**From:** Vaughan Hughes
**Sent:** 10 March 2016 09:58
**To:** Emily Shaw
**Subject:** RE: p.a.16/00015/DISC The Small House Sibford

Hi Emily,

Any kind of road markings in relation to this proposal seem a little excessive to me also. I don’t think I asked for them. I think that the inclusion of markings in such a rural area has very little benefit especially considering the low number of movements expected here.

As far as H.A. is concerned it is considered that this aspect of the details could be removed, subject to our understanding as to who requested them.

Kind regards,

Vaughan

**From:** Emily Shaw
**Sent:** 09 March 2016 13:37
**To:** Vaughan Hughes; Vaughan.Hughes@Oxfordshire.gov.uk
**Subject:** RE: p.a.16/00015/DISC The Small House Sibford

Hi Vaughan,

Thanks for your comments on the condition details at Small House.

The condition seeks road markings for the new drive access and the junction of Small House Lane with the main road. Could you please advise if new markings are required at the point of the new access and are any alterations required to the existing road markings at the junction? It is my view that asking for new road markings at the junction purely off the back of this new dwelling seems a bit excessive.

Regards,

Emily

**From:** Vaughan Hughes
**Sent:** 03 March 2016 09:35
**To:** Emily Shaw
**Subject:** p.a.16/00015/DISC The Small House Sibford

Hi Emily,

None of the areas shown of any significance on the detailed drawings meet SuDS requirements. The various surface finishes are, resin bonded aggregate or gravel and engineering brick pavers. Where there are some details of the drainage proposals these are not complete in that I can find no detail as to where the outfall is.

Of course if the various surfaces met SuDS we would not need outfall details.

It may be that they have done their homework and have concluded that SuDS will not work here. If this is indeed the case we ought to be informed.

With the exception possibly of the area of the junction which is to be pavers I would suggest that they look again at the details with SuDS in mind.

Kind regards,

Vaughan