

From: Johnnie Hume [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 March 2023 17:17
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: S62A/2023/0015

To whom it may concern.

I am writing in response to the proposed development at Grange Paddock, Ickleton Road, Elmdon, Essex. I would like to register a number of concerns surrounding this proposal as I do not believe this is a suitable village for such a development. I have listed these below.

- The proposed development is on a greenfield site 100% outside the village development limits.
- There has been no consideration for increased traffic flow due to the new development on current already stretched infrastructure in the village and surrounding roadways and the traffic numbers quoted in the proposal are not an accurate representation of the truth.
- The facilities quoted in the proposal are not just inaccurate but totally untrue - there are no bus services to the village beyond the school bus with the closest true bus service being a 30 min and 60 min walk respectively. There is no pub, it closed 10 years ago and shows no signs of reopening and the closest shop is over 3 miles away.
- This is classed as an unsustainable village and as such is in no way suited to a development of this kind.
- The land proposed for development is not only a greenfield site but is also grade 2 agricultural land only turned over to pasture in the last few years (with this proposal in mind) it is also host to extensive wildlife including badgers, Barn Owls and Great crested newts have been seen in the area.
- The village is host to all native and protected bat species in the UK, the proposed developments lighting will dramatically impact their hunting grounds as well as destroy the village's current night sky.
- The Proposal does not suitably take into consideration impact on the sewage network or flood risk to Ickleton road and previous flooding reports have been ignored or omitted.

In summary this proposal has not been thought through and consultation with the village was nothing more than a tick box exercise with no more than 48 hours warning. All promised follow ups from that meeting did not take place. I would strongly ask for an on site visit where I feel certain that the inspector would not only agree with the points raised but would find a number of additional factors that I have not mentioned.

With respect,

Johnnie Hume

[REDACTED]

--

