

From: Phill Bodsworth [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 May 2023 20:48
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Land at Warish Hall Farm North of Jacks Lane Smiths Green Lane Takeley, application S62A/2023/0016

Good Morning.

Re: Land at Warish Hall Farm North of Jacks Lane Smiths Green Lane Takeley, application S62A/2023/0016

My name is Phillip Bodsworth and I live at [REDACTED] with my family, where we have been resident for over 23 years. The property is an unlisted heritage asset having been built in 1700 and forming part of what was the local pub. It is just one of a number of both listed and unlisted heritage assets that will be affected adversely should this development be allowed to go ahead.

Only last year, a slightly amended version of this application was put forward by Weston Homes as part of a larger application which included other adjacent fields. It was rejected by the planning committee of the local authority and then rejected by one of your inspectors on a number of grounds (see link https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1152672/7_UTT.21.1987.FUL_-_OFFICERS_REPORT.pdf), including that it breached many policies both in the NPPF and the previous local plan. The other fields included in the previous plan have been left unplanted and the developers have made it clear that they intend to pursue other applications in the future. This is, therefore, a cynical attempt to subvert the original inspectors decision by simply breaking down the application into smaller blocks with slight amendments. Despite this the reasons for the original refusal remain valid. The government have stated on numerous occasions that locals should have a say in development of their area, however, locals do not have the vast financial and time resources of major developers to be able to fight against over development. Is it morally right that those with the largest pockets should have a bigger say than those with the most at stake?

Had there been a completed local plan and a neighbourhood plan, then it is unlikely that we would be here today. The recent call for sites for the emerging local plan has resulted in far more potential sites than will be needed to meet the need for new homes within the district. The local neighbourhood planning group are working at a pace to develop a sustainable plan for the village which will ensure that future development is both suitable and in the right place. Takeley lacks infrastructure to support further large scale development. The roads are insufficient and, in this case irrevocable damage would be caused to an ancient protected lane. The water pressure is insufficient, as highlighted by the Fire Brigade's difficulty in getting sufficient water pressure to fight a local

house fire within the last week. The water company have leafleted local residents to ask them to reduce their water usage in order to preserve endangered chalk streams – surely any further development risks more severe and possibly terminal damage to these fragile eco structures. There are insufficient medical facilities within the area to cope with the existing population, never mind a large increase.

The area where this development is proposed has been the subject of a recent assessment for conservation area status, funded by the Parish Council, and which is now with the local authority for consideration.

The NPPF Section 4 makes it clear that local planning authorities should consider emerging local and neighbourhood plans when considering planning applications.

Point 49 of the NPPF refers to when, in rare situations, a refusal on the grounds that an application is premature may be justified. I would suggest that this is one just situation. With the number of sites being put forward in the call for sites it must be highly likely that other more suitable sites may be found. Sites that do not cut across the council's own policies, or those in the NPPF. Sites that do not affect ancient woodland, heritage assets, chalk streams and the local water supply. Sites that do not erode the CPZ or build on farmland that will be needed to feed our future generations.

For all of these reasons I ask you to reject this application.

Kind Regards

Phill Bodsworth

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]