

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

25 JUNE 2019

Present:

Councillors Bullivant (Chairman), Eden (Deputy Chair), Austen, D Cox, H Cox, Cook, Daws, Evans, Foden, Gribble, Goodman-Bradbury, Hayes, Hocking, Jenks, Morgan, Mullone, Nuttall, Nutley, Orme, Patch, J Petherick, L Petherick, Parker-Khan, Purser, Rollason and Thorne

Members in Attendance:

Councillors Clarence, G Hook, J Hook, Macgregor, Taylor and Wrigley

Apologies:

Councillors Keeling, Parker, Peart and Tume

Officers in Attendance:

Eve Bates, Corporate Policy & Projects Officer

Graham Davey, Housing Enabling Manager

Rosalyn Eastman, Business Manager, Strategic Place

Rosie Gitsham, Democratic Services Support Officer

Sarah Selway, Democratic Services Team Leader & Deputy Monitoring Officer

Steve Wotton, Financial Services

53. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

54. AGREEMENT OF THE AGENDA BETWEEN PARTS I AND II

There are no Part II items.

55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

56. HEART OF THE SOUTH WEST LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (HOFSWLEP)

David Ralph, Chief Executive of the Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and Heidi Hallem, Partnership Manager, gave a presentation to Members on the LEP – attached to minutes.

Members were advised of the LEP's objective to double economy by 2038 and the strategy from 2014 to 2020. Particular focuses were improving productivity and the local industrial strategy.

In response to Members questions, the following was clarified:-

- the region would need to advance a circulator economy to increase investment and jobs
- with the changes taking place in town centres there was a need to look how to support they could be supported with the development of work hubs and enterprise centres
- the LEP wanted to be at the forefront of the changing economy
- there was a need to invest and support the development of Artificial Intelligence in the region
- there was a presumption that growth was good - LEP was emphasising the need to deliver better growth
- the LEP did not directly invest in public transport but worked with Peninsula Transport to support transport investment
- LEP could only fund development where there was a clear market failure
- concerns about local employment land noting that there was a distribution challenge across the region.
- the make-up of the Partnership and procedure regards to any members possible conflict of interest – must be minimum 2/3 private sector.
- LEPs were Community Interest Companies.

The Chairman thanked David and Heidi and asked that the HoSW consider:

- Public transport, in particular the need for new train station at Marsh Barton
- Communication, to support the improvement programme and delivery to outlying Teignbridge District Council areas.
- To put pressure on government to provide a mechanism for funding small businesses.

Heidi Hallem clarified the staff and finance resources of LEP and that they competed for funding against other national projects.

57. PERFORMANCE REPORT 2018-19 Q4

Eve Bates, Corporate Policy & Projects Officer and Steve Wotton, Finance Systems Manager presented the Council's quarter four 2018-19 strategy performance report.

Members were advised that the Council Strategy was formally adopted by Full Council in April 2016 and would run until the end of the financial year 2025/26. It was the Council's top overarching business plan. The contents, actions and expected outcomes within it were based on the statistical evidence and ensured that the Council focused on the key areas and improvements to ensure Teignbridge remains a healthy, desirable place where people want to live, work and visit.

Overview & Scrutiny Committee (25.6.2019)

There were 10 Super Projects each led by a Manager and Portfolio Holder who were responsible for driving forward the projects, performance indicators, regularly monitoring and reviewing their delivery.

Members were advised of the Councils key achievements for 2018/19:

- Household waste recycling was 56.32% Teignbridge would be either top or having one of the top recycling rates out of all the Devon authorities
- Amount of residual household waste per household for 2018/19 was 337.44 kgs, the lowest figure ever reported at Teignbridge
- Reduced the number of empty homes to 0.54% below the national average of 0.85% - had been a reduction year on year for the last 10 years
- 92% of registered businesses have a food hygiene rating of five
- 250 vulnerable and elderly residents had received assistance to remain in their own homes
- 289 properties had received free or subsidised energy efficiency measures to improve their homes, just under 500 since the start of the strategy
- 98% return rate of registration of elector's forms during the canvas in 2018/19
- The Council itself recycled 38.5% of waste produced
- Less miles were travelled in 2018/19 for operational work purposes than in the previous year
- Less gas, electricity and water consumption was used across Council assets in 2018/19 than in the previous year.

In response to comments and questions from Members, the Committee was advised:-

- CSROH 5.1 - Number of rough sleepers - Outreach Workers regularly go out and speak to rough sleepers, offering advice and assistance. There had been success in reducing the number of rough sleepers from 7 to 1.
- CSROH 5.2 & 5.3 - Homelessness prevented - the targets would be reviewed to reflect changes to legislation.
- Clarification why grants for disabled facilities to reduce homelessness are included in the data but no other benefits included. – attached to minutes
- Empty properties - the data included empty properties managed by Teign Housing; no empty dwelling management orders were issued by Teignbridge in the past year; 0.54% equated to 338 empty homes
- CSROH 1.3 Number of self-build homes provided – the Council Policy was for a target of 5% allocation of self-build homes, this was not a National requirement
- CSGP 1.1 Satisfaction with new development in your area - survey was sent to people who had bought new housing, the drop could be for various reasons which include living on a building site most comments were on the build quality rather than the overall development.
- CSGP 2.1 Satisfaction with open space / play facilities on new residential developments - lower satisfaction level could be because some developments were being built out and open spaces were not always delivered first. Standards and Compliance were being reviewed. Result regarding occupation of new development showed migration from within

Overview & Scrutiny Committee (25.6.2019)

TQ and EX postcodes – survey results were available on-line, data excludes national parks – attached to minutes

- CSGP 3.1 Number of conservation areas with appraisal & management plan adopted within the last 5 years – looking at Programme of works to achieve the target, officer had to prioritise other projects including the Wolborough enquiry
- CSHAH 5.9 Working days lost due to sickness absence – av/all employees – TDC HR – attached to minutes
- CSIIIP 1.3 Planning appeals allowed – a breakdown of the appeal reasons – attached to minutes

Decision maker	No. of Decisions	Recommendation overturned	Appeal Allowed	% Approved
Planning Committee	9	7	5	5/9 = 55%
Officers	40	-	12	12/40 = 30%

In response to a Member, it was clarified that Members would be invited to a member workshop session on Monday 2 September 2019 to find out what the priorities are in the District and feed in their ideas.

The Chairman asked that if possible Portfolio Holders and Officers were available to answer questions on items of concern at Committee.

The Chairman asked that a cross-party Spot Light review take place to look at the performance measures and the way that Performance Monitoring Figures were reported to Committee.

RESOLVED that the report to be noted.

58. EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN

The Committee noted the Executive Forward Plan circulated with the agenda.

59. WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee received and noted the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme circulated with the agenda. The Chairman noted that members should submit items for consideration using the form attached.

Chairman

CSROH 5.2 & 5.3

Why are homeless prevention figures “significantly below target at the end of the year”?

The way in which we complete a homeless prevention is now very different to previous years. Each applicant must be issued a personalised housing plan which takes between 1hr 15 and 2 hours. This is substantially more time intensive process for officers than the previous legislation required. There is a lot of data the Government want collating as part of their efforts to understand the households presenting as homeless and steps they wish to take in the future to address the needs identified. The Government did clearly understand the additional staff hours required to complete the additional burdens and did award additional funds to add additional staff to deal with these.

Why are grants for disabled facilities to reduce homelessness included in the statistics but no other benefits included?

Formerly we were able to count all Disability Facility Grants, Direct Housing Payments and Discretionary Housing Payments for rent shortfall as a simple tally chart to include into our statistics as these were all considered to be preventing homelessness by other departments. However under HRA we can only consider preventions from those we have completed the 2 hour Personalised Housing Plan with the housing team. We are awaiting process mapping on the DHP process to look at ways to manage this better and to include these statistics again soon.

Why do we have some households with “multiple placements” in temporary accommodation?

It is quite common for households to be moved from one temporary accommodation to another particularly in summer months due to availability of in hotel/B&B's locally. We usually only book B&Bs for a week or so at a time as if households leave or are asked to leave, TDC would be liable for the costs for the entire booking period. Therefore if the B&B is fully booked, we may need to find alternative (usually more expensive) accommodation for that period and then book them back in when it becomes available again.

For families with dependent children we must not allow to remain in “B&B” for longer than 6 weeks so most are moved from a B&B into Albany or a temporary tenancy in a flat we lease well within that time and generally remain until we can identify longer term accommodation. Some households may be moved because of behavioural issues and if we do not discharge duties due to this behaviour, we may be forced to find alternative temporary accommodation. In other instances, we may move people to secure cheaper temporary accommodation (because they are in employment and not getting the full amount covered by housing benefits and this is causing financial difficulties) or we are able to offer them alternative temporary accommodation in an area nearer to us/their employment or support.

This page is intentionally left blank

CSGP 2.1 Teignbridge New Development Post Occupancy Survey: Post O&S Note 25.6.19

1. The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny requested a note regarding the previous place of residence of respondents to the New Development Survey.
2. A full copy of the New Development Post Occupancy survey results can be found [here](#).
3. Section 2 of the report addresses Migration, Tenure and Demographics. Of those people who responded to the survey, 83% relocated from the southwest with 77% coming from TQ/EX postcodes.
4. The survey notes that even within this sample, there was under-representation of housing association households which, on new development sites in accordance with Legal Agreements attached to planning permissions, would all have been allocated to residents with a connection to Teignbridge, predominantly through already being resident here.
5. This level of local movement compares favourably with recent years:

Survey Year	% of households relocating from EX and TQ postcodes
2019	77%
2018	75%
2017	77%
2016	67%
2015	80%

6. In addition to this empirical data, ONS also monitors house moves and sales and internal migration.
7. This data is available on line: [Migration data](#) [Property sales](#)
8. National migration statistics from June 2018 show that in 2016/17 a total of 8,097 people moved into Teignbridge. Of these, over 80% moved from elsewhere in Devon (48%) or the rest of the South West (33%). Over 1,200 (15%) of these moves were made from just across the border in Torbay (ONS 2018).

9. 6,359 people also moved out of Teignbridge in 2016/17, resulting in a net migration of 1,738 people.
10. In addition, Devon Homechoice data is published regularly. Their own “myth-busting” website indicates that:

“In 2017 and 2018 less than 3% of homes were let to people who lived outside Devon. Although they lived outside Devon, many of these people will have had a local connection to Devon. For example, because they have lived in Devon in the last 5 years, work in Devon or have immediate family members who have lived in Devon for over 5 years. In addition, many will have moved very short distances into Devon. For example, from Saltash to Plymouth, or from Dorset to East Devon.”

11. We are therefore satisfied that, on balance, the data from the satisfaction survey, whilst not statistically reliable, is representative of the actual picture of the pattern of migration that takes place into and out of Teignbridge each year for both new homes and older stock.

R Eastman
25 June 2019

CSHAH 5.9 Working days lost due to sickness absence – av/all employees

In response to Member's questions, what systems are in place to support our staff to return to work when off sick, what we do to keep staff healthy?

The HR Team has implemented revised sickness monitoring. HR policies are currently being updated in order of priority and managing sickness absence is one of the priorities - this work is part of an ongoing programme of updating TDC HR policies. The new absence policy is in development including a managers toolkit to support managers in monitoring absence and carrying out effective return to work interviews. The HR Team are proactively managing sickness cases, with a particular focus on resolving long term sickness absence cases - this piece of work is ongoing and there is a dedicated HRBP who is supporting managers in Waste and Recycling and Leisure services. We have had some excellent feedback from employees who have been supported by HR and we will continue to support managers in addressing sickness absence via the policy and training.

As part of Health at the Heart we are promoting more effective working in respect of the Waste and Recycling part of the council with an emphasis on mental health. If an employee identifies themselves as having negative thoughts we triage as much as possible and go through a protocol with the employee over the phone to ensure that they have the correct support network moving forward. We keep in contact with the individual either via ourselves or via their line manager.

Once an employee is fit to return to work, if they have been off on long term sickness we use a phased return to facilitate this in order to provide the best possible chance a successful return.

Another tool we are beginning to use is called "MECC" Making Every Contact Count – our HR Business Partner has recently trained to be a MECC Trainer which is about having healthy conversations within the organisation. We can provide more information on the MECC programme. MECC run their own website for sign posting employees.

We make regular referrals to Occupational Health where an employee is having time off sick so we can support them with any changes or adaptations that may be needed.

We had a van outside at both Forde House and Forde Road who gave smoking cessation advice and assistance.

We also provided a flu vaccinations, which are available to all employees.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appeal Decision 01/04/2018 - 31/03/2019						
Application Number	Appeal Number	Delegated or Committee Decision	Recommendation in Approved or Overturned	Type of Development	Reasons for Refusal	Inspector's Decision
Decisions Made by Planning Committee						
17/00618/MAJ	18/00040/REF	COMM	OVERTURNED	Q1	Road unsuitable for level of traffic generated by 32 dwellings.	ALLOWED
17/02118/MAJ	18/00041/REF	COMM	OVERTURNED	Q1	Access drive not up to standard without detrimental effect on setting of and approach to Listed Building. Private Drive - Visibility.	ALLOWED
17/03031/FUL	18/00039/REF	COMM	ACCEPTED	Q18	Dwelling in the countryside not justified by agricultural need.	ALLOWED
17/01346/FUL	18/00009/REF	COMM	OVERTURNED	Q18	Residential use in the countryside. Committee not satisfied requirements for an exception (Policy WEG) have been met.	ALLOWED
17/03073/FUL	18/00030/REF	COMM	OVERTURNED	Q20	Adverse effect on residential amenity and character of the area.	ALLOWED

REASON

Main issue – likely effect on highway safety along Howton Road including the junction with Mile End Road. Predicted traffic flows indicate increase in conflict between pedestrians/cyclists are likely to be very low. The Appellant has suggested various improvement works to Howton Road/Mile End Road to include a priority system along Mile End road as well as improvement to visibility for drivers emerging from Howton Road. Therefore without setting aside the concerns of local residents the Inspector decided there is a greater weight of evidence to support the argument that permission should not be withheld on highway grounds. The proposal accords with the transport/highway provisions of LP policies S1, S2, S9 and S14

Main issues – highway safety, adequacy of the private drive as access and effects on the setting of Grade II Listed Building. No highway safety concerns as there is a good prospect that suitable alterations to the junction of the private drive with Newton Road could be achieved - no conflict with Policy S1 or NPPF. As the site was allocated for housing in the DP it is reasonable to assume the effect on the setting of the LB was part of the balance of considerations. With only up to an additional 30 dwellings proposed it is considered that the private drive would maintain its quiet character and, provided adequate parking is secured on site there should be no excessive off-site parking, therefore the Inspector decided that the private drive would be adequate to serve the development and that the setting of Indo House would not be harmed – no conflict with policies S1, S2 or EN5

Intense, skilled and unpredictable nature of the work, combined with the absence of suitable alternative provision, clearly demonstrates that there is an essential need for a rural worker to live at the appeal site for a period of three years. The scheme therefore accords with the relevant provisions of LP policy WEG and of NPPF paragraph 79(a).

The variable and unpredictable nature of the work to which the development proposed would relate, its present and forecast intensity, and a reasonable prospect of continued viability are collectively sufficient to demonstrate an essential need for a rural worker to live at the appeal site for three years. The proposal is therefore in accordance with the relevant provisions of LP policy WEG and NPPF paragraph 79(a).

The Inspector decided that an additional two occupants at the RHIO would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of nearby residents and would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area therefore not conflicting with policies S1 or S2

Application Number	Appeal Number	Delegated or Committee	Recommendation Approved or	Type of Development	Reasons for Refusal	Inspector's Decision
Decisions Made By Officers						
17/02709/FUL	18/00017/REF	DEL		Q13	The proposal constitutes poor design. The proposal would have an unacceptable and incongruous effect on the locality which would fail to enhance or better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area contrary	ALLOWED
17/02849/VAR	18/00024/REF	DEL		Q18	The removal of conditions 3 and 4 of permission 11/01085/COU would result in the creation of an unrestricted dwelling in the open countryside beyond any defined settlement limits.	ALLOWED
16/03079/FUL	17/00077/REF	DEL		Q18	The proposals would harm the policy objective of Policy S22.	ALLOWED
17/02895/VAR	18/00018/REF	DEL		Q18	Removal of conditions would create an unrestricted dwelling in the countryside. Council can already demonstrate five year land supply.	ALLOWED
17/01885/FUL	18/00004/REF	DEL		Q18	Proposal would result in an unsympathetic change of use of a large area of land designated as open countryside to domestic curtilage. Retention of the building is unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the natural landscape and the Denbury Conservation Area.	ALLOWED

The proposal would accord with Policy EN5 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 (LP) which seeks to secure the protection and enhancement of the area's heritage, including the significance, setting and distinctiveness of any affected heritage asset, and ensure development responds positively to the local historic environment. It would also comply with those aspects of LP Policies S1 and S2 of the Teignbridge Local Plan which seek to ensure that the development is of a high quality that integrates into the built environment, responding to the character and appearance of the area and maintains the character, appearance and historic interest of the street scene. My attention has not been drawn to any other policy conflicts and, therefore, I also conclude that the proposal accords with LP Policy S21 A that permits development in this location where it accords with other policies in the development plan. With the exception of one ground floor window, all side windows would be obscure glazed and, therefore, subject to boundary treatment being confirmed, the privacy of adjoining properties would be preserved. The dwelling would extend further back than either of the adjoining dwellings, but the size of the gardens and general arrangement of the properties would mean that there was no harm to the neighbours' outlook. Therefore the living conditions of adjoining properties would be preserved.

Given the location of the site relative to the local facilities and services, the permanent occupation of the building will lend support to local services, helping to meet the social and economic needs of the settlement. Furthermore, future occupiers are unlikely to be wholly reliant on the private motor car in order to access day to day services. As this is an existing converted building, it would not conflict with those aims of Policy S22 which relate to environmental matters. As there are no external changes proposed, there would be no effect on the character and appearance of the area generally or the nearby conservation area. It would, however, contribute to the local economy and thereby comply with the overall aims of Policy S22.

It seems far more likely that the use of the refreshments business would be made by existing walkers and cyclists rather than people making a specific journey to the proposed business. It follows that the tranquillity and character of the area would not be compromised by the presence of the refreshments kiosk. Similarly, as I have found that the proposed use would not generate a significant number of trips by itself it also follows that it cannot be construed to be unsustainable in the number of trips generated. As the use would not generate a significant amount of trips, and as parking would be provided, I consider that dangerous parking on the public highway would be extremely unlikely.

I have identified above that the proposal does not accord with certain elements of the development plan and of the NPPF. However planning presently accords support to the conversion of barns to dwellings in-principle, disputed conditions 3 and 4 are such that the barn may presently be occupied on a basis which approaches permanent residential use, and I am not of the view that any substantive planning harm would result from the proposal (whether economically, in terms of attracting traffic to the site, in other respects such as to character and appearance or residential amenity, or by consequence to the integrity of the development plan).

There is no significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and, given that alterations and extensions to dwellings are permissible under the policy, I judge that the proposals to extend the residential areas of two existing dwellings, and erect a garden building, are not contrary to the objectives of Policy S22 and those of the wider development plan in the circumstances of this case

18/00313/FUL	18/00029/FAST	DEL		Q21	Unacceptable level of overlooking, loss of privacy and amenity.	ALLOWED	<p>The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbours, with particular regard to privacy. Given that the principal ordinary use of decking is as an outside seating area, it seems unlikely to me that noise generated during its use differs significantly from that which would arise if the decking was constructed at ground level. Though the elevated position might result in sound travelling further than might otherwise be the case, I consider that such an effect would be sufficiently modest that an unacceptable degree of disturbance to neighbours is unlikely to arise. The masonry walled, flat roofed store built beneath the decking appears to be structurally independent of the decking itself, and fills what was, or would have been an otherwise accessible void. It has solid doors to either end which are positioned below or behind the plot boundaries. As such I could not, and cannot identify any obvious adverse effect that its construction has had on the privacy or living conditions of neighbours. Subject to the mitigation referred to above, I find that the development would not be in conflict with Policies S1 and W6 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 (the LP), which amongst other things seek to avoid adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties; the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as this also sets out objectives with regard to amenity; or Policy S1A which requires general conformity with Local Plan policies.</p>
18/00315/FUL	18/00028/FAST	DEL		Q21	Will result in an undue loss of outlook for a habitable room, with a loss of light and will be overbearing to the occupier. Affect on adjacent rail track.	ALLOWED	<p>The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 124A Torquay Road with particular regard to outlook and light. I do not consider the proposed extension would have a detrimental impact on either outlook or light. As such, I find no conflict with Policies D1 or W6 of the TLP which, amongst other things, seek to protect against such harm. In addition, I find no conflict with Policy S1A of the TLP which sets out the Council's presumption in favour of sustainable development nor do I find any conflict with Policy NAMP2 of the Newton Abbot Neighbourhood Plan which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that new housing development is of a high quality design which reflects local character and context and creates a strong sense of place</p>
17/02937/FUL	18/00015/FAST	DEL		Q21	Loss of openness which makes an important positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	ALLOWED	<p>the appeal site is sandwiched between two buildings and cannot be described as being particularly prominent. Nor is it an important part of a run of open garden areas. Whilst there are two more open areas to the west of the boathouse, beyond these the riverside frontage is built up. I also note that these two plots have small sheds and one has a close boarded fence which decreases the impression of openness. Only a very small area of the appeal site would be given over to storage and views of the estuary would still be available in either direction as, notwithstanding the small storage area, the development itself would be an open pergola style structure. In being used to store a boat and/or car, the appeal site would to an extent be returning to its original form of use, as detailed in the SCACA. It follows that the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved. There would therefore be no conflict with policies S2 or EN5 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033. The former of these requires that development integrates with the character of the adjoining built and natural environment whilst the latter requires that development should take account of the significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness of any affected heritage asset.</p>
17/02093/FUL	17/00078/FAST	DEL		Q21	Unacceptable overlooking to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.	ALLOWED	<p>In view of the above assessment, and given that the design of the raised decking and railings appears appropriate in all regards except for the privacy screen, I consider that the development could be made acceptable through installation of a screen of durable design and construction. This could be secured by a condition requiring remedial action according to a design and timetable approved by the Council.</p>
18/00989/FUL	18/00054/FAST	DEL		Q21	Harm the character and setting of the adjoining Grade II listed Eastdon Farm Cottage.	ALLOWED	<p>Whether or not the proposal would preserve the setting of Grade II Listed neighbour. With regard to the design of the proposal, its visibility, and the varied architectural surrounds, any effects would be of no real significance. The Inspector concludes the proposal would preserve the setting of the LB.</p>
17/02644/FUL	18/00021/COND	DEL		Q21		ALLOWED	<p>Given my reasoning above regarding the limited visual prominence of the development proposed and eclectic aesthetic of nearby properties, in my view either material or finish set out on the original application, with details submitted via the subsequent application, or a metal roof would sit entirely comfortably within its surroundings (in accordance with the relevant provisions of LP policies S1 and S2 and paragraph 127 of the NPPF). In that context, and as there is nothing to indicate that there is an existing requirement for windows at Riversmede to be obscured, undertaking the development proposed in the absence of condition 3 would not entail unacceptable effects to the privacy from which the occupants of Timberscombe currently benefit.</p>
18/01217/ADV	18/00047/CAS	DEL	ACCEPTED	Q22	Dominant and overbearing impact on the street scene. Unacceptable impact on public safety.	ALLOWED	<p>The main issues are the effects of the advertisement on the amenity of the area and on public safety. Whilst of differing designs, in overall height, bulk and siting certain signs nearby are not dissimilar from the scheme to which this appeal relates. The advertisement is not excessively or unduly prominent, and is sufficiently separated from other similar signage so as to avoid undue accumulative effects. The Inspector therefore concludes that the advertisement integrates appropriately with local amenity. As the advertisement sits relatively comfortably in its surroundings, is designed and located such that it does not impede views of the road network, sightlines, or associated signs, The Inspector concludes that the advertisement does not have unacceptable highways effects (or otherwise in public safety).</p>

This page is intentionally left blank