

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 February 2020 16:37
To: Planning
Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER DC/19/2464

FOR THE ATTENTION OF MATTHEW PORTER

Dear Sir

Further to a submission on 1 January 2020 I would like to object further to the proposed upgrade of PROW 1652 to a bridleway on the following grounds:

It will be impossible to stop illegal use by youths on mopeds and scooters who will be able to use the upgraded PROW to access Shaws Lane and then use the footpaths and bridleways leading to the ancient woodland beyond. Although the lane already has a bridleway along its route, there have been no issues of this nature as there is no direct 'off road' route from the built-up area. The proposed upgrade of PROW 1652 will allow this to happen easily. Not only will this cause disturbance to residents along the lane but will lead to damage, issues of trespass and serious safety and security risks. Consideration should be given to the negative aspects of allowing this upgrade and priority to protecting walkers and horse riders.

Although it is Government strategy to increase the cycling network, creating a route which is not safe or secure or which causes conflict between existing traffic use is not good practice. Conversion of footpaths to shared use should be the last consideration in designing a cycleway. In the latest 'Manual for streets' it emphasises how important it is that routes are designed properly as inappropriate provision can lead to anti-social behaviour and increased levels of crime. The design envisaged by BH shows a 'meandering' path to be shared by cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. According to street users' needs pedestrian paths should be kept as straight as possible and the hierarchy of users should put pedestrians' needs first. The fear of being struck by cyclists may deter pedestrians from using a badly designed 'shared' route

In BH Arboricultural Impact Assessment it is recommended that 5.25 metres of 'important' hedgerow (namely G34) plus several trees will need to be destroyed in order to provide access to the upgraded PROW. The total amount of hedgerow along the boundary of Shaws Lane earmarked for destruction is 10.50 metres. The Assessment equates this to less than 3% of the overall length of G34 and states that it will not significantly detract from its landscape and screening qualities. Any removal of an 'important' asset will most certainly detract from the landscape and remove important habitat cover for wildlife. The report does not take into consideration the amount of hedgerow already removed to provide the Emergency Access Route. This is not conserving or protecting biodiversity which HDC should have some regard to when deciding planning decisions. This is NOT enhancing the natural landscape: It is enhancing the development. This is allowing Shaws Lane to become an extension of the urban sprawl as the numerous large gaps in the natural screening will result in the new development to dominate the rural character. It will lose its identity as a country lane. Instead of destruction HDC should insist the Ecological Mitigation Area be strengthened and enhanced and the hedgerow protected.

There is no indication how the upgraded PROW is to be landscaped at the development's boundary or what traffic safety measures are to be employed. The field is at a higher level than the lane. There would be a natural incline down and over a ditch towards the lane which would encourage cyclists to speed down the slope just at the point where sightlines for motorists are poor. The prospect of horses, cyclists, buggies plus any illegal motorbikes appearing from the development into oncoming traffic is a real concern. The single track lane is in constant use by farm vehicles, delivery vans, oil tankers and residents' gaining access to their homes and businesses. Residents should be allowed unhindered, safe access at all times. This is not a

problem at the present time as a stile is in situ.

Notwithstanding the above concerns, WSCC have welcomed BH's agreement to upgrade the PROW. They have encouraged the applicant to negotiate with the relevant landowner (s) so as to secure the dedication. As land outside BH's ownership will be involved then permission should have to be obtained from an owner before any material change to the surface is allowed. BH should not take land not in their ownership to enhance their development.

Just as a footnote, in the initial application form submitted by Berkeley Homes at Question 8 answers are given as 'no' to the following questions

- 1) Is a new or altered pedestrian access proposed to or from a public highway
- 2) Are there any new public rights of way to be provided within or adjacent to the site
- 3) Do the proposals require any diversions/extinguishments and/or creation of rights of way?

Yet, a completely new access point is proposed by the LEAP and the existing PROW 1652 is proposed to be upgraded to a bridleway. Perhaps the application form should be resubmitted with accurate information so that the public have the correct information on which to base their opinions.

Regards


Oakwood
Shaws Lane
Southwater

