

**From:** Lois Prior [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 May 2023 10:32  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2023/0018 Land East of Pines Hill, Stansted Mountfitchet, CM24 8EY

I wish to object to the above planning application

I take issue with several lines in the developer's Planning Statement April 2023 as follows:

4.19 Policy H3 – New Houses within Development Limits – Whilst this policy is more directed towards sites for development within the identified Development Limits, it is worth noting in relation to this application the criteria that is applied to considering development that are considered to be “infill”. .....*The application site at Pines Hill would comply with these sustainability credentials required in compliance with this policy.*

My response:

This is inaccurate and misleading. The site is not infill - it is bordered on three sides by a main road, a railway line, and greenbelt. There are just two detached houses which I suspect are part of the developers plans for expansion.

4.22 Policy H11 – Affordable Housing on “Exception Sites” – This policy relates to the provision of affordable housing on sites outside settlements where housing would not normally be permitted, if it would meet all the following criteria:

a) 100% of the dwellings are to be affordable and provided through a Registered Social Landlord;

.....

4.23 Whilst this application does not propose 100% affordable dwellings, it will provide 52% of the total amount of dwellings

My response:

52% is still not 100% and therefore it still does not accord with this policy as it is not exceptional. It is offering just one extra affordable house to the plan which was refused.

4.46 As well as providing a Green Belt Assessment of the site, this Planning Statement sets out a number of Very Special Circumstances that would “clearly” outweigh the limited and localised harm to the openness of the Green Belt, and should also be taken into account in determining this application. In particular, taking into account that as the Council have an out-of-date Local Plan as a result of not providing a 5 year housing supply, that paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF is engaged as a result of the collective *Very Special Circumstances that are highlighted in this application and the tilted balance is towards allowing this form of sustainable development.*

My response:

It is not enough for the developer to merely 'tilt the balance'. The developer should be able to demonstrate unequivocally that he has met VSC. By admitting he has tilted the balance, even the developer does not think he has demonstrated enough. It therefore should be refused.

4.63 The Plan states that through the Uttlesford District Council's SHLAA a number of small sites with potential for development have been identified *and that the Parish Council agrees with 6 sites including the site at Pines Hill*. The Plan does not provide a specific plan of the Pines Hill site, but it is assumed that its reference is to the land where this application site is proposed.

My response:

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council, of which I am a member, has never given its backing to Pines Hill being identified as a site for housing. In the very latest Call For Sites process, the council did not give backing to housing being allowed on this site because it is Green Belt, and it is outside the village limits.

5.10 This report therefore demonstrates the very significant shortfall of delivering housing in one of the key villages within the District, and this lack of delivery continues to be a very significant material consideration, and should be given very substantial weight in the determination of this planning application.

My response:

Yes, we do have a shortfall of housing, but that does not mean speculative applications by developers wanting to build on Greenbelt should be allowed. Go find a brownfield site for your developments!

5.33 The site at Pines Hill is considered to be one of those types of sites, due to forming only a small section of parcel 5, and is located in the northern part of the parcel with residential and commercial buildings and uses to the south. The infill nature of the site would ensure that there would be no projection of development towards the southern part of parcel 5 and that neighbouring settlements of Bishops Stortford and Stansted Mountfitchet would not merge.

My response:

Allowing development in a small section of parcel 5 would make the whole of parcel 5 vulnerable to development, and that would be to the detriment of this area because all of the development would have to be accessed along the B1383 road.

5.81 The application at Pines Hill *would include 4 No. self-build/custom build houses that would be referred to in the description and delivered through a S106 planning obligation clause*. This would therefore contribute to not only the identified District wide shortfall, but also deliver the 4 plots to meet the local preference for Stansted Mountfitchet highlighted by the Council's Monitoring Report.

My response:

It is abundantly obvious that the inclusion of four plots of land for self-build has only been added into this application to try and get it over the line as a VSC. The developer would be financially content that he has provided 11 houses at full market value and walks away from any further involvement.

This is my individual response as a local resident, but also because I represent the area as an elected parish councillor. I have also contributed and agreed to the official response from Stansted Parish Council.

Lois Prior

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

STANSTED MOUNTFITCHET PARISH COUNCILLOR