Appendix 11

lain McCarthy
3Meadowbank View
Wellbank, Dundee
DD5 3PU
Tel:
Email

Dear Sir/Madam

Please see below my letter of objection with supporting details to the proposed applications at Meadowbank View and Meadowbank Gardens, Wellbank for road Construction Consent. Ref 145271-1002-A_RCC Application Sht 2 Meadowbank View & 145271-1001-B_RCC Application Meadowbank Garden, received from Andrew Barnes, Team Leader – Traffic, Angus Council on the 15/11/21.

Mr Barnes also advised that "as far as we are lead to believe the formation of the verge crossings is for access to the field for agricultural purposes." The below objections are based on this information and highlighting why they are unsafe, dangerous and unsuitable for a residential neighbourhood.

- The existing field has not been accessible through the village of Wellbank since the mid 1990's when the Meadowbank View and Gardens houses were constructed. Since that time access has been gained via the 3 routes shown in Fig 1 (on page 2) via existing farm tracks and crossing other fields. I'm not aware of any reason additional access routes would be required.
- To get to the 2 proposed new entrances, would require large agricultural machinery to be driven from the main B978 Kellas road, through Gagie Bank and into Meadowbank Gardens/View (shown in fig 3). This are is a solely residential area and the roads are small, have numerous tight turns and parked cars on them at all time. This makes it unsafe and unsuitable for large machinery to be using them especially when suitable alternatives are already available (shown in fig 1.)
- The village roads mentioned above roads are all used by the many local parents & children walking and cycling to the Mattocks primary school. It would be unsafe, dangerous, and unsuitable to have large, agricultural machinery sharing the same roads when suitable alternatives are already available (shown in fig 1.)
- Both Meadowbank View and Gardens are small residential cul-de-sacs and have sections of road where they narrow to single lane (shown in the blue boxes fig 2) which are unsuitable for large agricultural machinery when suitable alternatives are already available (shown in fig 1.)
- The applicant has requested 2 new accesses within 200m or each other on the same side of the field shown in the red boxes in fig 2 (at the end of this document) which seems excessive when suitable alternatives are already available as shown in fig 1.

If you require any additional detail on any of the above points please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Iain McCarthy

The below figures have been taken from google maps staelite view of the area. <u>https://www.google.com/maps/@56.5180323,-2.8589646,709m/data=!3m1!1e3</u>

Figure 1



Figure 2

Figure 3

