

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2025 11:05 PM
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Redetermination of Section 62A Planning Application S62A/2023/0019

[REDACTED]
Dear Sirs,

Once again I am sitting alongside my wife's desk on a Friday evening, listening to my dogs barking, about to write to defend a place very close to my heart. I am ironically amused to find that our last missive began thus:

“May I first say that I feel this is becoming more like trial by Iranian court! One thinks one is nearing the end of one’s sentence and suddenly a new charge (or proposal in this case) is launched. Defending Bulls Field, Jacks Lane and Smiths green feels like it needs to become a full-time occupation. Why can the applicant spend as much time as they like preparing submissions, yet those opposing them have very limited time against a backdrop that it is NOT their full-time occupation.”

I am assured that the previous representations will again all be considered as this is not a new application, but a re-hearing of the previous one. So I assume you will already have the rest of those submissions, and as previously I would want to speak in person at any hearing, as well as provide presentational evidence.

I have also taken the liberty of copying a previous piece written by my wife as speaking notes at the original enquiry as in fairness it not only remains a central tenet of my objections to the development but perhaps takes on even greater weight against the backdrop of the regulation 19 Local plan which has recently been submitted for consideration and which does not envisage development of Bulls field. Instead, it leaves unmolested Bulls Field, an area both around the ancient woodland as well as butting up against the newly registered Conservation area of Smiths Green (December 2023) as green space allowing a better, uninterrupted view of some worthwhile rural and agricultural landscape.

I had understood that, under the NPPF, wildlife corridors were to be given protection. That appears to be carrying little weight in the current debate. On the face of it we will be left not with “corridors” so much as islands of sanctuary. While I can see that this may not be so destructive for birds, winged wildlife or other insects, I am interested to know how soon we are expecting the deer, muntjacs foxes and others to develop jet-packs? Please note my attachment pleading the case for the preservation of Priors wood to understand how important I believe this ecosystem to be not only to the wildlife, flora and fauna, but also to the wellbeing of the neighbourhood and local population generally.

I am taking this opportunity to remind you as well, that this field is now on the *very* curtilage of the new conservation area. Had it already been developed would that even have happened? Further, there is virtually NO doubt that the fields on the

opposite side of the ancient lane will see significant development of some 1500 houses or more under the local plan currently being inspected. I believe it has been said elsewhere that, given that situation, none of the 'benefits' that are supposedly to be associated with this development can be given any weight at all, since they are not site specific and can as easily be attached to any of the further development currently envisaged under that (or any new) local plan. Indeed, it is hard to ever have considered them benefits, more consolation for the ruinous proposals put forward. At its heart this is essentially not a development plan at all – it is a plan by Weston Homes that is specifically aimed at environmental desecration and habitat destruction for all the local wildlife, flora and fauna that have had unfettered access to this space for at least the best part of a thousand years. Those habitat incumbents are as much a part of the Takeley community as are the human populations, and since they do not have any way to object to these proposals, deserve more and not less consideration than the short term profit objectives of a small property builder – not even worth the title of being a developer – arguably what WH are seeking to do is actually 'undeveloping' the local environment.

The field behind WH buildings has already been "developed" with consequent destruction of immediate area habitat and it is sad that some of the original design plan appears to have been disregarded and not enforced, including the buffer zone. Further, hardly surprising given some of the weather we've endured I guess, but the curtilage of the wood and even deeper into it now suffers additionally from significant amounts of plastic sheeting from that "development" ripped to shreds and hanging from the trees like warped bunting from a zombie or apocalypse movie. We've removed some of it during dog walks but no apparent action from the developer to do so. It doesn't bode well. I still fail to see how there is room between the existing Roseacres estate and the Woodland to accommodate adequate access for the efficient and safe movement of vehicles, pedestrians, children and animals associated with 96 dwellings. The new WH development on the main A1256 road with its tight space and corners (as well as "annexing" of trees from the Fritch Way) gives me no confidence that this is a high priority for the developer.

Given the moving dynamics of climate change and its proven implications for such things as significantly increased number and severity of high rainfall events, there is a fundamental requirement to ensure that ALL the existing housing and environment of the adjacent locale is protected from the effects of removing a large natural rainfall capture and subsequent release area of land. Over at least the last 100 years flooding has not been an issue for any land or property adjacent to the land in question. To that effect, given the current and projected increased / changed climatic conditions from global warming, any habitat desecration plans should include on-site capture and release mitigations for at least 2 '100 year' rainfall events on consecutive days to ensure that the historic 'integrity' of existing infrastructure in relation to flooding is not compromised, and should that fail, adequate financial arrangements are in place to ensure that the resultant costs incurred do not fall on the 'victims'. (Note: One potential way to ensure that would be an 'in perpetuity' insurance bond provided and paid for by the proposed developer, as it is a legitimate cost of doing business)

Finally, With the other developments envisaged and with pressure already on to change the nature of the protected lane simply to allow safe access to the Jacks lane site (a consideration which seemed to escape the notice of those permitting that development). I would be even more concerned about the ability of the remaining undeveloped land to cope locally with the increasing climate change induced increases in water run-off requirements, probably to the detriment of the woodland, but also to the local ditch and hedge network, and therefore with a detrimental knock-on effect to adjacent properties especially given the expectation of extreme rainfall events (as well as drought) we are increasingly seeing and told to expect to worsen.

Yours Sincerely

Paul K Kimber, B.Sc., M.Sc.