

Dear David Grant,
Please find my enclosed response to the contents of the letter tabled by
The Rt Hon Sir John Hayes CBE MP, dated the 19 February 2022.

Paragraph 1

My previous letter to yourself acknowledged and addressed the concerns raised from constituents on the approach cul-de-sac roads to the proposed site on Horsepit Lane from Church Street.

Paragraph 2

With regards to the width of Horsepit Lane this has always been the case and clearly an existing problem which has been further narrowed by a number of boundary walls and fences being constructed to the road edge with no allowance being made for any usable footpaths.

I consider that the matter of online shopping has no relevant bearing on this particular application.

There are a number of evident dykes on both sides of Horsepit Lane as mentioned that are applicable to all road users along this Lane and are trafficked daily by its residents without incident, the ditch however, adjacent the proposed road access crossing point to the proposed site would be back filled and constructed fully in accordance with the Highways Departments requirements.

The point referenced to increased traffic is common to all construction sites for ingress and egress for materials and workforce which will abate on completion.

As you are aware Horsepit Lane is also a cul-de-sac and the refuse vehicle has always had to reverse Horsepit Lane as no turning facility exists at its far end, these vehicles in question have also increased in size and capacity.

I have previously clearly stated that transport for materials and workforce will be available on fully constructed suitable off road hardstanding areas.

The adjacent Catherines Way having already had more properties constructed with no widening of Horsepit Lane or removal of ditches, how was this site passed for planning and not refused on the grounds of Highway safety and its upheaval to the existing properties, this being a mirrored scenario of this smaller application.

Paragraph 3

This design and dwelling layout makes the best use of the site and its boundaries with ample space between the properties without the removal of existing very established boundary hedges and mature trees.

The proposal is in character with the other property mixture within this area.

Paragraph 4

Touching the matter of permission this application is for two proposed bungalows and at no point is future expansion considered or included within this submission.

Paragraph 5

The want for this extremely small area to remain as prime agricultural land and contribute to the affordability of food prices is absurd and in terms food security plus environment protection.

I trust the foregoing appropriately deals with the matters raised.

Regards, Matthew Coulam