

LIDL PLANNING APPLICATION

I INTEND TO COVER, IN THE MAIN, ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC ISSUES INCLUDING THE WIDTH OF THE ROAD AND ROAD MARKINGS, THE SPEED AND DENSITY OF TRAFFIC AND THE LACK OF LOCAL PARKING.

HOWEVER I WILL ALSO QUESTION THE NEED FOR SUCH A FOOD STORE AND ALSO COMMENT ON THE DETRIMENTAL EFFECT UPON LOCAL TRADE AND COMMERCE.

FURTHERMORE I WILL BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION, THE EFFECT UPON THOSE RESIDENTS LIVING CLOSE TO THE SITE.

JUST TO RE-CAP, LIDL SUBMITTED THE PREVIOUS APPLICATION OVER 6 YEARS AGO. THE COUNCIL REFUSED IT AND THE INSPECTOR DISMISSED APPEAL, CITING SIGNIFICANT ROAD SAFETY CONCERNS.

IN MY OPINION, AND IN THE OPINION OF HUNDREDS OF LOCAL MOTTINGHAM RESIDENTS, THOSE SAME ROAD SAFETY CONCERNS HAVE NOT BEEN DEALT WITH IN THIS CURRENT APPLICATION.

THE SITE ITSELF IS SITUATED WITHIN A COUPLE OF METRES OF A VERY BUSY ROUNDABOUT, THAT SEES HEAVY TRAFFIC VOLUMES, FAST VEHICLE SPEEDS AND MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE OF ROAD ACCIDENTS, THE MOST RECENT BEING LAST FRIDAY INVOLVING AN ELDERLY PEDESTRIAN ATTEMPTING TO CROSS THE BUSY ROAD. THIS WAS A SERIOUS/NEAR-FATAL ACCIDENT INVOLVING AN ELDERLY LADY WHO REQUIRED HOSPITALISATION.

THOSE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE WHO HAVE VISITED THE SITE WILL HAVE SEEN FIRST-HAND THE HIGH TRAFFIC VOLUME AND THE SPEED OF TRAFFIC APPROACHING THE ROUNDABOUT, PARTICULARLY THOSE VEHICLES TRAVELLING NORTHBOUND ON THE MOTTINGHAM ROAD. MEMBERS WILL ALSO HAVE SEEN THAT THE WIDTH OF THE ROAD THROUGH THE VILLAGE IS RESTRICTED, WITH SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERING PAVEMENT WIDTHS.

IT IS IMPORTANT FOR MEMBERS TO NOTE THAT THE ROADS LEADING TO AND INCLUDING MOTTINGHAM ROAD ARE USED DAILY AS A CUT THROUGH BY TRAFFIC TRYING TO AVOID THE VERY BUSY A20, WHICH RUNS PARALELL SOME 300-400m. AWAY. THIS CAUSES A SIGNIFICANT TRAFFIC PROBLEM IN THE VILLAGE DURING RUSH HOUR EACH MORNING AND EVENING. THE CLOSE PROXIMITY OF ELTHAM COLLEGE JUNIOR AND SENIOR SCHOOLS EXACERBATES THIS ALREADY SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM.

WITH REGARD TO ROAD SAFETY, IT WOULD APPEAR TO ME THAT THERE ARE ONLY 2 SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENTS TO THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION, WHICH WAS REFUSED, BOTH BY THE COUNCIL AND ALSO THE INSPECTOR ON APPEAL. THESE ARE - THE ALL-IMPORTANT RE-ALIGNMENT IN THE ROAD OUTSIDE THE ENTRANCE/EXIT TO THE PROPOSED STORE AND ALSO THE WIDENING OF THE EXISTING PEDESTRIAN REFUGE, CURRENTLY SITUATED ACTUALLY ON THE ROUNDABOUT, BY THE PROPOSED STORE EXIT IN MOTTINGHAM RD. THESE ADJUSTMENTS ARE SUPPOSED TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE ROAD SAFETY AT THESE CRITICAL POINTS.

WITH REGARD TO THE REALIGNMENT, WE ARE TALKING IN PLACES OF AS LITTLE AS 50 CM. (20 INCHES) OF PAVEMENT ALTERATION, AND WHEN CONSIDERING THAT WE WILL BE SEEING 44 TONNE ARTICULATED DELIVERY LORRIES, EACH MEASURING 16.5 METRES IN LENGTH (THAT'S SOME 55FT) AND DOUBLE WHEEL WIDTHS PROBABLY WIDER THAN THE 50 CM. ATTEMPTING TO ENTER AND EXIT THIS SITE, THEN YOU WILL SEE THAT THE ROAD SAFETY RISK, IN RESPECT OF SIGHTLINES, IS BEING TAKEN TO THE UTMOST AND (IN MY OPINION), DANGEROUS LIMIT.

INDEED, BY MY CALCULATION AND LOOKING AT PLAN No. 2316686, THE REAR OF ANY SUCH LORRY TURNING INTO THE SITE FROM THE WAR MEMORIAL ROUNDABOUT WILL NOT CLEAR THE ROUNDABOUT, IF IT IS FORCED TO WAIT TO TURN INTO THE SITE! THIS CANNOT BE ACCEPTABLE AND IS **NOT COVERED** IN THE HIGHWAYS REPORT.

FURTHERMORE, WITH REFERENCE TO THE CRUCIAL ISSUE OF VISUAL SIGHTLINES, THESE ARE THERE TO ENSURE THE DRIVERS OF THE DELIVERY LORRIES CAN SEE ONCOMING TRAFFIC FROM A SAFE DISTANCE. PLAN No. 2316686 SHOWS THAT DELIVERY LORRIES THAT WISH TO EXIT WILL HAVE TO CREEP OUT, ACROSS THE PEDESTRIAN PAVEMENT, STOP - TO JUDGE THE ONCOMING TRAFFIC FROM BOTH DIRECTIONS, BEFORE MOVING OFF. THESE LORRIES ARE 55ft. LONG, WHICH MEANS MOST OF THE LORRY-TRAILER AND ITS SETS OF REAR WHEELS WILL HAVE TO REMAIN IN THE PUBLIC CAR PARK. THIS HAS THE SERIOUS POTENTIAL FOR CHILDREN, DISABLED AND ORDINARY PEDESTRIAN SHOPPERS – PLUS CARS AND CYCLES - TO BE PUT AT UNREASONABLE RISK, AS THE LORRY DRIVER WILL HAVE TO MAINTAIN CLOSE SURVEILLANCE, NOT ONLY ON SPEEDING ONCOMING TRAFFIC FROM TWO DIRECTIONS, BUT ALSO MONITOR BOTH SIDES OF THE LORRY AT THE TIME OF MOVING OFF. AGAIN THE HIGH RISK ISSUE OF LARGE LORRIES MANOEUVRING IN PUBLIC CAR PARKS IS **NOT COVERED** IN THE REPORT .

WHILST I ACCEPT THE PROPOSED INCREASE IN WIDTH OF THE EXISTING TRAFFIC REFUGE IS TO BE WELCOMED, IT WILL ALSO HAVE THE EFFECT OF FURTHER NARROWING AN ALREADY RESTRICTED AND TIGHT ROAD AT A DANGEROUS ROUNDABOUT. I BELIEVE THAT HGVs WILL HAVE DIFFICULTY NEGOTIATING THE NARROWNESS OF THIS PART OF MOTTINGHAM Rd., WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT

FURTHER REALIGNMENT OF THE ROADWAY. THIS ALSO IS NOT COVERED IN THE HIGHWAYS REPORT.

IN MY OPINION AND ALSO THAT OF LOCAL RESIDENTS, THESE ROAD SAFETY RISKS ARE WAY TOO HIGH AND WE BELIEVE ANY INSPECTOR AT APPEAL WILL COME TO THE SAME CONCLUSION AGAIN!

ANOTHER ISSUE THAT IS NOT COVERED IN THE REPORT IS THE LOSS OF A VERY IMPORTANT 6.6m. STREET LAMP THAT IS CURRENTLY POSITIONED CLOSE TO THE PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC REFUGE ON THE ROUNDABOUT. THIS ENSURES FULL ILLUMINATION OF THE REFUGE AND ALSO THE ROUNDABOUT ITSELF AND IS CRUCIAL IN TERMS OF PUBLIC SAFETY IN THE EVENINGS, NIGHTTIME, PARTICULARLY IN THE WINTER MONTHS, AT SCHOOL CLOSING TIME, WHEN ELTHAM COLLEGE STUDENTS ARE MAKING THEIR WAY THROUGH THE VILLAGE. THE ARTISTS IMPRESSION ON PAGE 23 DEPICTS THE STREET LAMP AS STILL IN POSITION; HOWEVER, AFTER THE PLANNED REALIGNMENT HAS TAKEN PLACE, BY MY CALCULATION THERE WILL NOT BE SUFFICIENT ROOM AT THIS POINT IN THE PAVEMENT FOR IT TO REMAIN. THIS IS A SERIOUS ROAD SAFETY ISSUE, NOT ONLY NOT COVERED, BUT MIS-REPRESENTED IN THE REPORT.

MAY I ALSO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION A SERIOUS CONCERN I HAVE REGARDING THE SITING OF THE MAINS UTILITY SERVICES UNDER THE EAST SIDE PAVEMENT OF MOTTINGHAM ROAD, OPPOSITE THE LIDL SITE. I HAVE BEEN INFORMED BY LOCAL RESIDENTS AND ALSO A FORMER MOTTINGHAM WARD COUNCILLOR THAT IT IS UNDERSTOOD THE MAINS UTILITIES ARE SITED UNDER THIS PAVEMENT AND AT A DEPTH WHICH IS LESS THAN IS NORMAL. THIS IS DUE TO WHAT IS THOUGHT TO BE AN UNDERGROUND STREAM WHICH RUNS FROM "THE TARN" BY MOTTINGHAM STATION (SOME 500-600M AWAY), TO THE RIVER QUAGGY (SOME 800M AWAY TOWARDS LEWISHAM). THE REALIGNMENT OF THE PAVEMENT, WHICH WOULD, IN EFFECT, ALLOW 44Tonne LORRIES TO DRIVE OVER THESE UTILITIES, COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT DAMAGE AND DISRUPTION TO THE LOCAL AREA. I DID BRING THIS TO THE ATTENTION OF THE PLANNERS IN MY OBJECTION (SEE PARA 6.3 PAGE 26) BUT CANNOT FIND REFERENCE TO THIS ISSUE BEING ADDRESSED IN THE BODY OF THE REPORT.

ON THESE ISSUES, I AND MANY LOCAL RESIDENTS SERIOUSLY CALL INTO QUESTION THE QUALITY OF ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THOSE OFFICERS WHO COMPILED THE HIGHWAYS REPORT. INDEED, WHEN CONSIDERING THE NUMBER OF MISTAKES AND ERRORS IN THE ORIGINAL REPORT, WHICH REQUIRED IT TO BE WITHDRAWN BY THE CHIEF PLANNER IN JANUARY, IT COULD APPEAR THAT THERE IS A QUESTION MARK OVER THE ACTUAL COMPETENCY OF THE PLANNING OFFICERS INVOLVED.

TURNING TO PARKING, I NOTE THERE APPEARS TO BE 33 SPACES PLANNED, HOWEVER, 10 OF THESE ARE TO BE DESIGNATED SOLELY FOR THE DISABLED, THOSE WITH CHILDREN AND FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLES. THIS LEAVES A MEER 23 FOR ORDINARY SHOPPERS. THIS, I CONSIDER, IS TOTALLY INADEQUATE FOR SUCH A STORE. LIDL SHOPPERS WILL NOT WALK TO THE STORE, NOR WILL THEY USE BICYCLES. THEY WILL DRIVE!

AS THE REPORT CLEARLY POINTS OUT, PARTICULARLY UNDER THE SECTION ON *PARKING* ON PAGE 25 AND ALSO IN PARAS 9.41, 9.42 AND 9.49 ON PAGES 47, 48 AND 49 RESPECTIVELY, THERE IS A SEVER PAUCITY OF AVAILABLE PARKING IN THE SURROUNDING AREA AND DEMAND IS CURRENTLY HIGH, PARTICULARLY AS MANY COMMUTERS FROM KENT DRIVE INTO MOTTINGHAM AND LEAVE THEIR CARS TO TRAVEL TO CENTRAL LONDON BY TRAIN FROM MOTTINGHAM STN. DEMAND WILL THEREFORE BECOME EVEN HIGHER SHOULD THIS APPLICATION BE SUCCESSFUL.

WITHIN THE REPORT I CAN FIND NO SOLUTION TO THIS PROBLEM, NOR ANY MITIGATION. INDEED, IT IS CLEAR THAT THE CURRENT PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN MOTTINGHAM ROAD WILL HAVE TO BE SIGNIFICANTLY STRENGTHENED TO STOP INDICRIMINATE PARKING AND THIS WILL REDUCE LOCAL PARKING EVEN FURTHER. THE EFFECT OF THIS ON LOCAL STREETS WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS FOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.

PARKING HAS CLEARLY NOT BEEN THOUGHT THROUGH BY OUR PLANNING OFFICERS. INDEED IT HAS BEEN KICKED INTO THE LONG GRASS BY THE OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION TO DEFER DEALING WITH THESE MATTERS UNTIL AFTER THE DECISION IS MADE, BY MEANS OF THE POSSIBLE IMPOSITION OF CONDITIONS AND THE REQUIREMENT FOR SAFETY AUDITS ETC. TO BE CARRIED OUT.

THIS IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. THESE MATTERS ARE MATERIAL AND NEED TO BE DEALT WITH AS PART OF THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS.

LOCAL RESIDENTS KNOW ONLY TOO WELL HOW MANY VEHICLES UTILISE MOTTINGHAM ROAD, THEY KNOW FROM LONG EXPERIENCE, THE SPEED, THE VOLUME AND DENSITY OF TRAFFIC AND THE LACK OF LOCAL PARKING – AND WE ARE ALL AT TOTAL ODDS WITH THE UNBELIEVABLE VIEWS OF THE HIGHWAYS OFFICERS!

I TURN NOW TO THE NEED FOR YET ANOTHER FOOD STORE IN MOTTINGHAM VILLAGE. FOR INFORMATION, THERE IS ALREADY A LIDL STORE CLOSE TO MOTTINGHAM (ONE JUST OVER A MILE TO THE EAST IN ELTHAM – SERVED BY 3 BUS ROUTES FROM MOTTINGHAM VILLAGE) AND ANOTHER WE, UNDERSTAND PLANNED FOR THE OLD WAITROSE SITE IN BURNT ASH LANE (JUST OVER A MILE AWAY TO THE SOUTH WEST – SERVED BY 2 BUS ROUTES FROM MOTTINGHAM VILLAGE). TO ADD TO THIS WE ALREADY HAVE 3 ESTABLISHED MINI-SUPERMARKETS IN THE VILLAGE, THE CLOSEST BEING ONLY SOME 30M. AWAY, ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROUNDABOUT, PROVIDING A 24HR.

SERVICE. THE OTHER TWO ARE SITUATED 150M. OR SO TO THE SOUTH OF THE PROPOSED SITE AND BOTH OPEN DAILY FROM EARLY MORNING UNTIL 2200. THEY PROVIDE LOCAL EMPLOYMENT AND A CHOICE FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS. IF THIS APPLICATION IS GRANTED PERMISSION, THEN AT LEAST TWO OF THESE HAVE INDICATED THAT THEY WILL NOT BE ABLE TO SURVIVE. THE REPORT MAKES COMMENT THAT ONE OF THE BENEFITS OF A LIDL STORE WILL BE TO EXPAND CHOICE FOR LOCAL PEOPLE. IN FACT THE EFFECT WILL BE TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE SUCH CHOICE. MARKET FORCES YOU MAY SAY, BUT DETRIMENTAL FOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITY!

MOTTINGHAM VILLAGE PARADE, LIKE MANY SHOPPING PARADES IN THE BOROUGH IS STRUGGLING TO SURVIVE AND SHOULD TWO OF THE MAIN SHOPS CLOSE, THE EFFECT OF THIS LOCAL OVER-DEVELOPMENT IS LIKELY TO BE CATASTROPHIC FOR THE VILLAGE.

FINALLY, TURNING TO THE MATTER OF THOSE LOCAL RESIDENTS, BORDERING THE SITE, THE PROPOSAL WILL, WITHOUT A SHADOW OF DOUBT, HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON THEIR QUALITY OF LIFE - PARTICULARLY IN TERMS OF PARKING, INCREASED TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS, NOISE POLLUTION, POORER AIR QUALITY AND LIGHT POLLUTION. THE REPORT APPEARS TO DISMISS EACH AND ALL OF THESE ISSUES AS "INSIGNIFICANT". I HAVE TO SAY THAT I, ALONG WITH HUNDREDS OF LOCAL OBJECTORS DO NOT AGREE. THEIR RIGHTS SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED IN SUCH A DISRESPECTFUL MANNER. THEY ARE BROMLEY COUNCIL TAX PAYERS AND DESERVE TO BE PROTECTED FROM AN APPARENT, CALLOUS BIG BUSINESS, WHICH CLEARLY WISHES TO RIDE ROUGH-SHOD OVER THEIR INHERENT RIGHTS.

FOR THE SAKE OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY, MADAM CHAIRMAN, I ASK THAT, WHEN COMING TO YOUR CONCLUSIONS, YOU GIVE MORE WEIGHT TO ALL THESE MATTERS THAN OFFICERS HAVE DONE.

TO FINISH, I HAVE THIS EVENING, POSED 6 QUESTIONS WHICH I DO NOT BELIEVE HAVE BEEN COVERED IN THE REPORT AND WHICH THE LOCAL COMMUNITY FEELS SHOULD BE ANSWERED **BEFORE** ANY DECISION IS TAKEN, AS THEY ARE CRITICAL AND MATERIAL:

1. THE REAR OF A LARGE DELIVERY LORRY STICKING OUT INTO THE ROUNDABOUT IN THE LIKELY EVENT THAT IT IS UNABLE TO IMMEDIATELY TURN INTO THE STORE.
2. LARGE DELIVERY LORRIES MANOEUVRING WITHIN THE PUBLIC CAR PARK AND ATTEMPTING TO EXIT THE SITE.
3. THE NARROWING OF THE ROAD WAY THROUGH WIDENING THE EXISTING PEDESTRIAN REFUGE
4. THE ISSUE OF THE DISAPPEARING STREET LAMP

5. THE ISSUE OF THE UTILITIES AND MAINS SERVICES UNDER THE PAVEMENT WHERE RE-ALIGNMENT WOULD TAKE PLACE.
6. THE EFFECT OF INCREASED DEMAND FOR PARKING AND THE POTENTIAL REDUCTION OF LOCAL PARKING SPACES.
- 7.

MADAM CHAIRMAN, I WOULD RESPECTFULLY ASK THAT YOU QUESTION THE HIGHWAYS AND PLANNING REPRESENTATIVES HERE THIS EVENING ON THESE ISSUES BEFORE YOU MAKE ANY FINAL DECISION