

Mr C Conway

Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2023/0017 - Land at Tilekiln Green, Start Hill, Great Hallingbury

Object as a Neighbour

Dear Sir,

I continue to strongly object to this application, development of logistics depot at Tilekiln Green. It will have a detrimental affect on all the residents. The road infrastructure, noise, light pollution, increased pollution, loss of natural surroundings, wild habitats, and especially in Brookside, a loss of privacy.

There are no beneficial changes to the amendments that I would consider acceptable. We are a residential area and the houses have not been included in the new access junction layout. The Old stables have been identified as a field entrance. The willows and Nonane not mentioned and Brookside Rivendell and Gerrard Terrace not included even though their driveways are very compromised by the visibility splays proposed.

Drawing No IT1896/SK/01 is grossly misleading and inaccurate. The existing road has been indicated a lot wider than it actually is. As you drive down the lane it reduces in width causing drivers to brake as they pass, and using residential driveways to do so.

The drawing fails to show our driveway [REDACTED], and how we will lose the line of sight as we pull off our drive. It also falls short of showing how vehicles following us down the lane will have limited view when we are turning onto and leaving the drive.

We have a blind bend on our right when leaving the drive. To adjust the lane over and create a new junction at the top of the road, will make us a concealed entrance. This will be a very dangerous to us and our neighbours. This will be detrimental to our highway safety.

Highway safety will be compromised on the lane, for access to the bus stop on the B1256. We will have to cross with on coming HGVs existing and entering the site. Local traffic travelling down and up the lane will have limited view on the bend, so again causing risk to pedestrians, cyclists and horseback riders.

The new amendments do not demonstrate how this industrial development is suitable for a residential area. As a resident this development have a detrimental affect on our quality of life and is already presenting each of the household members with undue stress.

The site is within the CPZ and for that alone it should be rejected. We should be safeguarding this wildlife area, rich with habitats and a wide ecological. We should protect the sites important biodiversity. This should be kept as a buffer zone between the village and the M11/junction 8. A logistics site will change the area it will no longer look like a rural village setting and the country lane will be lost forever.

The revised Landscape Proposal seems only to address mistakes and again the changes only seem favourable to the developer. No suitable landscaping has been submitted to improve privacy for Brookside. The parking area will produce noise pollution, light pollution, air pollution ground pollution and further invasion of our privacy.

Although 5 No Carpinus Betulus a nice gesture to pacify Heritage impact on the Old Elm. They will only obscure the view while in leaf, six months of the year. The trees will not protect the grade 2 listed building in any other way, least of all noise.

I am not convinced that the landscaping scheme will be adequate enough to give privacy screening to our property, especially with full view available across the whole site into our bedroom windows.

No evaluation has been given to fire risk? As a household we have oil heating. We have an oil storage facility on the direct boundary, next to the site. Our oil tank will be a few feet away from the electric charge facility. How much risk will this be? What happens if there is a car fire? This is a concern for us.

The Electric recharge point will create noise while charging and connecting to the cars. There is no plan on how this will be carried out safely. Will this area be supervised and how much noise and smell will this create? I regard an industrial sized recharge area unsuitable in a residential area, especially if this will be carried out while we are sleeping.

Fire risk has not been set out. Will there be flammable material on site and where will this be kept? Vehicle maintenance is a fire risk if carried out on site, again not suitable in a residential area.

Environmental Health response summary, if taken off plan should be re-evaluated in person. The documents submitted by applicant are most misleading and houses are not sufficiently accessed or indicated. I would like to invite a member of environmental health to our home to see for themselves the detrimental impact a 24/7 logistics site would have on our home.

I would like to make aware that no noise survey has been taken at [REDACTED]. We are close to flight path but it's not continuous sound and very brief. Vehicle noise [REDACTED] have a larger impact on us. Doors slamming, engine noise, hydraulic breaks, rattling trailers, empty rattling trailers, vehicle reverse alarm signals, humming electric charging, car engines running, passenger music playing, hydraulic lifting equipment, ramp movements vehicle horns signalling when ready to leave. All day every day every night.

The Stansted distribution centre one mile down the road has limited hours as stated in my original objection. Normal working hours Monday to Friday, short hours Saturday and closed Sundays and bank holidays.

Local amenities are located on or next to site. Electric and gas lines cross the land and water runs along the lane which will be relined. I object these being changed or removed and no consideration has been given to them. Pumping station is not adequate and site amenities should not be joined, it is residential only.

There are some discrepancies in the sizes of HGVs that will be on site. They will be passing under the electric pylons and I don't feel it is safe. Height levels of vehicles should be lower when passing under electric pylons.

The site was knowingly purchased with development limitations, and the negative affect it would have to the residents neighbouring the site and the detrimental affect on local traffic. The over 400 objections to UTT/21/0233/FUL that was refused, and over 200 for application UTT/22/0267/FUL, that was refused. This shows how much it is not needed and wanted by local residents in all surrounding villages.

Photos below show the view from the rear of the site, looking down on Brookside and Rivendell. Views left and right from Brookside's driveway. Left view will be drastically change if application goes ahead.

This application should be refused.

View from rear of site of Brookside and Rivendell.



Caleb Conway