

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 08 March 2023 16:17

To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Consultation on Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2023/0015 - Grange Paddock, Ickleton Road, Elmdon, Essex, CB11 4GR

From: KA Malone, [REDACTED]

Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2023/0015 - Grange Paddock, Ickleton Road, Elmdon, Essex, CB11 4GR

I wish to register my objection in general to development on Ickleton Road Elmdon, and in particular to the proposed Grange Paddock development, for the following reasons.

1. The site is not suitable for development. It is a greenfield site, is outside the village development boundary and is Grade 2 arable land. It would result in the loss of open countryside, which, as even the applicant admits, contravenes Local Plan Policy S7.
2. Elmdon is considered to be unsustainable in development terms. This was confirmed by Uttlesford District Council following the 'call for sites' which concluded in 2018 that it was **not** suitable for development.
3. Elmdon has virtually no facilities or amenities – no school, shop, pub (despite the application listing a pub in the village), surgery, or public transport. There is a small village hall and a church. As such I fail to see how it meets the National Planning Policy Framework definition of sustainability.
4. Local Plan Policy GEN7 'does not permit development that would have a harmful effect on wildlife'. It is impossible to see how this proposed development will not have such an effect.

In relation to the Grange Paddock proposal, there are some statements made in the application which are questionable in terms of accuracy.

- The applicant states there are a number of bus services – there are not. The only regular bus is the daily school service (term time only). The other services are not within safe or reasonable walking distances from the proposed development and none are within Elmdon itself. The only means of transport to anywhere not within walking distance is by car. This development would only serve to increase the number of cars using local roads.
- The applicant states that there is a pub – there is not. The pub closed a number of years ago.
- The applicant refers to community engagement – namely a single event convened in June 2022 with minimal notice. The applicant's Statement of Community Involvement says that '*most attendees recognised that there was a clear demand for new housing, both market and affordable housing*'. There is no indication as to how this information was collected or recorded. I was present and the overwhelming

response I witnessed was as being against the development. I was not asked for my view on the need for housing, nor was I aware of anyone else being asked. Whilst there may be a demand for housing in the wider district, as far as I am aware, there is negligible demand for housing in Elmdon.

- The applicant refers to the inclusion of affordable housing as part of the proposal. This appears to conflict with the information in the application form (*no.18 Residential Units*), where only the Market Housing section is completed, with the other sections of numbers of Social Rented, Intermediate and Keyworker housing units left blank.
- In the Design and Access, Heritage, Landscape and Planning Statement (4.109) the applicant disingenuously states that Uttlesford has a 3.11 year housing supply, but acknowledges immediately after that there is an updated figure, which is not given - it is now a 4.89 year supply. Why not quote the most recent information?

Following the 'community engagement' event on 17 June 2022, the Elmdon Community Group conducted a paper survey of village households (22-29 June 2022). Of the 69 responses, 62 – or almost 90%, were against the development. At the Parish Council meeting on 2 March 2023 there were 76 members of the public present. An informal show of hands saw an overwhelming majority of those present as being against the proposed development. This development is not needed, nor wanted in Elmdon.

Despite the applicant's statements in the Design and Access, Heritage, Landscape and Planning Statement to the contrary, I remain very concerned about the possibility of future flooding caused by surface water runoff overwhelming the ditch along Ickleton Road. As someone whose home has been affected previously by such runoff, I am not reassured that the addition of a development of 18 houses will mean any flood risk will be mitigated '*by way of the retention pond towards the south-east corner of the site, close to its lowest level*'. (4.90). It is likely that the flood risk will be greater.

I understand there are badgers and great crested newts on the site so the development would harm wildlife.

The applicant's Design and Access, Heritage, Landscape and Planning Statement states that '*the development could be accommodated with only a modest impact upon the general character of the area in terms of its openness and landscape*'. (4.5). This statement defies credibility. This is a significant development of large houses on an elevated site in a small village. It will be visible throughout the village, dominate the landscape, cause light pollution, result in loss of wildlife habitats, damage the ecology of both the site and the wider area and adversely and permanently alter the character and footprint of the village. The multiple harms that will definitely result should the development be allowed will far outweigh any conceivable benefit.

I would ask that, as part of the decision making process, a site visit is carried out. Without knowledge of the area it is difficult to appreciate the sheer scale of the proposed development in relation to its surroundings and the adverse impact it will have.