



15 March 2023

Enquiries and Major Casework Team  
The Planning Inspectorate  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

To whom it may concern,

**Application Number S62A/2023/0015**  
**Grange Paddock, Elmdon, Essex**

We have lived at The Carrier in Elmdon for 43 years, in the centre of the Village. It is a largely untouched, rural and quiet village, save for the twice daily commuter rush and the large and ungainly farm vehicles squeezing through the narrow roads. As such, it being largely untouched, it is a jewel in the crown of North Essex; and to add a newbuild estate would destroy its uniqueness in Essex.

The Grange Paddock application is most unwelcome, as the need for the 18 houses has not in any way been justified. My comments specific to the application follow:

**Introduction and Description of Proposed Development**

1.6 This paragraph is irrelevant. As the existing pavement is on the south side of the road it is not affected by retention of the mature hedge; nor does the development create an attractive layout conducive to walking within a safe environment to the existing services within the village because that already exists.

1.7 The management company would be responsible for the maintenance of the so called 'public' space. That would be an ongoing levy paid for by the residents of the development. No doubt the residents would be ecstatic at paying for a public space.

**Site Description and Location**

2.3 The natural drainage ditch has frequently proved inadequate, resulting in flooding of the existing houses on the south side of the road. Additional run-off from hard surfaces in the new development will totally overload the ditch.

### **3.0 Planning History**

A previous response to a call for sites concerning this site was made to Uttlesford District Council and was turned down.

### **4.0 The Applicant's Case**

4.2 There are no 'very significant benefits' outlined in this proposal.

4.4 As a contribution to housing supply, this proposed development is of houses of a type which do not meet local demand i.e. the affordable housing content would likely be unaffordable to younger locals who in the past have been forced to move out of the village to find cheaper housing.

4.5 'Modest Impact' is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. Due to the steeply rising terrain, and the proposal for two storey dwellings, the proposed housing will stick out like a sore thumb, or as the once Price Charles said 'a carbuncle on the landscape'.

4.6 This is not a sustainable development. There are no community services to support it and the village has been officially declared as unsustainable.

4.7c This development does not in any way contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.

4.8 This development is not in accordance with the local development plan.

### **Local Plan Policy**

4.11 This development does not protect or enhances the appearance and particular characteristics of the countryside within which it is proposed to be set.

4.12 There are no 'benefits' other than to enrich the developers.

4.14 The site has panoramic vistas and is an area with many trees and winding lanes, and has a sense of space and openness.

4.15 Statement is untrue

4.17 Landscape impact is a subjective process. This development ignores the subjective and deleterious effect on numerous existing residents, and is totally biased in favour of the developers.

4.18 The developers acknowledge the impact of relatively prominent built form. 'Short Term' is a relative term. Trees would take many years to grow in order to hide the impact of the prominent built form and would further detract from existing residents' panoramic view of the rolling hills.

4.20 The site as it exists clearly has an elevated landscape value.

4.21 There would be a great degree of harm arising in terms of landscape character.

4.26 The existing mature hedgerow is not sufficient to hide the development when viewed from the upstairs of the existing houses on the south side of Ickleton Road. To say that it would be behind the hedgerow is a gross mis-statement designed to mislead or confuse the planning authority.

4.29 Provision of communal areas open to the public, to be maintained by a management company, and paid for in perpetuity by the new residents is a recipe for eternal village conflict.

4.31 Elmdon has no street lighting, apart from Horseshoe Close, where the housing area is below the view of the village as a whole. To provide street lighting at the proposed elevated site would destroy the overall darkness of the village, which has long been one of the much respected and quirky features of the village. Lighting there would make this carbuncle stand out even more.

4.32 How can this 'further reduce' the likelihood of crime and anti-social behaviour? The security of the proposed development has no impact whatsoever on the security of the existing village.

4.38 What a preposterous statement. The only local services are the church and village hall. Neither are day to day services. Access to all day-to-day local services has to be by car as there are no public bus services whatsoever. Who's eyes are they trying to pull the wool over?

4.40 to 4.42 The level of local services in Manuden is not comparable to Elmdon in the slightest. This is a ridiculous assertion.

4.43 There would be a steep change of levels from the site to the public footpath on the south side of Ickleton Road. This would inhibit access to the rest of the village by wheelchair users.

4.46 As 4.43

### **Utilities Statement**

4.84 What is the relevance of the Thames Water sewer records? Sewerage in Elmdon is the responsibility of Affinity/Anglian Water. Full proposals for drainage and sewage do not appear to be attached to the planning application.

4.85 No mention is made of mobile communications. Coverage is almost non-existent. Smart meters do not function. These are facilities much in demand by today's smart society.

BT's cables from the serving exchange in Chrishall are at maximum occupancy and many telephone pairs are not in working order. The requirements of 18 houses would be a huge challenge requiring much investment by BT.

4.91 The release of water to the ditch at a steady rate related to the capacity of the ditch is an alarming prospect. Who would do this?

The ditch cannot carry the result of recent periods of exceptionally heavy rainfall – a phenomenon which is becoming more and more frequent due to climate change. Existing ponds have at times overflowed. There does not seem to be a plan to improve the ditch along the north side of Ickleton Road to cater for this.

4.93 A mis-guided assumption

4.96 This development would have an overbearing impact on the enjoyment of the countryside by occupants of Ickleton Road.

### **Affordable Housing**

4.101 The likely market price of the 'affordable housing' proposed in this development, even at affordable housing prices would place the properties beyond the means of local young people. One bedroomed properties would be far more appropriate.

### **Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land**

4.102 and 103

This amounts to vandalism of recognised good agricultural land. There are many small or individual sites within the curtilage of the village which could provide a gradual increase in dwellings.

### **Community Facilities**

4.106 The area of communal space should be separate from the boundaries of this development and not maintained solely by subscriptions from the new residents. Rather, a parcel of land should be set aside and donated to and maintained by the Parish Council.

### **The Planning Balance**

It seems that the developers are telling the planners how to make their decision. There is sufficient land within the curtilage of the village to meet the slowly growing needs of the village without overburdening the existing services or creating a single urban mini village in a distinctly calm and rural setting.

4.117 References to Henham are completely absurd. Henham is huge in comparison to Elmdon and has a multitude of local services and transport.

### **4.121 Elmdon is unsustainable**

4.122 No local services are accessible without use of a private car as there are no local services other than the church and village hall, and no bus services whatsoever within walking distance.

## **5 Conclusion**

Other than provision of additional housing, it is delusional to say that there are any wide-ranging benefits of the scheme. There also does not appear to be a proposal to an increase in bio diversity.

End