

**From:** s&k Woolverton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 March 2023 09:07  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Re: S62A/2023/0015 Grange Paddock Ickleton Road Elmdon Essex CB11 4LT

S62A/2023/0015 Grange Paddock Ickleton Road Elmdon Essex CB11 4LT

Dear Planning Inspectorate

Our most important points are described in hierarchical order in these paragraphs.

This is not a sustainable development.

'The Applicant's case' (4.0 of Design and Access, Heritage, Landscape and Planning Statement) is that the proposal would represent sustainable development and that adverse effects would not outweigh the benefits and they quote National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 11. NPPF para 11 does not describe the type of development which the applicant proposes in the Design and Access, Heritage, Landscape and Planning Statement. This is our most important point, the proposal does not comprise the 'sustainable' form of development promoted by the NPPF and against which it should be judged.

Elmdon is not a sustainable settlement; the site was rejected by Uttlesford DC in the 2015 Call for Sites for this reason. The unsustainable nature of Elmdon itself as a settlement is evidenced by the absence of services and facilities in the village. The addition of eighteen dwellings will not make the village sustainable as no enterprise is going to set up for so few additional residents. The totally inadequate public transport links, one bus into the village (term time school bus) will just create more car journeys for work, services and facilities. With climate change we should be reducing car journeys, not increasing them by building where there is a lack of work and where car journeys are necessary for pretty much everything. Elmdon has a school bus, small village hall and CofE church, it is not directly comparable to Manuden or Henham with their wider range of facilities and public transport.

It cannot be a sustainable development in an unsustainable village. It is also not made clear what the 'economic gain' is, residents of the development may or may not support the small village community but the development certainly cannot 'contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment'.

In addition the proposed development is on Agricultural land graded 'very good'. In the context of sustainability the importance of retaining good quality agricultural land cannot be overstated. In the current economic crisis and food shortages, can we afford to lose very good agricultural land when there is no good reason to build on it in this village?

The positive spin the applicants have put on their 'community involvement' last summer is at odds with the results of the Elmdon Community Group whole-village survey conducted after the 'community involvement'. 90% of responders were against building on greenfield sites, (of the returned surveys 68 were against, 4 in favour, 3 undecided). It is also totally at odds with the 'guidelines for housing' page 24 in the Village Design Statement. Seventy six villagers attended the Parish Council meeting on the 2nd of this month and we didn't hear anyone voice a need for more four and five bedroom homes in this village.

Whilst the site adjoins the village envelope as defined by the previous Local Plan 2005, the elevated and rising nature of the site makes it difficult to become part of the village, physically and topographically it is not well related to the village. The impact would not be 'modest' it would fill the hillside which starts well above street level, 18 houses, 40 something garages and a road on an open hillside would protrude into the panoramic vistas of this locality. This area is popular with walkers and enjoyed by many from around the district for its countryside and abundance of footpaths, spoiling the view from footpaths would reduce the enjoyment for more than just villagers.

Elmdon is close to an area of second darkest skies. Elmdon enjoys lack of street lighting, the development, higher than most village properties, would certainly create light pollution (street, security, spillage from properties).

*These other concerns (but still important) we list as bullet points:*

- The village does not need another area of open space and it would not create unity with the village.
- Utilities are inadequate, Elm Court already experiences sewage problems; the developers should have contacted Anglia not Thames Water.
- The Flood Risk Assessment and SUDS Report states that sewer flooding from the site would not affect the site but 'likely remain in either Elm Court or Ickleton Road and slowly recede into nearby street drains'!
- During periods of heavy rain (we can expect more due to climate change) it already floods off the hill, runs down Ickleton Road to seep into garages and Manor Row houses.
- The ditch (responsibility of the applicants) is inadequate and badly maintained.
- There would be an adverse impact on the ecology and biodiversity of the site; hares, badgers, bats, owls and other birds are seen.
- The agricultural land 'best and most versatile' cannot be replaced and much is already being lost here in East Anglia, breadbasket of England.
- Chunks of natural hedge would be ripped out by developers and possibly site residents who favour fencing or less natural hedging. Trees lost.
- Car use is essential here, suggesting cycling a 7 mile round trip on narrow, hilly, unlit country roads to meet a bus for work or to use the one small village shop in Ickleton for daily needs is unrealistic.
- The nearest primary school is full.
- The nearest GPs and dentists are struggling due to development in the area.
- We should consider climate change and limit use of fossil fuels, we should build homes where there is good public transport and work, here we have neither. We can see only harm in building 18 houses in a village which has no need for that number.

Finally, as the planning inspector is unlikely to know the area and this village in particular, we would be really grateful if a site visit could be made.

Kind regards

Stephen and Kathleen Woolverton

