

From: lorraine Flawn [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 June 2023 20:38
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Jacks lane planning permission

Dear sirs,

I have made representations previously to the application to build on all three original sites and will not repeat my comments here. I believe however that they all remain valid. The list of grievances that Weston Homes indicates in its application is long and tangible.

My deep concerns about the Jacks Green site are predominantly that it is the very thin end of a very thick wedge. It is clear that Weston Homes intends to push very hard at every boundary to fully develop the entire area which it acquired (in blue on the design and access statement) and it will chip away gradually until it achieves it. The CPZ will at that stage have been eroded to the point of non-existence (as usual!)

Calling it Jacks Green is laughable – it currently is green; once a ton more bricks and concrete has been thrown at it, it will clearly not be. I believe contrary to the findings of the plan that development of the green will have potentially severe ramifications for water run-off in inclement weather. The application acknowledges that the ways through the surrounding area (across bulls field and along the side of priors wood) are not easily passable during wet and inclement weather. Removing yet more land currently permitting soakaway to permit this development will make that worse, not better, and the ditches do practically overflow after heavy rain already. Weston homes suggests it will take this into consideration and improve the position. Sadly, this sounds more like a threat than a promise and suggests that further development will be suggested ostensibly to improve our “amenity “ of the countryside by making it more traversable. This in and of itself will change the rural nature of the countryside. Furthermore, Warish Hall Lane (or smiths green lane as the documentation has it) would need to be drastically changed in order to provide safe access for pedestrians cyclists and vehicles, in my view to such an extent that it would jeopardise any potential for retaining its ancient lane status going forward simply because it would no longer look any different to any other country road that has suddenly had numerous housing estates built along their curtilage. There is already significantly more traffic using it than it was intended for with the creation of the (very fine) Little Canfield development. The latter was properly planned at local level under the last local plan and though it could be better integrated into the rest of the village in and of itself it has worked with infrastructure created to support it planned into the original concept, including a school and shops. Two quite damaging, at least to the boundary vegetation of the lane on the bend in the road by Jacks field have already occurred and this on the face of it is exactly where it is intended the access to the new estate will be – doesn't seem a very sound idea to me.

Moving on from concerns of too much water in times of heavy rainfall, we already suffer from insufficient water for domestic use. The area is flat and the water pressure virtually non-existent; it is no possible to irrigate the end of our garden using a hosepipe, mains pressure simply doesn't push it that far. We are already considering the purchase of a private pressure improvement system. This is a known concern across the whole village even before the addition of further demand. Only in the last month there was a devastating fire at the Kearsley end of the village in which a timber framed house was virtually reduced to ashes. Whatever the cause of the original fire the Fire Brigade are known to have commented that they were simply unable to get the level of water pressure they would have liked in combatting it. Regarding mains drainage, well we don't have that, and it is unclear where the new estate will tap into to gain it for the development. At significant expense we

have already invested in a water treatment plant, this became necessary when the surrounding area ceased to be able to support our previous cesspit system. We see no benefit to changing that now.

There is no doubt that we are squeezing the biodiversity out of the area, but you can't keep moving it on. The bats to the south of us appear to have moved up and we see them more on the north of us now following the further development of Broadfield road. When the bats butt up against the edge of the airport zone they will surely pack their little cases and move on or simply die off. Similarly for the deer. They do still have places to roam but those places are being squeezed more and more. We are talking about protecting species that are in danger but that seems to ignore the need to protect those that are NOT in danger so that they don't become endangered. It should come as no surprise that this country has reduced its biodiversity over many centuries to a greater extent than almost all the rest of the western world. Its because we are an island and things can't keep being moved on because there is literally NOWHERE TO GO. If you have a small space things fall of the edge. Simple.

I am in no doubt however that we do not need to protect the NUMBERS of deer. Indeed there is a periodic need for a cull, the fact that this is made necessary in part because we have taken so much land that they may previously have grazed is neither here nor there. What I am certain of though is that particularly during the pandemic, it was clear that many more people were forced to explore closer to home. On the face of it many of the younger people who were previously never to be seen wandering the countryside, appear to have found significant solace and indeed interest in exploring the area on their doorstep. As a part-time driving instructor I am fortunate enough to spend some time with a particular age group that has had both its education and its social and mental development severely disrupted, while it should not be devastating for or to them it seems unjust to remove this new found opportunity for a different form of entertainment. Of course Jacks Green doesn't do that but it will change the habitat of the deer and muntjacs and other flora and fauna and as I say I fear it's the thin end of a very thick and many hectared wedge.

Regarding the plan itself. It appears to be a box ticking exercise. Our fault, we love a good box ticking exercise. But it's a fairly small site 40 homes yet the plan is to have a mixed site with some giants and some very small residences. Looking at the pictures fills me with gloom because although they may all look fine in their place, mixing them all together in that manner will, I fear, render the whole incongruous, incoherent and potentially lead to a small haphazard 'community' that lacks any tangible thread to literally build any community spirit on – potentially a recipe for disaster both at an individual and common social and mental health level. Yet the application talks up the need and the will to foster integration at the wider level. How? And what possible mechanisms do they have the levers over, other than the community design of the proposed site. Its not some isolated model village! Yet I fear it will look like one. Certainly it doesn't look like a development that expects to find itself on the very edge of a rural village for very long.

I'm afraid as an erstwhile cyclist and a driving instructor I have no clue what the maps relating to parking and cycling strategy are intended to prove but somehow it just seems to be more ticks in more boxes and absolutely in isolation from anything around it. Similarly for the "traffic control"; although I am delighted to note the concept of creating a built-up roundabout using the byway and jacks lane as potential one way access routes around the new estate has died (if it ever really existed.) I cannot see how both claiming to shield the development from appearing a blot on the landscape by retaining a curtilage of trees around it and not allowing it to encroach on the rural, while at the same time designing it in such a manner that other traffic users of the protected lane are not shocked to find the entrance and egress to an 80 vehicle estate suddenly appearing on the left hand side are consistent. Jacks lane itself has already changed character significantly with the

addition of a handful of extra dwellings at its eastern end and inevitably this has encroached on Warish Hall Lane (smiths green lane). I fear it has already had more than enough.

To end on that note. I feel Takeley as village has itself had more than enough “opportunistic development” during the past few years – the old A120 corridor was always going to get “hit” because that road itself provides a strong artery to other transport links including new A120 and the M11. It has however reached a point where friends of mine who live in adjacent villages and may be expected not to be unhappy that ‘somewhere else’ is getting the development, talk of Takeley as having been raped in this respect. And its not finished yet ... almost every conceivable pocket of land on the old A120 has been filled it wont stop until they have. Yet often the excuse has been that as a district we have managed planning badly and do not have a 5 year land supply. That, as I understand it, has now been rectified. Therefore now would seem to be the time to call a halt to opportunistic development and allow the plan to be exactly that: a coherent plan with considered infrastructure, the needs of current and potential future residents considered and catered for and a balance struck regarding the land use between community settlement and land reserved for both agricultural and pastoral rural and common use countryside. We have a swathe of byways going through the area including the Harcamlow way, part of which leads off the northern end of the lane at Bambers green. Walking any except small disjointed stretches of it is becoming increasing difficult, however and will become pointless if its through largely developed land. It is unacceptable to now concentrate on developing the roads lanes and byways off that road, simply because there are greenfield sites available and that’s what property developers do.

Please reject this application as being of little value yet a at considerable cost.

Yours Sincerely

Lorraine Flawn

