

From: Sujeeva Medagoda [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2023 16:34
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Land Tilekiln Green Great Hallingbury Reference - S62A/2023/0017

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to make the following representations in connection with the above submission.

Name: Mr. S. Medagoda

Address: [REDACTED]

Comment:1. Aerial photos on the Acoustics Report and historic Google images indicate a far greater number of trees and volume of vegetation in the middle of the proposed site than that indicated in the Landscape Proposals NC18.446-P204 in broken red line as 'Trees and hedging to be cleared'. This can be deduced by the comparative length of shadows evident on Google images. These same areas also appear to be missing from the plan EC02 'Ecological Features' Rev. C within the Ecology Assessment and some of it categorised as 'Tall Ruderal/Scrub'. Please provide an explanation on how all this mature vegetation has disappeared as there is an ethical question here about the accuracy of the information provided by the professionals/consultants. In essence the basic content of these documents is the same as those submitted with the previous application.

2. The Transport Assessment submitted mentions in clause 3.1 that 'The operation at the site would primarily involve heavy goods vehicles', yet clause 1.5 in the Acoustics Report states 'The proposed operation of the site involves the delivery of containerised kitchens from the factory (on large vehicles, or "road trains", carrying 2 or 3 containers each) to the site...'. An explanation is required as to which is correct as only 16.5m HGV's have been tracked on swept path analysis diagrams? Again, there are questions here about the coordination between consultants or the lack of it, and the consistency of the material provided. Please note consultation comments from Essex Highways on the initial application.

3. As with the previous applications, although it is proposed to widen the right turn 'ghost island' lane, the proposed new junction has been moved closer to the exit from the roundabout. At present, on leaving the roundabout to the B1256, there is a need for a quick and sharp manoeuvre required by cars to get into the right turn lane. Would this be a safe manoeuvre for 16.5m HGV's (or indeed vehicles described in the Acoustic Report as 'Road Trains' with 2 or 3 containers) to make in such a short length of road? Furthermore, there would simply be no room for anyone else to queue up to turn right and would cause serious danger/risks at this junction. Does the distance from the new junction to the roundabout achieve Highways Standards? This is another safety issue that could cause accidents. Please provide clarity on type of vehicles and the rationale to allow others road users to turn right as they come off the roundabout and the roundabout itself to function as intended.

4. On turning right into the bellmouth leading into the site itself, there is a set of vehicular gates. There a possibility of 'stacking' large vehicles here and thereby creating a real safety issue for other road users.

5. The length of the 'ghost island' to be provided to make the right turn (as indicated on the swept path analysis diagrams) appears not capable of accommodating more than one commercial vehicle.

6. As with the previous applications, an 'Existing Site Plan'/Topographical Survey appears to be missing from the information submitted. There is a partial indication of topographical survey in the tracking diagrams within the TA. If such information is a requirement for validation of a small household extension, how is this large commercial application able to get through the Council's validation procedure?

Please confirm receipt of the email.

Thanking you.

Mr. S. Medagoda