

Comments for Planning Application DC/23/1999/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/23/1999/FUL

Address: Land Rear Of Beechwood And Albany House Hill Crescent Haverhill Suffolk

Proposal: Planning application - three dwellings with vehicular and pedestrian access|cr|

Case Officer: Ed Fosker

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Eccleston

Address: 1 Bladon Way, Haverhill, Suffolk CB9 0AB

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:1 Bladon Way

Haverhill

CB9 0AB

Mr Ed Fosker

Planning Department

St Edmundsbury Borough Council

West Suffolk House

Western Way

Bury St Edmunds

Suffolk, IP33 3YU

February 23, 2024

Ref. Planning application DC/23/1999/FUL

Land Rear of Beechwood and Albany House Hill Crescent Haverhill Suffolk

Dear Mr Fosker,

I wish to register my concerns regarding the application to build a terrace of three houses on land directly opposite my property.

This is the third application for planning consent for that particular piece of land and, while I was not particularly happy about the previous applications, I chose not to raise objections because I felt they were in keeping with other properties on Wratting Road. However, now that the application is for three properties and seven parking spaces, I certainly do wish to raise objections.

At certain times of day the volume of traffic using Wrattling Road in both directions is exceptionally heavy and there are frequently queues of stationary traffic across the junction with Churchill Avenue, Wrattling Road and Covert Close. The imposition of a further vehicular access at this junction can only make matters worse and presents a safety issue. A further concern is that due to the restriction of space to accommodate seven vehicles there is an inevitability that additional vehicles will see Churchill Avenue or, even worse, Wrattling Road as a convenient place to park. I am also concerned that the rear of my property faces the proposed development and because of raised ground level my house is somewhat higher than those opposite. Even with a 1.8m fence around my property the whole of the rear of my house and patio will be visible unless the current line of conifers and deciduous trees remain in place.

It seems to me that since two successful planning applications by private individuals have failed to result in completed developments it may suggest they weren't viable and now a property developer wishes to impose three unrepresentative properties in the same space. At a time when Haverhill is seeing the building of some three thousand additional homes of all types within half a mile of this site I am tempted to suggest that we have already 'done our bit' to provide housing.

Yours sincerely,

John Eccleston