

From: Lori Flawn [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 September 2023 21:22
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Bulls Field

Dear Sirs,

May I first say that I feel this is becoming more like trial by Iranian court! One thinks one is nearing the end of ones sentence and suddenly a new charge (or proposal in this case) is launched. Defending Bulls Field, Jacks Lane and Smiths green feels like it needs to become a full time occupation. Why can the applicant spend as much time as they like preparing submissions, yet those opposing them have very limited time against a backdrop that it is NOT their full time occupation. Just downloading the documents and zooming out up down and round enough to even know whether it needs to be given consideration is an epic journey. Further, they have little or no access to what one might term "equal and opposite" expertise and are basically being subjected to a planning regime which appears to be geared to the grinding down of opposition. As the local residents, those who will inevitably be most impacted by the proposals, there seems to be an expectation that we will become increasingly resigned to having little or no say in the matter ultimately. And thus we will cease to object. Dream on!

The amount of documentation that goes with this application is quite impressive - or depressing depending on your point of view. In particular the arboriculturalists seem to have no remit but to consider the protection of the root system of individual trees. This surely misses the point. There is no mention of the need for a wider curtilage to protect not only individual trees but the sustainability of the wood as a whole and the ancient lights to which I would hope the natural inhabitants have some right. Any development of either side of the wood; bulls field or the field to the north, would without doubt change irreparably the context of this ancient woodland in its heritage setting with its historic green, protected lane, grade I and other listed buildings and all round beautiful ambience. I understand that it is recognised that the preservation of ancient woodland Must be recognised as sacrosanct since it cannot be restored once gone. Butt 96 dwellings right up against it and I genuinely cannot imagine its "survival" in any meaningful sense of the word, nor indeed that of its inhabitants. Ecosystems are much wider and deeper than those that we feel we see and personally experience, I believe the emerging scientific evidence for this is indisputable fact. I am no Malthusian, but the retention of balance rather than the wistful hope that it may be restored once lost is a different matter and there appears to be an increasing dependency upon restoration tomorrow rather than retention now. It genuinely makes me feel sick to my core.

A number of expert witnesses have been summoned to opine. But what is the point of asking the water companies whether there is a problem. Their duty is to provide water; to acknowledge a difficulty is to admit they are not up to the job. Indeed, to risk their authority to provide, one imagines. Instead perhaps ask East Anglia water or whichever wider authority it was that recently acknowledged that there is indeed scarcity of water in the East of England. Why ask whether there is a danger of flooding to be told no? It is undeniable that throwing concrete and asphalt on the land reduces drainage and thus increases risk. For sure these things can be mitigated and if the worst happens, resourcefulness applied which can take away the impact. But not I would argue without opening up the potential need to change radically and further the design context of the initial offending construction.

We are promised "nice new roads" or paths and cycleways hardened to improve access where we currently 'have none'. Not true! We have managed with our footpaths for centuries. It entails wearing appropriate footwear and the occasional washing of muddy paws. I can however assure you

that most of us who walk these paths would no more think of wearing stilettos for the task than expecting to find a burger bar and lemonade stop at the other side of our travails. (Please god!) And for sure our four footed friends are very much better equipped to cope with such paths than the hot -or cold - hard asphalt or worse dried cinder that comes with the built up territory. I am furthermore intrigued by the reference to some footpath that apparently gives access through the Croft from Jacks field into the estate. Do tell us more....its a walk I have not thus far experienced.

I believe the original application was rejected not merely because of the access from a protected lane (Which this application does address, but instead loads parsonage lane even further when as yet we have no experience how much of an effect the already built new estate behind the church will have) but also the impact on the heritage of the area. It will not I fear be inconsequential. Further the access at the pinch point as currently conceived encroaches significantly on the buffer zone that I believe is recommended for the preservation of woodland. This happened in spades along the flitch way. Indeed the curtilage of the country park was all but "disappeared" on some stretches, there is sadly no going back as the wielders of chain saws well know.

I would ask that my previous responses are considered in so far as they are relevant to this application and I would implore you to reject in its entirety this application.

Yours Faithfully

Lorraine Flawn