

Paul Birch



11th February 2024

Ref: PINS S62A Planning Application ref: S62A/2023/0030 Land west of The Cricketers, Clatterbury Lane, Clavering, Essex Outline application with all matters reserved, except access for up to 28 dwellings (Class C3) including public open space, sustainable drainage systems, landscaping and associated infrastructure

Dear Sir/Madam

This letter outlines my objections to the proposed development referenced above. I strongly believe this application should be rejected on the following grounds:

- The proposed site is outside the village development limits.
- There have already been three quite different previous planning proposals for this site, each refused by Uttlesford District Council for the same reasons, with one of them (for 31 dwellings) also turned down at Appeal. The current application is little different from that in the Appeal application
- The proposed development will seriously harm the character of this part of the village because:
 - The site will be visually intrusive from the road and nearby footpaths
 - It is yet another example of urban creep into the countryside. The proposed estate-type design of the new dwellings conflicts with the generally linear pattern of housing in the village
 - The north of the village is simply the wrong place for clustered housing which, in Clavering, is located mainly around the Stortford Road area
- Previous Appeals on nearby land in the northern part of the village have been turned down on grounds of excessive distance from core village facilities and harm to the countryside.
- I understand the proposed development fails all three NPPF tests of sustainability

- The development represents poor transport and highways practice since its proposed access point sits on a slow bend with limited visibility resulting in a potential traffic hazard.
- UDC have said that Clavering's 111 new house target is likely to be reduced when the Regulation 19 version of the draft new Local Plan is published in the spring this year. This reduces the need for larger developments such as that proposed.

Regards
Paul Birch