

Sent: 15 June 2024 16:40

To: planningcomments

Subject: Objection: Planning Application 5/2022/0599

Dear Planning Officers,

Further to the revised plan for the access road proposed in Planning Application 5/2022/0599, I object to the updated scheme. It is astonishing that the original drawings were so badly inaccurate but the revised plans do not fundamentally change the fact that the proposal for this access road is ill conceived and hazardous.

At the football club end of the car park, the revised layout does not adequately provide for the convergence of traffic coming from the football club car park, the new housing estate and cars that would be parked alongside the school fence. Indeed, the revised draft plan shown would result in a turning too sharp for cars to even access the football club!

The street lamp by the fence of No.106 must be retained to ensure adequate lighting at night and busy winter school days. This is not shown on the plan. Presuming that the access road will become a 30mph carriageway next to a primary school, surely there should be significant additional lighting, compared to that needed for a car park, but the application fails to address this.

Removing any stretch of grass verge may have an impact on the transitory routes of an unknown number of animal species that utilise that corridor from the field/lakes behind to the trees and grasses to the front of 96 to 106 and beyond to the Common. Without studies it is impossible to fully know this impact but it appears inevitable that the local biodiversity will be affected.

Tarmac's revised plans continue to equate tactile paving with safe crossing options. The route shown for this development will encourage primary school aged pedestrians away from the current relatively safe option provided by the zebra crossing to a new formal crossing across the access road and towards Park Lane near the postbox.

Given the speed and constancy of traffic and no opportunity for a mid-carriageway island this is not a safe option, particularly given the additional traffic generated by the new road junction.

Where the revised pavements are now proposed there are manholes for access to the main sewer of the road - this includes a significantly raised manhole on the tree side. These appear to be located where the tactile paving is indicated and will presumably need replacing to avoid issues for the visually impaired. I can see no indication on the plans that any investigation has been undertaken to ensure this can be done without detriment to this major service utility for the village.

In terms of parking, the major issues remain. Twenty nine cars parked on the Tarmac side of the car park during a recent busy match day (please see the Statements

submitted to the Planning Inspector by 96 & 100 High Street as part of the appeal hearing), not the 17 spaces indicated by the applicant. This revision does nothing to assist this loss of parking and in fact the situation will be worsened. Cars parked on the parish council side will need to reverse across the new pavements to enter the road. Equally if any parallel parking occurs on the opposite side of the road then the road becomes narrowed to a single carriageway whilst those cars will also need to three point to leave. At school pickup this will be chaos whilst the pavements as shown will create a false sense of pedestrian safety, particularly for small children.

Given the extent at the inaccuracy of the initial plans it is impossible to regard the remaining plan for the development area to be an accurate representation. It is already known that the graphics provided are inaccurate with the size of houses illustrated being significantly smaller and less dense than would be the actuality. I urge this revised plan also be refused along with the overall scheme.

Very best regards

Roger Barton
96 High Street
Colney Heath
St Albans
AL4 0NP