

Planning Application 25/01708/OP

Erection of up to 84 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDs) following the demolition of No24 Echo Hill with all matters reserved except for access

I wish to record my strong objection to this application

My objections raised in the previous planning applications still stand

This application does not provide clear engineering information on the construction of the proposed access road i.e., long sections, cross section, extent of structure etc., but from page 74 of the Flood Report indicates that the gradient of the road is to be 1:8 (12.5%) rising from Echo Hill to the boundary of the field, no other information on the gradient is available on the application.

1/ This gradient it is against the Inclusive Transport Strategy (2020 -2024) Accessibility strategy

2/ The gradient directly onto a junction will cause vehicles to run uncontrollably across it

3/ In cold icy conditions vehicles can slide uncontrollably across the junction into the garden of No 42 Echo Hill putting lives at risk. Grit boxes are on Echo Hill, but have run out, leaving residents unable to travel to work, persons on the proposed development will be totally isolated

4/ HGV vehicles travelling up the access road will cause noise and vibration issues with the residents of Nos 23 and 25 Echo Hill

5/ No information is supplied as to how HGV`s negotiate the proposed junction, it should be a requirement that before going into conflict with oncoming traffic, the end point of the conflict should be visible.

6/No information is supplied as to the relative levels of the adjacent properties to the proposed road

7/ People walking towards Echo Hill from the proposed development will be able to see into the bedrooms of Nos 23 and 25 Echo Hill

8/ Persons using wheelchairs, mobility scooters or pushing pushchairs will have great difficulty negotiating the 1:8 gradient

9/ The applicant has stated that the SuDs are a reserved matter, the system of drainage for the access road cannot be a reserved matter, the Flood Report chapter 5.19 "Access Road (water) will be directed to a Bio Retention System", no details or location is not provided, this should be in place before any construction is allowed

10/ HCC Highways have identified that it is “800m walking distance to the Bus Station with reasonable gradients”, time taken to walk this distance varied from 10 to 11 minutes within the letter. The East end of Sun Hill has a steep ramp approximately 1:10 , persons using wheelchairs or mobility scooters have to use the main carriageway against the flow of traffic as the pavements are too narrow; from Sun Hill up to the proposed junction, Echo Hill has a gradient of 1:10; then the proposed access road has a gradient of 1:8, how are these “reasonable gradients”? The letter goes on to express both HCC and national policies place strong emphasis on the importance of accessibility, to reduce car dependency.

HCC further state “while there is no national standard, HCC use 400m depending on highway conditions, 600m if no gradients/hills etc) as a reasonable walking distance to a bus stop”

I suggest that the use of “reasonable gradients” should be reviewed

There is a suggestion that Covenants should be set up to protect the `Line of Sight` at the junction, placing a restriction and responsibility on the owner of No 23 Echo Hill, this fares well with the developer ignoring the current Covenants that exist!

Reserved Matters

Flood Report

a/ I Plant Contracting/Geotechnical Report - Conclusion on Page 7 records” soakaway rates obtained during the investigation were found to be poor” and “consider the use of shallow soakaways is not suitable for this site” – this appears to be ignored

b/ Lagoons are proposed to be built using bunding on the downhill side of the lagoon, between 2 – 2.5m high, ground conditions have been described as “structureless chalk composed of sandy sub angular to rounded gravel, clasts are weak medium density white, grade Dc.

c/ The design of the water retention structure on pond 2 at the north east end of the trench, is lightly to fail due to the slope and the weak ground causing all 547 cubic meters of water to cascade downhill through dwellings adjacent to site

d/ The maintenance of swales is deemed to be done by the maintenance contractor appointed to site, and the maintenance of the Lagoon/SuDS the responsibility of the Local Authority, this would be a burden on the LA finances and with the site maintenance of the whole site carried out by an appointed contractor, is a huge annual cost for 84 dwellings (including 40%affordable).

With the costs associated with the demolition of No24, the purchase of building land, the construction of the access road, Swales, Lagoons, SuDs, Primary Roads, Secondary

Roads, Footpaths, play areas Foul drainage and other services, appears to be a huge cost just for 84 dwellings