

LANGFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk and Responsible Finance Officer

Michelle Albone

Email: michellealbone.langfordpc@gmail.com

Mobile. 07482 276173

26th January 2022

To: Debbie Quinn, Principal Planning Officer – by email only
Planning Reference: [Revisions](#) to CB/21/04193/RM, Land off Cambridge Road, Langford

Langford Parish Council's previous [Objection](#) to this application was based on a number of points which either remained unaddressed by the applicant, required clarification or gave an inadequate level of detail for the Parish Council to provide an informed response.

We are providing our original objections below (points 1-21) and LEAP (points 1-4) with comments *in blue italic underneath each point* that relate to this revised RM application.

[Further comments on this revised RM application are being provided at points 22 onwards.](#)

1. Access to the site remains a major concern for LPC, and whilst we acknowledge access has been granted we can see no further details of intentions to mitigate the dangers this access poses. The hump back bridge is narrow and vision splay limited, the small roundabout with Station Road is ineffective and there are no proposals for pedestrian crossing by way of a puffin crossing along Cambridge Road. There appears to be no updated TMP (latest version is 2019). Our concerns are for both during construction and once the site is complete.
Concerns remain unaddressed in the revised RM Application
2. There are concerns in relation to the access for phase 2. Highways technical note 2.1.3 states that 'Internally to the development there is vehicular access across the Public Right of Way (PRoW) and private road. Both routes would be retained. There would be no access from the development onto (or off) the private road'. We would request the Planning Officer insist on viewing the proposals for access to the western parcel – Will this be by the same access point off Cambridge Road? – if so, how will the right of way over the Concrete track work? Will pedestrians, cycles and cars travelling within the estate have the right of way over large trucks heading to the Sewage Works and the Farm? Further details of this proposal are imperative as work on the attenuation basin and emergency access (including the primary road) will be taking place on this western parcel during phase 1
Concerns are heightened in this revised RM application. The proposed engineering for access between phase 1 and 2 (over the concrete track) is unacceptable (by way of a one way traffic route with phase 1 given right of way over phase 2. The concrete track has no calming other than a sign stating "ahead only"). This is a disastrous proposal. We would insist that the site needs to be engineered as a complete site (phase 1 and 2 as one site) and the proposals for engineering crossing the concrete track be taken seriously with a priority route and some form of traffic light system. There has been no consideration given to the amount of traffic that travels the concrete track to and from the Sewage works and farm or the potential traffic crossing from phase 2 to 1 or 1 to 2. We would urge CBC to review the legal standings on access across the Concrete track in relation to permission for non-agricultural/commercial vehicles before deciding on this application.
3. On the site plan there is a pathway just south of the LEAP that shows access across the concrete track to phase 2 – how will this function for safety purposes (a pathway across the concrete track?) who will have right of way – children visiting the LEAP from phase 2 or HGV's heading towards Poppy Hill sewage works?
This has been addressed and the pathway has been removed
4. We can see no proposals for construction access – will this be via the new access (or the concrete track?) What measures are being put in place for safety during construction phase?

Concerns remain unaddressed in the revised RM Application

5. Housing density is high - homes appear crammed onto the estate, and gardens are small
Housing has been increased in this revision, further escalating this comment
6. Affordable housing is clustered in one location rather than scattered through the development
Little improvement in this area.
7. There are no 1 bed apartments or bungalows
Concerns remain unaddressed in this revised RM Application
8. There appears to be no accommodation for older people (MANOP state the development should provide a minimum of 11 units)
Concerns remain unaddressed in this revised RM Application
9. 2.5 storey housing is out of keeping with the village (refer to LNP)
Concerns remain unaddressed in this revised RM Application
10. Langford Village Academy is oversubscribed and there were 5 Langford students who were not offered a place and only through an appeal a temporary increase permitted for these students for entry in Sept 2021. This issue needs to be addressed long term?
This issue has further escalated locally, with a huge increase in applications to the school this year. A significant amount of funding for LVA within the S106 agreement should be included.
11. There is limited accommodation proposed for first time buyers (1/2 bed homes)
Little improvement in this area.
12. There are no solar panels or solar thermal systems proposed on this development – in fact there are minimal proposals to achieve a reduction in carbon emissions via energy saving measures.
We can see no improvement in this area
13. There is only intention for 20% of the site to have EV charging points installed, this is unacceptable based on government statements that in 2022 100% of new builds will be required to install EV charging points.
We can see no improvement in this area
14. Overall the technological and ecological proposals for energy and water usage are underwhelming, considering governments intentions to reduce emissions and improve long-term sustainability.
We can see minimal legislative improvement in this area
15. Impermeable paving percentage is unacceptable and will lead to localised flooding as other areas of the village already seen in the last few years.
We can see no improvement in this area
16. On the site map plots 1-7 have access immediately to the left of turning into the Estate – for vehicles coming off Cambridge Road this would seem a dangerous design?
We can see no improvement in this area
17. On-street parking in Cambridge Way is likely to prove troublesome for emergency services to manoeuvre large vehicles in the event of an emergency
We can see no improvement in this area
18. Residents raised concerns on the potential of flooding from the attenuation basin to their lower lying homes in Cambridge Way.
We can see no improvement in this area
19. The Police have raised concerns on site permeability which we assume you will review?
We can see no improvement in this area
20. The Design and access statement (page 8) shows the potential for attenuation basin to be in area of LEAP, we request clarification of this as the site plan shows attenuation basin in western parcel?, are there two attenuation basins?
We believe this has been addressed
21. Whilst the Drainage Strategy Technical note states proposals for the treatment of foul and surface water we require clarification of this (as it appears there may be an error*) and can see no formal consultation response from Anglian Water for the following proposals:

Foul Water (page 4) – by gravity to two connection points – one to north of site on *Cambridge Close and another to the west of the site on Cambridge way (page 4). Do they mean Cambridge Close as that is to the West – or do they mean Cambridge Road (which is to the north)?
Surface Water (page 13) – to be pumped to Flexmore Way

Nb. We have been made aware, by residents, of existing flooding (overflowing manholes) on Cambridge Way & Close. This point requires investigation to ensure further connections will be a viable option.

We can see no improvement in this area

New points on the Revised RM Application

22. We would request the developer supplies and fits a public defibrillator with lockable wall mounted box within the new development
23. We request LPC's objection be registered (and a condition enforced) that refuses the Developer/the site the right of any future vehicular access being approved to enter or exit via Cambridge Way (other than emergency vehicles).
24. We object to the 5m acoustic bund proposal, this comprises a 2.6m high earth bund topped with a 2.4m high acoustic fence. This will give a very unattractive look and urban feel to the village on entrance from the A1.

LEAP

1. Location poorly chosen: close to the Main road (Cambridge Road) and the dangers posed by this in relation to child protection (abduction opportunities), children being able to wander onto the main road, fumes from moving and waiting traffic and general safety and wellbeing
Issue remains unresolved
2. Passive surveillance is limited in the proposed location
Issue remains unresolved
3. Appears to be aimed at early years only, what about youths?, what are the plans for them?
We believe this issue has been addressed
4. It appears there is a proposal for a new electric substation on the LEAP area, is this acceptable for safety purposes and what impact will this have on neighbouring properties – will there be any noise from this sub-station?
Issue remains unresolved

We feel the LEAP should be placed deeper in the development and with more passive surveillance from homes.

We trust the above content will be considered, along with the policies within the Langford Neighbourhood Plan when determining the application.

Yours sincerely

M Albone

Michelle Albone
Langford Parish Council Clerk and RFO