

Section 62a20223/0019/

Land to the north of Roseacres between Parsonage Road and Smiths Green Lane

Takeley, Essex.

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to object in the strongest terms to the application to build 96 dwellings on Bull Field Takeley. This site was dismissed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate in August 2022. In the conclusions the Inspector said, "I have identified that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in Terms of its adverse effect on landscape, character and visual impact and would reduce the open character of the CPZ".

This development would also have a detrimental impact on the hamlet of Smiths Green which is in the progress of applying for Conservation Area Designation. It contains 9 Listed Buildings, all facing onto a village green plus a Victorian Villa and some Victorian Cottages which are buildings of heritage interest. There is also a listed village pump. The Conservation Area runs along the front of the application site on the protected lane in the form of Registered Village Green, which enhances the visual effect of open Countryside. The Conservation area also continues the other side of the road as far as a 100-year-old Bungalow next door to a Grade 2 listed thatched cottage. The view as you drive or walk down the road towards Smiths Green will be spoilt as you will view new build detracting from the setting of listed buildings in the Conservation Area.

With regard to the Heritage document submitted by the applicant, they feel that by having a buffer between the new build and the two listed buildings that back onto Bull Field, will mitigate the harm, saying the benefits of the application outweigh the harm. I disagree. Firstly, just because there are some mature trees in the garden of Goar Lodge now this will protect the setting of the listed buildings. These trees are deciduous and in winter, both houses are viewed from the field more clearly and visa-versa than in summer and therefore new build will bring the houses closer to the listed buildings and effect their setting. Building on Bull Field will introduce urbanisation into a rural area and downgrade this heritage area of Takeley. The Bull Field is also in the Countryside Protection Zone (CPZ) policy S8 and building houses in this field is against this policy. It is also beyond development limits of the village and in open countryside and therefore against policy S7.

Takeley has already lost large swathes of countryside to development in the past 10 years. The B1256 has lost most of its open spaces that used to separate the houses giving it a country appearance. Now we have an urban sprawl along the road from the section called the Street until the area called Brewers End. The Countryside Protection Zone has already been breached by some 380 dwellings and a 66 Care home been given permission or won at appeal, which has greatly reduced the CPZ in Takeley. This Policy was put in place on the recommendation of Sir Graham Eyre the Inspector at the 1981/83 Stansted Airport Inquiry. The reason for this

Policy was to put a countryside zone around the airport to get separation of the airport from the surrounding villages. UDC had a review of this policy carried out in 2016 and the resulting LUC report found that this policy was a good one and should be strengthened in certain areas. Bull Field was one of the areas that was highlighted as an area that would cause a high level of harm if it was developed. The Council accepted the recommendation of the report, and this report is part of the evidence-based documents for the new local plan. Therefore, it would be wrong to allow dwellings to be built on Bull Field, which is an ancient field known as part of the St. Valery Priory (now Warish Hall a grade 1 listed building that has an ancient monument in its grounds). The Priory is mentioned in the Domesday Book, so Bull Field has been used as agricultural land for hundreds of years. It was cultivated until Weston Homes put in their planning application. It is a shame that good agricultural land is left laying fallow.

Adjacent to Bull Field is the ancient woodland of Priory's wood. It is proposed in the application to make a buffer zone of 15 metres from the new development. In this buffer zone the applicant wishes to put a cycle path, footpath and street lighting. This will be introducing hard surfaces into an area which is a grass pathway at the moment and urbanising a country area with streetlights. I don't think this can be called a buffer zone if it has paths and cycle ways in it. There is a lot of wildlife in the wood, and this will disappear if traffic is introduced so close to the ancient wood. At the last inquiry Uttlesford District Council's arboriculture specialist raised objections to the size of the buffer zone as being too small and would not protect the wood. The spine road has a pinch point which goes very close to the wood and the canopy will overhang the road which is not good for the health of the trees.

The spine road is going to go through the industrial estate and exit onto the very busy Parsonage Road. Directing residential roads through industrial estates is not good planning design. Parsonage Road is already working to capacity, with four other new developments exiting on to it and the road is the main route into the Elsenham Quarry which is allowed 400 movements per day of heavy lorries as well as other lorries, cars, buses and taxis that go to the airport and other industrial sites along this road. The Takeley Four Ashes traffic lights are at capacity now so with more traffic this is not going to be a sustainable route, it will become more congested than it is now – in fact it will become gridlock for most of the time The road is also a "safe walking route to school" for the local primary school.

I am also concerned that the lack of water, (we are constantly told to save water here and the pressure is not strong enough to have a shower in some parts of the village at peak times of the day. Uttlesford Council has now reached a five-year land supply which should be reported to the Council in October. Therefore, this site should be refused as it is against the policies I list below.

This application is contrary to the following policies,

S7, S8, ENV2, ENV3, ENV8, ENV9, GEN1 and contrary to NPPF on setting of heritage buildings (p174b).

I would like to ask the Inspector to refuse this application and if this application is dealt as a hearing, I would like to request that I am allowed to speak at that hearing.

Yours faithfully

Jackie Cheetham

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]