
From: 29 January 2018 23:14
Sent: Planning Comments (SMDC); Planning (SMDC)
To: SMD/2017/0766
Subject:

I respectfully request that The Committee consider both residents comments and site appraisals regarding both the previous submission for this site (SMD/2016/0649) withdrawn by applicant *and* the revised application (SMC/2017/0766).

I cannot identify how the revised submission (SMD/2017/0766) has addressed concerns as follows:

Traffic

The recent traffic snapshot carried out on behalf of the developer (27.07.2016) has identified that the average speed recorded along the proposed feeder road (Tower Hill Road) as illegal. Indeed, an above average number of vehicles using the road recorded between 46-60 mph! This small survey demonstrates local resident's experience daily and reinforces both the unsuitable access point, danger to pedestrians and the existing homes.

The Highways Agency identified access unsuitability and the Bend to be dangerous with the withdrawn 2016/0649 application. I do not see the amendment for 2017/7066 as resolving the HA concerns.

Access

The access amendment seems negligible. Access from the Tower Hill side of the development was deemed unsafe enough to promote the above survey. Access remains restricted and this cannot be resolved within the proposed boundary. For an emerging vehicle to safely enter Tower Hill Road would require crossing or joining without visibility to the right. To safely enter the site from Tower Hill Road cannot be viable as visibility into the bend is blocked by homes.

The historic access road from Brook Street has been deemed as dangerous and unsuitable for the development. I feel this demonstrates the impact 10x luxury houses would have within the direct safety infrastructure.

Furthermore, I feel the very need for the recent access revision since the 2016 application only highlights the unsuitable road conditions surrounding access the site for such a large development.

Greenbelt

It is recorded that the site encroaches on established Greenbelt. Executive Houses should not be considered a challenge to 'very exceptional circumstances' written within protective Government planning. Development onto this Greenbelt will not only diminish and undermine the unique character of the original village but threaten the recorded wildlife including Bats, Owls, Newts, Badgers, Foxes & Hedgehogs. The site is home to a protected English Oak.

Local Plan

The SMDC Local Plan has emphasised a need for reflective Housing Options within the catchment. Luxury homes have not been identified as being a catchment priority. Please remember the site is primarily populated with low level housing and traditional terraced cottages. The development site has previously been deemed not suitable for Preferred Options within the Local Plan.

Mining History

Please take into consideration the Coal Board report identifying the possibility of adverse unmapped mineshafts and the impact on the local housing.

Other

Many residents feel that they are engaging on a 'submit/ withdrawal' cycle with proposals for the area Greenbelt Land in the hope one submission will stick. I understand that this site may be considered as 'self-build' if planning is granted and each unit sold with planning consent. Such plans would further place the existing residents at a huge disadvantage as any concerns would require multiple objections. This option feels somewhat like 'divide & conquer'. Therefore, I respectfully request that if heard, this proposal be heard by Committee and not be delegated.

Thank you for your considerations

C.A.Parker (Resident)

