

From: Matt C [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 August 2023 16:06
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Ref. No. S62A/2023/0019

To: The Secretary of State and Planning Inspectorate

6 August 2023

Dear Sirs,

Planning Application Ref. No. S62A/2023/0019

With reference to the above proposals, we would like to register our objections to the development. These are outlined below.

1. Infrastructure

a) Schools

The Takeley Primary schools are already full. So too are the schools in Great Dunmow and Bishops Stortford where significant numbers of new houses are already being built. There is no provision for additional capacity in these proposals. Additional land for Roseacres School is only of benefit if the School Authority has agreed to fund and operate any extension to the school.

b) Medical Centres

Similarly, the surgeries in Great Dunmow are already full. Despite all the various new build schemes in the area, no additional provision for medical facilities has been proposed and/or funded by health authorities.

2. Environment

a) Extensive Building Projects Already Underway

There are very large new housing developments currently being constructed in Great Dunmow (several)
Bishops Stortford (several)
Harlow (several)
Braintree
Chelmsford.

Hence significant tranches of land are already disappearing with the consequent adverse impact on our environment, wildlife, air pollution and access to the countryside. The importance of outdoor space to wellbeing was clearly highlighted during the recent lockdowns. While the Takeley proposals may be relatively small, they add to the problem by encroaching on the Countryside Protection Zone around Stansted Airport.

b) Surrender of Planning Control

These proposals are outside the accepted development limits of Takeley. Neither are they part of any local development plan. Uttlesford DC need to regain some semblance of control, otherwise developers will continue to take full advantage of greenfield opportunities. We acknowledge that the central government appeal process does not always support local opinion but efforts are required to control development of the area.

The developers are fully aware of weaknesses in the system and will play these, through modified proposals and appeals, until they get the financial gains they seek from private housing construction. In this case, the proposal is part of the wider scheme rejected at appeal and public inquiry in the early part of 2022. Taken together with planning application S62/2023/0016, these proposals are tantamount to the previous rejected proposal by Endurance Estates & Weston Homes. Apart from the planning issues, this is surely a waste of public money to have this process repeated so soon.

Takeley & Little Canfield have provided a substantial number of new homes in recent years. However, a line needs to be drawn until such times as infrastructure & environmental issues are properly addressed. We urge the Secretary of State and the planning inspectorate to reject these plans and to campaign against the developers seeking profit at the expense of growing a healthy community.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs Joan Clark

Mr. Matthew Clark.

