

From: David Royle [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2024 12:07 PM
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Land to the West of Mill Lane, Hatfield Heath, CM22 and the consultation reference - S62A/2024/0032

Dear Sirs

I am writing on behalf of the Sawbridgeworth Local History Society to repeat our objections to this planning application, as expressed in person and in writing for, and at, the UDC meeting on 25 October last year :

PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE: 25 October 2023 REFERENCE NUMBER: UTT/22/1261/FUL
Land to the West of Mill Lane Hatfield Heath

I am writing on behalf of the Sawbridgeworth Local History Society in relation to the planning application for developing the POW Camp site in Hatfield Heath.

As a history society we are concerned that the heritage aspect of the site will be lost. We note the comments under **heritage** at the Planning Committee meeting referred to above:

*The site was surveyed by Historic England in 2003, and was recorded as being 'Condition 2 – near complete'. This places it in a significant grouping of only 17% of the 'standard' camps that survive'.
Criteria: A, B, C, E, G*

14.5.8 "As before, although the conversion and reuse of the huts and water tower are supported in principle, due to the proposed demolitions and changes to the site layout, the scheme will inevitably result in harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, making Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) relevant."

We would like the opportunity to speak at the forthcoming planning committee meeting on this proposal, as previously mentioned to you.

We support the additional objections and access issues raised at that meeting by the local parish Council and residents. We understand that previous applications for redevelopment on this site have been refused, including once by the Inspectorate itself. We would also request that the inspectorate consider this case via a hearing. We would wish to attend such a hearing.

We understand that this application proposal is exactly the same as the one most recently refused by UDC and that the developer has, as far as we are aware, made no effort to address any of the many issues raised at the October Planning Committee meeting.

Best wishes
David

David Royle

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED])