

From: [REDACTED]
To: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Subject: Formal Objection to TRU Construction Access via Archer Street and Brookfield"s
Date: 18 December 2025 16:06:56

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed construction access arrangements associated with the TransPennine Route Upgrade (TRU), specifically the use of Archer Street, Mill Lane, Vernon Street, and Spring Street as primary access routes, and the proposed works affecting Brookfields.

As a resident of [REDACTED], I am directly and personally affected by this proposal. My concerns span both technical planning grounds and deeply personal wellbeing risks, which I urge you to consider with the seriousness they deserve.

Sensitive Information Statement

This submission contains personal health information and should be treated as confidential. Please handle with care and do not disclose beyond the consultation process.

1. Mental Health and Wellbeing Impact

1.1 [REDACTED]

1.2 My home on [REDACTED] was assessed for subsidence in 2023 due to multiple structural cracks, all documented with the housing association. [REDACTED]

1.3 My home is also currently affected by rising damp, which further compromises its structural integrity. The combination of subsidence, cracks, and damp makes the property especially vulnerable. Heavy construction traffic and vibration would exacerbate these issues, increase the likelihood of further damage and endanger my safety.

1.4 Brookfields is far more than a woodland, it is a daily sanctuary [REDACTED]

2. Planning and Environmental Grounds

2.1 Road Safety and School Risk: Mill Lane serves Milton St John's Primary & Nursery School. No road safety audit or traffic management plan has been published, despite the clear risk to children and pedestrians during peak hours.

2.2 Unsuitable Access Routes: Archer Street and surrounding roads are narrow, steep, and tightly terraced. Previous planning applications have been rejected on these grounds. The proposed access route is fundamentally unsafe and impractical for large construction vehicles.

2.3 Loss of Residential Amenity and Parking: Over 30 resident parking spaces may be removed or restricted, with no mitigation strategy provided. This will cause long-term disruption and hardship.

2.4 Ecological and Legal Violations: Brookfields supports protected wildlife including badgers, bats, and deer. No ecological impact assessments, surveys, or mitigation strategies have been submitted. Proceeding without these would breach national and European wildlife protection laws.

2.5 Tree Preservation Order (TPO) Breach: Brookfields is subject to a TPO. No root protection mapping, compliance assessments, or adherence to British Standard 5837 have been demonstrated.

2.6 Landowner Consent: Brookfields is privately owned by Clements Court Properties Limited. No evidence of landowner engagement or consent has been provided.

2.7 Failure to Assess Alternatives: Planning guidance requires the least harmful option to be selected. No robust analysis of alternative access routes has been published.

2.8 Health and Equality Duty: Under the Equality Act 2010, planning authorities must consider the disproportionate impact on vulnerable residents. No Health Impact Assessment has been undertaken, despite clear risks to mental health and wellbeing.

3. Requests

In light of the above, I respectfully request that:

- The proposed access route be reconsidered.
- Full ecological, structural, and traffic assessments be published.
- TPO compliance and landowner engagement be transparently demonstrated.
- A Health Impact Assessment be undertaken to account for vulnerable residents.
- Alternative, safer access routes be explored and presented for public consultation.

Conclusion

This proposal threatens not only the integrity of our environment and community, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Given the clear risks to both public safety and vulnerable residents, I urge the planning authority to reject the current proposal outright and require a safer, legally compliant alternative.

Sincerely,
Vicky Pearson
[REDACTED]

