26 Masons Close Haverhill Suffolk CB9 9SN

30th September 2021

Your Reference: DC/21/1716/RM

Dear Ms Waugh

Land at Brickfields Drive Haverhill Suffolk

I have received your letter of the 17^{th} September regarding the application for detailed planning permission for the above. I remain concerned both about a number of aspects of this proposal and that previous comments have been disregarded.

I would now post my objections as follows:

Access:

- The previous outline agreement, in reserved matter 10, said that a traffic review of Hales
 Barn Road would take place. The estate is now 5 years older where families have grown and
 more cars and vans are now parked. Indeed, in the last couple of months the refuse lorry has
 been unable to gain access to Masons Close on a couple of occasions.
- I am therefore surprised that this means of access is still proposed as this is perhaps that
 major concern. The provision of an additional 30 homes will lead to an additional 50/60
 vehides using the proposed access. That junction is already very busy at peak school/work
 times and often very crowded with parked vehides both on Brickfields and also on Hales
 Barn Road. Apart from the obvious difficulties that will be posed to construction traffic, it will
 present, in the longer term, potential for conflict, a real danger to highway safety (especially
 given the proximity of the play area at the end of Brickfields) and possible problems for
 access by emergency vehicles.
- As, under reserved matter 3, the estate cannot be started before the bypass surely it makes sense to either have access from there or off the roundabout adjacent to Colbeck Road.

Pedestrian Access on Masons Close:

- In the initial application, pedestrian access was proposed. An objection was lodged by Number 23 and that access has now been removed.
- The 'potential pedestrian access' has now been placed in a position that cuts across my front garden.
- There is no existing right of way or public footpaths and indeed it is a Close.

- In Planning Statement 5.25 it mentions as a constraint the sensitive nature of the boundary but this has not been taken into account.
- Indeed, the Landscaping Proposals (3.14) say nothing about the Southern Edge and rely on
 existing planting, trees and blackberries that have all grown wild in the intervening years and
 fencing, which is in need of repair in places. More work and planning is needed to prevent
 the whole border opening up.

I cannot see any need for this access, it does not lead anywhere or give better access to shops, transport etc. It will result in pedestrian traffic across the front of my house with associated safety and security risks and potential disturbance to the enjoyment of my property.

It would also potentially mean an increase in traffic and parked cars in an already crowded and restricted space with similar concerns for safety and security.

This is all in addition to the siting of Plot24 which, given the slope of the ground, will face and overlook the side of my house and rear garden leaving me facing restrictions to both sides of my property.

Yours sincerely,

John Senior