



Ford Community Land Trust

24 October 2024

Representations in respect of Planning Applications F/14/24, F/15/24, F/16/24

Ford Community Land Trust is supportive of the principle of development on the former airfield but raises the following issues which require clarification.

Planning Application F/14/24

Foul and Surface Water Drainage;

1. We assume that the size of existing surface water drain pipe under Yapton Road, adjacent to Horsemere Green junction (inset 3 drawing, plan drawing 2205771-136) is the 450mm diameter pipe indicated. Is this correct?

2. Inset drawing 2, plan 2205771-134, indicates a new 300mm SW drain pipe going across Yapton Road into an existing manhole in the field opposite. Will this pipe need pumping to get the water into the existing headwall ditch (invert level 3.59m)

3. Inset 1 drawing, plan 2205771-131, proposes a new 375mm diameter SW drain across Ford Lane into an existing ditch. Does this ditch flow northwards? If not the water will backup into the built swales within the site.

4. Some of the water-retaining swales appear to have a maximum of 2.0m depth of water. What safety provisions are provided to prevent children or animals from having accidents in the swales?

5. What measures are in place to ensure that the water in the swales does not become stagnant and insect ridden?

6. Where is the maintenance agreement for the SUDS?
7. The Plan relies upon surface water discharge to private drains outside of the site. What is the agreement with the landowner to maintain these drains?
8. Pumping stations 1 to 3 feed into 4. There is no mention of a backup should these pumps fail. Is this planned?
9. In light of the recent sewage leaks locally the pumping stations should all have more than just 'greencrete' vehicle access, and could you confirm they capable of receiving articulated tankers?

Transport movement

1. Page 3 of the Transport Strategy, section 2.8, provide for 'improvements' to the Ford Road pedestrian/cycle connections to Ford Station (Halt).

The application makes much mention of the use of routes to Ford Station. Where are the drawings relating to these improvements to be found?

2. Page 5 of the statement gives fifteen 'bullet-points'. Comments on these are as follows;

1. Point 1 states 'uncontrolled' pedestrian crossings at the Johnson Way/ Rollaston Park junction.

What drawing indicates these, and should they be 'controlled'?

2. Point 2 - as for Point 1 above.

3. Point 3 - With the speed of traffic on Yapton Road, should these not be controlled?

4. Point 4 - details not apparently shown on any plans to date

5. Points 5-7 inclusive - where are these items shown on current plans?

6. Point 8 - are the current and proposed roads wide enough to provide such on-carriageway cycle lanes?
7. Point 15 - with the speed of traffic along Church Road, should this not be a 'controlled' junction
3. Page 6 of the Transport Strategy, bullet point 1, the footpath on the western side of Station Road cannot be widened as it approaches the station without taking out the existing hedge along the road. Is this what is proposed?
4. Page 6, section 2.15 - should the Rights of Way junctions not have controlled crossings along the spine road?
5. Page 6, section 2.16 - bridleways do not normally have the same construction requirements as footpaths. Which will take precedence?
6. How will the PROWs be maintained throughout the build programme to ensure access for residents is maintained? The current Temporary Closure Notices states that the paths will be closed for up to 6 months. This is not acceptable as these routes are used by residents to get to work as well as for leisure purposes. How will all of the PROWs be maintained?
7. The main arterial road through the development will become a rat-run. Whilst it is accepted that there are traffic calming measures proposed should the road be made a 20mph zone?
8. How will enhanced bus services be funded and for how long?
9. The list of active travel modes does not include a new footpath from Yapton Road along Horsemere Green Lane but claims to be included in the S106 Agreement. Why the exclusion?

Ecology

An ecology plan to support the updated ecology report cannot be found making following the report references impossible, please could you supply one?

Ford Lane

During the consultation it was suggested to you, that a memorial on Ford Lane to the young girl who was killed by a car there would be a good idea. During the liaison meetings with the Parish councils and the CLT, you raised this with us and seemed open to the idea. We mentioned that it would be sensible and sensitive to check with the girls father that he would be happy for you to do this, which we have now done and would like to see something incorporated in the plans so that it doesn't get forgotten. The young girls passing was the inspiration for the walkways along Ford Lane.

Ford NDP

Policy LC6

Drawing 2205771-100 shows detention basins along the frontage with Yapton Road. This is in conflict with Policy LC6 of the Ford NP which designates these spaces as Local Open Space.

Policy EH5

The site plan allocates land outside of the approved site layout on Grade 1 agricultural land and is therefore in contravention of this policy.

Policy SP1

A portion of the application site in the north-western corner of the application site, to the south of Ford Lane is not part of the strategic allocation and as such falls outside of the Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) on grade 1 agricultural land and within the countryside (C SP1).

Policy EH1 (revised Ford NDP)

Does the planting meet the requirements of this policy? Is there 30% tree cover? Is there a long term maintenance agreement in place for management of onsite green assets?

In parts of the development you appear to be replacing mature trees with trees with a trunk diameter of 18-20cm, whilst in other areas you have suggested 10-12 or 10-14cm. Could you explain why there is a difference?

Planning Application F/15/24

Travel Plan

The Travel Plan states that there will be uncontrolled pedestrian crossings at Johnson Way/Rollaston Park and Yapton Road. The speed and volume of traffic on these roads warrants a controlled crossing.

Para 5.6 There is a proposed cycle lane demarcation from Rollaston Park to Horsemen Green Lane. Where are the drawings showing how this will work? The road does not lend itself to sub-division.

Para 5.7 Proposed widening of the existing footway to provide a 2.5 to 3m wide pedestrian/cycleway. How is this achieved? How will the path cross the extremely busy Church Lane to access Horsemere Green Lane?

Para 5.8 Realignment of Ford Road to provide a route between Ford Lane and the Station. How is this to be achieved? Where are the plans showing this?

The main arterial road through the development will become a rat-run. Whilst it is accepted that there are traffic calming measures proposed should the road be made a 20mph zone?

What measures are in place to ensure that the water in the swales does not become stagnant and insect ridden?

Ford NDP

Policy LC6

Drawing 2205771-100 shows detention basins along the frontage with Yapton Road. This is in conflict with Policy LC6 of the Ford NP which designates these spaces as Local Open Space.

Policy EH5

The site plan allocates land outside of the approved site layout on Grade 1 agricultural land and is therefore in contravention of this policy.

Policy SP1

A portion of the application site in the north-western corner of the application site, to the south of Ford Lane is not part of the strategic allocation and as such falls outside of the Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) on grade 1 agricultural land and within the countryside (C SP1).

Policy EH1 (revised Ford NDP)

Does the planting meet the requirements of this policy? Is there 30% tree cover? Is there a long term maintenance agreement in place for management of onsite green assets?

Planning Application F/16/24

The travel plan shows alleys leading to the rear of properties where cycle stores are located. This is not good design as such alleys lead to hidden areas where antisocial behaviour can take place. Also the access alleys are only 0.8m wide which is insufficient for a person to move a cycle along.

The Noise Assessment has not covered sufficient times of day and night to give a meaningful assessment of noise across the site.

The Travel Plan states that there will be uncontrolled pedestrian crossings at Johnson Way/Rollaston Park and Yapton Road. The speed and volume of traffic on these roads warrants a controlled crossing.

The main arterial road through the development will become a rat-run. Whilst it is accepted that there are traffic calming measures proposed should the road be made a 20mph zone?

What measures are in place to ensure that the water in the swales does not become stagnant and insect ridden?

Ford NDP

Policy LC6

Drawing 2205771-100 shows detention basins along the frontage with Yapton Road. This is in conflict with Policy LC6 of the Ford NP which designates these spaces as Local Open Space.

Policy EH5

The site plan allocates land outside of the approved site layout on Grade 1 agricultural land and is therefore in contravention of this policy.

Policy SP1

A portion of the application site in the north-western corner of the application site, to the south of Ford Lane is not part of the strategic allocation and as such falls outside of the Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) on grade 1 agricultural land and within the countryside (C SP1).

Policy EH1 (revised Ford NDP)

Does the planting meet the requirements of this policy? Is there 30% tree cover? Is there a long term maintenance agreement in place for management of onsite green assets?