

## Planning Committee 20 November 2018 – item 18/95b

### 13 High Street Planning Application

Edited/anonymised correspondence received from a village resident

I have no issue about the building work and contractors. Several people have now sent me that document and it is irrelevant to the case I am making. The document is not about long-term issues.

1. Sabertons are proposing to install a car-park - possibly at speed before SCDC or anyone else can stop them. Their contractors are out there, working right now.
2. The designation of this part of Primrose Lane for safe passage for Elderly, Disabled and even schoolchildren is well-known. WPC have ignored that status.
3. Nobody seems to have examined the legal precedent that twice parking has been refused on the Rose Cottage site because it was deemed that this part of Primrose Lane should not have any further additional traffic.
4. IF Sabertons get that parking into place, my conversation with them leads me to think that it will be used for customers as well as staff - and more than double the existing traffic in the lane.
5. The junction with the High St is potentially lethal. I invite any Councillor to try exiting from Primrose Lane, at any time.

I believe that Councillor Johnson is already on the case but the matter - and potential injustice and flagrant disregard of Planning Law and Community - need to be examined and championed by the whole Parish Council.

---

There is a multi-layered scenario here.

1. The Developers of the new Opticians achieved Planning Permission because they proposed 'a garden' at the rear of the premises. Within days they propose to make this, in actuality, a car-park. It may well more than double the flow of traffic in and out of Primrose Lane.
2. The Parish Council voted against other developments in this lane because higher traffic levels would be unsafe. Why have their minds changed?
3. Primrose Lane at the High St end is designated and surfaced specifically because of the high distribution of Elderly and Disabled residents in this sector of the village. There is a serious conflict of needs and purposes if a car-park is illegally installed.
4. Traffic safety and road-vision at this junction warrant site-meetings with Parish Councillors and Highways Department officials. The pinch point is already seriously hazardous and has been the scene of several instances of Road Rage. Doubling the traffic without management of parking is unlikely to improve safety.
5. SCDC availability of website information, by its own admission, is unsatisfactory. The function of its Planning website is erratic.
6. Waterbeach Parish Council's disregard of representations about the Lane/High St Junction and Parking problems is culpable. At this point, the Parish Council is allowing the Developers to 'pull wool over local eyes'. Residents do not wish to live in sight and sound of a car-park, tree-denuded environment and conservation-infringed area.

Is the Parish Council prepared to uphold Environment and Pedestrian safety? Is it prepared to challenge a flagrant flouting of a Planning Agreement?

---

There are a number of unsatisfactory matters relating to the redevelopment and some aspects may not conform to plan. The 'garden' agreed is to be used as a car park, and the traffic thus generated constitutes a serious hazard to pedestrians of Primrose Lane, which is surfaced to provide safe passage to elderly and disabled in the wider neighbourhood.