

From: Peter Colgate [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2024 6:25 PM
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2024/0032 Land to the West of Mill Lane, Hatfield Heath

[REDACTED]
To whom it may concern,

As a neighbour to the proposed development and as a concerned Hatfield Heath Resident, I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, namely, the demolition of 12 no. existing outbuildings / structures, the conversion and restoration of 8 no. existing buildings to form 8 no. holiday cottages and 1 no. dwelling, the construction of 3 no. single storey dwellings. The creation of a pedestrian and cycle link path'

Reasons for objection - Contents

1. Within the Greenbelt
2. Not within the Hatfield Heath Planning Development Area.
3. Within the greater Conservation Area
4. Environmental Health
5. Proposed widening of Mill Lane
6. Impact on Hatfield Haven Dementia Home
7. Change to use of existing footpath
8. Impact on overburdened community infrastructure
9. Baseline traffic movement
10. Public Transport
11. Hatfield Heath is not a holiday destination
12. Proposal does not contribute for affordable housing
13. Impacts on existing POW Camp.

Reasons for objection - Details:

1. Within the Greenbelt
 - a. Government guidance advises LPAs that, in general, development on the green belt is "inappropriate" and "harmful to the Green Belt". It provides that LPAs should allow development on the green belt only in "in very special circumstances".
 - b. The proposed development site is allocated as Greenbelt land.
 - c. Development of Greenbelt leads to poorer air quality and more greenhouse gases which contribute to climate change.
 - d. Development of Greenbelt leads to increased surface water flooding and there has already been a fatality due to this on Stortford Road.
 - e. Should the development be approved, with the exception of removing permitted development rights, further encroachment on greenbelt areas could occur within these new residential dwellings and holiday homes, (and their curtilage), through future development/extensions which would have an even greater impact on the openness of the Greenbelt.
2. Not within the Hatfield Heath Planning Development Area.
 - a. The proposed development site is not within the Hatfield Heath Planning Development Area.
 - b. Please refer the attached diagram showing Hatfield Heath Planning Development Area.
3. Within the greater Conservation Area.

- a. The proposed development site is within the greater Conservation Area.
 - b. Please refer the attached diagram showing the conservation area within which Hatfield Heath falls.
4. Environmental Health
- a. The Environmental Health Response-4121287 report covers specific points covering Contaminated Land, Environmental Noise Impact, Construction/Demolition, Construction/Demolition Management Plan and Air Quality.
 - b. There appears to be no evidence as to how the Applicant will fulfil the conditions of these points.
 - c. There is no mention of the impact on Air and Noise pollution regarding Hatfield Haven (see point 6c below).
5. Proposed widening of Mill Lane
- a. No where on the plan does it show that, at its narrowest point, buildings are directly on the side of the roadway and therefore Mill Lane cannot be widened.
 - b. Where it can be widened, the widened road is still too narrow to allow for vehicles coming from opposite directions to pass each other, which will require some of the vehicles to reverse back up or back down Mill Lane. In the case of emergency vehicles, this will have a serious impact if the emergency vehicle cannot gain quick access.
 - c. There is no space to provide the proposed pedestrian facilities as the Mill Lane is already too narrow to provide a pedestrian footpath.
 - d. The applicant is implying that they have the right to widen and resurface Mill Lane. They do not own Mill Lane. Mill Lane falls under Essex Highways.
 - e. There is no mention of how construction vehicles will enter/leave the site and the impact these will have on:
 - i. on current users of Mill Lane
 - ii. vibration, noise, pollution on the residents of Mill Lane including Hatfield Haven
 - iii. Greenways Eggs
 - iv. Invicta Motors
6. Impact on Hatfield Haven Dementia Home
- a. Ambulances require access to Hatfield Haven from Mill Lane. No mention is made of the impact on access for ambulances due to increased traffic. This point has been raised before but the plan still does not show Hatfield Haven.
 - b. Nowhere on the plan does it show that, at its narrowest point, Mill Lane runs along the edge of the wall of the building of Hatfield Haven, a home for people with Dementia. It runs so close that there is no separation between the roadway and downpipes.
 - c. There is not mention of the environmental and physical wellbeing impact on the residents of Hatfield Haven from pollution from additional vehicles or noise impacts of additional vehicles.
 - d. The kitchen windows from Hatfield Haven open onto Mill Lane. There is not mention of the impact from pollution from additional vehicles on the kitchen.
7. Change to use of existing footpath.
- a. On the official Essex footpath map, the footpath, shown as Hatfield Heath 12 on official Essex footpath map, is designated as a footpath.
 - b. Furthermore, a footpath is described as a way that may be passed on foot, or using a mobility aid. Cycling on a footpath is forbidden.
 - c. The applicant is putting forward that they are the owner of the piece of land comprising a section of the "Hatfield Heath 12" footpath or that they have the right

to change the footpath to a cycle path or widen the footpath. Neither of these are true.

- d. Changing the use of a footpath, its course or land covered cannot be done without official prior notice and for the opportunity of the users of the footpath to object to such changes.
 - e. There are bollards across the footpath allowing access for pedestrians only.
8. Impact on overburdened community infrastructure
- a. There are other developments already approved for Hatfield Heath which will impact on the already the overburdened community infrastructure including the school, GP surgery, parking, gas, water, electricity and sewage management of sewers that are regularly blocked and a sewage farm that overflows.
 - b. The proposed development will put additional further strain on the overburdened community infrastructure as covered in the previous point.
 - c. In addition to this application, there is a planning application for development under reference UTT/22/1947/FUL at Camp Poultry Farm, Mill Lane, Hatfield Heath. Both this application and Application UTT/22/1947/FUL need to be reviewed alongside each other as there are in terms of additional buildings/dwellings and additional traffic generated along Mill Lane which challenges highway safety as huge articulated lorries are arriving from Europe as early as 4am in the morning and up to 9pm at night, including at weekends.
9. Baseline traffic movement analysis is not current.
- a. The baseline traffic movement analysis has not been updated to include changes in the traffic movements in and around Mill Lane. The baseline traffic movements for this application are therefore out of date and need to be updated.
 - b. Invicta Motors are now located in Mill Lane. This company attracts many customers, some of whom test drive vehicles and use Mill Lane to and from Invicta Motors for their test drives. Staff also use trailers to transport car stock which is often 7 days per week during peak and off-peak hours.
 - c. Previous planning applications submitted to develop the POW Camp were based upon Greenways Egg Farm being relocated, which is now no longer the case. The Egg Farm will remain in Mill Lane and generates high volumes of traffic including up to 44 tonne articulated lorries that can barely move up and down Mill Lane.
 - d. The local care home, Hatfield Haven, have just completed building work which reduces the capacity of their car park. This has increased the number of staff and visitors trying to find parking around the immediate area which is often already congested around the entrance to Mill Lane from Stortford Road.
 - e. A new Junction 7A has been opened on the M11 which has increase traffic volumes through Hatfield Heath.
 - f. The swept path of a large vehicle entering, turning, and exiting Mill Lane only shows a Refuse Vehicle entering and leaving Mill Lane from the West side. It does not show a refuse vehicle, or other large vehicles, entering and leaving Mill Lane from the East side or the impacts of entering or leaving from the East side.
 - g. Although, from the ECC highway and transportation perspective, the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority, it is subject to strong conditions before they commence development. There appears to be no evidence as to how the Applicant will fulfil these conditions.
10. Public Transport
- a. Hatfield Heath Bus Services
 - i. Bus Service 5, although advertised as every 60 minutes is not reliable.
 - ii. Bus Service 57 runs every 60 minutes and is reasonably reliable. This is between Harlow and Chelmsford.

- iii. Bus Service 347 in the proposal is not correct. According to the proposal, Bus Service 347 runs every day and twice a day. This is inaccurate. The service only runs on a Tuesday and a Thursday and once a day in each direction, namely, 09:49 to Sawbridgeworth Station and 12:46 from Sawbridgeworth Station. It is therefore complexly not suitable to transport for the Sawbridgeworth rail station
 - b. Rail Services
 - i. The nearest station is Sawbridgeworth Station.
 - ii. The proposal states that there are 33 bays available, however, these are mainly prebooked and by 9:30 on weekdays are fully utilised.
 - c. The proposal is therefore inaccurate in its statement that public transport services are easily accessible for residents and especially holiday makers.
11. Hatfield Heath is not a holiday destination.
- a. There is no evidence to support Hatfield Heath being a holiday destination.
 - b. Hatfield Heath has no easy access to rail stations or places of interest.
 - c. Approval of the proposed holiday homes will undoubtedly lead to the request for permission for these to be converted to permanent homes in the near future.
12. No contribution for affordable housing
- a. The proposal does not contribute any affordable housing as part of the scheme and will not address local housing needs.
13. Impacts on existing POW camp.
- a. The development is on an existing POW camp.
 - b. This has been covered in detail in other objections and reposts.
 - c. It is my understanding from the local History Society that a further application has been submitted to Heritage UK to have the site listed.

Thank you for your kind considerations and attention to our arguments and objections.

Yours sincerely

Peter Colgate

████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████

Attachments:

Diagram showing proposed development lying outside of the Hatfield Heath development boundaries.

Diagram showing adequate housing allocations within the Uttlesford local plan and showing Hatfield Heath within the Conservation Area.