Mr and Mrs James and Julie Puxley

11th June 2025

To: The Planning Inspectorate

Application Reference: S62A/2025/0107

Site Address: Former Friends School Field, Mount Pleasant Road, Saffron Walden, CB11 3EB

Dear Sir/Madam,

We write as residents which lies directly to the south of the proposed development site, to register our formal objection to planning application S62A/2025/0107. Our concerns relate to the detrimental impacts the proposal would have on residential amenity, parking and traffic, local infrastructure, and security, particularly for those living in Greenways and the surrounding area.

The revised proposal significantly underestimates the implications of parking displacement. While on-site parking has been included, there is no guarantee that this provision will be sufficient to prevent visitors to the sports facilities from parking in Greenways. Our road is a quiet residential cul-de-sac, not designed to absorb overflow traffic or high-turnover parking. Previous applications for additional development here have already been refused due to road safety concerns on Winstanley Road. The narrow layout of Greenways means that on-street parking already poses difficulties for access, particularly for emergency and service vehicles.

A particularly troubling change in this revised application is the reduction in on-site parking. The number of standard spaces has been cut from 28 to 22, with no provision at all for coach parking—despite clear advice from Sport England that 30+ spaces would be the minimum requirement. This directly contradicts national guidance and is inconsistent with both the Essex Parking Standards and Sport England's own recommendations. Local

precedent at Herbet Farm, where regular overspill parking occurs despite more generous provision, demonstrates that inadequate parking is a real and avoidable problem.

The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that new developments must not have a negative impact on local roads or residential amenity. Yet this proposal is almost certain to do so. Greenways is the nearest and least restricted road to the new pedestrian access, making it the most vulnerable to becoming an unofficial overflow car park. This not only inconveniences residents but also compromises road safety and the overall character of the area.

Further, the proposed pedestrian access from Greenways to Mount Pleasant Road is described in the Inspector's previous report as a moderate public benefit. In practice, however, it will channel a large number of non-residents through our street, fundamentally altering its character. This raises legitimate concerns about increased noise, littering, loss of privacy, and the potential for anti-social behaviour—all of which will harm the quality of life for residents, particularly families with young children and older people.

The current application also places heavy reliance on assumptions rather than enforceable solutions. The supposed effectiveness of the travel plan and future management measures is not backed by any binding commitments. There is no effective mechanism in place to prevent Greenways from becoming an overflow parking area. Relying on post-approval planning conditions to resolve these issues is insufficient and overlooks the lived experiences of similar developments.

The positioning of the sports facilities and clubhouse at the southern end of the site, adjacent to Greenways, further compounds the issue. This layout encourages visitors to park as close to the pitches as possible, thereby funnelling traffic and footfall into residential streets. A more appropriate approach would be to relocate the sports facilities to the northern end of the site, where they could be accessed more directly from Mount Pleasant Road and better integrated with the main transport infrastructure. This would reduce the impact on Greenways and other nearby residential roads, and allow for improved site management overall.

It is worth noting that the original 2019 application proposed sports pitches at the northern end of the site, a layout that more effectively addressed access and amenity considerations. In seeking to overcome previous objections, the current application has overcorrected—placing undue pressure on Greenways instead of achieving a balanced and sustainable layout.

In conclusion, we believe this application should be refused on the grounds of inadequate parking provision, insufficient mitigation of traffic and access issues, and the likely negative impacts on residential amenity and safety. At the very least, we urge the Planning Inspectorate to require a full redesign of the site layout to move sports facilities and their parking northwards, supported by enforceable parking management measures to protect Greenways and the surrounding neighbourhood.

Yours faithfully,



Mr and Mrs James and Julie Puxley