

From: Jane Sharp [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 May 2023 08:52
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2023/0017 - Land at Tilekiln Green, Start Hill, Great Hallingbury, CM22 7TA

Mrs Jane Sharp
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

As a concerned resident who although not living in close proximity to this site uses M11 junction 8 of the M11 on a regular basis, I listened to the full debate of this planning application, including the many excellent speakers and fully endorse the conclusion council members reached to refuse for all the reasons outlined in the planning committee report.

Like many residents I am keen to encourage employment within the district but not at any cost. Although it was established that approximately 84% of employees live within 30 miles of the proposed site, that doesn't mean in Uttlesford. Equally, there are many locations in close proximity such as Harlow with large industrial sites on the edge of the town which would make a far more appropriate location without impacting on the lives of village residents and all users of an already congested motorway junction. Furthermore, there is now an additional motorway exit for Harlow which makes access to their industrial estates far easier.

It is possible to support the creation of jobs without making the lives of residents miserable by noise and light pollution, without destroying the CPZ (countryside protection zone) and without destroying woodland and wildlife habitat.

Members were absolutely right to refuse and it was a unanimous decision. If allowed it would demonstrate all that is radically wrong with the planning system: 1. Deals that were made between Highways and the applicants to move a junction so that the Highways objection could be withdrawn, despite local residents knowing this would not help alleviate traffic problems.

2. The forestry commission allowing the destruction of woodland so that there could be no objection on the grounds of nature conservation.

3. The ecology report being undertaken after the trees were felled and the wildlife destroyed or disappeared.

4. Ignoring genuine concerns about noise and light pollution.

5. Ignoring the CPZ.

Quite frankly having listened to the debate, any faith I had in the planning process was destroyed and only partially restored by the decision made by the planning committee. I sincerely hope that their grounds for refusal will be sufficient to be upheld at appeal.