Holme Parish Council

Planning application 20/00923/REM

Points made at public consultation and during Parish Council meeting 21 July 2020

**Footpath along Pingle Bank East side** – whilst a footpath is absolutely necessary for road safety it would mean removing the existing 3/4 parking spaces which are used daily. What alternative street parking is to be provided for those who have no or insufficient off street parking on Pingle Bank?

The crossing point over from the proposed estate to the proposed new footpath on the east side of Pingle Bank should be a zebra crossing to allow children going to school the confidence that vehicles are supposed to stop.

The proposed position of the dropped kerb at the estate end of Pingle Bank is shown as in someone’s driveway and it needs to be repositioned 2 or 3 metres further south.

At any time of day there is considerable parking on both sides of Pingle Bank by current residents and visitors/tradesmen. The road is already congested and narrow and introducing a footpath would cause issues of its own. The road is not a quiet back road but has a lot of traffic using it even before any more traffic is introduced from the new homes.

Because of the number of cars which park along Pingle Bank which would lose their existing space and to prevent blocking the road, residents will most likely park on the footpath - rendering it useless for the disabled and those using prams and pushchairs.

Dropped kerb and access will additionally need to be provided for the driveway to numbers 9-15 Pingle Bank (access between numbers 3 and 5).

The road is narrow (the topographical survey shows the road to be approx. 8m widening to 12m maximum) and if the installation of a footpath of 1.8m width caused carriageway width to be further restricted then it could cause difficulties for farm traffic, lorries, buses and emergency vehicles as there are always parked cars to negotiate. The school bus uses this route twice a day although does not stop here.

The existing 30mph limit should be taken down further south along Pingle Bank – perhaps as far as the bridge - to give vehicles a chance to slow down to 30mph before arriving at the southern entry/exit to the development.

This is a through route to Peterborough Business Airport which is quite a busy commercial light aircraft airport as well as a flying club offering lessons etc.

**The Development**

Is the spine road to be a one way road as the width of the road is only 3.10 m as shown? This will need to be cleared with the Fire Officer. This width is too narrow for 2 cars to pass.

Visitors’ parking spaces on the site are insufficient for the number of homes and disabled spaces are not shown.

Are vehicles in each household going to be somehow limited to numbers that can park on each plot? How? If not, where will the overflow park as the road is too narrow and Pingle bank will be full?

Landscaping - Noise and artificial light screening. Currently the onion sheds provide some screening from the view and noise of the airfield (and lighting during operational hours). Many trees near to the boundary of the adjoining field have already been felled by the landowner leaving the whole area very open. The new homes will need some sort of screening to reduce noise and light disturbance from the airfield. This is part of the S106 agreement. The few trees to south and west shown on the Soft Landscaping schedule will not provide much protection and this needs to be revisited.

The house designs are uninspiring, the houses are cramped being less than the recommended minimum of 12m between frontages, and do not have sufficient parking provision for 2 cars per home as the driveways are narrow. This could lead to parking on the spine road and in the visitor places.

There do not appear to be any bin stores which will lead to wheelie bins (3 per household) being left in view which will be unsightly and cluttered. (This is already the case following development in Church St) and no garages/bicycle storage either.

No evidence of sustainability measures e.g. rainwater harvesting, solar panels, and ground source or air source heat pumps. It is assumed that the chimneys are drawn for appearance only and that the heating systems will not be oil fired (no mains gas).

\*The plans and layout do not correspond in terms of the house types on individual plots. It is not clear exactly what is proposed. (\*This has been raised with Ms Bell already)

**Open Space** Will this have a play area or be suitable for ball games? There is no play equipment in Holme at present. Measurements of this land are not shown. Fencing to keep animals (domestic or wild) out will be required. Maintenance of area and fencing needs to be discussed and arranged per the 106 agreement. Is it possible to take the opportunity to incorporate a larger area of land at this stage?

**Junction Pingle Bank/Station Rd**

The junction of Pingle bank and Station road is on a blind bend.

The B660 regularly takes traffic passing at high speeds, breaking the speed limit. Data from the Speed Indicator Device shows the average is about 35mph in the 30 zone at this point but speeds up to 85mph have been recorded.

Traffic volumes using the junction will increase by possibly 50 cars each way per day if each home has 2 vehicles. This would be a significant increase and could cause queueing when the crossing is closed (traffic frequently backs up to this junction) or vehicles trying to pull out into or turn in front of fast moving traffic. People may use the road down to Conington as a rat run going south which will have an adverse impact on Conington village.

The pedestrian crossing point on the corner needs to be very well marked – preferably by a zebra crossing and/or with a central refuge for pedestrian safety.

As combine harvesters and all sorts of large vehicles use this junction daily it would be better to stagger the crossing point back (southwards) away from the main road to allow for turning heavy vehicles.

The crossing point should not be on a curve.

**Pedestrian crossing across B660/Station Rd**

There are no measurements on the plan. The proposed crossing appears to be about 30m from the junction but this is too short a distance to comply with regulations on this busy road.

Type proposed – dropped kerbs only – this is not a proper pedestrian crossing and 2 dropped kerbs to mark this crossing point are not sufficiently safe along this fast road near a bend.

There is currently no street lighting in the area. Children going to and returning from Holme School or the bus stop for the school bus (at the Green on Station Rd) will use this crossing and in winter it will be dark at school going home time.

The crossing needs to be a Pelican or similar signalised crossing with warning signs in both directions.

As planned the crossing point is far too close to the bend. Drivers coming from the east would not be able to see pedestrians until last minute (at the apex of the bend) making it difficult for them to slow down in time. During the winter months the issues surrounding this crossing would be compounded by the dark and possibly bad weather.

This is a crazy scheme and the location of the dropped kerbs as proposed is a dangerous place to cross this busy road.

 The crossing point and signalised crossing needs to be measured in compliance with the Dept of Transport rules set out in the Manual for Streets chapter 7.5.

**Co-ordination with Old Coal Yard scheme**

The scheme for the land off Pig and Whistle Yard (the Old Coal Yard) HDC ref 20/00989/OUT shows the crossing point over the B660 further west, on the western side of the access to that site. No crossing type has been shown. Similar comments have been made on that application i.e. that provision of a lit crossing **at the minimum** should be a condition attached to the development.

One suggestion would be to re-profile the road by purchasing part of the field and enhance visibility by removal/reduction of the hedge.

Another suggestion, made by the operator of the mobile post office van (which parks at the Green on Station Road and is acutely aware of the traffic passing at speed), would be to install a series of speed humps in the area.

**Ecological Survey**

At the time of the meeting 21 July 2020 a local resident pointed out the current existence of bats flying at dusk in and out of the area. A further bat survey should be requested as the survey carried out in June did not discover the bats.

There are yellowhammers, swallows and reed warblers using the site. The Ecological survey is disappointing.

**Contamination Survey**

Asbestos removal is a concern for local residents, some of whom have small children. Particular regard should be had for the prevailing wind conditions when the asbestos is removed, indeed the whole of the demolition is likely to cause significant nuisance to neighbouring properties and appropriate mitigation should be employed.

**Logistics**

If an agreement can be reached on all of the above it will be fundamental to provide the infrastructure (footpath, crossing points) before any building works start so that safety is assured **before** lorry movements associated with the building works begin. Furthermore all site deliveries will need to be made actually on site not in the road. This is covered in the S106.

Members of the District Council should view this road junction and critically examine the proposal to appreciate for themselves the dangers that such a proposal would potentially cause. This is not a crossing proposal as it stands. The provision of 2 dropped kerbs simply allows people to negotiate the kerb and does not help them to cross the road, nor does it make it safe – indeed it may lead them to think it is safe when it is not.