

From: Pauline [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2024 5:07 PM
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Proposal S62A/2024/0057 Erection of 91 dwellings, provision of playing fields and clubhouse at Former Friends School Field Mount Pleasant Road, Saffron Walden

To the Inquiries and Major Casework Team
Planning Inspectorate

Proposal S62A/2024/0057 Erection of 91 dwellings, provision of playing fields and clubhouse at Former Friends School Field Mount Pleasant Road, Saffron Walden

Whilst in principle, I do not object to Chase building 91 new homes as proposed in this Planning Application, I am deeply concerned about Chase's piecemeal approach to the development of the site. When will they be required to address the old school buildings? Or, will they be allowed to develop everywhere else on the site, take their profit and then claim it's too expensive to redevelop the historic school building?

I implore you to take into account that previously Chase promised a swimming pool but having got permission to build houses have subsequently failed to deliver said swimming pool. Here they are now, promising a sports facility, changing rooms, clubhouse - how do you suppose that will actually happen without constraints imposed contractually on Chase as part of the approval for the 91 additional homes.

The proposed site is protected by the Uttlesford Town Council Local Plan 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Plan policy LC1 - Loss of Sports Fields and Recreational Facilities states that if replacement facilities are proposed these must be at least as good as those lost in terms of location, quantity, quality, and management arrangements. The Local Plan also states that the new sports facilities must be made available before development of the existing site begins. The key point here is that Chase should be contractually obliged to provide the sport facilities BEFORE any further planning approval is granted for more housing development.

I have already seen that Chase were unable to comply with this in their previous application in relation to the swimming pool and this valuable facility has been lost to the community without any comeback on Chase.

Chase Homes propose an informal footpath from Greenways to Mount Pleasant running alongside the woodland to the East of the playing field. However, there are no detailed plans of how this will be made safe for the public nor who will manage the path once the Developers have left the site. Will the path be lit? If so, what will be the effect on the wildlife in the woodland of the resulting light pollution? If not lit, what steps do Chase propose to ensure that this informal footpath does not become a muggers' and druggies paradise?

Historically access to the playing fields and woodland area was severely restricted and therefore, the impact on neighbours was minimal and limited to school

hours. The proposed informal footpath could potentially be used 24/7 leading to increased impact on neighbours and the wildlife in the woodland.

Opening this site up for a housing development is one thing, but actively creating a thoroughfare for no apparent gain, short of an attempt to make the application look more inclusive, is completely another thing.

I request that you please take into account the above comments when considering your decision on this planning application.

Pauline Quincey