

**From:** David Evans [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** 15 December 2023 12:07  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** 'David Evans' [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Proposal :S62A/2023/0027

Dear Inquiries and Major Casework Team, Please see the amended objection below as requested

**Proposal:S62A/2023/0027 Full planning application for Erection of 40 no. dwellings including open space landscaping and associated infrastructure.**

We will reiterate later, below, our comments made to you in respect of the proposed Development of Jacks Field, Takeley in May 2023, some of which were sustained by Ms Susan Hunt's Refusal Decision notice, dated 9th August 2023.

As you can see, it is made clear from the attached "highlighted" article by the independent journalist Emma Doyle of the "Dunmowbroadcast", reporting on a public Consultation Meeting, to debate the Local Plan, that took place in early October, that advice being provided to UDC by their Planning Department, is in direct opposition, to current Planning Inspectorate guidelines.

Her report, quotes Councillor John Evans, declaring himself and perhaps others, as "amateurs" when it comes to Planning Processes. Then we have Councillor Geoff Bagnall, declaring that the Council have not seen any evidence to support the proposed New Housing Blueprint and might be forced to "blindly support" it.

Most damningly the "interim Planning Manager" Andrew Maxted (n.b. Interim), shows his contempt for the Planning Inspectorate, by stating that rejected applications by the Planning Inspectorate (including I would suggest, Mr McCoy's detailed findings in 2022 with regard to the Weston Homes failed Planning Application for Takeley and also Ms Susan Hunt's rejection for Weston Homes rehashed proposals for Jacks Field, made upon similar findings in August 2023) were made on just "Technical Grounds" appearing to dismiss the grounds for rejection as unimportant.

All the foregoing, has encouraged developers like Weston Homes to continue with proposals that have long been rejected. How long will UDC failings, continue this encouragement.

Additionally, what of the considerations with regards to the promises made by Government in respect of "Stansted - The Airport in the Countryside" in 1985, resulting in the CPZ of 1995?

The foregoing suggests that this 3<sup>rd</sup> application should once again, be refused, as little has changed, if at all.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards

David & Carole Evans  
[REDACTED]

---

**Original Objection 22 May 2023**

Dear Inquiries and Major Casework Team,

**Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2023/0016 Warish Hall Farm, Smiths Green Lane, Takeley, Essex, CM22 6NZ**

This planning Application is clearly a "Rehash" of the failed application of 2021/2022, however providing for a significant increase in properties on Jacks Field, compared to earlier rejected plans. Its impact on the environment and the area is exactly the same as the earlier rejected application, albeit on a smaller scale.

For example, in **6.3 entitled Jack's - Warish Hall Farm - Ecology Documents Note**, the very same inaccurate data is provided that was examined in Mr McCoy's public enquiry by residents (2022) and was found wanting. ( Is this because, it is a duplication of the original Environmental Report, created mainly in 2021) .

There appears to be an arrogance in this application, in that, it has not acknowledged the findings of Mr McCoy in his earlier enquiry. Once again no mention of the presence of Red Kite (see attached photo) and Skylarks (protected species on the Red List, as I understand).

No mention of Fallow Deer (see attached photo) and the barrier this development will make, to their free movement and entry, into the Copse in Jacks Lane.

No mention of the substantial increase in traffic in Smiths Green Lane (originally Warish Hall Road, a Protected Lane) and the pressure this development will place upon water resources and the like.

In closing we would restate our original objections to the larger development, which were expressed as follows:

"As we know, this site is in reality unsustainable, nowhere near adequate public transport, there is no real infrastructure and there is already too much traffic movement along narrow single lane roads such as Warish Hall Road (not Smiths Green Lane). With many new cars associated to the development, combined with the air pollution from Stansted Airport, air quality will deteriorate to unacceptable levels in what should be a rural area. There is also a growing lack of Water facilities (pressure), quite apart from the other obvious infrastructure needs."

In closing, we believe that approval for this plan, should be refused.

Yours faithfully,

David & Carole Evans

