

From:Planning.Help
Sent:Wed, 16 Dec 2015 15:03:28 +0000
To:Rand, Chris;planning.technical
Subject:FW: Planning Application Objections

From:
Sent: 16 December 2015 14:29
To: Planning.Help
Subject: Planning Application Objections

Notification of comments and objections to Planning Application DC/15/2151/OUT

Application Great Wilsey Park, Little Wratting Suffolk

Case Officer Mr C Rand

Person Commenting Mr. Philip Morrison

18, Marcus Close, Haverhill, Suffolk CB9 0NT

I am making the following specific objections regarding the Great Wilsey Park Development as detailed below. Additionally I would also like to point out that my wife and I attended the consultation meeting at Haverhill Town Hall earlier this year. At this meeting we were told there was absolutely no question that any trees on the belt line or wooded areas would be removed. We were assured this was guaranteed and if anything the tree belt would be added to. Please explain how and why this "guarantee" has seemingly been revoked.

- Objection items**
- A. The removal of woodland from tree belt
 - B. The siting of development access Chalkstone Way
 - C. The siting of car park access Coupals Road

A. Objection to the removal of woodland from tree belt

The plans, including supporting document, Hedgerow removal plan show the removal of 1660 square metres of woodland abutting the green area between the Wilsey and Roman Way estates. I am objecting to this on the following grounds.

1. The removal of the trees will break up an integral mature tree belt which has a pleasing aesthetic visual character.

2. The area of tree removal is grossly excessive and totally unjustified in relation to its stated purpose of providing access for a footpath. It is a greater area than the 1350 square metres allocated elsewhere on the same plan to provide access for a major road on the estate.

3. The principle in Vision 2031 was accepted that the tree belts would be preserved where possible, and enhanced. It is clearly possible to provide a footpath access, with minimal tree removal, and an "S" curved pathway, in such a way that the tree line appears visually unbroken, thus maintaining its pleasing appearance.

Objection to the removal of woodland for housing

The supporting paper "Alternative, volume 2.5" and the hedgerow removal plan document both show a 1 Hectare removal of woodland for housing. I am objecting to this on the following grounds.

1. It is clearly in contravention of Vision 2031 principles for the masterplan, where the woodland would be preserved where possible and enhanced.

2. At no time in the vision 2031 consultation documents was there any proposal in the masterplan for woodland to be destroyed to facilitate housing.

Requirement for safeguarding of tree belt and environment in the construction of the main foul water sewer and pumping station.

The water report, supporting document at figure 3 shows the proposed line of the foul water sewer and effluent pumping station to a rising main. This cuts through the tree belt and impinges onto an area currently used as a golf driving range, but designated as a wildlife area. I am requesting that any planning consent has adequate safeguards during the construction phase, to protect the tree belt and the wildlife area. Also the construction of the pumping station should not

interfere with the footpaths connecting East Town Park with the proposed new Country Park in the buffer zone.

2. Objection to the siting of Development access road to Chalkstone Way

1. The access should be opposite the Millfields Road junction with Chalkstone Way. The objection is on the grounds of safety, and reducing congestion. The current proposal creates two major junctions close to each other, one traffic light controlled, the other by mini roundabout. Both junctions have the potential to interfere with each other, as a back up of traffic from one junction impinges on the other, affecting driver's sight lines, and causing a hazard for pedestrians threading their way through stationary traffic.

2. Congestion would be reduced, if there was only one junction, traffic light controlled, with four significant roads, rather than having two junctions of three significant roads each.

3. Objection to siting of Car Park Access in Coupals Road.

Objection on the grounds of safety.

The plan of the junction shows the limited sight lines. It is immediately below the brow of a hill, on one side, and on the other, a single lane carriageway bridge in a dip. There have been a number of accidents at that place over the years, without the added complication of an access road. Additionally to the restricted sight lines, the easterly bound traffic give priority to the oncoming traffic on the single track road, and wait just beyond the proposed access point, further obstructing sight lines. Also at busy times the number of waiting vehicles queuing, will obstruct the proposed access point.

Sent from my iPad