

From: R Sudlow [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 August 2023 09:03
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: planning@uttlesford.gov.uk
Subject: S62A/2023/0021

Dear Sir/Madam,

I received a letter from Uttlesford District Council informing me that planning application number Application Number: UTT/21/3596/OP is now under consideration by the planning inspectorate. I objected at the time and have pasted that letter at the bottom of this email for your info..

I was extremely disappointed that the application was approved, given the very real devastation it will cause to our area. One doesn't have to be a NIMBY to see that the huge additional number of SUVs/cars on our village road will cause havoc. Drivers already hurtle along narrow country roads. They do not slow down for pedestrians or cyclists. They are a dangerous menace. UDC seems to have no plans for speed bumps. Everyone says they're expensive, but if there is one thing above all that the Planning Inspectorate should consider it is the devastating effect of hundreds of additional cars on villages such as Felsted, where I live, and through which these cars race.

Things to bear in mind:

The bus service is poor and almost EVERYBODY drives, at least half of them up through Felsted to get to Chelmsford and beyond. The other half will drive towards the main road, causing more congestion.

The 30 mph village speed limit is ignored constantly. In the early mornings while I am at the bus stop the road through Felsted resembles the A120 and I can do nothing.

The roads are littered with the corpses of dead animals, mown down by speeding SUVs. If more children were allowed out to play it would be them too. The issue of speed is a national one, with a reduction in traffic police resulting in drivers driving in the most dangerous and appallingly selfish ways.

Therefore to cope with a further 320+ new cars on the road, which is already blocked by the construction of 2 new housing developments, **we urgently need speed bumps all along the two roads in central Felsted.** This is the only thing that will make cars slow down and has proved effective in so many other towns and villages. It must surely be in your gift to make the provision of speed bumps through Felsted village a condition of going ahead with the application? I urge you to do so in the strongest terms.

The other thing I want to emphasise is the environmental impact of building on yet more green land. The addition of a 'countryside park' is the most appalling greenwash, as the countryside is what they're concreting over. We know this. You know this. The government knows this. The impact of the development in terms of human activity, water use in a dry area, noise, light pollution, pets, cars, BBQs etc etc cannot be underestimated. Despite conditions being placed on builders they invariably rip out all the hedging before they start. This should not be allowed.

Please enforce ideas such as green roofs, solar panels, grey water recycling, reduced lighting, a ban on solar lighting (which stays on all night, disturbing wildlife). The area surrounding the development should not be 'landscaped', it should be rewilded.

I am too depressed to write more.

Yours faithfully,

Rosalind Sudlow (Turvey)

[REDACTED]

Comments for Planning Application UTT/21/3596/OP

Application Summary

Application Number: UTT/21/3596/OP

Address: Moors Fields Station Road Little Dunmow Essex

Proposal: Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for means of access from

Station Road) for residential development of up to 180 dwellings, a countryside park, up to 100sqm of office hub floorspace, sustainable urban drainage system and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: [REDACTED]

Customer Details

Name: Ms R Turvey

Address: [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the proposed development for the reasons outlined below. I will keep this

letter short as my views align with most of the others who have objected:

1. It would have a severely detrimental impact on the village of Felsted, which already has the traffic flow of a small town even before new, already-approved additional housing has been built.

Access to the proposed site, on a narrow, winding road, would be highly dangerous. Up to 180

new houses could add roughly 350 more cars to our already clogged village roads.

2. The proposed site is agricultural, i.e. greenfield. Furthermore its development would effectly

coalesce Flitch Green/Cromwell place with Pound Hill, which itself is subject to inappropriate development applications. Felsted and Little Dunmow are historic villages and should remain so.

3. The site could currently already be considered 'a country park' as it is in fact the countryside. To destroy what is there, churn up all the land and then plant a few trees and call it a park is

ridiculous greenwash and should be recognised as such. Such a park would do little to promote

the survival of our beleaguered wildlife, with large numbers of new dogs and cats in the area chasing or eating what is already there, walkers and excessive tidiness ruining the prospects for nsects and amphibians, and more speeding cars running over larger mammals on the busy roads.

4. The lack of school places, of doctor availability, public transport, parking, sewage provision,

water and so on, plus the ecological damage and loss of amenity to existing residents are all clear red flags proving without doubt that this site is wholly inappropriate for development.

I urge planners to reject this application.