

From: CARMEL doherthy [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 September 2023 21:02
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: Bulls Field, Smiths Green, UTT/23/1583/PINS

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: CARMEL doherthy [REDACTED]
Date: 6 September 2023 at 16:35:20 BST
To: Planning <planning@uttlesford.gov.uk>
Subject: Bulls Field, Smiths Green, UTT/23/1583/PINS

This application must be considered in the context of UTT/21/1987/FUL which was refused on appeal.

The applicant is seeking to obtain back door permission by breaking down the component parts of the reject application. The (apparent) change in scale (from 126 to 96 dwellings) is not materially relevant to nor impacting on the reasons for the original planning refusal.

The smaller part of refused UTT/21/1987/FUL relating to Jacks Field was resubmitted in a different cloak and still refused.

This is another bite of the same cherry and all of the original objections and reasons for refusal remain valid including without limitation:-

*The development abuts to and will be wholly detrimental to a designated ancient woodland and there is not sufficient room to create a corridor that would preserve that status.

*Although the ingress/egress to the proposed estate is on/through land owned by the applicant, ownership alone is not grounds for land to be used to create an unacceptable additional flow of vehicular traffic onto an already overused, heavily congested minor road.

*The proposed estate would have a drastic and detrimental impact on the rural setting, the setting of the ancient woodland, the setting of pre-existing residences (some of which are listed and of historic significance) and the setting of the Smiths Green village hamlet.

*There would be no way to provide safe conduits for the inevitable heavy increase in pedestrian and cycle traffic to areas to the east of the site and even if there were those conduits would themselves be in conflict with the existing, settings, rights and rulings of areas to the west.

*There has already been a significant increase in residential development in the Takeley area and there are already outline plans for developments on the fringes of an already stretched and over-populated village with poor infrastructure and meagre social, recreational, transport, road, education, social and other services.

I object to the application and cannot see any conceivable revision that would temper that objection.

Kind Regards

Carmel Doherty