

Faye Morley (Planning Department),
East Herts District Council,
Wallfields,
Pegs Lane,
Hertford,
Herts,
SG13 8EQ.

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Dear Faye Morley,

I write to object to the following multiple planning applications & list my reasons in each case but firstly I make four overall observations which should be read in conjunction with my objection to all four applications.

Firstly it is my belief this multiple application represents development by stealth given the original consent granted to Greene King under 3/12/0802 FP & inherited by Tesco under the terms of their lease only granted permission for some works to internal walls, a small single storey extension to rear & the erection of a totem sign. These new applications propose much more & are totally unacceptable.

Secondly is the impact upon local businesses many of which are already council tenants, the fact there has been no consultation with the community other than a few letters to immediate residents serves to undermine the social fabric of the community. No information concerning numbers, timings & size of deliveries or waste disposal arrangements has been provided.

Thirdly these applications seem at odds with The National Plan Policy Framework Section 17 (1) empowering local people to shape their surroundings. Section 26 requiring an impact assessment & the impact of proposals on existing investment. Section 8 (69) Promoting Healthy Communities. Also at odds with East Herts Local Plan TR8 Car Parking Accessibility & STC8 Local centres & rural provision.

Lastly there are already two existing establishments selling alcohol in the immediate vicinity and given the history of under aged drinking in this area (Bishop's Stortford Police can confirm the numbers) there is no need to exacerbate the problem by having another supplier.

Your Ref. LPA Ref. 3/12/2150/FP
Proposal: Installation of air conditioning and refrigeration units
Location: The Archers, Havers Lane, Bishop's Stortford, CM23 3PD

I am writing to object to the above application for the following reasons: -

1. Building access and work will cause significant noise and environmental pollution.
2. The proposed housing for these units will not be sympathetic with the original aesthetic of the building, nor the surrounding buildings or area and therefore detrimental to the amenity of residents.
3. Building access will cause a significant increase in traffic movements and therefore an increase in the risk of road traffic accidents.
4. There will be significant noise pollution from the accumulative affect of all the various units such that this will be detrimental to the amenity of local residents, especially to those whose properties border the site, but also to others as noise will travel further during the night and also in particular atmospheric conditions.

5. The proposed installation of these units indicates the high volume and turnover of consumables that Tesco expects to hold in store, which will in turn require the significant increase in traffic movements of large, refrigerated delivery lorries at all times of the day and night, thus causing further noise, light and environmental pollution.
6. The resultant sudden impact of large numbers of delivery vehicles, in addition to increase traffic due to customers driving to use the proposed store, will create an unacceptable increase in traffic movement resulting in a significantly increased risk of traffic accidents around the site entrance and congesting the surrounding roads.
7. The Archers is listed by EHDC as a building of particular/special interest and as such any alterations to the exterior are not permitted. The proposed alterations contravene this rule by substantially and significantly changing the visual aesthetic of the building and will be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.

Your Ref. LPA Ref. 3/12/2151/AD
 Proposal: Replacement & installation of car park signage and illuminated fascias & 1no externally illuminated projecting sign.
 Location: The Archers, Havers Lane, Bishop's Stortford, CM23 3PD

I am writing to object to the above application for the following reasons: -

1. The original consent 3/12/0802 FP was for one totem sign. The proposed signage will be unsympathetic to the surrounding area and will therefore be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.
2. The proposed illuminated fascias will create significant light pollution, especially for residents living opposite the site, and will therefore be significantly detrimental to the amenity of those specific residents.
3. The proposed development of the car park, including signage, is a clear indication that Tesco expects large numbers of shoppers to arrive by car. This will cause an unacceptable increase in ingress & egress traffic movements and therefore a significantly increased risk of traffic hazards at the entrance as it crosses a very busy footpath that allows access to & from the town centre and local schools for very large numbers of pedestrians.
4. The '20 minute' restriction is indicative of the speed and rapidity of turnover expected of shoppers, who will almost certainly be rushing in and out of the site, therefore significantly increasing the risk of collisions of both vehicles and vehicles with pedestrians.
5. Under a EU directive EHDC Highways Dept installed a pedestrian crossing to comply with the "Safer Route To Schools" initiative, which is very close to the car park entrance. There are a lot of parents and children who use this facility & walk past the entrance of the site in the mornings and afternoons, not to mention all the other pedestrians during the course of a normal day. The proposed development and associated parking facilities represent a significantly increased risk of injury as a result of collisions caused by the increase traffic movements.
6. Insufficient parking facilities for the number of people who will undoubtedly drive and park at this proposed development due to the difficulty parking elsewhere in town to shop, especially with the promise of '20-minutes' free parking (that in all likelihood will not be enforced due to staff not wanting to risk confronting customers) will lead to significant traffic and parking congestion on all the surrounding roads along with the increased risk of collisions between vehicles and pedestrians as well as detriment to the amenity of residents as a result of this increase.

Your Ref. LPA Ref. 3/12/2152/FP
 Proposal: Installation of ATM unit
 Location: The Archers, Havers Lane, Bishop's Stortford, CM23 3PD

I am writing to object to the above application for the following reasons: -

1. The installation of ATM unit will cause additional light pollution as it will be lit '24-hours' a day, which will be detrimental to the amenity of residents living opposite the site.
2. There will be a significant increase in noise and environmental pollution (exhaust fumes etc) due to the increase in vehicles that will use the site to access the ATM at all times of the day and night.
3. There will be a significant increase in traffic movements as a result of the installation of an ATM, especially as access to others in the town is made difficult by the lack of free parking in North Street and elsewhere, which will significantly increase the risk of road traffic collisions.

4. Insufficient parking facilities for the number of people who will undoubtedly drive and park at this site due to the difficulty parking elsewhere in town to shop, especially with the promise of '20-minutes' free parking (that in all likelihood will not be enforced due to staff not wanting to risk confronting customers) will lead to significant traffic and parking congestion on all the surrounding roads along with the increased risk of collisions between vehicles and pedestrians.
5. The litter left by users of ATMs, e.g. receipts, cigarette butts and other general rubbish, will be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.
6. The increased risk of theft & associated anti social behaviours or crimes as witnessed at Sainsbury Thorley ATM. Youths already loiter outside Havers Parade shops at night & this facility only provides more opportunity for same.
7. A precedent has already been set by Northumberland County Council who refused planning permission for Tesco to install an ATM in the Victoria & Albert Pub, Seaton Delevel on the grounds of road safety & opposition from the local community.

Your Ref. LPA Ref. 3/12/2153/FP
 Proposal: External alterations to elevations etc
 Location: The Archers, Havers Lane, Bishop's Stortford, CM23 3PD

I am writing to object to the above application for the following reasons: -

- 1 The Archers is listed by EHDC as a building of particular/special interest and as such any alterations to the exterior are not permitted. The proposed alterations contravene this rule by substantially and significantly changing the visual aesthetic of the building and will be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.
- 2 The changes will not be sympathetic to the surrounding area and buildings and will be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.
- 3 The proposed external staircase again contravenes the listing referred to in 1 above & will be an eyesore as it will not be sympathetic to the current visual aesthetic of the building and will be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.
- 4 The proposed building work will cause significant disruption to local residents as a result of environmental impacts, including noise and light pollution.
- 5 Increased risk of road traffic hazards & dangers associated with contractor's traffic accessing & leaving the site, as well as an increase in traffic customers using the shop thereafter. The site is near a busy junction where parking either side of the Archers site, especially on the Havers Lane side, is already heavily obstructed seven days a week and therefore will be more dangerous for drivers and pedestrians alike.
- 6 A precedent has already been set by Northumberland County Council's southeast planning committee who rejected Tesco's plans to extend the Victoria and Albert pub. They refused the plans on the grounds that it would lead to an increase in noise and traffic around an already busy corner much like the corner close to this site. Tesco appealed against the decision but in September the Planning Inspector dismissed the case concluding that i) the adverse highway safety implications of the scheme would be likely to be worse than would be the situation with the suggested 'fall back position' of the conversion of the pub without its extension ii) lack of safe and suitable access and iii) he could not be assured that the proposal does not conflict with the Framework and that it would not harm the promotion of competitive town centres in the area. Para 27 of the Framework states that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test it should be refused.

Finally may I request that if Bishop's Stortford Town Council Planning Committee rejects any of these applications on 18 February that they go to full committee?

Yours sincerely,

CC: Cllr Mrs N Symonds, Cllr P Gray, Cllr T Page, Cllr C Woodward, Mr K Steptoe (EHDC Planning)