

Dear Sir or Madam.

I write as on behalf of the owner and occupier of 3 Wrattling Road. Dr. Rajesh Wadhvani has operated his Dental practice business from this address for more than 15 years, the location itself has been a dental practice for more than 40 years. Dr. Wadhvani took full control of this Practice in January 2019 and since that time has invested more than £400,000 in internal refit and upgrade. This year's financial budget (2023/24) includes further development of the outside of the Practice with new windows, a proposed Garden room to the rear of the Practice and development of the outside space for the use of staff. In the main we have enjoyed a peaceful and courteous relationship with our neighbours at 5 Wrattling Road and we wish that to continue.

Based on the plans submitted we have series of questions and concerns. We have managed to make contact with the property owner who has been helpful in providing some information and background to his proposed development. We would have valued additional time to enable a site meeting, but events on the part of both parties, conspired to make this unachievable in the timeframes laid down under planning processes.

Our concerns around this development echo many of the concerns raised by the planning officer which the developer has responded to in the Design, access and planning statement.

Access and parking during and post construction.

Les Ager Drive is a narrow private road. At the best of times this road is so narrow that two vehicles struggle to pass each other. Signs have been erected to discourage delivery vehicles from parking here as large 'long wheel base (LWB) transit style' vehicles block the road. Currently vehicles delivering to properties at 5 and 3 Wrattling Road, reverse out of Les Ager Drive onto Wrattling Road due to the limited ability to turn and manoeuvre on Les Ager drive. The road is simply too narrow to allow a LWB van to make a three-point turn. It is difficult to see how this will not be the case for construction vehicles and the additional delivery vehicles that this development will attract.

We note the following in section 5 of the Design, access and planning statement:

This proposal is seeking a car-free development in line with the existing HMO accommodation at No.5 Wrattling Road.

Following a review of the planning application granted in June 2015, based on revised drawing submitted 8th May 2015, the existing building at 5 Wrattling Road appears to have been granted with provision for 3 parking spaces. A copy of this revised drawing is attached. Given that the existing building at 5 Wrattling Road was granted permission for subdivision into 5 dwellings, 3 car parking spaces seems minimal, but appears to be basis upon which consent for the original subdivision was granted in 2015.

The effect of the current application, should it be granted, will be to consume two of the three planning approved parking spaces leaving a total of 11 dwelling (5 dwellings at no. 5 and a further 6 dwellings at the proposed new development) with no just one (limited access) parking space. While we recognise the aim and ambition of the developer to commit to a car free planning condition, the reality is that cars directly associated with the current 5 Wrattling Road building often occupy the space shown outside the double garage and we have had to on a handful of occasions had to contact the landlord at 5 Wrattling Road to arrange for the removal of cars blocking our access to the car park at the rear of our site at 3 Wrattling Road. A picture of a car that completely blocked our access last year is attached. Haverhill is one the largest towns in England without a train station. Haverhill has also been impacted by recent reductions in bus services to places like Bury St Edmunds and

Cambridge, we know this as we are struggling to recruit staff from Haverhill to work at both our Bury St Edmunds and Cambridge locations. We believe it will be vital for people seeking to rebuild their lives and secure gainful employment to have access to a private vehicle and that appears to be the case currently for some of the occupants of the current 5 Wratting Road location. We therefore question the reality of maintaining a car free HMO at this location.



Fig 1.

At this stage we can see no plan for managing contractors access and materials storage during the construction phase. This may be covered by conditions imposed if this application is accepted, but nonetheless we would want assurances that the construction traffic and construction activity would not adversely impact our patients, our employees and our business. The developer has explained to us that they may be able to build overhead, thus reducing the need to access our site and they are also looking at the possibility of a modular build to reduce build time and disruption. All of these considerations are welcomed.

At section 3.8 in the Design, access and planning statement, the developer points to a section of hardstanding that has the 'visual effect' of widening Les Ager Drive. This section also includes a picture (Image 9). A land registry search indicates this land is not owned or controlled by the developer submitting this application. We would make several points here:

We believe the developer has no control over the future use of the land referred to in their response contained in section 3.8 of the Design, access and planning statement and therefore cannot reasonably rely upon this area to mitigate concerns that Les Ager Drive is narrow or that the proposed development has vacant land around it giving it a sense of space. This land could be fenced off or subject to a separate planning application by the land owner at any point.

The picture submitted is somewhat misleading. This area of land is used to park cars and generally dump rubbish. This is regrettable and not the fault or responsibility of the party making this application. Figure 2 below shows a picture of this same area of land taken 31st March 2023. This is much more typical of the use this land is put to and offers little support to the developer's case that this piece of land, outside the ownership of the developer, offers a visually wider plot or wider and safer throughfare.



Fig 2

General points

The proposed development seems to us to be simply too large. It will fill almost the entire plot, it will dominate and loom over the rear garden space and our building at 3 Wrattling Road located lower down the hill from the proposed site. Within the Design, access and planning statement the planning officer makes the following comment. *“Taken together [traffic and parking concerns], these are further factors which support an argument that the development is asking too much of such a limited and physically constrained site.”* The highlighted point perfectly sums up our concerns, this development is out of all proportion to buildings in the area and is of a size and scale that is inappropriate.

At the rear of our property we will be confronted with a brick building rising at least 8.55m high (over 28 feet) built on the very edge of the boundary between 3 and 5 Wrattling Road. This will dominate and overshadow the garden space as well as our building. The proposed development sits on a plot that rises above both 3 and 5 Wrattling Road and this will inevitably create a sense that a 2.5 floor building is ‘looming over’ our building. We note the plans submitted indicate that the edge of the proposed building’s roof eaves comes in line with the boundary of our property. This indicates the proximity to our property and would no doubt require the building owner to seek access to our land to both build and maintain the building which we feel may be unacceptable. We also question the location of items such as surface water soakaways

The Planning Officers comments contained in the Design, access and planning statement are as follows *“The roof form is noted, but the physical proximity is considered challenging, and that, on balance, the impacts upon amenity are considered significant”* As next-door neighbours to this development the impacts upon our use of the garden area will be directly and significantly impacted. Our garden area is currently disused, but we have discussed plans with developers to construct a garden room and make use of the outside space for staff during better weather. Not only will the construction phase impact those plans, due to the fact this building is being built to the very edge of its plot, but the new building combined with the impact of the tree belt that separates our plot from The Cangle, will deny this area a great deal of sunlight for grass or plants to grow.

Together with the planners we fear the scale of the proposed development will adversely impact the growth of the tree belt that exists between our plot and The Cangle on the edge of the conservation area. The adverse impact of this development on these trees could lead to these trees needing to be dealt with in future years potentially eroding the benefit these trees offer in shielding the conservation area.

Construction concerns.

We are concerned about the impact that construction phase will have on our site and the people who work at 3 Wratting Road. The car park at the rear of our building is used by staff who take a path across our garden area to the rear of the site. This path is within 1m of the boundary. Our long serving staff have long enjoyed the benefit of parking on site, but as the team has grown the car park has reached capacity such that when recruiting we can no longer offer the option of parking to new starters. Any impact construction would have on our right of way or use of the car park would need to be carefully considered and mitigated.

So, in summary our concerns are:

- i) The size and scale of this development on the very edge of our boundary with our neighbour.
- ii) The lack of any provision for vehicle parking or ability for vehicles to make deliveries.
- iii) Our view that this proposed development is out of proportion and far too close to our boundary. We feel this proposed development will overshadow and appear overbearing in terms of our space.
- iv) The continued ease of access to Les Ager Drive, and in particular the entrance to our car park post completion, given the proposed development is so close to the edge of this private road.
- v) The impact a development of this size, scale and proximity to our boundary will have and the impact this building will have on our access to sunlight such that any kind of vegetation could flourish.
- vi) The impact this building will have on the tree line that exists between The Cangle and our rear garden and the likely need to prune these trees to enable sunlight to reach the rear garden.
- vii) The proposed plans around this or any amended development on our access and safe and reasonable use of the garden space we own

We are grateful to the developer for his comments and reassurance and we trust that if this development goes forward we will be able to work together to minimise disruption.

Your sincerely

Greg Kane

Greg Kane. Operations Director, for and on behalf of Dr Raj Wadhvani.