

**Site Reference RN117M**

**Site Location West of Valley Drive**

**Map Number 1.3**

**Site (ha) 1.3**

**Intended Use Residential**

**Yield (dwellings) 60**

I would like to explain the reason why I got involved with **VDAG (Valley Drive Action Group)**. This is because SLDC are proposing a number of homes to be built within our green space. People deliberately purchased their houses to the east of this proposed site because it overlooked a Green Gap/Space. Part of the definition of a Green Gap is that houses cannot be built on it. SLDC have now decided to “move the goalposts” and ignore the views of all the people who responded to the initial consultation stages to air their views on a site which has been rejected twice in the past but has been put forward once again.

#### **EX066 Highways Study - Main Report March 2013**

I would like to address the comments made in respect to the modifications after initial concerns were addressed during the hearing in October with the Inspector Mr Simon Berkeley. During this hearing the representatives from CCC and the highways agency could not answer any of our proposed questions/concerns and indeed had not even visited this site in question prior to the hearing taking place.

With regards to the modifications noted within the highways study. CCC comments that satisfactory access can be achieved via cul-de-sacs to the east although access point is not defined. The proposed photographs indicate a two way access via Yealand Drive which is unthinkable. People who live in this cul-de-sac already have a problem exiting this area onto the very busy road on Valley Drive which has now had Twenty's Plenty signs erected due to the speed of oncoming vehicles. CCC comments state that this cul-de-sac is wide enough for a two way traffic system which we feel is not acceptable. It does state that a secondary access should be considered. There is only one other access point on this road and this access is extremely narrow in nature. The photographs of the proposed access within this document have obviously been taken at a convenient time of the day where there are no parked vehicles. CCC should visit during the evenings or weekends to reflect what the cul-de-sacs actually look like when there are several vehicles parked along the adjoining pavements and roads.

**Category. All categories have been given a green light and notes from the study reveal. There are not considered to be any known highway factors which would prejudice delivery. No concerns.**

**Visibility** – This is an issue for access from Yealand Drive and indeed any other proposed cul-de-sac onto Valley Drive road. Also, there is the public footpath which surrounds the land to the east of the site boundary and this will have to be crossed by oncoming traffic.

**Land Ownership** – Land owned by CCC and access rights owned by Russell Armer Ltd. Previously rejected on two separate occasions but now up for proposal for yet a third time!

**Road Width** – Residents still feel despite CCC stating that a 4.8 m wide is acceptable for two way vehicle system including commercial vehicles we deem this to be totally unacceptable.

**Pedestrian Access** –Oncoming traffic will affect the current public footpath east of the site boundary as the proposed road access will have to cross this route.

**AECOM Comments.**

The modification does state that a second access via another cul-de-sac would be encouraged. However, the other cul-de-sacs are much smaller in nature and not an easy access solution off the busy Valley Drive road especially as these are in close proximity to Junction 22 which has been classed as a high priority junction! This would put this road as a high risk area for accidents.

It has also been noted at a later stage in the modifications that access would also be achievable from Castle Rise. Visibility levels would also be an issue due to the nature of the surrounding road layouts.

**General Comments within the Highways Study for Peak Times**

AM Peak 2 way trips (rounded) = 35

PM Peak 2 way trips (rounded) = 38

Total 2 way peak movements = 73

If sixty homes were to be built then the above figures do not add up. We would like CCC to clarify how the above figures were met and what criteria was used to determine the relevant numbers.

**Within the modification documents no mention has been made with regards to our initial concerns in respect to run off water rates.**

**Run off Rates affecting homes to the East of this Site.**

The Town Council have asked SLDC to carry out a full hydrology survey of areas as part of the LDF evidence base, and this was rejected. The Flood and Surface Water Management Act 2010 is gradually coming into effect, and developers will have to submit details of Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes (SUDS) for developments of 12 or more properties to the local SUDS Advisory Board (SAB). Individuals have been actively urging the County Council to get ahead of the game on this and gear up for their SAB responsibilities – Clearly individuals have not been helped by the government constantly shifting the implementation date further into the future.

**Yours Sincerely,**

**Caroline Hodgson.**

**(On behalf of Valley Drive Action Group)**