

**Comments on Place Services' Submission of 27<sup>th</sup> March 2023 and UDC's Landscape Officer's Remarks of 27/03/23 re S62A/2023/0015 – Grange Paddock, Ickleton Road, Elmdon CB11 4GR.**

Attn. Inquiries and Major Casework Team

Dear Sir/Madam,

**1) Re: Place Services' Submission of 27<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

Ms. Gibb's submission does not explicitly address the matter of badgers (including a sett believed to be active) being in close proximity to [REDACTED] [REDACTED], nor the destruction of the hunting ground of the barn owl(s?), nor the threat to Great Crested Newts from this development proposal. Perhaps she has not read the submissions of villagers in this regard and has relied solely on the PEA?

**2) Re: UDC's Landscape Officer (Ben Smeeden)'s Submission of 27<sup>th</sup> March 2023-03-29**

Mr. Smeeden says, "A layout informed by farmsteads would be more appropriate for this type of site, but no analysis of local character has been undertaken to inform this." He appears not to be familiar with the 'Landscape Character of Uttlesford District Assessment' regarding H1, the Elmdon Chalk Upland (pp. 328 – 330) [LCA 8 Uttlesford.pdf](#), nor the Village Design Statement (adopted by UDC in June 2019) [Elmdon-VDS-hi-res compressed.pdf \(uttlesford.gov.uk\)](#) which draws on this - unless he means that the applicants have not conducted an analysis of local landscape character.

He goes on to state that, "*The visual impact of the development on the wider rural landscape may be limited,*" a sentiment with which I completely disagree. Perhaps he has not been to Elmdon. If he has, I cannot conceive that he can have walked the footpaths to the south of the village, particularly the Icknield Way, from which the site is very prominent from the perspective of pedestrians for a considerable distance. This would be even more the case from horseback. (This is also a bridleway, as is one of the other footpaths from which the site can be clearly seen.) Since the ridge behind the site rises so little above the upper part of the site, houses would block off from view almost all the hillside on which the development would be situated. Almost the whole hillside would appear to be filled with houses, where now the vista is of green fields. This can surely hardly be seen as a "*limited*" visual impact on the "*wider rural landscape*"! This would also be the view from the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Mill Mound – a view which includes the Grade II\* Listed village church, the Conservation area and the Grade II Listed Elmdonbury barns complex. In my opinion, this would be extremely damaging to the historical setting of these buildings, and to the village as a whole, which contains 37 listed buildings/groups of buildings out of the 147 dwellings in the village.

It also seems questionable if Mr. Smeeden is aware that the access to the proposed development involves the perspective from the Protected Lane of Quickset Road, although he does acknowledge the tree loss which would result. This would greatly increase the view of the site and the proposed dwellings, urbanising the entry to the village from this Protected Lane to the east. Further urbanisation would result from the proposed changes to this 'gateway'.

I would have commented on some of the other responses from Statutory Consultees, had I been aware that this was an option. Unfortunately, I did not realise this until too late, so I confine my remarks as directed.

Yours faithfully,

Evelyn Pick (3rd April 2023)