

From: Matthew Diamond

Sent: 02 December 2020 16:31

To: 'jono palmer' <>

Cc: Baan AL-Khafaji <BKhafaji@exeter.gov.uk>; Karime Hassan <karime.hassan@exeter.gov.uk>; Bindu Arjoon <bindu.arjoon@exeter.gov.uk>; Jean Marshall <Jean.Marshall@exeter.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 19/1556/FUL

Dear Jonathan

Thank you for your email below and I hope you and Dominic are well.

I was contacted recently by someone else making a connection between the current consultation being carried out by Devon County Council on temporary footway widening along Queen Street and the Harlequins application. As I explained to them, we have not been involved in this proposal and as far as I'm aware have not been consulted by them on it as Local Planning Authority. Having said that as I understand it, it is being carried out as a direct response to the covid-19 pandemic as opposed to other road safety concerns in order to allow more space for social distancing, particularly by Exeter College students walking between the Hele Road campus and the city centre. This seems sensible to me and I would have no concerns.

The access and highways issues related to the Harlequins application to redevelop the site to provide a co-living accommodation block and hotel were addressed in the Planning Committee Report, which is available on our website. The report acknowledged the concerns raised in this regard by members of the public and summarised the views of Devon County Council as Local Highway Authority, which as you know did not object. Please be assured that improving the environment and safety of pedestrians, cyclists and people with mobility problems along Paul Street and at the Queen Street/Paul Street junction was a key requirement for us as Local Planning Authority and the Devon County Council highways team. I'm pleased to say that not only did we achieve the permanent widening of the footway adjoining the shopping centre, but also the footway on the opposite side of the road running alongside the Guildhall Shopping Centre, together with improved crossing points along the road. Therefore, I hope you can see that the development will provide significant benefits in this regard.

In terms of the DCC Highways' comments and recommended conditions, I went through the s106 items and conditions with the highways officer before drafting the report as there was some overlap. We agreed that the request for VMS/signage to manage use of the Guildhall car park should be a s106 item. Therefore, there was no need for the recommended condition in this regard, which is copied below:

Prior to occupation of the development, details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority of additional signage/VMS to notify drivers of alternative car parks. Development shall not be occupied until such details have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and Local Highway Authority, and prior to occupation the signage/VMS shall be provided in accordance with the submitted details.

REASON: To ensure that sufficient information is provided to vehicle users ensuring that parking within the city is managed.

As you can see this condition does not include an assessment of traffic impacts. This is something that should be done at the planning application stage in any case. A Transport Assessment was submitted with the application accordingly.

The list of s106 items is copied below:

- £10,000 towards traffic regulation orders in the area
- Co-Car and e-bike docking station
- Details of VMS/signage to manage the use of the Guildhall carpark
- Details of the type of materials used on the highway (Section 44 Of the Highways Act 1980)
- Management Plan to ensure no parking is associated with the development and to ensure the operational facilities of the loading bays (in conjunction with the Guildhall)
- Rights of access for all users for the new footbridge over the highway

All these were included in the Planning Committee Report recommendation (see attached), except for co-car and e-bike docking station, which myself and the highways officer agreed could be covered by condition and didn't need to form part of the s106.

I hope this clarifies the position.

Regards

Matt

Matthew Diamond

Principal Project Manager (Development)
City Development
Exeter City Council

01392 265214

From: jono palmer [[mailto:](mailto:jono.palmer@exeter.gov.uk)]

Sent: 02 December 2020 13:20

To: Matthew Diamond <Matthew.Diamond@exeter.gov.uk>

Cc: Baan AL-Khafaji <BKhafaji@exeter.gov.uk>; Karime Hassan <karime.hassan@exeter.gov.uk>

Subject: 19/1556/FUL

Dear Mr Diamond

The recent invitation to participate in a survey from DCC re Queen Street traffic highlighted an issue which I/we flagged to you much earlier in the year: the road and pavement system in the Queen St/Paul St area already struggles to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians safely. The construction of the Harlequins' scheme will only lead to further problems as, I/we believe, DCC Highways also indicated in their s106 condition. In its response ECC was asked to condition improved signage AND an assessment of traffic impacts. In your report to the Planning Committee you neglected the second part of that condition and only mentioned the signage. Perhaps this was an oversight? Whatever. Is it not incumbent on you to include all recommendations from a statutory consultee? Please advise at your earliest convenience.

Attached in the letter. A highlighted section from DCC highways and also the omission highlighted in the report to committee.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Palmer
39 Northernhay Street
Exeter
EX4 3ER