

The Parish Council Strongly Objects

This is an unsuitable site for such a dense housing development because of its remoteness and lack of local facilities resulting in almost total reliance on car use in contravention of guidelines.

Openness of the Green Belt.

All the houses substantially exceed the height of the existing building and will give the appearance of greater development due to the spread of properties over the site. As a result, the proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. For this reason, the proposal is contrary to national and local development plan policies

Overdevelopment.

The proposal, by reason of its siting, layout, scale and design, represents overdevelopment of the site resulting in an urban appearance that is unsympathetic to, and would detract from, the open and rural character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to adopted policies of the local plan

Flooding.

The EA have confirmed that the site is still designated the high risk flood Zone 3; and taking into account both climate change and this level of housing's impact on the surrounding area could be substantial. The applicant is relying on a 2017 submission and we understand that the EA criteria for assessing flood zones and risk has changed significantly in the intervening period. Therefore, the EA requirement in November 2020 for a Flood Risk Assessment and clarification from the EA of the flood zone of the site should be insisted upon, not least due to the potential impact on the sensitive neighbouring land.

Highways.

The site is located on the apex of a bend in the road. The concealed access leading into an unrestricted commuter route with bends, no pavements and inadequate sight lines going South with questionable going North is a hazard to both pedestrians and cyclists. This is confirmed by our own highways expert and NP T1 conflict.

The site has less than half of the DMRB recommended visibility splays of 2.4 x 215m in both directions. Even at only 40mph, sight lines of 120m are the minimum expected.

The applicant relies upon previous Highways assessments accepting substandard visibility splays. These rely on MfS2 being most applicable but they do not draw to the Planning Officer's attention clause 1.3.7 which states that this is appropriate in rural roads where the speeds experienced are below 40mph. We would add that MfS1 states at para. 7.5.1 that its standards are applicable for 85th percentile speeds up to 60 kmph (37mph). Table 7.1 of MfS1 puts this more concretely by setting out SSDs only as far as 60 kmph. The applicant's own unverified data confirms speeds experienced in excess of these guidelines.

Separately we will be requesting Highways to clarify why they choose not to draw the Planning Officer's attention to this guidance and also to attend the site to meet with residents, to confirm the measurements (which are incorrectly measured by the applicant) and achievability of sight lines.

The applicant's assessment of vehicle movements and accident data is misleading. Current vehicle movements at the site are negligible and therefore attempts to link higher volumes of movements based on TRICS data to no accident data is not matching like with like. Residential development of the site to the proposed scale will greatly increase vehicle movements on the bend with restricted sight lines creating a severe risk to life, especially young children who will undoubtedly look to utilise bicycles at this remote location.

Should the council be minded to approve the application the following should be taken in to account.

1. All trace of conflict with openness of the Green Belt has to be removed in order to protect the rural nature (ie character) of the surrounding area closed in by an ancient woodland, a local wildlife site and priority habitat, on one side and a working cattle farm immediately adjacent on the other. This means:
 - (a) House plot 7, which is half outside the hardstanding, has to be removed.
 - (b) All the houses with height in excess of the 8m hangar, 9 to 10.6m high, must be lowered to reduce external visibility.
2. Conditions must be robust to protect neighbours, occupants and wildlife. These include no urban entrance gates; ground level lighting if at all; 2m high stout close boarded fencing on both sides to prevent trespass, including dogs, and to protect both woodland ecology and pedigree cattle breeding.
3. With 12 households and 30 car spaces there will be much increased traffic activity, including deliveries, compared to the intermittent warehouse use; it is a concealed access with bends on both sides and a known sub-standard visibility splay going south with no pavement or cycle path. There is a requirement for both entrance warning signs and continuation of 40 mph speed limit to attempt to influence the speeding commuter traffic AM and PM. The planning officer should note that the Police stated an objection to the approved reduced speed limits to 30mph in the surrounding villages on the basis that they did not have the resources to enforce reduced speed limits in these remote locations.

MARCH 2022