

From: john doherly [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 May 2023 08:59
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2023/0016

Dear Sirs

I note that this Section 62A application is being made by a large developer who is located in and who represents themselves as being at the heart of a rural community but who's plans and actions directly contradict this stance.

It's plans for effective urbanisation of a historic village community were disclosed in its original comprehensive planning application which was rejected for very good reasons. Breaking down the original application into smaller parcels does not add any merit to this (or any future) component of the original application it merely reinforces the belief that this developer will use all of its considerable resources to (literally) steamroller a local community into submission.

S62 is broad brush (for reasons set out by parliament) and allows a route for frustrated planners to press ahead with developments that have merit and may otherwise be approved if the responsible planning authority were in a position to carry out its usual functions.

S62 is not intended to provide a back door for developers who have been frustrated by having their applications declined for sound planning reasons.

In my opinion this S62 application is evidence of an avaricious developer determined to achieve its objectives regardless of the cost to the local community (it claims to belong to). If the planning inspectorate is indeed standing in the shoes of (local) planners, and considering the application from a planning perspective, there can be no grounds for permitting this planning application.

I have to presume that the legislation does not require S62A applications be notified to interested parties; I live at [REDACTED], directly opposite (5 or 6 meters from the proposed site boundary) and have received no notice of the S62A application. Regardless of whether there is a legal obligation on the part of the applicant or the planning authority to give some reasonable notice to affected parties, a good neighbour, as the applicant claims to be and with the applicant's resources, would have taken that small step.

I reiterate my previously stated objections to the proposals. "This is a "back door" application" being made a developer seeking break down an earlier planning application which was rejected for very sound reasons. All of the previous objections and the reasons for planning refusal still hold. A responsible corporate body with policies in place which take into account the interests of all stakeholders would not be using its substantial financial and general resources to deplete those of the local community and regulators. To do being so at point in time where we are all (seemingly except the applicant) under great financial, social and environmental pressure, points to an opportunist inconsiderate party. This part of the (original) application focusses on Jacks Field but conveniently omits to address the residents of Jacks Lane including those who directly border the field. There are no images at all for Jacks Lane so I presume that this is a deliberate attempt to mask some additional issues which were raised in part in my original objections but not acknowledged or responded to. Document "Landscaping Strategy" 2952-RE-06 Jacks" states ".....footpaths will link into

existing routes to the north and east long (sic) Jacks Lane and back towards Smiths.....” Attached are images West to East and East to West along Jacks lane as it borders Jacks Field – what existing footpaths are being referred to – this is a narrow singletrack carriage way with posted speed limits (20mph) and no footpaths. It beggars' belief that this forms part of the key strategy. Attached are images of the “footpaths” from the eastern edge of Jacks Field North and East. The Strategy implies that there are existing volumes of pedestrians and cyclists that will benefit from ingress/egress to the proposed development. There are no such volumes. The continued reference to Priors Green is intended to imply a closer proximity than actually exists. The rear boundaries of the four properties directly opposite Jacks Field are bounded by the school field – there is absolutely no residential, commercial or other connection between the Jacks Field. More alarming is the gross omission in the Estate Site Assessment at S3.5 Flood Risk “.....no inlet or outlet could be identified from the walkover....” and at S3.7 “.....no adopted sewerage is in close proximity...” None of the properties in Jacks Lane are connected to Sewerage! All the properties (not just those that bound Jacks Field) do or will (following legislative changes) rely on the drainage ditch shown in the fifth image for discharging water from installed recycling units. Any inspection could not fail to see this and indeed there are clear signs in Jacks Lane where for example the routing of conduits under the road are clearly visible." (images were supplied with the original objection and can be viewed on UDC planning portal).

Regards, John Doherty