

26 JUL 2017

By Planning Services

To TDC Planning Officer

TDC Offices

Thorpe Road Weeley

CO 16 9AJ

~~I/we~~ 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 reasons:

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 the policy references OR would be a NEGATIVE aspect if adopted. (reference; Section Two Local Plan (SA))

V.E. CUMPER AK CUMPER
Name *A. L. CUMPER* Address *1 SIENNA MENS WEELEY* Post Code *CO16 9DY*

Date *22-7-2017*

(Section two Local Plan Document page 1194)

Item b) 'Employment land' etc...Weeley and surrounding area is NOT a viable employment area mainly due to (a) no general work in this area anyway and (b) the local road systems are over congested, have unreliable / infrequent bus services and cycling is a distinct hazard with a recent fatality, hence are unreliable for the purpose of employment or trade in general (c) many nearby Clacton work premises where the concentration of available labour resides are vacant anyway!

New 56 place primary school? 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 SAMU5 "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The alleged rail crossing bridge is NOT viable and must be withdrawn, as the off /furthest side of any bridge would need to be built on PRIVATE farm land, where the land owner would NOT allow such building, nor ANY cyclists, let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. Therefore I ask "any cyclist/pedestrians TO NO WHERE?" (such a structure would also need to meet "Accessible to all" criteria which it plainly could NOT?)

Local people/walkers have never has issues with the current railway level crossing !

To TDC Planning Officer

TDC Offices

Thorpe Road Weeley

CO 16 9AJ

I/we 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 reasons:

Name A. CUMPER Address 1 SIENNA MEWS Post Code CO16 9AJ Date 22-7-2017

(A) Any such proposals must accord to the written document Local Plan Draft Publication. Several of the policy references below are either in direct contravention OR detriment to the policy references OR would be a NEGATIVE aspect if adopted. (reference; Section Two Local Plan (SA))

- 1) Several anomalies ref; Spatial Portrait (2;1) Detrimental to Weeley Village (e.g, Reason for selection:-"Weeley is a broadly sustainable location, with both strategic road and rail links" etc (Section 2 Local Plan SA) this is both misleading also untrue, and is at best a farcical statement where local roads are over already congested with frequent LONG tailbacks, also with several recent fatalities that includes a cyclist. The POOR rail service is at best a local shuttle service between villages. It has NO parking facilities AT ALL now and a recently installed ticket machine is not functioning hence tickets cannot be purchased. It has but ONE train per hour and NO Sunday service at all.
- 2) Policy SP3 (Sustainable design shall make a POSITIVE contribution etc) the only contribution the proposed site would make MUST be a NEGATIVE one. Hence this is detrimental to the village and against the general interest of the villagers and is a distinct NEGATIVE aspect.
- 3) Policy HP1 (Improving Health and Well Being?) This would most certainly be detrimental and prove a NEGATIVE impact on Weeley Village with total disregard to local residents well being? Currently the village does NOT have a pharmacy nor a GP surgery and the NHS have already proven unable to fund similar. (65% plus of residents are aged 65 plus)
- 4) Policy HP2 Green spaces-WEELEY already HAS such "Green Spaces" yet they will be all built over IF this site is approved!
- 5) Policy HP2: This will be a NEGATIVE aspect and detrimental to the Local Plan Policy and NPPF criteria.
- 6) "Assets of Community Value" If the proposed site was agreed then this WILL be detrimental to NPPF Para ;70
- 7) Policy LP3 ...Detrimental to current local scene and nearby areas of beauty (ANOB) also an historic woodl(with private access only)
- 8) Policy PP8; already flawed and detrimental to WEELEY'S PROTECTED employment/Tourism etc, due to ALREADY over congested roads that will only be worsened by this developments traffic.

Received On

26 JUL 2017

By Planning Services

1 Sienna Mews
Weeley
Essex
CO16 9DY
24-7-2017

Dear Sir/Madam

SAMUS, Development South of
Thorpe Road, Weeley, Essex

We object to the proposal to development of
280 homes behind the Barleyfields development

The way the present development is set up
causes problems with parking, with every evening
cars are parked in the main Barleyfield drive.
We don't think widening the road will make
any difference.

This parking causes problems for emergency
vehicles accessing the development in a emergency.
Accessing and exiting the development is also
a problem with no lane defined for pulling
into the development.

We do not think Weeley can sustain a
large development as this, as there is no Doctors
or Dentist nearby in Weeley with people
having to travel miles to visit them and with
the present shortage of G.P.s We do not think
this will improve in the near future.

CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

There is not enough senior school in Weeley and the cost of busing the children to school would be very expensive therefore people will take them by car causing more traffic problems in the area.

There are no shops in the village which means people have to travel by car to get their weekly shopping.

Even if the developer puts shops on the estate this is the last to be built and after dropped, as we can testify with the Beauchamp development in Orsett, Thurrock, Essex.

Often with this development the house or brought by London authorities up setting the balance of the area.

Yours sincerely

Uwien + Anthony Cumber

U.E. Cumber A.L. Cumber