

From: donotreply@uttlesford.gov.uk <donotreply@uttlesford.gov.uk>

Sent: 28 April 2023 17:34

To: Planning <planning@uttlesford.gov.uk>

Subject: Comments for Planning Application UTT/23/0950/PINS

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 28/04/2023 5:33 PM from Mr John Devoti.

Application Summary

Address: Land Tilekiln Green Great Hallingbury

Proposal: Consultation on S62A/2023/0017 - Development of the site to create an open logistics facility with associated new access and ancillary office and amenity facilities

Case Officer: Madeleine Jones

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Devoti

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: S62A/2023/0017 Land at Tilekiln Green Gt Hallingbury

The applicants have already taken up valuable officer's time in 2016 (UTT/16/0956/PA) and were told that this site was covered by local and national planning policies and that the application site is part of the countryside protection zone.

This is now their third application and it would appear that the applicants would wish to circumvent the planning law by their persistency.

The applicants have already damaged some of the flora, fauna and wildlife habitat on this site in preparation to obtain planning consent, and the site is now being scoured in its appearance to further aid the applicants.

The very reason why this policy is there is to protect the village of Great Hallingbury, this policy has become even more important due to the opening of the Sheering interchange because of rat-running that now takes place through the village.

If consent was allowed for a regional distribution centre at this site it would generate even more traffic that could not be stopped from using the roads through the village as vehicles would try to avoid the congestion on the M11, and Birchhanger interchange!

Parts of the village have no pavements or lighting, or dedicated crossings it also has established equestrian facilities which also use the village's roads. There is also a 30mph limit and weight restriction which are rarely enforced.

A regional logistics depot used by a possible 500 vehicles a day is totally unacceptable, it would also be sited adjacent to the busiest junctions on the M11, which has a 24-hour service area, taking in the fact that Stansted Airport has already been granted planning permission for 43 million passengers. This intersection is already greatly oversubscribed.

We all know the Government made a mistake in allowing a 24/7 motorway service area to be placed at this intersection, It is the only service area on the entire length of the M11. HGVs because of the tachograph rest regulations queue in and out of this facility blocking this intersection.

Opposite the application site is an ESSO service station where people at busy times queue to use this facility so as to avoid being trapped in the motorway service area. This must be a very serious concern for pedestrians and traffic entering the site and the entrance to the village.

Local and national planning policies are there to stop these types of conflicts.

Surely we must protect our villages this is the very reason they are there to give people a safe place to live, not to add to the regional traffic network.

Residents rely on local planning policy for the protection of their homes, why would you pay a local council for a property search to see if in any detrimental development was to take place adjacent to the home you are purchasing, only to find a 24/7 industrial site was being proposed the following week?

Local planning policies make provision for industrial areas, which take into consideration 24/7 use, they also take into effect of light, noise, and air pollution. This application is trying to circumvent local council policy by placing this industrial facility on a green field site which is not intended for that use.

One of the fundamental judgements in any planning decision is to ask, does this new development harm its existing neighbour, does it comply with local planning policy, will it be detrimental to the village of Great Hallingbury.

I have been a past Mayor of Bishop's Stortford, and East Herts District Councillor and Chairman of Planning and I have become increasingly alarmed with the incessant growth of Bishop's Stortford coupled with the expansion of Stansted Airport the proposed development will greatly increase the coalescence of other areas into a continuous urban sprawl.

This application fails on every planning principle and it must be rejected otherwise it would be an absurdity to a democratic planning process.

Kind regards