

Sent: 30 November 2025 10:29
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: SMD/2025/0243 Objection 11

30 November 2025

Dear Sirs,

OBJECTION NUMBER 11 to application number SMD/2025/0243

Site address LAND EAST OF MANIFOLD DRIVE AND SOUTH OF RAKEWAY ROAD

MANIFOLD DRIVE SPECIFICATION NOT RECOGNISED

Further to Objection 6, which highlights that Manifold Drive does not meet the specification of a “Street” as defined in “The Department for Transport’s Manual for Streets”, specification as below:

Street dimensions and character			
Minimum carriageway width	5.5 m		
Footway	2.0-3.0 m on each side		
Cycle way	No - Parallel routes provided on other streets		
Verge	No		
Private strip	2.0 m		
Direct vehicular access to properties	Yes		
Plot Boundary Treatment	2.0 m private area to building line with up to 1.0 m encroachment 0.9-1.1 m railing on plot boundary with footway		
Maximum number of properties served	Not restricted		
Public Transport			
Bus access	No		
Street design details			
Pull out strip	No		
Traffic calming	Features at 60 m-80 m c/c, parking, trees, formal crossings		Non parallel kerbs, variations in planting/ building lines, parking
Vehicle swept path to be accommodated	Removals/refuse vehicles enter and leave using own side of road only (assuming 20 mph)		Refuse vehicle passing car on street
On street parking	Yes, both sides, 2.0 m wide	Yes, one side, 2.0 m wide	Yes, one or both sides, informal
Gradients (footways)	1:15 Maximum, footway to follow carriageway		
Maximum forward visibility	33 m, 20 m (measured 1.0m out from kerb)		
Junction sightlines (x/y)	2.4 m/33 m		
Junction spacing-same side/other side	60 m/30 m		
Junction radii	4 m		
Stats services (excluding storm and capping layer drainage)	In footway, each side. Drainage below carriageway	Footways, where necessary	

The proposed development has since been amended to meet the minimum requirements demonstrated in document “SCP_220469_D02 Rev C - Access off Manifold Drive” in terms of access to the proposed development but fails to address the fact that Manifold Drive does not meet the same standard.

Once again, the application is only looking after its own purpose and completely fails to address its impact on the existing community.

I remain deeply concerned with the entire application and urge that this proposal be rejected on the grounds stated above.

Yours faithfully,
Darren Whitehead & Joanne Johnson