

From: Mike Marriage [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 June 2023 19:57
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to UTT/23/0902/PINS

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to planning application UTT/23/0902/PINS. Location: Land At Warish Hall Farm North Of Jacks Lane Smiths Green Lane Takeley

I have previously made objections to the Warish Hall Development, which this current application formed part of. The Warish Hall Development was refused by UDC and then dismissed at appeal (Appeal Decision APP/C1570/W/22/3291524). I will use direct quotes from that appeal decision as part of my argument. I was a founder of a local opposition group to this series of developments (STOP The Warish Hall Development) which to date has 580 members.

Key Reasons for Refusal

1) The development introduces extensive urban form in an isolated area of open countryside that does not connect well with the existing settlement. There is no reason for the development to be in this inappropriate location. To quote the inspector:

"The development would introduce an urban form of development that would not be sympathetic to the local character and landscape setting, and notwithstanding the mitigating design measures to create green infrastructure and character areas of varying layouts and densities, in the context of Policy S7 and what I heard, I consider that no special reasons have been demonstrated as to why the development, in the form proposed, needs to be there."

2) The development would damage a Protected Lane (Warish Hall Road). This is a narrow lane, bounded by vulnerable verges and village green. It is highly sensitive to increased traffic flow as demonstrated during recent closures of Parsonage Road. The resulting increase in traffic led to Warish Hall Road becoming heavily potholed and the verges and green being damaged and eroded.

There are no pavements or paths across Smiths Green forcing pedestrians to walk on the road. My two children were nearly hit by a car in their pushchair when a car swerved to avoid a large pothole on 01/12/22. It was such a near miss that I reported the incident to the police.

Road safety must be considered a key argument against this development that will put more cars and more pedestrians onto Warish Hall Road. From my own experience, this could literally prove lethal.

To quote the inspector:

"While I note the existing hedges along the verge of the Protected Lane, I nevertheless consider that the roofs of the proposed dwellings and the new accesses to the development would be apparent from the Protected Lane and the overall built form would be noticeable at night when street lights and other lights from the development would be likely to be seen."

The Built Heritage assessment misconstrues the inspector's findings in regards the Protected Lane, on p24 claiming:

"the Inspector in Appeal Decision (APP/C1570/W/22/3291524) only identified harm arising from the proposed development of Bull Field and not the Site which is the subject of the current application."

This is categorically untrue and misleading. The Appeal Decision finds multiple detrimental impacts that apply to "Jacks" as well as to "Bull Field" as demonstrated in the quote above.

3) The proposed development is inside the CPZ. To quote the inspector:
"the proposal would nevertheless result in an adverse effect on the open characteristics of the CPZ in conflict with LP Policy S8."

4) The application makes biased presumptions based on the Appeal Decision. For example para 5.94 of the Planning Statement boldly concludes:

5.94. Accordingly, given that the proposals of this application represent a small proportion of the development previously proposed by the Warish Hall Farm Application, it is deemed that the same conclusions can be drawn on the impact of the proposals upon the Protected Lane.

However, the Planning Statement conveniently forgets to consider that the "public benefit" of the current application is also only a "small portion" of that of the previous scheme: less than a quarter of the housing, no extension to Priors Wood, no land given to the primary school and no medical centre.

Furthermore, UDC's housing supply situation has improved since the Appeal Decision, detaching this application from the weighting process made in the past.

Finally, the applicant completely fails to appreciate that presenting "Jacks" for development in isolation makes the application significantly more disconnected from the existing settlement and even more inappropriate to the countryside settling.

You can not simply cherry-pick statements from the previous application and presuming that they apply to "Jacks" as an isolated development as they have done.

For the reasons given above, the harm or this development would substantially and demonstrably outweigh the very limited benefit provided towards housing supply. There is no reason for such a development in this sensitive location. I therefore request that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully

Mike Marriage

████████████████████

██████████

████████

██████████