

Comments for Planning Application 22/01217/REM

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01217/REM

Address: Land At Haverhill Business Park Phoenix Road Helions Bumpstead Essex

Proposal: Application for the Approval of Reserved Matters (in respect of Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) pursuant to outline planning permission 15/01477/OUT granted 04.10.2016 for: Construction of access road and the erection of a freestanding drive-thru restaurant with car parking, goal post height restrictor, customer order displays and associated works.

Case Officer: Carol Wallis

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Burns

Address: 10 Kingfisher Close, Haverhill CB9 0JW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Councillor

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: In response to the re-consultation I reiterate my previous comments over the access road, visual disturbance to the street scene, total lack of formal consultation with West Suffolk or Suffolk County Councils (despite the outline permission mandating this which the applicant and Essex CC have ignored) and traffic assessments. I also emphasise I have no objection to the concept of a restaurant on this site as that was approved (somewhere on the entire site) at outline level.

Specifically, in response to applicants "Technical Note":

a) The approved access route into the site was designed, as specified in the outline, as for a few HGV lorries to a B2/B8 development. Not 100's of vehicles a day. How the applicant can state there will be effectively no difference I do not understand. It begs the question whether their consultants have even visited the site.

b) The no right turn from Bumpstead Road was not needed at outline because of the very few lorries that would have been using the access. This is a completely different ballgame and the applicant has totally ignored that.

c) The assumption that vast majority of users will come from the bypass direction is a fallacy. Based on local social media reaction it is plainly clear that the majority of residents who support the restaurant will come from within the town. The bypass itself, does not carry a vast amount of

traffic being as it comes from a rural road network from the east, and there has of course been no assessment of that.

d) Para 1.19 relates to a traffic counter set up for 6 days (excluding a Friday noticeably) claiming that average speeds to be 28-30 mph and 85% to be 33-35mph. Anything over 34mph is a Road Traffic Act infringement so they are already admitting the road exceeds those limits. However, at the time this assessment was done, Bumpstead Road was undergoing various repairs by utility companies and drivers were either being diverted or deciding to take a different route rather than wait for traffic lights to clear.

My own detailed analysis, taken over 6 years from 2015 with 72 different assessment periods using a calibrated Speed Indicator Device (often for 3-4 weeks at a time) show the southbound 85% to be 38.75mph and northbound 37.94mph with maximum speeds of 76 and 61mph respectively across the exact point of the proposed entrance. 30.9% of drivers exceed the 35mph figure southbound and 23.8% northbound.

This is on basis of 131, 437 (5 minute) records taken for northbound vehicles and 127,938 records for southbound vehicles. Around 3,500 vehicles per day passing the point in each direction or roughly a vehicle passing (on average) every 15 seconds at peak periods.

e) I reiterate this point is also monitored by the local police and Suffolk SaferCam network as a recognised speeding area issuing several fixed penalty notices every time they attend for an hour.

f) It is still not clear how deliveries will be separated from pedestrians and other vehicles using the drive-thru. The drawing suggests a HGV will have to queue up with drivers.

g) What is the point of providing a pedestrian access from the Travelodge whose guest have their own food facilities on site? But not considering Bumpstead Road itself which is still lacking a proper footpath along its entire length.

h) No consideration has been made as to the effect of providing a local eatery for the vast number of HGVs parked up overnight (in Phoenix Road) that Essex CC have failed to do anything about when it comes to waste products being dumped. Do Essex Planners not care about the environment?

i) What has this to do with National Highways - their nearest trunk road is 20 miles away?

j) The noise assessment is all based on theory of a site in Norwich. They have not taken any account of the height of the land and the direct line of sight of audio waves travelling across the valley, let alone the nearest neighbours. A very limited noise assessment was made and nothing about the effect of the drive-thru speakers, vehicle idling, etc.

k) Although not part of this application per se, the visuals show that the totem pole proposes will be a blight on the landscape far exceeding the height of nearby buildings and houses. This needs to be reduced in height or alternatively considering moving to the edge of the bypass so that users on that road can see there is indeed a McDonalds nearby.

l) There still are only 2 x EV points which is far too low considering the government's climate change policy which Suffolk CC (and assume Essex CC) has adopted.

I again request the applicant consider the access being from Phoenix Road otherwise there will be accidents.