

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 January 2020 18:14
To: Planning
Subject: Application DC/19/2464 - Land west of Worthing Road, Southwater (phase 5)
Attachments: download_20200101_175548.jpeg

For the attention of Matthew Porter

Application no DC/19/2464 – Land West of Worthing Road, Southwater PHASE 5

1. ADDITIONAL FOOTPATH

I have a strong objection to a proposed new access point onto Shaws Lane on safety, privacy, ecological and other grounds. A proposed path located adjacent to a LEAP is to be 'retained'. This retention is based on incorrect maps (Raster Maps on Ground Investigation Reports 2000 and 2006, Vector Map 2017 and Site Sensitivity Map 2017). This fact is acknowledged by Berkeley homes in the Proposals document 5.9. The residents who have lived here for 30 years can verify that there has been no access point here. The historic maps in the Ground Investigation Plans show PROW1652 in the correct location. This additional exit and potential public right of way is proposed to be 'retained' when in essence it only ever existed on incorrect plans. There is no need for an additional exit as the official PROW 1652 is placed in a central location of the Development which gives easy access. With reference to PROW 1652, it should be guaranteed that the stile presently in situ will be retained so as only to allow pedestrian access. It should be noted that Shaws Lane is a public bridleway (2929) which can only be accessed from Bonfire Hill and Marlpost Wood. There is no pavement or lighting (which is how it should remain) and is bordered by ditches so it is totally unsuitable for additional exits by pedestrians, horses or cycles.

This proposed new footpath is a serious traffic and highway safety issue, as well as an environmental concern. Being adjacent to a LEAP there are obvious risks to children. There is no indication as to what barrier is proposed at the end of this path. The exit will be opposite a working farmyard using heavy machinery and would lead onto the historically privately maintained area of the lane which is in constant use by residents gaining access to their properties and businesses. As this whole area of the Development is designated an 'Ecological Mitigation Area' serious consideration should be given to damage limitation to the natural landscape. If this proposed path and exit is allowed then the existing hedgerow and trees will be destroyed as there is presently no gap. There is further concern that this path will attract members of the public to park in Shaws lane in order to gain easy access to this attraction, thereby blocking access to residents' properties.

I conclude that this proposed footpath is withdrawn from the application and not only that the hedgerow should be retained but reinforced and protected in order to avoid breaches by members of the public trying to access the lane through the hedgerow. This will also protect wildlife habitat and maintain the countryside ambience for walkers and riders.

2. LEAP SITUATED ON BOUNDARY WITH SHAWS LANE

I strongly object to the siting of a LEAP close to the boundary of Shaws Lane. This play area dominates a 'natural environment. This seems at variance with a potentially noisy, litter attracting area with high volume use which might attract anti-social behaviour. It is far too close to existing neighbours making it a safety, security and a privacy concern to residents. It is sited right next to the proposed new footpath so traffic safety and parking would be a major issue. There are concerns that the raised areas around this LEAP will enable neighbours to be overlooked. The lighting plan for the development is unclear in this area. As this is designated an Ecological Mitigation Area then an increase in light levels could have a detrimental impact on

ecosystems and wildlife.

A suggested resolution would be that this proposed LEAP is withdrawn from the planning application. Alternatively consideration to moving it further away from the boundary to a more central location or even incorporating it into the small play area close to the emergency access area. It should be noted that there will be a LEAP on the periphery of Phase 4.

3. LOSS OF TREES AND LANDSCAPING

I strongly object to the loss of mature trees, the inadequate landscaping and lack of protection of ancient hedgerows. There are many mature and veteran trees in the development area. They are exceptionally valuable and have great biodiversity value. Given that the UK government has recognised the need to plant thousands of more trees, it is disturbing that so many trees including mature English Oaks (for example a Champion Tree as marked on the Tree Report as 442 photo attached) are recommended for removal for varying reasons. The removal of a large tree plus roots will leave a scar on the landscape causing damage to the hedgerow and ditch. This will not only change the character of the semi-rural area for good but deprive wildlife of their habitat and remove an irreplaceable asset. Mature trees help fix the soil and absorb rainfall so removing so many could increase the flooding risk. Even hollow trees can thrive for many years. Careful consideration needs to be given by the planning authority in allowing any mature specimen to be destroyed. Tree Preservation Orders should be considered or HDC should re-evaluate every tree earmarked for destruction so as to protect for the immediate and future. WWW.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences recommends that planning authorities and developers should identify ways to avoid negative effects on ancient or veteran trees and that even dead or dying trees should be managed to help prolong their life.

There is insufficient environmental protection for wildlife along Shaws Lane in the application. The 'buffer zone' fronting Shaws Lane should be more densely planted than at present and made inaccessible in order to avoid damage to the existing hedgerow. The existing planting is inadequate. These areas should contribute to wider ecological networks. The natural landscape should be protected and enhanced so as to keep the distinct barrier between urban sprawl and rural environment.

Additionally the field gate by the emergency access point should be retained and the post and rail fencing reinforced to stop cyclists or motorbikes removing the rails and using this to access Bonfire Hill. Thick hedging should be planted to discourage this.

4. DRAINAGE ISSUES

Consideration should be given to drainage issues on the Development. The proposed LEAP area is a surface water flood zone as it is on heavy Wealden clay which appears not to have been recognised on the drainage report. The run-off from the development risks flooding Shaws Lane at public footpath 1652 location. As the development will take away most of a natural soakaway by building on the field and replacing with hard surfaces there will be very little land to soak up water. This will obviously increase the run-off onto the lane as the development land is already higher than the lane. This will exacerbate if the Developers are allowed to cut and fill the earthworks around the southern and Shaws Lane boundary. Excessive water run-off will cause damage to the privately maintained surface in the immediate location and lead to potholes and problems further down the lane. The surrounding footpaths and bridleways will then become unusable.

Suggested resolution is to create another detention pond where the proposed LEAP is located. Consider drainage provisions to ensure flooding and damage to the surface of the lane does not occur. Retain trees and hedgerows to help soak up the water. Ensure that the soil level on or close to Shaws Lane is not raised.

Regards



Oakwood
Shaws Lane
Rh13 9bx

Sent from Samsung tablet

