

Inquiries and Major Casework Team

The Planning Inspectorate

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Temple Quay House

2 The Square

Temple Quay

Bristol

BS1 6PN

5<sup>th</sup> February 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: Land West of Cricketer's Clavering Essex (S62A/2023/0030) 28 Dwellings**

We wish to strongly object to this application on the following grounds:

**Relevant Planning History**

In recent years there have been three varying planning applications on this site, all of which have been turned down by Uttlesford District Council for the same reasons. One application for 31 dwellings was turned down on appeal by the Inspectorate and is not significantly different from this one for 28 dwellings. This application is therefore a waste of public funds.

**Outside Development Limits**

The proposed development site is outside village development limits.

**Urban Development Impact on Village**

This block estate-style development is against the overall linear pattern of housing in the village. Eldridge Close opposite was a brownfield site development and arguably, unlike this case, could be considered an improvement on what stood before.

This development would be very detrimental to the character of the village and push the countryside edge away from the original village. This urban creep will be visually intrusive from the road and nearby footpaths and destroy an important piece of open countryside.

**Distance from Village Facilities**

This proposed development is some distance and at the wrong end of the village to benefit from the main village facilities of the shop and village school. Previous planning appeals have turned down applications because of this fact and because of harm to the countryside. There can be no justification for locating such a major development this far from these facilities, thus making the use of cars essential. Footpaths through the centre of the village are narrow and in places dangerous and there are no public bus services now or planned for the near future.

**Heritage Assets**

This development will have a detrimental impact on nearby heritage assets.

### **Traffic Hazard**

The proposed site is on a bend with limited visibility and would create a potential traffic hazard.

### **Wrong Place**

The proposed development fails in all three NPPF tests of sustainability. Any benefits which might be attributed to a further 28 dwellings, in a village already overburdened with a mass of ongoing development, is far outweighed by the damage caused by such a large development in an important piece of open countryside. It is a development in the wrong place and as previously determined, "not in a sustainable location."

For the reasons outlined above we would submit that this application should be **REFUSED**.

Yours Faithfully,

Jeremy and Rebecca Veitch