STRONG OBJECTION TO: Planning Application submission, ref – 2025/0377/OUT - Land South of Peafield Lane, Mansfield Woodhouse, Notts.

Name:_____ Date:_____

Address:_____

I strongly object to the above mentioned planning application for many reasons. Although, my objection focuses on the weaknesses in the submission:

1. <u>Transport & Access</u>

Trip Generation & Cumulative Impact: The Transport Assessment (TA) underestimates traffic by relying on selective TRICS data and does not robustly account for all committed developments in the area, despite previous appeal and highway authority concerns. Adjustments for partial build-out are arbitrary and not robustly justified.
Access Design & Road Width: The proposed access relies on a carriageway width (6.2–6.6m) that is below the minimum (7.3m) required for ghost island right-turn lanes and safe two-way operation, especially for HGVs and buses. No formal departure from standard is justified or accepted
Safety & Outdated Data: The Road Safety Audit (RSA) and Designer's Response do not resolve the fundamental safety concerns of the substandard width, visibility, or swept path. All designs are based on a 2018 topographical survey, likely outdated and inaccurate, undermining reliability across all related technical assessments

2. <u>Travel Plan</u>

Lack of Measurable Outcomes: The Travel Plan (TP) is generic, lacks enforceable targets, and overstates sustainable travel potential in a car-dependent area. It does not provide a robust monitoring or enforcement framework, nor does it address parking management or integration with local strategies
No Robust Mitigation: There is no secured funding or delivery mechanism for public transport improvements, cycle infrastructure, or behaviour change. Cumulative impacts from other developments are ignored.

3. <u>Air Quality</u>

Underestimated Impacts: The Air Quality Assessment (AQA) relies on underestimated traffic forecasts and does not robustly model cumulative impacts from all relevant committed developments
Baseline & Verification: The AQA uses a single roadside diffusion tube for model verification, insufficient for a site near sensitive receptors. No PM10/PM2.5 monitoring data is used for verification.
Mitigation & Compliance: The AQA assumes that unenforceable Travel Plan measures will mitigate impacts. No contingency is provided for failure to achieve modal shift, nor is there a robust assessment of construction-phase impacts or risk to vulnerable groups.

4. <u>Historic Environment</u>

Incomplete Asset Identification: The Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (HEDBA) focuses on designated assets and historic hedgerows but only superficially addresses non-designated assets and archaeological potential.
Setting & Cumulative Impact: No systematic viewshed analysis, photomontages, or assessment of cumulative impacts with other developments. The significance of "important" hedgerows and unknown archaeological remains is underplayed.
Mitigation: Recommendations for further archaeological work are vague and not secured by condition or legal agreement.

5. <u>Flood Risk & Drainage</u>

Outdated & Insufficient Data: The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) rely on old topographical data and generic mapping, with no recent site-specific infiltration testing or groundwater monitoring.
Surface Water & Cumulative Impact: No robust assessment of surface water flood risk, exceedance flows, or cumulative impact of multiple developments. The drainage strategy is only indicative, with no confirmed outfall, attenuation calculations, or maintenance arrangements.
Climate Change & Sequential Test: Latest climate change allowances are not applied. There is no compliance with the Sequential or Exception Tests. Emergency access/egress during flood events is not addressed.

6. Water Quality

Lack of Site-Specific Data: The Water Quality Assessment is based on generic data and lacks baseline sampling or a clear assessment of sensitive receptors.
Mitigation & Monitoring: No enforceable plan for water quality protection, monitoring, or adaptive management. Risks from SuDS failure or cumulative impacts on local waterbodies are not addressed.

7. Community Involvement

Minimal Engagement: The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) demonstrates limited, late, and non-inclusive engagement with the community and statutory consultees. No transparent reporting of feedback or evidence of scheme influence.
Non-Compliance: The SCI does not meet Mansfield District Council's standards for early, iterative, and inclusive consultation.

8. Geoenvironmental & Topographical Evidence

Insufficient Investigation: The Geoenvironmental Desk Study relies on historic mapping and regulatory data, with no recent site walkover or intrusive investigation. No robust conceptual site model or remediation strategy.
Outdated Survey: The 2018 topographical survey is outdated, likely inaccurate, and undermines the reliability of all technical assessments dependent on it.

9. Design, Biodiversity & Environmental Quality

Design & Access Statements: The DAS documents are generic, lack site-specific analysis, and do not address technical or environmental constraints. No evidence of stakeholder engagement or response to feedback.
Biodiversity Net Gain: The BNG mapping is not supported by up-to-date, field-based surveys or condition assessments. Calculations are not transparent. Over-optimistic assumptions about on-site delivery, no off-site compensation, and no enforceable long-term management plan.

10. Cumulative & Cross-Document Issues

Reliance on Outdated Data: Multiple documents rely on a 2018 topographical survey, undermining all dependent assessments.
Failure to Address Cumulative Impacts: There is a consistent failure to robustly assess the cumulative effect of committed and proposed developments on transport, drainage, air quality, biodiversity, and heritage.
No Robust or Enforceable Mitigation: Across all disciplines, mitigation measures are generic, uncosted, and unenforceable, with no mechanism for monitoring, adaptation, or enforcement.

Conclusion

The application is fundamentally flawed and should be refused due to:

- Inadequate, outdated, and unreliable technical evidence across all major disciplines,
- Failure to robustly assess or mitigate cumulative impacts,
- Non-compliance with national and local policy requirements for safe access, flood risk, biodiversity net gain, heritage protection, and community engagement,
- Lack of enforceable mitigation, monitoring, and management provisions.

For the above reasons, I urge you to refuse this planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Additional Comments: