope Road (A6187) have been modified in accordance with the application drawings, laid out, constructed and provided with 2.4m x 145m (to the west) and 2.4m x 122m (to the east) visibility splays in accordance with Drawing no 1707201, the area in advance of the sightlines being maintained clear of any object greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) relative to the adjoining nearside carriageway channel level throughout the lifetime of the development.
- 4 A safe pedestrian crossing point over the A6187 Hope Road and improved public transport facilities based on drawing no 2112890 RevA shall be fully implemented in accordance with detailed plans and specifications which shall have first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority within six months of the date of this permission.
- 5 The car park shall be maintained throughout the lifetime of the hotel in full accordance with the approved Proposed Car Parking and Building Siting drawing No 020033-AAD-01-GF-DR-A-0102A REV C01 for vehicles to be parked and for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear.
- 6 The Wadobi building housing the cycle parking facilities shown on the approved drawing shall be retained for use by the occupants of, and visitors to, the hotel at all times throughout the lifetime of the development.
- 8 There shall be no gates or other barriers within 10m of the nearside highway boundary and any gates shall open inwards only.

- 8 The Approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timescales specified therein, to include those parts identified as being implemented prior to occupation and following occupation, unless alternative timescales are agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Approved Travel Plan shall be monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan targets.**
- 9 Access into the site shall be restricted to the eastern entrance only with the internal one-way system clearly signed with egress from the site limited to the western access point.**
- 10 The development shall be carried out strictly in full accordance with the recommendations set out in the submitted Final Ecology Report ref 9537\_R\_APPR\_20117.**
- 11 The construction and associated management and maintenance plan of the surface water drainage for the site shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details set out in the following documents before the development is first brought into use; 1. ADEPT Eng (7-06-21 rev 08-04-22) Proposed Drainage Strategy. Ref: 20296-ACE-00- XXDR-C-1201, rev-C7 2. ADEPT Eng (15-03-21 rev 08-04-22) Proposed Surface Finishes. Ref: 20296-ACE-00-XXDRC-1210, rev-C4 3. ADEPT Eng (May 2021 rev 14-10-21) Typical Drainage Details. Ref: 20296-ACE-00-XXDRC-1230, rev-C1 4. ADEPT Eng (08-04-22) Typical Drainage Details. Ref: 20296-ACE-00-XX-DR-C-1232, revC1 5. ADEPT Eng (08-04-22) Section through Outfall Chamber and Headwall. Ref: 20296-ACE-00- ZZ-DR-C1600, rev-C1**
- 12 The hard and soft landscape works shown on the following approved drawing numbers, revised Landscape General Arrangement drawing No 531-1002 N, amended Planting Plan Drawing No 531-2001C and amended Landscape Hard Works and Street furniture Plan ref 531-2003 rev C shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with such alternative programme as may be agreed in writing with the National Park Authority.**
- 13 No external lighting of the site shall be installed other than in complete accordance with approved drawings both numbered D42307/JB/D, (one showing the plan view with details of the lighting fitting and luminosity, the other showing aerial views illustrating the light spread) together with the specific details and plan showing the visualisation of the night time lighting approved under NP/DIS/0223/0212. All lighting shall be maintained throughout the lifetime of the development controlled by ‘Astro Time Clock’ or similar such mechanism/device to be on at 17:00hrs and off at 00:00hrs and that after midnight the Astro time clock and building mounted PIR’s to the car park entrance area, reception entrance and staff entrances (4 in total) will only come on temporarily when activated.**

- 14 The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved report 'Sustainability Appraisal MEP overview – Issue TWO 1/4/21' The hotel shall not be brought into use until the 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging spaces shown on the approved plans have been provided along with cabling extended to 2 more spaces to accommodate a future upgrade of those spaces to EV Charging spaces. Written verification confirming completion in full accordance with the above report including the EV charging provision shall be submitted in writing to the National Park Authority within one month of the completion of the development.
- 15 Prior to the car parking being brought into use the 2m high acoustic fence detailed in the AAD Architects email dated 30th June 2023 and shown on the approved landscape drawings shall be erected along the boundary of the car parking area with the neighbouring residential garden. Thereafter the approved fence shall be maintained throughout the lifetime of the development in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Footnotes re;

**S106, works within Highway, Travel Plan monitoring and drainage**

### **Key Issues**

16. The highway safety implications of the provision of the pedestrian crossing and associated signage without the pedestrian island.
17. Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that an application may be made for planning permission without complying with conditions applied to a previous permission. It is stated that local authorities may decide whether to grant permission subject to differing conditions (this can include imposing new conditions), remove the conditions altogether or refuse to alter conditions. Thus, it is possible to apply for conditions to be struck out, or for their modification or relaxation. The section makes it clear that in considering such an application a Local Planning Authority may only consider the question of the conditions and not revisit the principle of the development.
18. Therefore, only the acceptability of the proposal in the context of the reasons for the imposition of the condition falls to be considered in the determination of the current application, in this - highway and pedestrian safety. However, in terms of decision making, a section 73 application should be treated just like any other application, and due regard paid to the development plan and other material considerations as any approval results in a fresh new planning permission for the development. Any new permission would also require all the conditions to be updated to reflect any other variations and amendments already agreed since the original grant of consent.

### **Relevant Planning History**

19. 2020 – Approval for the replacement hotel - NP/HPK/0719/0820. Plans indicted a crossing incorporating a central island and Condition 6, suggested by the Highway Authority, restricted the hotel from being taken into use until '*a scheme for the provision of a safe crossing point over the A6187 Hope Road and improved public transport facilities has been fully implemented in accordance with a detailed plans and specifications that shall first have been submitted to the National Park Authority for approval in writing.*
20. 2021-2023 Various applications to discharge planning conditions attached to that

approval followed.

21. 2023 - Approval of a S.73 application ref NP/HPK/0123/0036 for the variation of condition 2 – Approved Plans on approval no NP/HPK/0719/0820: to allow minor amendments of external fenestration to all elevations. At the same time Condition 6 was also revised by the Authority to require a highway crossing scheme to be agreed and then completed within 6 months of opening of the hotel. This was because by then it was clear that it was not going to be in place by the opening.

### **Consultations**

22. Derbyshire County Council as Local Highway Authority (LHA) – Final formal response awaited, Initial response to the Highway Officer from the internal implementation team stated that;
23. *'At this moment, we do not support the removal of the safe crossing point over the A6187 Hope Road. I think the developer either needs to get approval from planning regarding the removal of the splitter island and afterwards, we will look into this matter more thoroughly or the planning can progress with the breach of the condition and enforcement actions.....'*
24. Planning Officer Note – The proposal is to provide a crossing without a central refuge, not remove the crossing altogether. Therefore, given this does not provide a specific response on the acceptability or otherwise of the actual development proposal officers have sought further clarification from DCC and will update the meeting accordingly.
25. High Peak Borough Council – No response
26. Bamford with Thornhill Parish Council – Objection - the traffic island is needed for pedestrian safety reasons. Summary of comments made below;
27. Question the assertion in the Highways Technical Statement that "The island was originally requested due to concerns that the crossing would be utilised by a scouts troop within the vicinity of the proposed development. This scout troop has since been defunct however" . We are not aware that any such scout troop ever existed.
28. Planning Officer Note – The reference to a scouts troop in the Technical Statement is considered to be the Glenbrook Outdoor Activity Centre some 300m west of the hotel until it closed in 2023 was run by the Girl Guides which closed in 2023.
29. Leaving that aside, it is clear that the requirement for the pedestrian refuge came from the Highway Authority's response to the initial application to redevelop the old hotel. Whilst that application was refused, in their successful resubmission the developer took account of this requirement incorporating the refuge into their proposed plans which were then approved.
30. The PC consider the reason for the condition was representations from this Parish Council that there needs to be a traffic island to assist bus passengers crossing the road to/from the hotel, given that the speed of traffic at this point. (Planning Officer Note – The Parish Council actually sought a formal pedestrian crossing in the original application response, not a refuge).
31. Note that an island is not possible because of the 50mph permitted speed; however, this traffic island proposal was made in the context of a reduction of the speed limit to 40mph past the hotel. It is surprising that Via Solutions did not consider that 40mph possibility. (Officer Note – the technical statement does but as currently there is no

reduction they looked at a crossing without) Also, their 'lack of available width' argument could be overcome by a slight alteration to the curtilage of the land at the front of the hotel.

### **Representations**

32. None

### **Main Policies**

33. Relevant Core Strategy policies to this amendment: GSP1, GSP3, T1, T3

34. Relevant Local Plan policies to this amendment: DMC3, DMT3,

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

35. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises our Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the development plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. There is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the development plan and the NPPF and our policies should be given full weight in the determination of this application.

36. Paragraph 189 states that *“great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”*

37. Para 117. States that applications for development should:

- a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;
- b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;
- c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;

### **Peak District National Park Core Strategy**

38. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GPS1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.

39. Policy GSP3 sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
40. Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport states that A Conserving and enhancing the National Park's valued characteristics will be the primary criterion in the planning and design of transport and its Management.
41. Policy T3: Design of transport infrastructure, states that:
- A. Transport infrastructure, including roads, bridges, lighting, signing, other street furniture and public transport infrastructure, will be carefully designed and maintained to take full account of the valued characteristics of the National Park.
  - B. Particular attention will be given to using the minimum infrastructure necessary

#### PDNPA Development Management Policies

42. Policy DMC3A says where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
43. Policy DMC3B sets out various aspects that particular attention will be paid to including: siting, scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation, settlement form and character, landscape, details, materials and finishes landscaping, access, utilities and parking, amenity, accessibility and the principles embedded in the design related SPD and the technical guide.
44. DMT3 states for access and design criteria that;
45. Where new transport related infrastructure is developed, it should be to the highest standards of environmental design and materials and in keeping with the valued characteristics of the National Park.

#### PDNPA Transport Design Guide SPD

46. This sets out the requirement for ensuring that the design of transport infrastructure enhances, rather than detracts from the special qualities of the National Park. It lays out the guiding principles to be followed for the design of all forms of transport infrastructure and overall advocates a minimalistic approach, recognising this is least likely to have impacts on the special qualities of the National Park.

#### **Assessment**

##### The principle of the development

47. The replacement 60 bed 'Bike and Boot' hotel has been operational for some time now so for the purposes of this S73 application the principle of a replacement hotel and all matters relating to the siting, design and layout on the hotel site have been established by the previous planning approval.



48. This application solely concerns the provision of a safe pedestrian crossing outside of the hotel and seeks a variation to provide it without the previously shown pedestrian refuge island in the centre of Hope Road. The crossing was secured by condition to agree a scheme and for it to be provided before the hotel opened for reasons of highway and pedestrian safety given the only pavement linking the site to nearby settlements lay on the opposite side of the road along with the west-bound bus service stop.
49. Therefore, as a S73 application to vary Condition 6 consideration of the application will be confined to the impact and acceptability of the proposed pedestrian crossing without the central refuge island.
50. However, as any approval would result in the grant of a new permission for the hotel development as a whole, all the remaining conditions on the original consent need to be restated and updated where appropriate to incorporate any detail already approved via separate discharge of condition, non-material amendment and the other S73 decision.

#### Consideration of the provision of a crossing without the pedestrian refuge island

51. The applicant's Highway Technical Statement summarises the case for the deletion and is supported by a separate Road Safety Audit report. Although it states that the application follows concerns raised by the planning authority regarding the suitability of a pedestrian island in this location, officers are however not aware of any formal concerns being raised by the National Park Authority.
52. There were some safety concerns raised by third parties at the time of the hotel approval and DCC as LHA also noted the main issue from a traffic safety view was lane width. They stated that the ideal pedestrian refuge should not be narrower than 1.5m but that would leave sub-standard lane widths, if the cycle lane widths (1.5m) were kept as existing. It went on to say that 3m running lanes would leave space for 1m cycle lanes. At that time the Planning Officer, having spoken to DCC Officers, was assured that any scheme submitted would be assessed by their in-house road safety team before getting the go ahead and pointed out that it may be that the central refuge proposed is deleted due to lack of space/safety issues.
53. The agent's Technical Statement sets out that the island was originally requested due to concerns that the crossing would be utilised by a scout's troop within the vicinity of the proposed development. This is assumed to be a mistaken reference to the nearby Glenbrook Outdoor Activity Centre which until it closed recently housed a large guides camp.
54. However, as stated above, the reason for the original condition is clear in that it was requested by DCC for highway safety reasons related to the likely increased numbers of pedestrians from the larger hotel crossing the road at this point to access the west-bound bus stop and the main pedestrian footway.
55. The submitted Road Safety Audit (RSA) of the proposed S278 pedestrian crossing works without the pedestrian island identifies 3 problems with the designers response/recommendation.
56. The first two related to insufficient intervisibility between pedestrians and vehicles in an easterly direction from the north side of the crossing and from the south side looking west due to high roadside vegetation. It recommended that the designers detail the required visibility envelopes running along the nearside kerb lines and that these are always kept clear of obstructions and vegetation at all times. These sightlines are now

detailed on the accompanying plan.

57. The third problem identified was that there was no street lighting which could lead to vehicle pedestrian conflicts during hours of darkness. It noted that it is not clear if street lighting is to be provided at this location but that poor visibility during hours of darkness may increase the risk of road user conflicts, particularly between vehicles and vulnerable road users. It recommended the design team assess the need for street lighting at this location and provide where required. Being a rural location well outside nearby villages there is no street lighting and the plans submitted have not proposed any.
58. The applicant's technical statement sets out that the proposals have been reviewed in terms of providing a crossing facility both with and without a pedestrian island and that the main safety concern with providing the pedestrian island is that it does not comply with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This states that pedestrian refuges "shall not be provided where the speed limit is greater than 40 mph except where the refuge island is incorporated into a single lane dualling design".
59. Whilst the speed limit outside the hotel is currently 50mph, the hotel approval was subject to a S106 agreement securing a substantial contribution to DCC to enable them to progress an extension of the 40mph speed restriction westwards to incorporate the hotel frontage and adjacent property. We understand that DCC are currently pursuing that with the developer so that it can progress the speed limit extension along with monitoring of the approved travel plan.
60. The agents explain that design works were initially undertaken to provide a pedestrian island on the 50mph road and potentially apply for a departure from standards. However, the constraints on the site meant all lane and island widths proposed were to the minimum standards. As a result, and supported by the RSA, drawings were prepared which show that suitable pedestrian intervisibility splays can be achieved from the crossing points in both directions (145m west and 122m East) without the provision of a pedestrian island, as well as the wider existing carriageway lane widths and retained advisory cycle lane. It also reduces the overall crossing distance required for pedestrians from the proposed crossing point.
61. In addition to the deletion of the island refuge, the plans also show the bus stops either side of the road outside the hotel being relocated nearer the western end of the frontage and the removal of the existing raised bus stop platform construction. In addition, on the approach either side of the hotel it is proposed that 'SLOW' road markings are added within the carriageway together with a proposed 'other dangers ahead' sign annotated 'PEDESTRIANS CROSSING' to warn approaching vehicles. Furthermore, at the eastern approach it is proposed that the existing central double white lines be further extended to prevent overtaking and thus secure the maximum available visibility sight line.
62. Consequently, with these measures the agents reached the conclusion that the most safe, reasonable and practical design proposal is to vary Condition 6 and provide the proposed crossing as shown on these drawings, without the pedestrian island.
63. A crossing without the central refuge would be a simpler, less visually intrusive form of highway infrastructure and subject to highway safety standards being met, accord with the minimalist design principles for highway infrastructure set out within the PDNPA Highway Design SPD. Officers note further that pedestrian safety would be enhanced further when the separate introduction of the 40mph speed limit is delivered.

## **Conclusion**

- 64. Provided the crossing and associated works are carried out in accordance with the plans in the RSA officers agree that the evidence demonstrates that this proposal represents a suitable and safe alternative form of pedestrian crossing. However, as the officer support for the application relates to a critical highway safety issue, final acceptance is wholly dependent upon the full support of DCC as LHA.
- 65. Formal confirmation from DCC as the LHA is expected in time for the meeting and so officers will update the committee with their final formal response.

### **Human Rights**

- 66. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
- 67. List of Background Papers (not previously published)
- 68. Nil
- 69. Report Author: John Keeley