

From: Aimee Moore [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 January 2024 18:12
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2023/0028 Land off Chelmsford Road, Hartford End, Chelmsford, Essex

[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

Re: Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2023/0028 Land off Chelmsford Road, Hartford End, Chelmsford, Essex

I would like to object to this planning application for the following reasons:

Highway Safety - Transport Concerns

Road Safety

The access from the proposed development on to the B1417 presents a number of hazards:

- The B1417 is narrow, has a significant gradient at this point and is a busy through-route carrying large amounts of industrial and farm vehicles, any additional traffic can only exacerbate the existing problems.
- The speed limit of 40 mph is regularly exceeded.
- Due to some of the existing hedgerow not being owned by the applicant the claimed available Northbound Sight Line of 90m (as detailed on SPD drawing SPD306-E-110 Site Access Arrangements), is unachievable.
- The claim of achievable visibility splays is further undermined by the contradictory statement contained in the Transport Statement produced by Intermodal Transport (document IT2259 TS 22.09.23), page 6, paragraph 3.11 where it states:

'Drawing IT2259/TS/02 shows that a visibility splay of 2.4m x 102m is achievable within the limit of the adopted highway, although the clearance / trimming of

vegetation and hedges at the frontage of Hillside, would be required to achieve the visibility splay...'

- There are two road junctions within 40m of the proposed new access road. One of these has reduced visibility and requires vehicles to 'edge out' before being able to join the main carriageway (B1417). The other is less than the distance recommended for 'same side' road junctions in the Essex Design Guide, Highways Technical Manual.

- In the Planning Statement produced by SPD (document SPD 306) page 5, paragraph 4, there is reference to a new 'crossing Point' it states:

'...with a separate pedestrian and cycle access proposed between Hillside and The Brewers House. The existing vehicular access between Hillside and The Brewers House would be removed, as this was found to be sub-standard and raised concerns for the safety of highway users, due to the limited visibility splays'.

The fact that the new access and crossing point to the proposed Bus Stop is both on the brow of a hill and a 'blind bend' and in addition, as acknowledged in the planning statement, has '*poor visibility due to limited splays*' (splays which are outside of the applicants control), it is difficult to see how this can be considered safe.

In the Planning Statement Document produced by SPD (SPD 306) on page 17, paragraph 3, it states that there is access to a public house and hotel within walking distance of the proposed development site, these facilities (actually a pub with 5 rooms to let) are approximately 1 mile away through open countryside with no public footpaths.

It also states that there are further accessible options within 5Km from the site, whilst this is true, the facilities are only accessible by driving, cycling or walking 2.5 miles along the B1417 which is unlit and has no public footpaths.

Bus Stops

Great emphasis is given in the proposal to the provision of 2 new Bus Stops with improved accessibility via an extended footpath.

It should be noted that, despite the B1417 being a major through road, it is very narrow (approximately 5 metres) and, as previously mentioned, carries a large volume of heavy industrial and farm vehicles.

The proposed new bus stop locations, one on a steep incline and the other less than 10 metres away from two further road junctions and inside the proposed visibility splays could only increase the potential for accidents and delays.

The Transport Statement produced by Intermodal, (drawing number IT2259 TS 02) appears to show an intent to move the existing Southbound Bus Stop from a safe lay-by location to an on road 'cage' spot.

The reality is that Hartford End already has 2 Bus Stops just a few metres from the proposed new ones (albeit in safer locations). One of these is a traditional Bus Stop with a lay-by and the other a 'Hail & Ride' stop.

It is also the case that the significance of the bus service has been overstated. Whilst it does run every two hours there are in fact only 4 buses Monday to Saturday in each direction and no service at all on Sundays.

Landscaping & Visual Amenity

Hartford End is a rural community, a Hamlet consisting of a few residential dwellings and the converted brownfield site of The Old Brewery.

The proposed development would not only change the open countryside nature of the Hamlet and remove valuable agricultural land but it would more than double the population of Hartford End without adding any public amenities.

The proposed development would therefore irreversibly change the character, setting and visual amenity of this important open countryside, river valley setting.

This is a fail against key policies of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan:

- FEL/HN5 – avoiding coalescence
- FEL/CW1 – damage to the landscape

Contradictory Statements Re Landscaping

In the Design and access statement (document SPD 306 351 02), page 18, 4.2 'Opportunities', it states: '*Existing mature vegetation to the boundaries to be enhanced and maintained*' and on page 22, 6.2 'Layout' of the same document it states: '*All existing hedges along the boundaries are to be retained*'.

However in the Planning Statement (document SPD 306), page 20, 3.9 'Trees and Hedges', it states: '*...one tree and a section of one hedge would need to be removed to permit development*'.

And in the Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement, (document 072395 Hartford End AIA Report) page 7, 3.3 it states: '*One tree and a section of a hedge require removal to permit development*'.

Also, in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal carried out by Plumb Associates (document Hartfo I 2) page 9, 5.5 it states: '*While most of the hedges will be retained and enhanced a short section fronting Chelmsford Road will require removal to allow the creation of a new vehicle access*'.

Furthermore, although not forming part of the applicants land, in the Transport Statement produced by Intermodal Transport (document IT2259 TS 22.09.23) page 6, paragraph 3.11 it states: '*although the clearance / trimming of vegetation and hedges at the frontage of Hillside, would be required to achieve the visibility splay...*'

It is clear from both the plans and illustrations provided that the removal of a large part of the hedge bordering the B1417 will need to be removed to allow access to the proposed development site.

It is also clear that, as noted above, without removing even more of the existing hedge, and that of neighbouring properties, the visibility splays required for safe access cannot be achieved.

Flooding

Since The Old Brewery development was constructed the Residents of Ridley Green have suffered from almost constant flooding of the Green Space, Road & Pathway from the site proposed for development.

As recently as September 2023 the residents appointed a Land Management company to carry out remedial works including rebuilding existing land drains and providing additional drainage to try and mitigate the flooding.

Unfortunately, despite the residents commissioning these works at a cost in excess of £10K, the situation remains largely the same with almost constant flooding.

Despite the impressive array of statistics and analysis contained in the proposals Flood Risk Assessment document (SPD306-01-01) there are few definitive statements and everything is prefaced by the observation 'with all matters reserved'.

Furthermore, the document does not reflect the reality of the lived situation of the extensive current and historical flooding problems of the adjacent Old Brewery site.

Foul Water Discharge

Since The Old Brewery development was established we have been beset by problems with regard to the removal of Foul Water and have had to spend thousands of pounds on repairing and replacing plant and machinery. There is very little detail in the Flood Risk Assessment (document SPD [306-01-01](#)) page 13 refers, about how this would not be repeated/worsened with any new development.

Height and Overlooking

The applicant states in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (document Hartford End Landscape Assessment 1.1) prepared by Plumb Associates that the proposed development site slopes by 6 metres from North to South.

The height of the site immediately adjacent to Hop House is approximately 2 metres above the ground level of Hop House and continues to rise away to the North of the proposed development site by a further 4 metres.

This is also referred to in the Geoenvironmental Assessment carried out by Gemco (document 2268 R1) on page 3, 2.1.3 'Topography' it states: '*...however a short steep slope was noted along the south boundary with the neighbouring*

residential development, which appeared to be 1-2m lower in than the Site. The slope steepened from west to east'.

Given this topography, it is difficult to see how the development will not result in significant overbearing and loss of privacy issues not only with regard to Hop House but to the surrounding area as a whole.

Light & Noise Pollution

The proposed development will inevitably cause a significant increase in both Light & Noise pollution to the surrounding rural area.

Loss of Agricultural Land

The proposed development would result in the unnecessary loss of good quality agricultural land.

I would strongly urge the appointed Planning Inspector to hold a hearing of this case and I would like the opportunity to attend the hearing if there is one.

Yours faithfully,

Aimee Moore

████████████████████