


Sent: 19 May 2020 17:48

To: customer.services <customer.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: Application DC/20/0614/RM



Further to recent letters received and studying of various online plans, I have a number of objections as detailed below;

1. Objection 1; details and letters incorrectly refer to name of the road development. Planning application DC/20/0614/RM as referred to by Penny Mills in letters dated 28th April and 30th April refers to 'Anne Sucklings Lane'. This road does not as far I can see exist! The Constraints documents refers to 'Ann Suckling Way. Again as far as I can see this 'Way' does not exist so therefore I object to misleading information being presented to the public by West Suffolk Council. The road is Ann Suckling Road.

2. I object additionally on the basis that the plans are vague and misleading and it is difficult to identify both orientation of the plans and what they actually mean. It may be acceptable to a person with knowledge but I doubt whether any member of the general public would find them clear. An appalling submission.

3. After discussing the online documents with neighbours and having to infringe social distancing to clear points of interest, it took a while to determine where actually Ann Suckling Road featured on the plans.

4. I object to the continuation of Ann Suckling Road joining up with the Hales Barn estate. This will create a 'rat-run'.

5. I object to the creation of new 'crescent' shaped development with various off shoot roads off of Ann Suckling Road. Both this and objection 4 will add additional traffic on the current Ann Suckling Road and create a traffic hazard where Ann Suckling Road joins the A143. At current peak periods it is difficult and dangerous to exit Ann Suckling Road onto the flow of the A143.

6. Carrying on from Objections 4 and 5, currently cars are parked on the right hand side of Ann Suckling Road near to where it joins the A143. This currently causes congestion, and so with additional traffic the congestion will only increase. The double yellow lines do not extend far enough down Ann Suckling Road.

7. Further objection relating to Objections 4,5 and 6 refers to the lay-by style exit road from Ann Suckling Road on the A143 heading north towards Bury St Edmunds. Currently the double yellow lines do not extend far enough and it is used as a 'lay-by' by vehicles both cars and HGV making visibility difficult from the Bury St Edmunds. Any increase in traffic will only add to the potential risk of a traffic collision.

8. Objection relating to the provision of a bus route along Ann Suckling Road once the new development has been constructed. This will only add to the additional traffic flow along Ann Suckling Road as highlighted in Objections 5, 6 and 7.

9. Objection to Allotments unless they can be guaranteed to be constructed and not at a later date the developer, due to lack of interest, requests that the land's use is changed to residential/housing.

10. Objection to Allotments if no car parking provision is allowed for in the plan. No on street parking.

11. Objection to the removal of any well established hedgerows or trees unless the developer replants sufficient to make it carbon neutral to compensate for excessive Carbon Dioxide usage.

12. Objection to 'four storey' dwellings in the vicinity of the existing Botyon Hall development. Additionally I don't recall any such dwellings anywhere else in Haverhill.

13. Partial objection to any green space unless St Edmundsbury gives a guarantee that it will be better maintained than other grass areas in Haverhill.

14. Objection to any new development until St Edmundsbury invests in new pavements for the Boyton Hall development.

15. Objection based on a lack of employment opportunities in Haverhill to take up all new residents. It is likely that the new development would be a location for workers employed in either Cambridge or Bury St Edmunds. With the current status/congestion on both the A143 and A1307 no further properties should be constructed until transport links are improved. People should work where they live, with Cambridge or Bury St Edmunds.

16. Object to the provision of 'LOCAL CENTRE'. One due to a lack of knowledge of what this actually is and secondly so near to the existing Boyton Hall development.

17. Objection to any construction traffic using Ann Suckling Road.

18. Objection as there is mention of traffic calming on Ann Suckling Road

