

From: Lee Page [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 March 2025 10:31
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: PINS Objection to S62A/2025/0077, Land West of High Street, Stebbing.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to object to the proposal (S62A/2025/0077, Land West of High Street, Stebbing) for the 28 dwellings either in full scheme or parts thereof.

1. The scheme fails to recognise the updated neighbour plan, which states the proposed areas as local green space and are located within the village core, the site area also abuts the conservation area, which is a protected characteristic, this scheme does not preserve or enhance the current conservation area, protection thus extends beyond buildings, to include streets, trees, paths and views which the scheme would obliterate.

Other areas in and around Stebbing have been identified in the Local Neighbourhood Plan for the preservation of the community and village aesthetic, these should be utilised before any other development is considered.

The local services in Stebbing have been at capacity for some time, the school is full, my family are currently unable to send our children to the school despite living 120mtrs from the entrance. This consideration of schooling was brought up at UDC's planning decision where the planning officer stated that there was plenty of space, this however in retrospect was not true, Essex County schooling has capacity, but Stebbing does not. Building more dwellings is not going to help this fact and children will have to driven to other local schools exacerbating traffic volumes. The village has one shop that is volunteer run, the nearest supermarket is in Dunmow and is inadequate for the towns size due to the influx of housing developments, similarly doctor and dental practices are above capacity.

2. The assessments for environmental – phase 1 habitat, Greater Crested Newts (GCN), Biodiversity net gain (BNG), National Vegetation Classification (NVC), Tree, Heritage, Landscape Visual, Transport are vague and lacking in any real analysis or report mistruths to the local knowledge of the sites. Complete bat, bird, wintering bird, dormouse, red squirrel surveys as a minimum should be undertaken before any consent is granted.

3. Document AMENITY_BENEFITS_PART_1-4138690 which was presented to the community June 2022, it shows on page 4 more housing than is currently applied for, this document was issued 20 Sept 2023. Document DESIGN_AND_ACCESS_PART_4-4138889 adds further confusion into the amount of housing requested, (Plot A = 6, B = 5, C = 3 and D = 23) a total of 37 dwellings, this overall document was produced Sept 2023. This shows intent from the developer to go above and beyond the stated number of 28 dwellings, whilst that may form part of a separate application it shows no regard to the environmental, landscape visual, acoustic, socio economic or transport impact and would bring unwanted and unneeded development of green field sites.

4. A zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) assessment under a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) hasn't been undertaken which would allow residents and planning to see the visual impact of this scheme. It would take the bare earth topology of the sites and compares to the built scheme. Photomontages would also be useful to inform the planning decision, these are not present so a complete picture of the visual impact on views across green space cannot be properly assessed, although it would be quite clear that countryside views of both sites would be blighted by out of keeping modern and overbearing housing.

The South site in particular (Plots C&D) are atop of a hill, the houses placed here would be overbearing to the village scene and would take away the only remaining green vantage points in the core of the high street before the downs, which is where the North site (Plots A&B) would be

situated, again taking away an important village aesthetic, the development would take wellbeing views across the countryside with the only beneficiaries being the new owners of the new development.

5. Lighting, the Police response is for safeguarding by providing lighting to deter nefarious activities, considering the proximity of conservation area I believe this would cause a light pollution island that radiates the light pollution as a beacon towards the high street, as the site slope is naturally facing south.

6. Soils assessment, I see not indication that soil bore samples have been taken across the sites, given the topography of the land, one would assume piling and substantial foundations would be necessary given some of the houses appear to use stilting to shore up, presumably this is being done and the land is rolling with two natural valleys on each site, soils samples would indicate the amount of foundations necessary which could have a real impact on the environment, especially the water table and courses that run through the Stebbing Brook Valley, this in turn would have a detrimental affect on the flora and fauna.

7. An acoustic assessment hasn't been undertaken identifying residential receptors which would be impacted during the build and post build phases of the scheme. The largest impact that is apparent is that of School Hill portion of this application, not only would construction noise and vibration severely impact the neighbouring homes in an approximate 1km radius given the topography, the school which is located directly across the road would find it difficult to dampen any noise or vibration at all in turn affecting key learning for the nursery and primary school pupils including Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) children. I see no safeguarding or mitigation measures mentioned for the school or neighbours. Affecting the pupil's learning environment should be considered a key factor in refusing consent alone.

8. Document HERITAGE_IMPACT_ASSESSMENT-4138671 identifies just 2 listed buildings along the high street that would be impacted by the scheme, the other listed buildings that have been negated have direct lines of sight to and from the South site, Photo 16. View of High Street to the north-west, is disingenuous in its depiction due to the photographers positioning, the South field site can be seen from the east side vantage point approximately in front of Archway and Shamrock cottages which are Grade II listed buildings, there are numerous other Grade II listed buildings between these homes and the South field site.

9. The transport statement of the application only seems to mention car parking which is under played and the refuse collection turning arcs. There is a distinct lack of any mention to road safety mitigation including construction traffic flows and routes, traffic. Access to the site is via rural roads that are not suitable for heavy traffic number by Class 2 and Class 1 vehicle which would be required for the excavation and delivery supply of materials of a scheme of this size. Any construction traffic would have an immediate and negative affect on village life and only exacerbate parking issues and access. The village does have a problem with speeding traffic above the posted limit. Adding 4 additional entrances off the high street will only add further risk with the potential to cause serious harm to life and damage to property, given the site is predominantly sighted on a bend that has notorious parking issues during school drop off and parking times, providing a car park cannot is not a guarantee for safety in this area, taking note that the current school zig-zagged area would be reduced with the Southern most entrance to Plot D.

10. With the mildly modified application which takes away the community building and adds in additional planting (the community building is still show on various other plans). The revision from

Montare still do not address the harmful impact on the setting of the scheduled Motte Castle, the abutting conservation area and the visual cohesion of the High Street.

11. There is no substantial justification from Montare that there is a requirement for the developments in the areas chosen over and above those indicated in the Local Neighbourhood Plan, instead Montares proposal goes directly go against it. The community took considerable thought and time to resolutely develop Stebbings LNP, with 97% of the responding public (534 for, 17 against) in favour of adopting it. Montare make no consideration for the plan, or the residents.

12. Montare make no recognition for the designated green space within the village, even after the planning refusal from UDC whom specially commented upon it.

In conclusion before any planning consent is considered I would like to invite the planning inspectorate to visit the area and engage with residents and see firsthand how out of character this scheme would be and how it would blight the land and lives of the residents.

Kind Regards
The Page Family.
c/o
Mr Lee Page

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]