

**Roundabout: Condition 5**

The proposed mini-roundabout is not compliant with safety regulations CD116: -

1. The visibility splay on the Walnut Drive approach has been compromised by the Applicant (see Appendix II, Diagram 1a) in two ways: -
  - i. DWH has surreptitiously reduced the F distance to **3.68m**, despite being labelled as 4.5m; and
  - ii. DWH has shifted the visibility splay to the centre of the passenger side on Walnut Drive, instead of taking it from the centre of the driver's side.
2. When measured correctly from the driver's side and with the correct F distance of 4.5m, the visibility splay (the D distance) on the Walnut Drive approach is only **17.97m**.
3. The visibility splay (the D distance) from Main Street (South) has been arbitrarily reduced from 25m to **20m**. There is no road safety study to underpin this compromise, no justification given, and no safety risk assessment has been carried out.
4. The Stopping Sight Distance on the Main Street (North) approach is only **30.36m**. There is no authority or safety risk assessment to justify measuring the SSD from the roundabout sign.
5. The SSD measured from the roundabout sign is only 'annotated' as being 50m. It is not fully shown on the drawing provided so there is no way to check that it is 50m.
6. The Stage 1 RSA is well over 5 years old, both for the roundabout and all the other highways works so it no longer valid. This needs to be updated in accordance with RSA guidelines (*GG119 "4.22. Stage 1 and stage 2 RSAs shall be repeated if the previous RSA for the relevant stage is more than 5 years old"*).

**Footpath: Condition 7**

1. In the PROW Officer's consultation letter for the RMA 23/01636/ADP dated 17.11.23, he noted the footpath MMT/2/1 would require a formal diversion onto 3<sup>rd</sup> party land for the proposed cycleway to work. To achieve this, he required:
  - A diversion of the existing footpath be secured under s257 TCPA 1990;
  - The gate on the existing footpath be moved to the edge of the site where the new cycleway would meet the diverted footpath MMT/2/1; and
  - The remaining length of the existing footpath heading East down to Foscombe Road be upgraded to a bridleway or cycleway.None of this has been done.
2. Instead, the existing footpath MMT/2/1 remains in its original location but is now blocked by the site boundary hedge and the proposed new cycleway through the development leads nowhere.
3. The existing gate has not been moved to the site boundary and there is no evidence that the remaining footpath MMT/2/1 has been upgraded to a cycleway or bridleway.

### **New means of access to Foscote Rd & Walnut Drive: Condition 5**

1. No details have been submitted on the new means of access to Foscote Road, and only scant information about the new means of access to Walnut Drive. There is no detail on visibility splays or stopping distances, no evidence of Stage 1 and 2 RSAs being complete and no detailed design.
2. An existing ditch which runs alongside Foscote Road will need piping to accommodate the visibility splays. This requires pre-commencement permission from the LLFA. There is no evidence that this has been done.

### **Broadband: Condition 15**

The email confirming registration with Openreach does not contain any details of the measures to facilitate the availability of high-speed broadband, it merely confirms registration of the site.

### **Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP): Condition 25**

1. The CEMP requires a pre-commencement badger survey be carried out three months prior to commencement. This has not been done.
2. The CEMP requires a licensed bat worker to carry out an inspection with an endoscope for any evidence or the presence of any live bats immediately prior to commencement. This has not been done.
3. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (2015) and Ecological Enhancement Plan (2016) being relied on for details of flora and fauna within the site are now **10 years** out of date so no longer sound as an ecologic reference point. The June 2023 surveys to which the Applicant refers are wholly inadequate as an 'updated survey report' because they only covered bats and badgers and are themselves now 2.5 years old. The CIEEM 'Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports' confirms that reports and surveys over 3 years old are out-of-date and need to be redone.

### **Ecological Design Strategy: Condition 20**

1. An **updated** ecological walkover appraisal to reassess bat roosting potential has not been done (June 2023 was two and a half years ago).

*Please go to '[www.maidsmoretonmatters.org](http://www.maidsmoretonmatters.org)' to see full copies of all the AG objections, and instructions on how to submit an objection.*