*Dear Sirs*

*We are writing with reference to the above development and our views relating to the recent Highways Technical note from Bellamy Transport Consultancy.*

*Some of the points and summaries concern us as a Parish Council and we are puzzled with some of the rationale.*

*As mentioned in previous correspondence, we have had concerns of this development from the onset when the planning escalated from one permitted dwelling to five properties plus a farm shop. Now there is a proposal to further increase this by two, to seven properties and a Farm Shop.*

*Our major concern still relates to the access lane which we believe and still believe is inadequate to take the additional traffic, the lane being narrow and opening out onto the main road on a ‘blind’ bend. There is no possibility of a legal ‘splay’ being installed so the traffic will exit in a totally ‘blind’ situation. There is also little possibility of vehicles once on the access lane passing in opposite directions so we can see a situation of traffic ‘backing’ up on the main road further creating a dangerous situation.*

*We are also puzzled why a total of seven properties and a farm shop have been considered with access by a single lane. Our understanding of Highways policy is that only a maximum of three properties should be built with access from a single lane. In Clyst Hydon, we have two examples of developments where these criteria were exercised by Highways. We are puzzled why this policy no longer applies and would be interested in Highways comments.*

*The report makes mention of the fact that there is little evidence of collisions in this area over a period of time. We feel this statement is irrelevant as the situation of the full development gives a totally new situation. As a Parish Council, we have considerable local knowledge, and we feel we can recognise and understand the potential risks. Decisions, we feel, should be based on assessments of risks and the implementation of pro-active measures and not re-active measures once accidents happen.*

*In summary with the considerable increase in traffic, this in our opinion is ‘an accident waiting to happen’.*

*Looking at some of the specifics in the Highways Technical letter we would comment as follows.*

* *There is mention that Highways raised an initial objection and then subsequently withdrew this. We believe this statement is misleading as our understanding is that Highways agreed to withdraw their objections provided specific requirements (ie a legal and safe splay) were installed.*
* *The report seems to suggest that there is little traffic impact when compared to the original site which was a farm. We have several points on this,*
	+ *Comparisons seem to be drawn between the original farm and the two additional dwellings under the latest plan..* ***This is not the case****. The comparison (if any) should be drawn between the farm and the intended full development, ie seven houses and a farm shop. We assume that customers are expected to visit the farm shop and we find it hard to understand why the report doesn’t take this into account. In fact there seems little mention of the farm shop and its implications in the report as a whole.*
	+ *In the first part of the conclusions it states that there would be no more than one vehicle on average every 30 minutes during am and pm peak hours. Again, we cannot see how this has been arrived at given the impact of a Farm Shop. Surely the owner would be looking for more customers than this and including weekends?*
	+ *We even believe that the additional traffic from seven dwellings would exceed that stated in the report.*
	+ *In addition, the comparison of a farm with agricultural vehicles should not be used and a suggestion that it could go back to this as a fallout position. The original purchase was for the original buildings and not any land. In other words, if this development was retracted back to fallback and a farm, it could not be viable as there is no working land present.*
* *The report makes mention of the access at the entrance of the lane onto the main road and the fact that two vehicles can pass*
	+ *It fails to mention that the lane becomes very narrow from there going towards Ratcliffe Barn with virtually no opportunity to pass. In other words, if a vehicle is turning into the lane and another vehicle is approaching down the lane there will be no room to pass, so if several vehicles are involved, there will be a situation of vehicles backing out onto the main road where a ‘blind bend’ is situated*
* *It suggests that a legal splay can be installed at the entrance but discussions with Highways suggest this is not the case and the only way it can be done is with acquiring land from both the adjacent landowners.*

*As a Parish Council, we take our responsibilities seriously and where we see a safety risk with a development, we feel we should make the appropriate observations. We struggle to understand how a development can go beyond three properties fed from a single lane (as per a Highways policy) and the increase in traffic with the seven properties and a Farm Shop creates an unsafe environment. We also note that the plot of land was originally sold with permitted development of one property.*

*Yours Faithfully*

*Clyst Hydon Parish Council*

*24th March 2021*