

From: Dan Woodington [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 September 2023 15:41
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2023/0019

Dear Sir /Madam,

Re: S62A/2023/0019 - Land Known as Bull Field, Warish Hall Farm Smiths Green Takeley

Please accept the below letter in strong opposition to the planning application above.

Where should I even begin? We've been here before on more than one occasion, yet the planning process in this country seems to be weighted fully in favour of the profits of developers over the needs of the communities in which they operate.

This site is utterly inappropriate for a development of this nature or scale. Previous applications focused on access via Smiths Green Lane, yet the developer now appears to acknowledge that this would be neither safe nor suitable for the increased traffic of 96 dwellings. Instead, this revised application appears to propose access between 2 office buildings and their car parks, and through a warren of commercial buildings (for which there is no demand in the village but the application was granted on appeal £\$€). Then there is a very narrow gap between the backs of people's existing properties and the ancient protected woodland. This is barely wide enough for a single carriageway (unless they accidentally knock some of the trees over during construction). The vehicles of 96 dwellings are supposed to be able to squeeze through this gap? They would have to have a rota for who can come and go when. What if there's a fire? With all the problems we have with airport parkers abandoning their vehicles in the village, there is no way emergency vehicles will be able to get through. Additionally, so many of these new estates are built without sufficient parking and many even without pavements. It would be a disaster waiting to happen.

Run off that would currently be soaked into the arable fields would cause flooding and disruption for neighbouring properties during heavy rainfall (as is the case in certain stretches of the Flich Way after recent development).

All of that is without even beginning to mention the existing infrastructure of the village, or lack thereof. Water pressure is already so low that many villagers already struggle to shower at peak times. The village doesn't have a doctors surgery and the local ones are at bursting point. As is the village pharmacy. You can't register with an NHS dentist within about 10 miles. There is little in the way of places to go for adults, let alone kids - there is absolutely nothing here for kids to do - and public transport is hit and miss at best. Which means more cars on the road to get to work/school/shops, etc.

The proposed plot is frequented by local dog walkers who moved here to enjoy the countryside. Not to walk around another identikit estate, which will look like a slum in 20 years (take a look around the estate on the old Herts and Essex hospital site in Bishop's Stortford for a perfect example)

The properties in the development that is being proposed here will likely be bought up by local authorities in London as a cheaper alternative to resolving their housing needs (as has been the case on much of the new large estate in Bishop's Stortford). It doesn't help in any way with local housing issues as the developers are more interested in their bottom line than the community in which they're based.

So what do you end up with after all this? A rural ghetto negatively impacting on the existing residents of the village. No thanks.

If you have any shred of decency, you will clearly see that the proposal is utterly inappropriate for the site and the village in which it's located.

But money will probably decide, rather than what's best for our local residents. The only positive in that regard is the General Election on the horizon.

It would be a travesty of decency and common sense if this development were to be allowed to progress.

Dan Woodington

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]