

From:Christine Spicer
Sent:Tue, 22 Dec 2015 13:09:33 +0000
To:planning.technical
Subject:RE: Planning application DC/15/2151/OUT

Dear Sir,

Sorry I forgot to include my address.

My Address is

16 Marcus close

Haverhill

Suffolk

CB9 0NT

Regards

Phil Spicer

From: Christine Spicer
Sent: 21 December 2015 11:17
To: Planning.Help
Subject: Planning application DC/15/2151/OUT
Importance: High

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

Application
Suffolk

Great Wilsey Park, Little Wratting

Case Officer

Mr C Rand

Person Commenting

Mr & Mrs P Spicer

Objection items

A. The taking out of woodland tree belt not in previous plans and access through Chalkstone Way now being added.

B. Amended plans for now removing existing established woodland.

C. The inclusion of a foul water sewer and effluent pumping station location.

D. Access through Chalkstone Way now being added.

E. Car park access via Coupals Road.

A. Objection to the removal of woodland from tree belt

The plans have been amended with 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. Trees are an essential part of our environment and offer screening between developments. When I attended the open meetings I was assured these trees would remain. At that meeting I did give written concerns regarding this. It is totally unnecessary to amend the plans for removing these trees. The belt of trees is essential for maintaining the settings already enjoyed by current residents.

2. The area of tree removal is totally unnecessary for a footpath access. 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. Or, is the intention to make a future amendment for road access to the Wilsey estate / Roman Way at a later stage?

3. My understanding of the principle of Haverhill Vision 2031, was acknowledgement that the tree belts would be preserved, and even expanded. With ongoing amendments to these development plans, the vision objects are clearly being ignored.

4. Trees are essential to our environmental, wildlife and surrounds for us all. We have a duty not to disregard this when establishing new dwellings.

B. 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.

3. As stated above, trees are essential to our environmental, wildlife and surrounds for us all. It is your duty, on behalf of Haverhill residents, not to disregard this when establishing new dwellings. Why are the plans now amended disregarding this principle, that was originally acknowledged in the Vision document.

C. 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.

D. 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.

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

Objection on the grounds of safety. This road infrastructure is totally inappropriate for encouraging additional car use.

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. This has a real potential for creating an accident black spot, as car volumes increase in Haverhill with road infrastructure not fit for purpose.

An extremely concerned resident, with ongoing planning amendments to this project.

Phil spicer

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed.

If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this email in error please contact the Sender.

This footnote confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses and content security threats.

WARNING: Although the Council has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this email, the Council cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments.

-W-S-