



3 June 2015

North Somerset Council
Town Hall
Walliscote Grove Road
Weston-super-Mare
BS23 1UJ

FAO: Mr Lee Bowering, Planning Officer

Dear Sir,

RE: 15/P/0946/O

Application by Hallam Land Management for up to 170 residential dwellings on land east of North End, Yatton

I am writing to express my strong objection to the above application.

As a resident of Yatton, and having studied the plans at some length, I would make the following **observations relating to traffic and road safety**.

- The proposed new 5-arm access junction with Arnolds Way and North End/B3133 (14/P/2406/F) is oversized and inappropriate for a semi-rural B-road.
- In addition, the proposed housing access road is located onto a roundabout that officers from North Somerset Highways Department told Yatton Parish Council¹ is not capable of accommodating any further arms (after the Bloor development access arm has been implemented).
- There would be a worrying impact on the safety of an increased number of pedestrians given that the Arnolds Way roundabout is already used by many HGVs. This is only likely to get worse with the planned commercial expansion along Arnolds Way - e.g. Smart Systems, Pullins, etc.
- The B3133 is already suffering from high volumes of traffic - e.g. 800 vehicles recently recorded by Speedwatch between 08:00 - 09:00.
- In the not unusual event of the M5 motorway being closed, the main road through Yatton becomes gridlocked - with tailbacks often stretching from the junction of the A370/Smallway in Congresbury, back through Yatton to the location of the proposed housing development and beyond. More housing on the scale proposed would by definition result in more traffic adding to the congestion.

¹ Meeting on 17 September 2014

- The traffic surveys conducted by the developer give only a partial picture as they were undertaken in the winter months - rather than in the summer when holiday traffic volumes peak.
- The new large estate would generate an additional 200+ vehicles² and an increased volume of traffic resulting from more car journeys. A recognised 'rule of thumb' for transport planners is 6 car trips generated per household per day - suggesting a very conservative estimate of an additional 1,000+ car journeys around the village each day. The developer's own Transport Assessment estimates 1,071 daily "vehicle trips". This would only exacerbate the issues of congestion and road safety I mention above.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties." This is patently not the case for this scheme. As anyone who lives in Yatton knows, the vast majority of journeys (to key facilities) by residents at the north end of the village are made by car. Therefore, I believe the development is contrary to the objectives of NPPF paragraph 38³.
- The Council has already rejected⁴ an application (14/P/1901/O) from Barratt Homes on land off Brinsea Road in Congresbury citing that "the existing road network in Congresbury has insufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development, leading to unacceptable queues and delay." Similar constraints apply to this application, which is on an even larger scale.

For these reasons I consider the proposed development to be 'unsustainable'.

In addition, I am of the opinion that the Council should have refused to accept what is effectively a "duplicate" application (as recognised by the Case Officer himself). This is plainly a 'ruse' by the developer to orchestrate a situation where it can appeal to the Planning Inspectorate, since the original application (14/P/2017/O) has not advanced at the speed they would have wished.

I urge the Council to reject the application.

Yours sincerely,



² Average 1.27 cars per household in SW England (National Travel Survey, 2014)

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

⁴ Decision notice dated 13 February 2015