

Mr Nick Morley  
Gedling Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Arnot Hill Park  
Arnold  
Nottingham  
NG5 6LU

26<sup>th</sup> June 2014

Dear Mr Morley

**Formal Observations of Linby & Papplewick Parish Councils – Objection**

**Application Ref: 2013/1406**

**Application by The Co-operative Group**

**Outline Application for demolition of three properties on Papplewick Lane to provide access for a residential development, education provision, public open space and attenuation ponds with Access defined and all other matters reserved**

I refer to the Council's letter, dated 2<sup>nd</sup> June 14, inviting comments on revised plans submitted by the applicant.

The additional information submitted by the applicant does nothing to alleviate the concerns raised previously. The Parish Councils make the following observations in addition to those made previously.

**Residential Travel Plan Framework, dated February 2014**

We find it rather disappointing that this document has not been revised since February even though we have commented on its failings 4 months ago. I have re-attached our previous response and the comments we raised still stand. Some additional comments we would like to add are.

**Para 1.2** - This makes reference to the site and to land north and east of the site as undeveloped, it depends upon for what purpose you are regarding it as being developed for. The land is currently developed for agriculture it being 'greenfield' land, the adjacent land in parts green belt. Thus, the statements should correctly record that the site and the land to the north and east is 'greenfield' land and has not been developed for residential use.

**Para 2.4.1** - Again distance provided is from closest edge of site not actual travel distance

**Para 3.6** – Encouragement of cycling and walking is encouraged; additional infrastructure required has been highlighted and accounted for, apart from one notable but significant exception. There is no mention of provision of safe and secure cycle storage. Without these residents are going to have to make their own allocations, the design and layout of the housing may mean this is not possible or a compromise is required. Therefore, written into the plans and included within the Residents' Travel Pack (para 3.2) should be provision by the developers of safe, secure and easily accessible cycle storage dedicated to each property on an individual basis at a rate of not less than one space per expected resident, maximum occupancy. i.e. one bed property, 2 places, 2 bed property 4 places etc.

**Para 3.6.5** - Refers to a TOUCAN Crossing to be provided on Papplewick Lane. There is no other reference to this and it is not shown on the following plans; Access Sketch Design (101197/8012c), landscape photomontage Visualisation (101197/8013C) and Proposed Ghost Island Right turn (0218-FO3). It can only be assumed this reference is an error. If a TOUCAN crossing is to be provided then its existence should have been included within the traffic assessments provided by Croft Transport

Solutions submitted as part of this application as it will impact negatively on vehicle traffic flow, especially traffic not related to this proposed site

### **Proposed Traffic calming Improvements at Linby Lane/ Main Street (0218-FO4)**

Firstly Papplewick Parish Council and the residents they represent have not been consulted in relation to this proposal, either formally or informally.

The proposed raised plateau would be inappropriate in this location. The principal behind these is that they're used as part of a larger network-wide scheme of traffic calming, often employing similar measures at nearby locations. Installing this large raised plateau in isolation is not good practice, & certainly not recommended on a main strategic link. They are not meant to be used where goods vehicles, delivery vehicles, agricultural machinery & emergency vehicles regularly traffic. This plateau detail is intended for a more urban environment, typically in an estate location – not at such a junction on a main arterial route.

No evidence is presented to demonstrate how this may act as an improvement at a cross roads junction which at peak periods is at the limits of its capacity to function. With traffic traveling either very slowly or stationary at peak times such an arrangement will serve no purpose with regards to easing congestion or calming the traffic.

The area and roads leading up to it in all four directions are already well within 30mph zones and thus traffic should be travelling within this limit. The plan shows a higher 40mph limit south on Moor Road raising the existing limits. This is presumed to be an error on the part of those submitting the plan, but is none the less wholly unacceptable.

The proposed humps will create additional vehicle related noise to residents living in close proximity to the junction as vehicles slow and accelerate. Light goods vehicles, trailers and agricultural traffic will make significant clatter. Thus, the amenity of those living, working and using the Public House will be negatively impacted upon.

Therefore, written into the plans the developers should look at meeting the cost of triple glazing or a high spec secondary glazing unit, for those houses on the junction that are listed, for the people that are affected.

However, no vibration risk assessment has been provided to assess impact on any of the adjacent properties, some of which are "Listed". This should have been provided in support of the proposal.

Practically, the raised plateau will introduce more danger to this location. Approaching traffic will not expect to come across it. Vehicles will likely miss-judge the approach speed which will cause late braking & confusion – resulting in more accidents. Some vehicles will have to drop down to walking pace to drive onto the plateau, whereas others will hardly slow at all. Approaching this scenario from Linby on the B6011, where cars regularly travel at around 60mph & over, there will be an increased risk of accidents due to the large variety of interpretations & the manoeuvring required as vehicles arrive at this unusual feature on such a main route.

Visually, a large raised plateau painted bright red will negatively impact on the visual amenity of the area, & would certainly be at odds with the "conservation area" status of that part of Gedling Borough. Similarly, the requisite warning signage would also have a negative impact in this location.

Physically, the raising of the road would impact on the safety of the footpaths at this junction. Far from providing an element of safety to the many pedestrians as they do now, if the footpaths become at road level, there is a strong probability that some vehicles will utilise them to help "squeeze through" what is already an extremely constrained junction.

This proposed raised plateau has done nothing to address the concerns of this dangerous junction, in reality will do nothing to improve the current situation, will likely make things worse and goes against best practice.

### **Papplewick Lane Blockage Assessment, Response to Environment agency Comments dated 3 April 2014.**

This makes reference to an “assumed peak stage of 65.7mAOD at Papplewick Lane which allows a depth of 0.3m of flood water flowing over the road.” This raises a number of concerns;

- [ The Residential Travel Plan Framework presented, makes reference to bus stops on Moor Road, this location is part of the pedestrian route from the site to the bus stop so residents’ access to transport services could be restricted by flooding.
- [ Adjacent to the Road is a pedestrian footpath; this also would be flooded presenting a safety risk and preventing passage.
- [ A topographical survey of the Historic Warp Mill property with its former Chapel situated adjacent to the River Lean upstream of Papplewick Lane shows that at this depth this properties ground, the Chapel and most importantly for the occupants the house would also be flooded.

Thus in conclusion flooding to this depth as a consequence of the development taking place is not acceptable.

### **Emergency Access**

We welcome that the emergency access is no longer by the side of the river and has been downgraded. However, moving the emergency access to the main access point raises significant concerns. The applicant proposes that 300 homes are accessed off a single point off Papplewick Lane. This is double the Highways guidance figure and there appears to be no rationale as to why this is acceptable in this location.

### **Pedestrian Access other than to Papplewick Lane.**

The documents submitted do not mention within the text any reference to access to the site other than the two proposed routes directly onto Papplewick Lane. It is noted that the Drawing titled; Southwest Boundary Proposals along transect A-A shows a proposed footpath running parallel to the existing boundary hedge within the site.

Drawing Titled; Illustrative Landscape Master Plan shows this area to be a paved area with ornamental tree and shrub planting incorporated within it, coinciding with the transect A-A. This area in fact looks like a potential pedestrian access off Devitt Drive.

This is confirmed by Drawing titled; Southwest Boundary Proposals, which states that Section A-A is in fact a ‘Proposed access point off Devitt Drive’. If this is the proposal then it should be included for within the text of the residential Travel Plan Framework Document and be part of the full application. It has to be highlighted that there is no existing permissive right of way from Devitt Drive to the proposed site in existence. Thus the plans can be read as an intention but might not become fact.

### **Letters to Nick Morley, GBC from NJL Consulting LLP dated 25th March and 10th April 2014.**

These letters both attempt to justify the location of attenuation ponds as part of the Sites drainage network within Green Belt on the grounds of 'very special circumstances' as identified within Paras 81 and 90 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The proposed Ecology Park including the attenuation ponds and public access is in fact overspill from the site created to maximise the development potential of the site. Thus the reasons for encroaching Green Belt are weak. Whilst the area is shown as providing public access it will offer little ecological value. High public use, especially dog walking, is generally not compatible with establishment of new wildlife populations. Mammals and birds are likely to also suffer predation, especially by domestic cats from houses on the Site.

The Ecology Park should not encroach on Green Belt and should be incorporated within the Site.

We trust you will take the above additional comments into account and we would reiterate our earlier request to be kept abreast of the proposals

Yours sincerely

Mrs Denise Ireland

For and on behalf of Linby and Papplewick Parish Councils