

APPLICATION NO: 20/01465/FUL DATE VALID: 02.10.20 APPLICANT: Mr Ian Newman 17-18 Great Pulteney Street, London, W1F 9NE, UK DESCRIPTION: Erection of 7 No. two storey dwelling houses, accompanied with 17 dedicated parking spaces. LOCATION: Land To The Rear Of Heathers And Candletree The Green Hatfield Peverel, CM3 2JF

Statement from Mark East resident

Councillors,

You will appreciate that under planning law the starting point for decision making is any adopted plans and policies. Furthermore the High Court judgement CO/4265/2019 clearly guides us to the conclusion that para 11 of the NPPF does not mean that planning permission is automatic.

The village - and I emphasise village - has already been subject to approval of 7 planning applications outside of the emerging Local Plan with planning consent granted for a further 492 dwellings within the village setting. It is inconceivable to think that you can simply keep adding more housing to an area that has limited infrastructure capacity. This would represent **unsustainable development** and would result in further harm to the village.

The Case Officer guides you to the previous appeal decision but that was at a time when the Hatfield Peverel NDP had not been examined, nor had the Local Plan examiner issued his correspondence stating that Braintree District Council had sufficient sites to meet their housing need up to the end of the plan period. Councillors you will be aware that the Local Plan examiner has accepted that the housing requirement for Braintree should not be revised but in reaching his decision he takes a pragmatic approach in that a review would only further delay examination. However that correspondence notes without challenge that mortality rates could arguably reduce numbers.

Braintree District Council has in writing on the 31/7/2020 stated that Hatfield Peverel has already met its objectively assessed housing need. This is a significant material consideration. You may recall that Cressing recently lost an appeal decision. A key reason being that the LPA authority had not agreed the Objectively Assessed Housing Need.

It is perhaps worth reminding Councillors that the examiner of the NDP **added** the following under FI3:

‘New development **will only be permitted** where it can demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate education capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered by the development’.

This has not been demonstrated by the applicant nor has the officer’s report made reference to this policy. It is also noted that there is no comment within the report from Essex Education.

You may be aware that through the Cressing appeal that Essex County Council produced a report showing school capacity levels within the District. It is clear from that recent report that there is no additional capacity within the village or neighbouring areas of Boreham, Witham or Terling to accommodate needs from further development.

In addition to environmental harm there would be social harm as a decision to grant planning permission would **undermine** the adopted NDP, which the community overwhelmingly voted for including the development boundary.

Councillor's given the comment above I urge you not to follow officer's recommendations in this instance and to refuse planning consent.