

Mr C Conway

Section 62a planning

Application: S62A/2023/0017

Land at Tilekiln Green, Start hill, Great Hallingbury CM22 7TA

Object as a Neighbour

I strongly object to the application UTT/22/0267/FUL, development of logistics depot at Tilekiln Green. I have lived at [REDACTED] which border the south of the site, for 17 years.

Over the 17 years we have seen a lot of increased traffic on the lane, which very often get congested up to the junction onto B1256. Junction 8 is a extremely busy M11 junction which is pushed to its limit.

Junction 8 facilitates the Welcome Break Service, M11, Stansted Airport, and local traffic from Great Dunmow to Bishops Stortford. To have a logistics site for HGVs on it is just asking for disaster. The waiting at traffic light lane and the highway yellow boxes are not sufficiently long enough for the size vehicles regularly used by the applicate but not stated in the documents.

When accidents happen on the M11, junction 8 regularly becomes congested. When this happens the HGVs will take alternative routes. This most often will be along the B1256 through Takeley and Canfield. Passing many heritage listed homes.

The application states they will only be leaving at off peak times. This is not what we observe from the operation they already use, based at Stansted airport.

At off peak times cars leaving Junction 8 onto B1256 do so at great speed. This will be very dangerous as the new planned layout doesn't give much room before the filter lane to turn right into Tilekiln Lane.

I have experienced first hand how dangerous the B1256 as I was involved in a RTA, outside the ESSO garage. Which has left me with life changing injuries.

In 2019 over a bank holiday the area for planning was obliterated with over 200 large trees being removed. This was a disaster for the wildlife bats, hares, deer, badgers, snakes, slow worms, lizards and birds. This was also devastating to a natural pond which is fed by a stream and spring water source.

Stripping of the land took place before ecological report was taken. No survey has been undertaken on pond, and pond is not even acknowledged by application.

The application fails to show felling License, where is it, why is it not available to public view?

Re stocking plan as I understand has not been carried out as stated by the applicant. As I understand it is standard practice to plant small whips, and to plant with tree guards and stakes to protect from rabbits and deer. Preparation of the ground is key to ensure the young plants grow without invasion of other species.

Re stocking states 2917 trees and shrubs to be planted.

As our property has full view across the site I could observe that correct practices were carried out. On a very hot April day in 2020 a group of youths with a football were observed planting. This was done with no real preparation of the ground.

As we can count and observe there are only a fraction of the 2917 trees and shrubs planted. 487 plastic tree guards can be seen. Of these only 87 have started to grow in spring 2022.

Stansted distribution industrial area has a entrance on the B1256, approximately a mile away from Tilekiln green lane. A small section at the rear of the site is near Tilekiln lane. There is no exit or entrance here. In 2005 the old Elliott's site entrance was removed and stopped up with trees/shrubs planted. UTT/1641/02/FUL. To keep the lane in keeping with a rural setting.

The industrial estate has limit operation hours set as it sits behind an residential area.  
Monday - Friday 7:30 - 18:00  
Saturday 8:00 - 13:00  
No working hours Sundays and Bank Holidays.

The application site sits well within the CPZ S8, this was a policy set up many years ago to protect the local residents and area. It was set up and agreed that it was not flexible to change. The policy is to protect the rural character of the countryside, including settlements around the airport. Harps farm which is a short distance from the site and shares a boundary is sited in the CPZ policy.

The logistic site has no bearing or worth to the area and although they are positioned at Stansted Airport. They do not fly out and export by Stansted. The purpose of their location is to access the road network to the south of England.

The only benefit they offer to the local area is employment which is a good thing, but bringing it to a already affluent area isn't giving much. The site is relocating here from the Airport so already have staff. The drivers who will bring HGVs are already based in Barton-on Humber.

Local independent are struggling in this area to recruit, its hard to compete with large national companies offering 0 hour contracts. Local site already have top bus employees in to cover employment shortages. Investment should be in local business not bringing it in from other parts of the country.

The land is within the PSZ and would therefore be contrary to the policy if it allows multiple employees.

UDC in 2019 declared a climate change emergency and are now acting to prevent a climate and ecological catastrophe. <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/5768/The-council-and-climate-> The changes on this site would mean a loss of amenities for local residence ( i.e. the benefit to people of enjoying a piece of land, either by walking on it or passing it), and changes to traffic.

Allowing this development will be going against UDCs climate policy, CPZ S8 policy and PSZ policy!

Residents home have not been sufficiently identified in this application, The Old Stables and Willow house sit opposite the planned entrance. The plan fails to show how residents will enter their properties. Nonane, Brookside and Rivendell have been greatly under represented.

The Old Elm is Grade 2 listed building and the planned site will have a huge detrimental effect on the building and residents.

The lighting plan shows extensive light pollution will fall into surrounding properties. Bedrooms at the rear of Brookside and Rivendell will be flooded with light. As well as back gardens.

Noise will have a huge detrimental impact on the residents 24 hour 7days a week is not suitable for residential area.

In the past any dealing we have had we people on site representing the the land owner/applicate, have not been pleasant. They are not the type of people we want as neighbours. They have been rude bullish and threatening.

I conclude that this application should not be authorised and the needs and well being should be taken into account.

Cormac Conway