

From: Ian Lissamore [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 October 2020 15:19
To: Maria Tomalova [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to planning application AL/70/20/PL

Dear Mrs Tomalova,

Thank you for your time this morning, in trying to help me find my original objection to this application, which I posted on your planning portal on the 21st of October, and which cannot be found.

I wish to object most strongly to this application, on several grounds.

It contravenes all of the following plans and guidelines, which have been put in place precisely to prevent outrageous and inappropriate proposals such as this one, from ever getting permitted:

It represents a complete departure from the area development plan

It lies outside the established settlement boundary

It would represent a gross overdevelopment of the site

It would damage the nature and character of the conservation area

It would have a harmful effect upon a quiet lane

It lies outside the built up area boundary

It does not accord with the principles of the Aldingborne Neighbourhood plan, and the Parish council have already recommended refusal of this application, though for reasons unknown, this hasn't yet been published.

I fully concur with the detailed objections registered by Mrs Oldham and Mr J Spence in their eloquent and technically correct submissions.

That this application is the third such almost identical application, is an affront to the whole planning process, and an insult to the intelligence of all those tasked with the job of administering this system.

Looking at the proposals Sustainability credentials, I would comment as follows :

It is shameful that WSC Highways, have by their own admission, not visited the site, and attempts to contact them have also met with a pitiful response. Their lack of objection to the application is therefore in my view, invalid, since it has no factual, site specific investigation element.

Similarly the traffic analysis presented by the consultants Motion, is equally invalid, comprising a further glossy bound desk top analysis, which contains no site specific data, just generalised reports about sites which have ' similarities ' to the West Barn site. No doubt again written by consultants who have never visited this site, and are therefore not competent to comment.

Taking their transport connection argument in support of the sites supposed sustainability, the distances to buses and shops quoted, has been shown in Mr Spence's submission to be false, and I have verified myself that the distances quoted by Mr Spence are correct.

The bus service quoted is ineffectual, usually two buses per day, and since it's a request stop only, and in eleven years I have never seen anyone waiting for a bus, it may as well not exist. No one who lives in Norton, can or does rely on the bus for transport.

Footpath 310 is quoted as being suitable for walking to Eastergate. Having walked this path many times I can confirm that it is a muddy verge around agricultural fields, and which terminates onto Nyton Road. This road has no pavements or street lighting, it is narrow and has sharp bends, and traffic rarely obeys the 40 then 30 mph speed limits. Though an avid walker, I have never felt sufficiently suicidal, to try and walk along this road. It is not a practical means of access.

That leaves only cycling, and for all of the above reasons, and the absence of any cycling lanes, this too is not a viable means of transport.

Since access to this site is totally dependant upon the car, it cannot be considered sustainable.

Coming to the site itself, and its access, I feel qualified to comment on this matter, having lived at the end of Old Dairy Lane for the last eleven years.

Many have commented about the unsuitability of Norton Lane to carry increased traffic volumes, and having added to that problem if this application were approved, this traffic would have to then pass up Old Dairy Lane. The junction between the two, is a very tight T junction, constrained on both sides by existing dwellings, and immediately opposite a listed Cottage. The aerial photograph shown in the submission, does not portray the current constraints on the junction, no doubt why a picture from 2004 was used!

The visibility splays quoted for this junction in the Motion Report, are a nonsense, since to define them requires the junction to be clearly defined on the road surface. No such definition exists, and why should it, it's simply a tiny private Lane (at this point not even owned by the developer), meeting a single track country Lane. As other users of this junction will confirm, when exiting onto Norton Lane, the visibility to the right is severely impaired by the presence of the Cottage Long Barn. Anyone exceeding the 20 mph limit would not be seen, before having to manoeuvre out from the junction, into a vulnerable position in the middle of Norton Road.

From that junction, for the first 35 meters up Old Dairy Lane, two vehicles cannot pass each other, it is simply too narrow. So vehicles trying to turn up Old Dairy Lane have to reverse back into the Lane. The many large delivery lorries servicing the office block at the end of Old Dairy Lane, often cause chaos at this point.

This office block is only partially occupied at the moment, if we visualise it filled, and a minimum of 12 cars trying to access the site as well, it would be a recipe for danger and conflict.

Old Dairy Lane itself is a shingle covered track, which affords little grip to vehicle tyres, and despite the presence of traffic calming measures, many delivery vans speed up the track. The top of the Lane is constrained where it enters the West Barn site. Many lorries cannot get through, and have to park in the lane, and make the final deliveries by forklift truck. Such activities would not be in keeping with housing access.

Moving on to the site itself, it is much more constrained than the plan, and artistic impressions (or are they artistic illusions) would have us believe. During the development of the site, application was made to locate the large commercial waste bins just outside the garden border of Easter Cottage, and to show additional 'overflow ' car parking of 8 spaces immediately behind this Cottage and Norton Dairy. The Parish Council planners rejected this application on the grounds that it was unacceptable to expose private dwellings to either car fumes, or headlights, so close to their properties. The current developer arrogantly stated that these properties were only ' holiday lets', as if this excused the objection. Since that time both cottages have become full time dwellings. The eight parking spaces shown, should therefore be removed from the total designated spaces, and rigid enforcement of the ' overflow only ' category reinforced.

The car spaces north of the office block has never held more than 5 vehicles in the present concreted area. My point is, that the site in reality, is not large enough to accommodate this proposal, without significant expansion into the current greened areas, which will further exaggerate this massive office block as a blot on the landscape. For all of the above reasons, please post this submission as a strong objection to this application.

Regards,

Ian Lissamore. Norton Dairy, Old Dairy Lane.