

From: tina [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2023 21:16
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Land Tilekiln Green Great Hallingbury - S62A/2023/0017

Tina Demetriades
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

OBJECTION

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

I live at [REDACTED]. My house adjoins the proposed development. No noise survey has ever been conducted at my home. The reports omit and create confusion regarding the locations of the immediately surrounding residential properties.

Ref:6/7 1.7

The external lighting ecology report stated that no residential properties are in relatively close proximity that would require design compliance. Yet Under heading safeguarding stated the site is relatively close to Stansted airport. This is incorrect! The airport is almost 4 miles away from the site, where as residential houses are feet away. Visual appraisal report (9.7) acknowledged that from the southern eastern boundary residents would have views into the sites lighting but in keeping with lighting around the M11 junction 8 roundabout. This is also incorrect, the M11 Junction 8 lighting is not visible from our homes and therefore the new lighting would be OUT of keeping.

My home [REDACTED] adjoins the southern eastern boundary, the views are of a rural dark country setting , no lighting is visible from my home and garden. The industrial lighting proposed, 36 columns, up to 10 metres high, is extensive in this location which will have an impact on residents, wildlife, and surrounding area.

KTA (environmental consultants) have supposedly calculated the vertical spill on the adjacent properties and "report" that there is only one building affected and the impact of which is very low. This is also incorrect, [REDACTED] who shares a boundary with the site and [REDACTED], my home, which adjoins the southern eastern boundary, both have bedroom windows & gardens overlooking the site. Light pollution will occur due to the obtrusive lighting. The acoustic board measures 2.4metres high whereas the industrial lighting columns range from 6-8-10 metres high! Also, the road is currently completely dark at night throughout the village. How will HGVS and staff be able to navigate to find the entrance into the site In the dark? The light pollution will cause more problems than is being reported.

The planning officer who supported the application UTT/22/0267/FUL 10.2.8 regarding external lighting stated it was satisfactory and acceptable, yet 14.5.3 stated development potentially to result in unacceptable amenity issues including air pollution and light levels at existing sensitive dwellings.

Place services (ecological consultants) comments 10.4.4 considered the external lighting does not accurately reflect true light spill.

The lighting will be intrusive to my home, all bedroom windows to rear and back garden have a visual outlook into the site, and no mitigation will cover nor eliminate the light pollution

There are no material changes in this application, this industrial development will impact the open rural character of this country protection zone, policy S8 S7 and bring a sense of urbanisation and urban sprawl to this village. This belt of countryside is similar to green belt, it's an attractive landscape and important within its setting and a buffer into the bell mouth of the village of Great Hallingbury.

In fact, the previous application was refused due to the following:
UTT/21/0332/FUL

The development would have a significant adverse impact on the exiting open character and appearance of the site, whilst the cumulative effect of the sites infrastructure proposed, with any associated external lighting would erode the integrity of the zone. This is still relevant!

The site location in the country protection zone will result in sense of coalescence with airport development. The mitigation proposed would not eliminate this sense.

The intrusive impact on my home and neighbours regarding the oppressive dominant presence, visual outlook, constant noise day and night ,sleep disturbance ,light pollution light intrusion, and increased air pollution will have a long term impact on health, mental health and quality of life. It's an unacceptable burden to place on residents at existing sensitive dwellings.

Noise

As stated previously no noise surveys have been taken from my home and neither is Rivendell mentioned in the updated report March 2023, Are they based on assumptions as what the noise level will be at each residential property? Noise has a significant effect on the environment and quality of life. This commercial industrial B8 facility proposal in this village location is a statutory noise nuisance not only noise from an industrial load of open air B8 storage yards and distribution but noise associate with it, noise from associated car park and staff. We have aircraft noise which stops at night for us to sleep, we open our windows for ventilation, the application is for 24/7 operation and will contribute to unwanted sound , HGV movements and vibrations in and around the site, reversing bleeping trucks, engines idling, and everything associated with this kind of proposal, there will be no respite day or night. Proposals like this need to be kept away from country villages next to residential houses and kept in industrial areas similar to its kind.

Noises vary substantially according to their source and the type of activity involved. In the case of industrial development for example, the character of the noise should be taken into account as well as its level, sudden impulses, irregular noise or noise which contains a distinguishable continuous tone.

National and local policy's make it clear that where existing residential premises are already exposed to high levels of noise any future development should avoid increase in the noise burden experienced by residents. This proposal is for a 24hr 7 day week, sleep disturbance.

I noted Coke Gearing's letter to justify that they could not find a suitable site. The sites they found stated were unsuitable for Large HGVs and not suitable for B8 storage and distribution. Please be aware that Coke Gearing were the selling land agents and are therefore not independent or impartial and their report should not be relied upon. We should not suffer the consequences of the applicant being unable to find appropriate premises.

In fact the Officers report refusal application UTT/21/0332/FUL stated:
However, the permission will be for a general B8 use. A sensitivity test for a general B8

distribution site should be undertaken to ensure that there is no detrimental queuing on the B1256.

The application as it stands is therefore contrary to the NPPF and Policy GEN1 a), GEN1 b) of the Uttlesford Local Plan relating to highway safety. This application would compromise road safety for residents, pedestrians, other roads users, cyclists, walkers, horse riders.

At the committee hearing meeting 8 Feb 2023 it came to light that the applicants chose not to disclose that they have a larger HGV of 18.75 metres which highlights and confirms the applicants dishonesty and lack of transparency on other matters concerning this whole application!

The application proposes movement of up to 500 HGVs movements EVERY DAY, that's approx. 15,000 movements a month, excluding staff movement. These vehicles would be circulating in and around the site, day and night. Each one that passes the grade II listed building The Old Elm, and neighbours in close proximity to the site on a permanent basis day and night, poses a threat to mental health, risk to life, local residents and the wider community (cyclists, joggers, walkers, dog walkers, horse riders and others who use the route to access the Flitch Way bridge cycle path, the linear wildlife rich trail accessing into SSI historical HATFIELD forest.

Highway safety and traffic generation

Access is not safe and not suitable for HGV access at any time especially 24-hour access in a residential country setting. The continuous traffic is likely to cause highway safety issues to oncoming vehicles and an increase in traffic in surrounding areas.. The M11 junction is already congested, all HGVs and staff vehicles leaving from this location will hugely impact traffic on the B1256 and M11 roundabout.

There is nothing to stop the smaller HGV lorries turning right out of the site towards the Flitch Way as these will fit under the bridge to access other routes, if needed. If there are diversions or road closures how do they plan to access the site? Will the large 18.75 metre HGV's, 16.5 metre HGV's and 7.5 ton vehicles and their staff vehicles be circulating in the area or parking up on verges? Or will they filter through the surrounding villages and areas causing chaos and more traffic? They do not have an electric fleet meaning more pollution.

Ecology

Significant woodland area on the site was destroyed by the applicant prior to any ecological report which would have caused a major impact to and disturbance of wildlife and protected species in the area. The existing woodland on the site was decimated by the applicant in 2019. Subsequent reports and surveys were carried out in April/May 2020 and a walk over survey in 2021. This means that any survey would likely show a decrease impact given that a substantial amount of the natural landscape had been destroyed and removed prior to the survey. Using defra maps it is clear the site is in close proximity to SSIs/SACs/SPAs/Ramsar sites, where it has been evaluated that any development would likely have an impact on nearby SSIs. The ecology report page 16 4.3.23 states ponds could not be accessed and so no habitat survey was carried out. In ecology report regarding bats which have the highest level of European protection it was noted that recordings had stopped due to an error with recording equipment page 16 it is also extremely suspicious that both errors and reports and omissions in the report relate to species with the highest protection, i.e bats and newts, and calls into question the validity of the entire report.

UDC landscaping officer response stated in regards to country protection zone: The proposed development would have a significant detrimental visual impact on the open rural character in a substantial area of the zone. ECC heritage did not support the application

Conclusion

A preapplication proposal meeting was held on the 4th of May 2016 to consider the use of the site for commercial employment for this purpose (B8 logistics). The Council responded by saying that the principle of change of use of the site to commercial use would be contrary to local and national policies due to its countryside location within the CPZ and therefore any proposal would need to demonstrate how the need for the proposed use would outweigh the harm it would have on the countryside (UTT/16/0956/PA).

The applicant FKY/WREN have had three attempts over the years to demonstrate this, all three attempts have failed and been refused. The latest refusal occurred on the 8th February 2023, where at the UDC committee hearing it was unanimously refused despite of the planning officers recommendation. The harm this industrial commercial proposal will bring in this location far outweighs the benefits it would bring to the residents and wider community.

There is no change to the nature of this development nor the nature of its uses it's an open air general B8 storage and distribution facilities.

This application should be REFUSED.