

**From:** Loftus Buhagiar [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 March 2025 23:35  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** S62A/2025/0077 - Land West of High Street, Stebbing, Essex

Hi

I have reviewed this application and object to it based on the inaccuracies within and non compliance with policies.

It is hard to believe that the livelihood's and wellbeing of village residents can be threatened by developers lack of thought and greed.

Our Neighbour Plan was developed for a reason and we believe in it. Why should an external third party rip it apart for their own benefit?

You have a responsibility to stand up for our village in terms of policies and procedures and we have developed the Neighbour Plan to define our requirements.

Attached are my comments and the previous submission I made.

Please be honest to us and the district. We don't want this development and it will not benefit anyone except the developer.

Regards

*Loftus*

Loftus Buhagiar  
[REDACTED]

## Introduction

I object to this development.

The developer has:

- Ignored the Stebbing Neighbourhood Plan - Our Neighbour Plan was developed for a reason and we believe in it. Why should an external third party rip it apart for their own benefit?
- Appears to have ignored comments made by the villagers from the previous application objections
- Wants to destroy a conservation area
- Has no respect for our village quality of life
- Has not followed up on approvals from various authorities and has deliberately gone to the wrong ones for approval, e.g. National Highways and not Essex Highways
- Has lied about the villages' consent for this development
- Thought of his own greed before the benefits a country life provides for our village.

The inspectorate must consider:

- Why can a developer challenge/ignore the approved Neighbourhood Plan?
- Why can our village quality of life be destroyed?
- Why has the developer been able to arrogantly proceed with a new application when nothing material has changed?
- Why is the inspectorate not looking after our interests? (an example in Stebbing would be a development called Ploughman's Reach which went ahead, changed 100% from original plan, and had no enforcement control. This applied for construction and development.) How will this be enforced? It made our lives miserable and nobody in UDC did anything to enforce it. Is this how UDC and the government plan our future? Explain?

I am astounded how this is not picked up by the inspectorate and ask how this is value for money as a tax payer and for our community and district? Is there a government policy for destroying the countryside and villages therein?

Having reviewed this new application, previously and now, my comments are below as to why this development should not go ahead using your notations. A copy of my previous comments is also attached. The developers' documents/statements are highlighted in grey.

### **Document: Planning Statement Addendum**

#### **Policy Statement (ii)**

UDC submitted their emerging Local Plan (2021 – 2041) under Regulation 22 to the Secretary of State for independent Examination on 18th December 2024.

I have a major concern that developers are ignoring neighbourhood plans in other areas as well as Stebbing, Great Chesterford for example, challenging how robust Stebbing's

Neighbourhood Plan is given the government's desire for building and its ability to overrule.

When Neighbourhood Plans were requested by government, Stebbing rose to the challenge and were among the first in the district to comply. It is robust and accepted/recorded by 97% of the village community with UDC.

As far as our plan is concerned, it is just over two years old and still has 'Super Status' which will last for five years.

Stebbing Parish Council has also reformed the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee to review and include the new government housing requirements and this is a work in progress.

**Q.** Please explain why the Stebbing Neighbourhood Plan is out of date when the "emerging plan" has not been approved?

#### **Document: Appendix 1 – Public Consultation and Feedback**

Montare held a public consultation event in respect of their sustainable development proposals (for land to the west of the High Street) at The White Hart PH in the village on 22nd June 2022 between the hours of 2.30pm to 8.30pm. This followed a 600 leaflet drop that took place in the village to advertise the event; all of the District Councillors and Parish Council were invited by email, as were the relevant Planning Officers involved.

68 people from the village attended the event; 13 (mostly anonymously) of whom filled in feedback forms.

The 2021 Census recognises 1,061 people living in Stebbing and the survey conducted only accounts for 6.4% who were asked their opinions in a pub where alcohol was provided with only 13 anonymous filling out the forms, i.e., 1.2% with mixed responses.

**Q.** Please explain why 1.2% of the village community (mixed responses) carries a majority vote for your development survey and approval? Sounds wrong to me!

#### **Document: Appendix 2 – Amenity Benefits**

**Q.** How will the woodland / wildlife parks be of benefit to the village when they have already been provided by the parish council through the Kingdom Woodland Walk. The areas nominated by the developer for such recreation contain natural springs, making the area wet, inaccessible and susceptible to flooding in winter.

#### **Document: Technical Note – Transport**

#### **Conclusion**

The Proposed Development will result in fewer trips than the previously submitted proposal.

**Q.** How?

The associated highway works to provide additional pedestrian footways are retained from the previous application.

**Q.** How does this work with road crossings? There is no Essex Highways comment on this, please explain? Nothing shown on the drawings!

The resulting highway impact assessment shows a negligible impact on the surrounding area and is considered robust in the context of the current proposals.

**Q.** How do the access points to these developments compare to the school entrance and the parent parking along the main road at school times? The access points are adjacent yellow boxes opposite the school and the quantity of cars parked daily for school drop-offs and pick-ups far exceed the spaces being provided by the development. The school plans are to expand and I ask what provision has been made for this, particularly relating to the new accesses. Also, will there be new yellow lines around the bend, between the accesses for traffic/pedestrian safety?

Therefore the Proposed Development is not considered to give rise to unacceptable issues of road safety, nor would the residual cumulative impacts be considered severe.

**Q.** Noting the point above, how will construction traffic and residents manoeuvre around the bend? Will it require permanent traffic control? Which road safety policies and processes will be used to enable construction and use of the new accesses? If permanent traffic control is required, how long will this be for? How will residents opposite the new development be treated?

### **Documents: 24112 House Types**

**Q.** Please explain how these “house types” are similar to those existing in an Elizabethan Village?

### **Consultees**

#### **National Highways**

**Q.** Why have National Highways been consulted and not Essex Highways? National Highways have no responsibility here and I ask how is this relevant?

#### **Essex Police**

**Q.** Questions asked about safety. Also, questions raised about resident’s abuse of the school parking that are not addressed. Where are the answers?

## Historic England

Q. Why Ignore them? They say:

### “Recommendation

Historic England objects to the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 199, 200 and 206.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

In addition, section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 asks you to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

We also draw your attention to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which asks you to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”

## Watermans Transport Statement

Q. The school parking assessments are very light, particularly in the afternoons. There are photo surveys. Why are we being told something different to what we see with our eyes?

## Previous Comments

## Comments for Planning Application UTT/23/2496/FUL

### Application Summary

Application Number: UTT/23/2496/FUL

Address: Land West Of High Street Stebbing Essex

Proposal: Erection of 28 residential dwellings (comprising 14 affordable and 11 private market homes together with 3 self-build plots) and local affordable employment unit/flexible community space; provision of public open space and associated local amenity facilities (activating Local Green Space allocation); together with integrated landscaping and car parking (to include additional community parking facility)

Case Officer: [REDACTED]

### Customer Details

Name: Mr Loftus Buhagiar

Address: [REDACTED]

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this development for the following reasons:

This development is not included in the Neighbourhood Plan and is proposed in an area that is an "important and protected view" for the village, therefore depriving locals of their village characteristics.

The consultation process described involved inviting people to a pub (on 22nd June 2022) to gather their views before any formal application was made, but the following day (23rd June 2022) the referendum for the Neighbourhood Plan was approved. So the facts stated in your planning statement are incorrect!

Access arrangements are weak as both plots are on a long bend that is parked on by teachers and parents, making it a one-way traffic route during the day and making it unsafe for access to be located here. The public parking shown to ease this problem is inadequate as it competes with resident and visitor parking and it too will be unsafe with the remaining cars parked on the road.

This does not take into account the construction period which makes no provision for school parking, but does include heavy vehicles and deliveries disrupting traffic and village life. Plans need to be detailed for this period with timescales to show how residents will have no disruption. S106 agreements are discussed, but with no consultation or proposals. This makes it very difficult to see how this development will benefit the community.

The development does not bring any benefits to the community, but increases the population and squeezes the existing amenities and services.

How can this development claim to be sustainable when it is destroying our environment and biodiversity?