

From: Gary Slaughter [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 May 2023 22:12
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: Gary Slaughter [REDACTED]
Subject: Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2023/0017 - Land at Tilekiln Green, Start Hill, Great Hallingbury

Dear Sirs,

I raise my objection to this application, already refused twice by the District Council. I would note the following for consideration by the Planning Inspectorate:

This is an unsuitable location for road safety and traffic. The proposed location of the depot will increase traffic trying to enter an already over stretched junction/roundabout at the M11. The plan does not allow for swift entry/exit of vehicles given the constraints of the location and will exacerbate the existing traffic congestion in the area that people are already experiencing.

The applicant submitted multiple documents to the council as part of its application process and my comments below refer to these documents.

1. The Transport Assessment submitted does not address or mitigate the concerns expressed in respect of HGV traffic exiting the site onto the B1256 Westbound. The 'AM peak hours' quoted in sections 5.3 and 5.4 (08.00 to 0900) do not correspond with the 'AM peak hours' as identified for the B1256 Westbound as shown by the K&M Traffic surveys (0600 to 0900). It is noted from information supplied in the Traffic assessment that a significant number of both 7.5t and 18t departures from site occur at times within the peak hours for the B1256 Westbound as assessed by the traffic survey (0600 to 0900 on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday).
2. Given the comments in para 5.7 of the Traffic assessment it follows that 100% of HGV traffic leaving the site will be turning left onto the B1256 as that is the only way they can access either the M11 or the A120 from there. Those familiar with the area who have suffered the frustration of just getting onto the roundabout that is at the junction 8 of the M11 will know that, at best, 3 or 4 vehicles can enter the roundabout from the B1256 at any time when the lights are 'Green'. Moving the road closer to the junction will do nothing to assist a smooth and/or orderly exit from the site, especially when factoring that the road beyond the traffic lights is 'yellow hatched' and is regularly backed up. The 'knock on' effect of point 1 above being that HGVs will be unable to access the B1256 and will back up into site (and probably prevent lorries exiting the B1256 to access the site). This will inevitably result in HGVs attempting to turn right onto the B1256 to drive through Takeley to pick up the A120 further down. Not only this, but the road at said junction is quite narrow and will inevitably lead to lorries turning out for this junction having to cross over on to the opposite carriageway in order to complete the turn which will cause delays to traffic coming the other way.
3. Why do the Transport Assessment assumptions submitted (para 5.3) work on a 5 day week, 10 hour pattern when my understanding the proposal is for the site to be operational 24/7?
4. There is already significant roadworks occurring on the M11/junction 8 Birchanger roundabout which are ongoing and will exacerbate already significant issues on this road in the mornings. It is currently not unheard of to take over 1 hour to travel 1.5 miles from Takeley to Bishops Stortford in the mornings before even contemplating this development.
5. When I moved to the area, the 'new' A120 was built to alleviate significant traffic congestion on the B1256. Why are we doing our utmost to put significant and unsuitable traffic back on this roadway?
5. Ref 2.4 of the Planning Statement – In terms of environmental concerns, for an area which

already hosts a major airport. If the company is 'planning to invest in high-tech and low carbon electric urban fleet to comply with environmental regulations in the near future...' why are there only 13 HGV charging points proposed when there are spaces for 80 HGVs? This leads to the conclusion that there is no real intention to use these vehicles at this site.

This planned development is not in the interests of the local community and does not address genuine concerns about location, access or traffic flow. It should (again) be rejected.

Yours faithfully,

Gary Slaughter