

Received On
26 JUL 2017
By Planning Services

(1)

To TDC Planning Officer

TDC Offices

Thorpe Road Weeley

CO 16 9AJ

26th July 2017.

I, the undersigned do hereby object to the proposed building of 280 new homes; reference **Policy SAMU5**, Development South Of Thorpe Road Weeley for the following Planning also "other" reasons as detailed below :-

- It is my belief that SAMU5 was not properly presented to the public where draft local plan documents also SAMU5 documents contained many "errors", incorrect statements, and alleged "facts" that are and were in fact misleading at best, through to being simply NOT TRUE.

It is MY opinion that TDC have attempted to "steamroller" development plans through to unsuspecting local inhabitants.

(also I cannot see any named "developer" for the SAMU5 site advertised, yet plans and associated proposals somehow appear to have been submitted and are being rushed through?)

Many people have suggested that Horsely Cross would be a suitable ALTERNATIVE site to easily accommodate all proposed local developments hence satisfying any needs for numbers of homes as having a potentially ideal road system (A120) also within easy reach of a MAINLINE station with good through connections to London/Ipswich & Norwich. YET this idea has been repeatedly squashed by TDC planners as one that they had advised as being a "weak site" when questioned by members of the public also by newer Councillors at recent TDC planning meetings...?

(yet TDC WERE able to offer the Horsley Cross site VERY RECENTLY for a proposed HMP (prison) site to HM Government" I)

Further issues I have are that Horsley Cross had "MYSTERIOUSLY" disappeared from the Planners radar whilst recent "other" proposals were submitted instead, despite becoming an approved potential site and one that WAS approved by Councillors at a planning meeting just a few years back? Was there a lack of local "political will" or even a locality ownership issue I wonder ?

(2)

OTHER reasons for my objection(s) :-

- Any such proposals must accord to the **“Written Document” Local Plan Draft Publication.**

Several of the policy references below are either in direct contravention of that draft policy's references AND/ OR would be a NEGATIVE aspect if adopted. (reference; Section Two Local Plan (SA))

(e.g. Section two Local Plan Document page 1194)

Example: Item b) 'Employment land' etc...Weeley and surrounding area is NOT a viable employment area mainly due to (a) very little or no general work in this area anyway (b) the local road systems are **over congested**, have unreliable / infrequent bus services and cycling is a distinct hazard with yet ANOTHER recent fatality. Hence unreliable for the purpose of employment or trade in general (c) many nearby Clacton work/commercial premises are vacant or unsustainable anyway. There are few concentrations of available other labour outside of low paid restaurant/ seasonal holiday/agricultural workers !

Cars would **HAVE** to be used to get to any work or school, doctors or pharmacy.

New 56 place primary school?...ALL Local secondary schools are already FULL. Also parents **WOULD** need to travel to any school **BY CAR**, thus this in fact is detrimental to the local Plan Policy and against NPPF, Policies TR1a, SD8,CP1, Cp2, with smaller local B feeder roads also being circumvented as they already are, to avoid traffic hold ups especially at peak & school run times.

Items (e) (f) (g) Policy SAMUS "Proposals **MUST** accord" etc

None of this is viable OR possible therefore would be detrimental to **MANY** references and clauses within the Local Plan Policy.

The proposed rail crossing bridge is NOT viable and is naïve and must be withdrawn, (the off /furthest side of any bridge would need to be built onto PRIVATE farm land, where the land owner would NOT allow such building, nor would he permit ANY cyclists access , (to go WHERE?) let alone even more members of the public! (other than as a direct access to a public footpath across his ploughed field) therefore to speculate or promise a pedestrian / CYCLE way is both unwise and unprofessional. (e.g. NOT in accordance?)

Therefore I also ask ;- would such a structure would also need to meet "Accessible to all" criteria which it plainly could NOT and is NOT needed and is further evidence of this plan not

(3)

having substance but is simply a "taster menu" in a vain attempt to appease unsuspecting local people?

.. The section of the plan that depicts **WEELEY EXPANDED SETTLEMENT having good strategic roads/rail etc.**

IT FALSLEY CLAIMS that WEELEY has "Good STRATEGIC Transport connections"? ...It does NOT !

- BOTH main through roads are usually gridlocked at all peak times (A133/local A120)- even worse during holiday 'changeover' times - therefore NO potential commercial enterprise OR public transport would be viable considering such a POOR transport network...the local rail facility is also at best, poor as described above.
- **What part of :- "WEELEY has already been BYPASSED twice due to the pressure on its road network" is not understood?**
- **2;3 (part 2..) SP2 (Settlement development Boundaries)** This STATES that there is a **"general presumption" in favour of new development..."**? ...Residents here do NOT accept any such "presumptions"...nor do they WANT OR need any, especially since all previous /most/ "others" have proven to be totally flawed & OR are incorrect! It is estimated that WEELEY residents are around 60% plus of "older" people? **As any such development would need to show "A NEED FOR LOCAL HOUSING".... IT COULD NOT DO SO.** Neither is there ANY DEMONSTRABLE NEED FOR SUCH A HIGH NUMBER TO SATISFY THE MEAGRE NEED FOR NEW LOCAL HOMES. Nor are they "affordable".

*** (I have recently spoken to several residents where one who had recently moved to a new house in Thorpe Road just 3 months ago is already planning to 'sell up' and now wants to move after seeing the proposed plans right in his front garden so to speak another of his neighbors had also agreed with him...BOTH NEW residents advised that they had moved here as it "seemed nice and quiet and peaceful" but SAMU5 would end that dream! That first new resident is prepared to speak to any inspector regarding this issue!)

- **Policy (part 2) SP3; Sustainable Design...**The policy STATES that ***"all new development should make a POSITIVE contribution to the quality of the local environment and protect -or- enhance local character"***...the whole reference to the policy is in fact flawed WITH MISLEADING STATEMENTS ENTERED INTO THE DRAFT DOCUMENT/LOCAL PLAN/samu5 This is totally detrimental to, and goes against the interests of residents, also the whole well being of the entire VILLAGE & its residents therefore this would be a NEGATIVE impact. (as evidenced via several residents surveys/signatures etc)

(4)

- Policy HP1: (Improving Health & Wellbeing) This 'proposal' is NOT viable and has already proven to severely contradict the policy with evidence!

Some local residents are already, and are increasingly, suffering ill health, stress and torment. Many 'Assessment Criteria' regarding the "Local Plan" statement are erroneous OR in direct CONFLICT with FACT, also in direct conflict with NPPF/SEA themes and indicators, far too numerous for this objection letter BUT where I would be happy to "debate" during any later Government inspectors visit.

HP3 Green Infrastructure ...This site, if permitted would destroy FOREVER CONSIDERABLE irreplaceable local GREENSPACE, as well as considerable local historical land and views through to the local church in "the fields" with parts mentioned in "The DoomsDay Book" e.g. footpaths and agricultural, environmental, habitat space (e.g. particularly the footpaths across the Napoleonic Barracks and Hospital fields). **THIS would be Irreplaceable!**

Policy CP2...This development would be detrimental Weeley that has already witnessed a dozen plus fatalities on its main highways (A133 etc) in VERY recent times, including one of the sad death of a cyclist...therefore I consider SAMU5 to be in contravention of CP2 and to all aspects of this policy!

The indicated entrée/exit to SAMU5 will bring more traffic onto an already busy stretch of a local pinchpoint (Thorpe Road) that is a major feeder to all points between Walton /Frinton-Clacton to Colchester with that whole area effectively being a 'spit'/peninsular with NO alternative route.

Heritage assets, the fields, footpaths, associated views and Napoleonic Heritage beneath will be destroyed forever if SAMU5 is developed, the Development is also very close to an Historic Recorded Woodland with some rare species of wildlife within the area.

Policy HP1 SAMU5 would be detrimental to many aspects of this policy reference as described where the majority of Weeley Residents are over retirement ages and where there aren't ANY local NHS services (GPs, Dentists, Pharmacies) in the village as it is and where the NHS have already stated that they cannot fund such future services...residents currently have to travel by road to use already over-subscribed services in other villages outside Weeley as mentioned above. SAMU5 development would impede much local wellbeing, especially as the village of Weeley is predominately populated by an older generation. It would NOT contribute to the overall economy, in fact it would most likely become detrimental to existing economy as it would

(5)

certainly expand a small village to become a small town, but retaining current very limited and fragile small village infrastructure and poor road networks.

'Health And Well Being' of local residents would also be badly affected by SAMU5 where local beauty spots, walks and views would become several tarmac roads and rooftops instead!

NOT to mention this whole idea being against public needs and opinion (with evidence)

Further:

- SP/SPL 1 not compatible and could not comply
- HP1 The proposal could never "ensure" any of this requirement as the policy requires
- HP2 This is not required as it is NOT needed (with good evidence)
- HP3 (Green Infrastructure) Cannot be enhanced as required by building ON IT hence destroying it forever!
- I fear the tragic loss of so much GREENSPACE, walks, scenery, natural beauty together with our and its 'historic heritage' as well as so much natural and some protected species of wildlife where the area is a natural habitat.

***** I hereby request an appointment to meet any Inspector regarding my objections and my reasons for them.....**

Mr C D Crane.....

5 Bentley Road, Weeley, Clacton on Sea CO16

9DT...Email.. [REDACTED]

signed..........C.D.Crane. 26th July 201