

From:Planning.Help
Sent:16 Jun 2016 09:42:27 +0100
To:planning.technical
Subject:FW: Revisions to DC/15/1251/OUT

From: Margaret and Ian Johnson
Sent: 15 June 2016 16:20
To: Planning.Help
Subject: Revisions to DC/15/1251/OUT

Having viewed the recent revisions to the plan I would wish all my previous objections to stand (as shown below) as the revisions have not materially altered the plan, or dealt with the points raised. The revised siting of the car park access from the Coupals road is in a better position than where it was previously shown on the plan of the site, having removed it from under the brow of the hill, but the other dangers still remain, and therefore the objection still stands.

However the provisions for footpaths and rights of way in the country park are welcomed. The amended proposals would be acceptable for footpath/cycle-ways to be no more than 3 metres wide provided that breaks in the tree belt to accommodate them are no wider than this

and S-shaped to ensure that the tree line appears visually unbroken.

Ian Johnson (Address and representation as below)

**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 K I Johnson. 3 Marcus Close,
Haverhill CB9 0NT

(Representing 350 people with regard to
woodland preservation)

Objection items A. The removal of woodland from tree
belt

Chalkstone Way

B. The siting of development access

Road

C. The siting of car park access Coupals

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.

B. 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.

C. 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.

IAN JOHNSON.