

[REDACTED]

From: Stuart Corbey
Sent: 14 November 2018 17:11
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FG/129/18/PL 44 Ferringham Lane

Applicant correspondence -- please save to file

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 November 2018 16:04
To: Stuart Corbey; Sarif; Juan Baeza
Subject: Fwd: 44 Ferringham Lane

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 14 November 2018 at 16:00:55 GMT
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: 44 Ferringham Lane

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 14 November 2018 at 16:00:02 GMT
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: 44 Ferringham Lane

Dear Stuart

After checking all your paperwork and correspondences,
It clearly shows with a traffic light system in place which we have, for the
access at 44 Ferringham Lane, condition which has been passed by your team
leaders,
The access width doesn't have to be as wide, on your policy documents it
clearly shows a 2.75 metres

Below is the wording from Ian Hayward's Report :

"With regard to access widths, using guidance within Manual for Streets, I
can advise that a typical single carriageway should measure 2.75 metres."

“Vehicular access movements at the site onto Ferringham Lane will be controlled by a traffic light system. This system has been secured via planning condition. This system limits the access to a single flow of traffic. As such the access does not need to be wide enough to allow the opposing vehicles to pass.”

Have you and your team gone through these guidelines ?

We are getting more and more confused as your paperwork backs up our case and your highways consultant Ian Hayward and our highways consultant Steve Reeve had no concerns or objections as we are covering all the outstanding issues,

We have consulted all our planning consultants, and SED Associates who have been in touch with you , addressing all of these issues between Anita Gardener and yourselves.

Kind regards

Mr & Mrs Cornell