

Application Summary Application Number: S62A/2023/0017
Address: Land at Tile Kiln Green Start Hill Great Hallingbury CM22 7TA.
Creation of an open logistics facility with associated new access and ancillary office with amenity facilities
Case Officer: Major Casework Team
Customer Details Name: Mr Roger Keys. PGCE, Head Lecturer (Engineering)
LRA CCCG. (Resident)

Address: [REDACTED]

Date : 16^h May 2023

Application Number S62A/2023/0017

Reply to the Applicant (FKY) (Wrens)

The ground swell of resistance to this application is quite astonishing. People from not just this village, but the surrounding ones have formed a collective voice to say NO.

The applicant has shown a total disregard to the views and feelings of the neighbouring village folk. Not once have they tried to engage and explain their intentions. It feels like a steam rolling exercise to force the villages into submission. Their approach has been purely antagonistic towards their opposers.

The applicant has stated that the sound emitted from the site will be always the same or near enough the same. The applicant has never asked me to place microphones around my residency, so how will he know what the sound is like. From a DESKTOP. How can a desk top model be a true reflection. The applicant states that they intend to decant their HGV lorries onto smaller lorries at 4am and the noise will be the same. I can assure them there is no noise at 4am apart from animals. Therefore, I would not welcome a 4am or previous time wake up call. This would cause a massive intrusion upon my health and mental wellbeing via sleep deprivation.

The applicant will require a lot of light on the site. At present we do not have any lighting not even street lighting. Therefore, with their plans it will create a daylight feel at night. This will again be a massive intrusion and cause more mental health and wellbeing issues due to sleep deprivation.

The applicant intends to mitigate the noise via acoustic fencing, acoustic fencing will not reduce the noise of HGV's trundling past resident's houses at all hours of the night.

The applicant states the business will be of benefit to the area. The impact will be a negative one and not a beneficial one to the area. There can be no benefit to the area as it is already in existence.

In the applicants Planning Statement under 3.1 they wish to claim Sui Generis use i.e., "in a class of its own" and not B8. This should not be allowed as an Industrial Logistics Site is being applied for.

Under 3.2 Proposed development. It states "The proposals remain identical to those proposed in the most recent planning application 22/0267/FUL Therefore is this an appeal and not a new application.

Under 6.2 it states. The site is subject to existing high levels of transportation noise, and the PREDICTED noise levels would be below the background level at all times of day and night. This is not the case as already stated previously in paragraph three.

Slowly but surely our countryside heritage is being eroded from us. That is why the Countryside Protection Zone (CPZ) was put in place and why it is so very important to keep it in its original and intended form. To have great swaths of it removed would be catastrophic for the surrounding areas.

Indeed, in the CPZ policy under 2.1 Sir Graham Eyre QC who chaired the Airport Enquiries stated that the rural landscape around the airport was a precious landscape and further expansion would be and I quote from 2.3 "unprecedented and grotesque invasion of a large area of pleasant countryside." Based on Eyre's vision UDC (Uttlesford District Council) developed the CPZ planning policy to limit the physical size of the airport and to maintain an area of open countryside.

Under 2.4 it states "The priority within this zone is to maintain a local belt of countryside around the airport that will not be eroded by coalescing developments"

Under 2.5 the plan goes as far to say that Stanstead is an airport in the countryside.

Under 2.12 it states the main objectives and requirements of the CPZ remains valid as stated in Policy S8.

Under 2.22 The CPZ stated purpose is to maintain a local belt of countryside around the airport that will not be eroded by coalescing development. It is similar to two of the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) paragraph 80, “to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another, and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.”

2.23 states the purpose of the CPZ which promotes the open characteristics of the zone, and paragraph 79 of the NPPF which states “the fundamental aim of the Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. In this way CPZ could be described as a Mini Green Belt.

The applicant has stated that the Local Plan 2005 is out of date which maybe the case but, in 2020 Joanna Hill who was part of the Planning Policy Team Uttlesford District Council 2020 stated that the CPZ is not, therefore in the absence of a new plan the adopted Local Plan 2005 remains valid and the **CPZ should still be given weight.**

The applicant has stated that their client has nowhere else to relocate and could place the business in danger of collapse.

Are they seriously trying to say that if this application is refused then their client’s business is in jeopardy?

I find it hard to believe that a company the size of Wren’s has not got a plan B or some sort of contingency. If they have not, then someone in the organization is not doing their job. Or could it be that it is BECAUSE of the size of their company that they are arrogant enough to believe this planning application will just proceed.

If the site is so good, then why has it been refused not once but twice and been withdrawn by their client on a previous occasion. And why are there so many residents opposing the application.

This smack of bully boy tactics is to achieve what is best for the client and not what is best or beneficial to the area.

The neighbourhood already feels badly let down by the overzealous removal of trees and wildlife by the applicant’s client over and above what was permitted on the Operations Map for Tree removal.

The applicant has mentioned Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/W21/3268990.

The appeal was allowed but it needs to be noted that the application was for residential housing and not an Industrial Open Logistics facility site.

There is a massive difference between residential housing and a 24/7/365-day Industrial Open Logistics Facility Site with approximately 500 lorry movements on a daily business which would blight the countryside.

In conclusion this application is in disregard of the CPZ by way of the reasons given and should therefore be rejected.

If for some inexplicable reason you should allow this application to be granted, I would like to refer you to UTT/20/1098/FUL. As stated by the applicant

UTT/20/1098/FUL schedule of conditions number 30. " Demolition or construction works shall only take place on weekdays between 08:00 - 18:00hours and Saturday's 0800-13.30 hours and shall not take place at any time on Sunday's or on Bank or Public Holidays.

These times must also apply to the working hours of the applicant due to the close proximity of residential properties to the Industrial Open Logistics site.

As a side issue, notice should be taken of the following, Uttlesford District Council has been awarded £160,000 under the Government's trailblazing new design programme to ensure communities across the country lead the way in shaping the design of their neighbourhoods.

Local MP Kemi Badenoch has welcomed the funding, awarded through the Design Code Pathfinder Programme, which will empower communities to have their say on the development of new homes, buildings, and amenities, such as shops and workspace, in their area.

As part of the government's plans to level up for communities across the country, 25 areas in England from Bournemouth to Carlisle, have been awarded a share of £3 million to help them set their own standards for design locally.

The codes are a collection of design-principles to help local areas deliver more beautiful and sustainable places and communities – such as specifying local building materials or deciding the layout of streets.

Commenting, MP Mrs Badenoch said:

“It is important that local people have the power over how their communities look, especially in towns and villages like ours which each have a unique character and identity.

“We must make sure all new developments enhance their surroundings.

“This funding, part of the Government’s Pathfinder Programme, will ensure communities visions of greener, more beautiful homes and places are standards for developers to adhere to.”