

From: [Redacted text]
Sent: 20 October 2022 11:42
To: Weaver, Steve
Subject: Re: Appeal W/22/3305704 Lower Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

Dear Steve,

Thank you for your prompt reply. Yes, I would like these recorded as representations.
The issue of highway safety is not simply a matter of highway capacity...how much can we add?
When will the pips do more than squeak? It affects the ambiance and character of the Conservation Area.
The modelling shows there is a much greater impact than suggested by iTransport. The HA have been taken in by the error and members (LPA) need to know this in order to advise the Inspector.

Thanks again.

From: [Redacted text]
Sent: 19 October 2022 10:57
To: Weaver, Steve
Subject: Appeal W/22/3305704 Lower Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

Dear Steve,

Now this is going to appeal, I guess HBC will be asked what their decision would have been and why.

With this in mind I think there are some things that add to the balance and reason for refusal.

Yes, I am in danger of teaching my grandmother. My apologies, if I am.

Safety: You know that this was omitted from the reasons for refusal before, which meant that although the Inspector acknowledged the concerns of residents he felt unable to take this further. We have now had several months of experience with site traffic which has relied upon the banksman to maintain a degree of safety and when, for any reason, he has been absent we witness the problems that arise. The industrial unit at the end of Lower Road now generates significant flows of commercial traffic that was not included in the original transport assessment and now adds to the mix. This is not under Bargate's control. Once occupation starts we will see the volume of site traffic replaced by uncontrolled traffic from new residents and their deliveries. So there will be two sources of additional traffic to include before considering that arising for any proposed development of 43 dwellings.

Statistical error in the risk assessment: We have yet to see an acknowledgement that the iTransport calculation is based upon an incorrect application of statistics and not a modelling of the many variables...traffic in and out by vehicle sizes, non traffic movements in and out including pedestrians, dog walkers, joggers, cyclists, scooters, ramblers, riders, motorised and non motorised wheelchairs, also taking in account those using the wrong side of the lane.

Market conditions: Part of the justification for the non planned 50 dwellings was the lack of a 5 year housing supply. Market conditions have now changed and will impact immediately upon the demand for housing with a forecast of an extended recovery time . A reassessment is needed. Moreover the new Local Plan will address this and this supports the case for the application now being treated as premature.

I hope this is timely and helpful.

Kind regards,

[Redacted text]