

## **QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

### **TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 9<sup>th</sup> December 2025**

#### **Item 7 – 25/01046/FUL – The Old Nursery, Butts Green Road, Sandon, Chelmsford, CM2 7RN**

##### **Question from Mr S**

##### **Statement of Objection**

CCC has previously removed large sheds on nearby agricultural land, so approving residential use here with a day room would be inconsistent.

No proof, no identified end user, no local need, and no justification has been provided for Gypsy/Traveller status for PPTS to apply.

The dayroom is to reduce fire, we're told, yet thousands cook safely in caravans every day. Residents fear it may pave the way for permanent structures. The turning space required for a fire engine is 3 metres short. So instead of reducing fire risk, fire risk increases.

The officer subjectively calls the road "wide", without providing a measurement. In reality, its not wide enough for pedestrians and vehicles to pass without stepping into the carriageway. There is no pavement, no lighting, and the nearest bus stop is 3 times the 400m guideline. The PROW is shin deep mud for much of the year and unlit.

Buses are infrequent, with gaps of 160 minutes. Regular commuting, shopping or medical appointments would not be practical. Anyone living here would be car-dependent for every journey.

From my home opposite, the development would also increase noise, headlight glaze, loss of privacy and a permanent change to rural character - 121 objections have the same view.

Drainage has not been addressed. Without a foul drainage plan, environmental risk cannot be assessed.

##### **Conclusion**

There is no proven local need, no safe access, and no drainage detail. The proposal would not provide a suitable living environment for residents and would negatively affect those already here.

This application should not be granted.

The officer is subjectively making this fit, not looking at the facts.

##### **Question from Mr M**

The application for the g/t pitch does not actually declare how the need for it arises in this location and who it is for. There is strong evidence to suggest that the applicant is the licensee and resident of an authorised g/t site in Oxfordshire where his current and future needs have presumably been assessed and met under that authorities accommodation assessment process.

It is a surprise that the planning officer has determined that the application succeeds in meeting **All** aspects of the local criteria based policy DM 3. This outcome is against the overwhelming strength of 112 objections from the local community who unanimously say that it most definitely does not.

Furthermore, the officer has dismissed the net worth of the existing planning conditions to maintain horticultural use on site, imposed in 1996. That statement implies that the proposed set of 15 conditions attached to this application will also be worthless in time, which diminishes public confidence in the planning process.

The application should be refused.

### **Question from Mr G**

My comments relate to Paragraph 40 (iv) “ no significant adverse impact ...” of the Planning Officers Report and Section 7 concerning “precedent”.

“No significant adverse impact on the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside” is the relevant test which must be met. Clearly this is a subjective assessment. Fortunately 113 people have done this. 112 local residents, who know exactly what we value in Butts Green have taken the time and effort to conclude that a caravan on this site does have a significant impact on the character and beauty of the countryside of our road. And what would be worse than one caravan? Why, two of course . Meanwhile, one person, the Planning Officer, has reached a different opinion. If local democracy means anything, the views of such a large proportion of the street must be respected by you, the decision making body.

On precedent, the report dismisses this by saying that each proposal must be judged on its own merits. Whilst this statement is of course true it also a non sequitur. It side steps the fact that past developments are hugely influential on future ones. Butts Green Road’s residential frontage only covers approx 50% of the total, the balance being fields. It has retained its intrinsic character and beauty only because the Planners, over many years, have resolutely turned down miscellaneous applications for infill housing and low level commercial developments. This same application could have been made for maybe twenty plots of a similar shape carved out along Butts Green Road. If the Council permits this proposal to go ahead it is opening the way to further developments citing this decision as a change of stance by the Planners. On behalf of the people you represent that live in this immediate area please, please hold the line and refuse permission.

### **Question from Mrs W**

#### **Change of use**

This is agricultural land.

The landowner is not a local resident; we are being asked to welcome a material change of use by an unknown Applicant without confirmed GT status or any evidence that there is a local or personal need for this site.

We ask the Committee to please consider why this change of use should be granted to an ‘unknown’ applicant.

**Paragraph 6.33 ‘The site benefits from reasonable proximity to local services with Howe Green and Sandon, located approximately 2km away.’**

Howe Green has a very infrequent bus service.

There are no doctors, no dentists, no primary school, no shops at Howe Green or Sandon. It would be extremely difficult to live here without the use of a car.

The footpaths mentioned, leading to the bus-stop at Howe Green are unlit, so can only be used in daylight. There is access to the Park and Ride -either by car, motorbike or a forty minute walk at least along Brick Kiln Lane which has frequent traffic often travelling above the speed limit.

The Officer's conclusion under **40 (ii) Adequate Community services** is that ' the site is not considered to be so unsustainable that it fails to comply with this criteria'.

This is not a positive recommendation, more like 'let's make this fit because we need another G/T site.'

Please don't allow this Application.

### Question from Mr M

The current designation of the plot in question is NOT PDL ( what evidence has CCC and the applicant that it is PDL is) but Agricultural albeit a dated designation which must of been reviewed given the erection of gates on the site which allegedly were installed without agreement and were challenged c 5 years ago. My question is:- how can this designation be changed when the criteria for this application clearly has not been met on many counts. The Council has a duty of care to the environment, countryside, and residents who deserved to be protected from "Random" development/s such as the one proposed. The current recommendation by the Council appears to totally ignore this point despite the views of over 100 objections being registered. The Council has, when deemed necessary, vigorously enforced "agricultural status" and planning rights when local residents have had minor infringements

CCC state that every app is judged on its merits, what merits does this one have?

### Question from Mrs B

I would like to raise my objection to the approval of the planning proposal Application reference: 25/01046/FUL and ask the council to answer the following questions during the Committee meeting:

- Of the 8 organisations approached for consultation, 4 did not respond and one actively objected to the proposal. This is on top of the 89 objections raised by local residents. Why has approval been granted without these consultations if they were requested and deemed relevant? Particularly as a lot of the objections were regarding concerns about waste management/access to household amenities that surely require input from Public Health authorities.
- One of the organisations that refused to comment was the ECC Gypsy Traveller Services Manager - without their input how do you propose to ensure the 15 conditions for approval are met before any development of the land takes place?
- Why has an application with 15 conditions been recommended for approval?
- Why is the timeframe for preventing trees/shrubbery being removed from the site set at only 5 years?
- How can residents be reassured that conditions will be followed and held accountable when their views have been ignored thus far in the application process?

I hope you will reconsider this proposal and reject it.

### **Question from Mrs K**

I am writing in relation to the above application and will be attending the Planning Committee meeting tomorrow. I wish to raise several significant inaccuracies and inconsistencies within the Officer's Report which I believe must be addressed before any decision is made.

#### **1. Access to the A12 and Park & Ride**

The report states: "Additionally, there is convenient access to the A12 and Park and Ride."

This is incorrect. The nearest Park & Ride is approximately a 40-minute walk away, accessed via an unlit single-track lane with no pavements or street lighting. This cannot reasonably be described as "convenient access."

#### **2. Proximity to Bus Services**

The report states: "The site is approximately 1km north of a bus stop which has regular buses to Chelmsford, Witham and Southend."

This is misleading. The bus service is not regular; buses operate only two to three times per day and are often unreliable. The last service typically runs at around 4:30pm, providing no realistic provision for working residents or access to essential services. The closest regular and reliable service runs along the A414 which is at least a 30 minute walk away from the site.

#### **3. Rural Character and Precedent**

The report states that the "proposal should respect the rural nature and open landscapes of the Parish."

The surrounding area consists predominantly of detached rural properties. As far as I am aware, the Council has consistently refused applications for permanently sited caravans on similar rural plots. Approving this application would therefore contradict previous decisions and establish an inconsistent precedent.

#### **4. Highway Constraints**

The report fails to acknowledge that the majority of the local road network serving the site is single-track, with no safe passing places. This raises clear concerns regarding road safety and increased vehicle movements.

#### **5. Access to Local Facilities and Services**

The report again references regular bus services and implies access to a range of facilities. In reality, there are no local facilities within a reasonable distance. Access to shops, doctors, dentists, hospitals and other essential services requires either a car or genuinely reliable public transport. Walking to the nearest facilities would take approximately 45 minutes, again along unlit single track roads.

#### **6. Fire Safety Concerns**

The report notes no significant concerns from the Fire Brigade, yet also indicates that the proposal may not fully meet current fire safety regulations. This contradiction should be clarified before any approval is considered.

#### **7. Public Footpath Access**

Section 2.3 states there is a footpath providing “easy access” to Sandon. In reality, the walk takes around 30 minutes and the path is only usable during daylight hours. Furthermore, Sandon offers just a public house and a secondary school—no shops, medical facilities, or other essential services.

## 8. Gypsy and Traveller Policy Assumptions

The report relies heavily on Gypsy and Traveller planning policy despite stating that “the applicant has not provided information to confirm Gypsy or Traveller status.” It then suggests that a condition could be imposed to ensure the site is used by persons who meet the PPTS definition. This is highly concerning and procedurally questionable. It is not appropriate to apply a planning policy category that the applicant has not demonstrated they fall within.

### Question from Mr G

I am xx from Green Planning Services and I am speaking on behalf of our client xx in support of this application.

This committee is here to decide the application according to planning law only. This application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The application is for the material change of use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes, the laying of hardstanding and erection of a dayroom ancillary to that use.

As your officer’s report explains in detail, there is a fundamental need in the county that, other than windfall sites such as these, will not be met in the foreseeable future. Chelmsford City Council accepts that there is a requirement over the period 2023-2042 for 71 pitches (ethnic definition), or 44 pitches (PPTS definition). This is likely to be an underestimate.

The council cannot demonstrate a 5-year land supply of deliverable gypsy sites, which constitutes a failure of policy and is therefore a material consideration that also counts heavily in favour of the application.

Worse, the latest GT delivery strategy was published in April 2024 for the period 2013-2026. No further delivery was expected after 2024.

Additional soft landscaping will be planted within the site to further mitigate effects upon the landscape. The small scale of the development and the recognised need for gypsy sites outweighs any impact on the landscape.

The effect upon local amenity is considered minimal, the nearest property being screened with significant conifer trees in between.

Highways have stated that they have no objection to the application.

There are 15 suggested conditions and Mr xx is happy to comply with them. On that basis I urge you to approve this application.

### Question from Mr S

I live directly opposite the proposed site, and it is clear from the report that the Planning Officer has NOT attended the location or its surroundings, as several conclusions are subjective, inaccurate and do not reflect the physical reality of the area.

#### 1. Access to the A12 and Park & Ride

The Officer states “convenient access to the A12 and Park & Ride.”

This is incorrect.

The nearest Park & Ride is a 40-minute walk via an unlit narrow lane.

There are no pavements, no lighting, and no safe pedestrian provision.

Vehicles regularly pull over to pass — this is not a “wide road” in any reasonable interpretation.

PROW Sandon 10 is described as a diversion route — in reality, it is a mud field, impassable through winter and unusable in darkness.

This cannot be described as convenient or safe access for daily movement.

## 2. Bus Services

The report states “regular buses to Chelmsford, Witham and Southend.”

This is misleading.

Services run only 2–3 times per day, with long gaps of 160 minutes.

The last service is typically around 16:30, making commuting impossible.

Weekend provision is minimal or absent.

This is not regular or reliable public transport.

## 3. Rural Character & Precedent

The Officer notes that development should “respect the rural nature of the Parish.”

However:

Surrounding plots are low-density rural dwellings.

Caravan-based applications in the area have historically been refused.

Approval here would undermine consistency and establish precedent for future expansion.

121 objections reflect this shared local view — not a single individual opinion.

## 4. Highway Safety

The local road network is predominantly single-track with no formal passing points.

Increasing vehicle volumes presents serious safety hazards, which the report does not meaningfully acknowledge.

## 5. Access to Facilities

The report implies ready access to services.

In reality there are:

No shops, doctors, dentists or essential facilities within safe walking distance.

Walking to services is approximately 45 minutes, via unsafe unlit roads.

Daily life here is car dependent, contrary to sustainable development principles.

## 6. Fire Safety

The report claims no major Fire Brigade concerns, yet also notes potential non-compliance with current fire regulation requirements.

This contradiction must be resolved before any approval is considered.

#### 7. Inconsistent Application of Planning Controls

I have previously been challenged by the Council over a simple potting shed on agricultural ground.

How then can a full residential change of use be recommended here?

#### 8. Footpath Reality

Section 2.3 describes a footpath offering “easy access” to Sandon.

The truth:

The route is 30 minutes minimum, seasonal, and not viable in winter or after dark.

Sandon itself offers only a pub and a primary school — no medical or essential services.

#### 9. Gypsy & Traveller Status Assumptions

The applicant has not demonstrated Gypsy/Traveller status, yet policy relating to such is central to the recommendation.

To impose a condition to retro-fit definition compliance is procedurally unsound and sets a concerning precedent.

Furthermore, the applicant already holds an address in Oxford — creating double provision with no local need.

#### Conclusion

We ask the Committee to reflect not only on policy but on lived reality.

121 objections demonstrate overwhelming public opposition.

Please respect the rural character of Butts Green and reject application 25/01046/FUL.

#### Question from Mr H

I appeal to councillors on this committee to listen to its constituents and refuse this application, I will be in attendance at this meeting.

I wish the committee to re-examine some of the officers report where it appears to give weight to approving where I believe some of this reasons are not born out in reality. Most of this is around DM3 and the land being previously developed. Please be aware the officer has stated there are 89 comments, on **the portal it is showing 112 comments** a 20% difference, this shows how much concern it is to the community and they are trying to point out where this is failing.

#### **Previously developed Land :-**

The officer confirms it is NOT previously developed land and we have 2 poly tunnels in poor condition with some hard standing and a porta cabin in a bad condition. I like to point out the porta cabin was placed there unlawfully around mid-2008/2009 as was the upgrades to the tunnels ie hardstanding which should have gained permission. From this no other applicant would gain any approval for residential use as it stands, it is **Agricultural land**.

#### **DM3:-**

ii, adequate community services and facilities are within travelling distance.

Officer says this complies, No this does not and is a stretch of the truth: There's a Pub, Church and school not in realistic walking distance. So the need to travel further is required.

**FACTS:-** Officer states bus stop to North 1KM. It's in fact 1.6KM on mainly single lane not as portrayed as wide road. Not advisable to walk in peak time or dark hours as there are no verges.

Officer states regular bus service to Chelmsford Witham and Southend. Here's a list for that stop.

**Bus No 513 :-** This service runs between Witham and Southend. Primarily to Southend School for girls. Comes into Sandon around 07.30am from Witham heading to Southend and returns late afternoon in Sandon heading to Witham. It is Term time only ie **it's a school Bus**

**Bus No 99 :-** Service from Maldon to Bromfield Hosp. Heads to Broomfield twice in Morning and return Journey's twice in Afternoon. **Not exactly frequent.**

**Bus No 3 :-** Chelmsford to Southend every 2 hours when not cancelled that's not frequent.

**Conclusion :-** to obtain reasonable transport you need to get to Maldon Road or Sandon park and ride. These are a considerable walk and on roads that carry considerable traffic. Therefore all journeys will be by **Car**.

iii, The site is of a sufficient size to accommodate the proposed facilities.

I will argue it is not. The officers attention has been drawn by Essex Fire Service to Documents B,B5 compliance is required and ref to ADB V1 Table 13.1.

The two things here is a required turning area for a standard appliance wall to wall is required of 19.0M. The officer states the plot width as being 16M. i.e. **3 M to Narrow**.

On a single track they can't reverse an appliance more than 20M but the officer say this track is in excess of 100m to the pitch.

**Conclusion:- if a fire should occur the size of the plot seriously affects Essex fire Service to deal with it safely.**

iv :- There is no significant adverse impact on the intrinsic character of the country side

Officer view is it complies but we have 112 comments to the contrary. I live here and have a full view of that open land / countryside . I look at a porta cabin that should not be there . " poly tunnels that are obscured by foliage. You are saying that instead of a poly tunnel standing just 2.5M high, the proposed development is the equivalent of 3 large structures. Fixed mobile home 20M long by 6.8M wide and internal height 3.05M. But that's not the external height. These structures are on wheels and usually sit in a brick base some 500 to 600mm in height . They have a pitched roof in excess of 1M so overall its more likely around **5M - twice the height of the poly tunnels**. Then add the touring caravan and day room and lots of hard standing parked vehicles, all visible from my property and the road and street which completely changes the character of the existing properties and countryside.



## Question from Mrs C

With 112 objections formally submitted on the planning portal, it is evident that this proposal has generated significant and widespread concern. I therefore respectfully urge the planning committee to reject this application.

Having recently relocated from South London, my family and I chose this area specifically for its quieter environment, strong community cohesion, and ultimately for safety. We sought a place where our children could grow up in a place where they could freely play outside without anxiety of their wellbeing.

Approval of this application would fundamentally undermine this.

It would create a heightened sense of insecurity for my family within our own home and would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and wellbeing of this close-knit community, one in which residents have invested considerable effort and resources to establish a peaceful and idyllic standard of living.

I respectfully, but strongly, request that the committee give full weight to these concerns and uphold the interests of the existing community by refusing this application.

I wish to highlight several key inaccuracies in the Officer's Report that should be addressed before any decision is made:

1. Park & Ride Access – Described as “convenient,” yet it is a 40-minute walk via an unlit single-track lane with no pavements.
2. Bus Services – Report claims “regular” buses, but only 2–3 run per day, often unreliable, with the last around 4:30pm - unsuitable for working residents or essential travel.
3. Rural Character & Precedent – The area is predominantly detached rural properties, and similar caravan applications have previously been refused. Approval would be inconsistent with past decisions.
4. Highway Constraints – The report omits that surrounding roads are single-track with no safe passing places, raising road safety concerns.
5. Local Facilities – No essential services are within reasonable distance; the nearest are a 45-minute walk, making residents reliant on cars or genuinely reliable public transport, which is not available.
6. Fire Safety – The report notes no major concerns yet also states the proposal may not meet current fire regulations. This contradiction must be clarified.
7. Footpath Access – Claimed “easy access” to Sandon is actually a 30-minute walk, usable only in daylight, and Sandon offers no essential services.
8. Gypsy/Traveller Policy – The report applies Gypsy/Traveller policy despite no evidence that the applicant meets the PPTS definition. Conditioning occupation on this basis is procedurally unsound.

## Question from Mr A

With 112 formal objections already submitted, it is unmistakably clear that this proposal has caused serious and widespread concern among local residents. I therefore urge the committee to refuse this application outright.

I wish to highlight key issues and Inaccuracies in the Officer's Report:

- **Park & Ride Access** – Described as “convenient,” yet it is a 40-minute walk via an unlit single-track lane with no pavements. This is plainly not convenient or safe.
- **Bus Services** – The report refers to “regular” buses. In reality, only 2 buses run per day. This cannot support the needs of working residents or access to essential services.
- **Rural Character & Precedent** – The surrounding area is composed mainly of detached rural properties. Similar applications for caravans on comparable rural plots have been repeatedly refused by the Council. Approval here would be inconsistent with established precedent.
- **Highway Constraints** – The report fails to acknowledge that most approach roads are single-track with no safe passing places, posing clear safety concerns with any increase in vehicle movements.
- **Local Facilities** – There are no essential services within a reasonable walking distance. A walk to the nearest facilities takes around 45 minutes, making residents wholly dependent on cars or reliable public transport—which does not exist here.
- **Fire Safety** – The report states there are no major fire concerns yet also indicates that the proposal may not comply with current safety regulations. This contradiction requires clarification before approval can even be considered.
- **Footpath Access** – The claim of “easy access” to Sandon is misleading; it is a 30-minute walk and only viable during daylight. Sandon itself offers no essential facilities, only a primary school and public house.
- **Gypsy/Traveller Policy** – The report applies Gypsy/Traveller planning policy despite acknowledging that no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the applicant meets the PPTS definition. Imposing a condition on this basis is procedurally unsound and inappropriate.

In light of the overwhelming public objection, the safety concerns, the factual inaccuracies in the Officer's Report, and the clear inconsistencies with previous planning decisions, I strongly urge the committee to refuse this application.

### **Question from Mr C**

With regards to Application reference 25/01046/FUL, how can it possibly be recommended for approval by the planning officer when so many local residents (119?) have objected for very valid reasons, including impact on drainage, road safety, fire safety, local fauna and flora, inconsistency with local environment, etc. You need to listen to the voice of the people that live there already, not an unnamed person who uses a planning consultant to get what they want.

### **Question from Mrs T**

I appeal to the planning committee members to question some of the statements made in favour of the applicants of this planning application by the planning officer. Please can you take into account all the questions/facts raised by residents that counteract the information supplied by the officer in order for members to make an informed decision.

## Question from Mrs S

There appears to be many inaccuracies with the officer's report which, as a resident I can wholly confirm are wrong. I will list some below –

1. Public footpath access to Sandon– this is wrong, it's only useable during the day if its not thick with mud from the road, Sandon has no facilities other than a pub & takes at least 30mins walk, that is not 'easy access'
2. This plot of land should not be recommended for change of use. This is agricultural land.
3. The road is suggested by the officer as 'wide' – its is not! Its hazardous & width is 4.2m . I have measured it. We have no safe passing places & much of this road is single track- a huge concern for safety
4. The road floods dreadfully. Have you investigated this thoroughly?
5. The complete contradiction on fire safety needs to be addressed before you even begin to think about approving.
6. The officer seems to believe we have local access to facilities & services – this is wrong, we have no local services here, you must be a car driver to get anywhere- walking to the nearest facilities would take 50mins. There is no regular bus service despite the officer suggesting otherwise. I know, I live here. You are lucky if you see one x2 a day!
7. We are in a rural area of mainly detached properties & the council has consistently refused applications for permanently sited caravans on similar rural plots, if this application is approved it's a complete contradiction to previous decisions & establish an inconsistent precedent.
8. We do not have convenient access to A12/park & ride – this is wrong! It will take you 50mins approx. to walk there via un-lit single-track lane with no pavements. It's dangerous! This is certainly not as your officer has described.
9. The report relies on G&T planning policy despite stating that 'the applicant has not provided info to confirm G&T status' it goes on to suggest a condition could be imposed to ensure the site is used by the persons who meet PPTS definition..this is extremely concerning & procedurally questionable – its is not appropriate to apply a planning policy category that the applicant has not demonstrated they fall within!

I sincerely hope residents concerns are addressed & views are respected.

## Question from Mrs S

I am writing with reference to the application detailed above and wish to confirm that I will also be attending the Planning Committee meeting tomorrow. I would like to address several concerns regarding the officer's report, which I believe is wholly inaccurate.

Firstly, the site in question does not have suitable access to the A12 Park and Ride. The lane leading to the site is unlit, lacks a footpath, and requires at least a brisk 40-minute walk. Additionally, bus services are extremely limited, operating only two or three times per day.

It is important to note that the majority of the route consists of a single-track road, which becomes heavily trafficked whenever the A12 is closed or experiencing congestion.

Historically, the Council has consistently rejected applications for permanent caravan sites on comparable rural plots. Approving this application would contradict previous decisions and establish an inconsistent precedent.

I also struggle to see how a Change of Use to residential could be considered acceptable, as this would potentially allow other small parcels of land in the vicinity to meet similar criteria and thus be open to development.

To eliminate any uncertainty, I strongly recommend that officers visit the site in person to fully appreciate how inappropriate this proposal is in the context of the Council's current planning policies.

### **Question from Mr S**

I am writing in connection with the application referenced above to confirm that I will also be attending the Planning Committee meeting scheduled for tomorrow. I wish to raise several concerns regarding the officer's report, which I believe to be wholly inaccurate.

Firstly, the site in question lacks suitable access to the A12 Park and Ride facility. The lane leading to the site is unlit, devoid of any footpath, and requires a fast 40-minute walk. Furthermore, the available bus services are extremely limited, operating only two or three times per day.

It should also be noted that the majority of the route comprises a single-track road, which becomes heavily trafficked whenever the A12 is closed or subject to congestion.

Historically, the Council has consistently refused applications for permanent caravan sites on comparable rural plots. To approve this application would contradict previous decisions and set an inconsistent precedent.

I also find it difficult to understand how a Change of Use to residential could be deemed acceptable, as this could potentially allow other small parcels of land in the vicinity to meet similar criteria and thereby become open to development.

In order to remove any ambiguity, I would strongly recommend that officers visit the site in person, so as to fully appreciate how inappropriate this proposal is within the context of the Council's current planning policies.

### **Question from Mr N**

I strongly support the objections to the scheme from the local community, particularly as experience elsewhere shows that this could be the thin end of the wedge in this area for similar development.

I note that the committee report attempts to control this development with conditions, but are concerned that condition three may not be easily enforceable, for example, or that the development may not be occupied by the applicant personally.

Furthermore, the application wording itself does not specify that the application is for gypsy or traveller use and paragraph 40 of the committee report says that the applicant has not provided information to confirm gypsy or traveller status.

It follows, therefore, that as the application description does not specify, gypsy or traveller use nor is the applicant indicating gypsy or traveller status that this application would fail to meet policy DM8 for ordinary residential use in the rural area and should be refused.

### **Question from Mrs W**

Whilst I will not be speaking at the committee meeting I'd like my comments/ objections known and possible clarification by the planning officer to his recommendation for approval.

1- there are no easy transport links for this site. The nearest bus stop is infrequent, once every couple hours and cannot be accessed without walking in a national speed limit country lane (which is not 'wide' as noted, you frequently have to pull to one side to let other cars past) with no footpaths or pavements. How can the planner say there are good transport links?! Park and ride is a 45 minute walk away, again down narrow national speed limit country lanes. This development will encourage the use of cars which is not in line with planning policy for new residential pitches

2- it's clear this is a Gypsy and traveller pitch as noted in the planning statement with supporting G&T policies and documentation, however in the description for proposed development it does not states G&T. It is a planning requirement that the description is accurate and not misleading. It is imperative that the description is correct as the application must be reviewed against the relevant policies, which in this case it has not.

3- seems unreasonable a separate day room is required when caravans are supposed to be self sufficient for touring or self sufficient without additional need for day rooms if stationary

4- after grenfell fire safety is something that should be considered at planning stage as noted by the building safety regulator. The site does not comply with approved document B - it is unlikely this site would require building regulations due to its 'temporary buildings' however it should still comply. This is a fire hazard with unacceptable access in case of emergency.

Can it be explained/revised as to how these are deemed acceptable when clearly these points have not been acceptably considered against relevant policy

### **Question from Mr S**

I am writing in relation to the above application and am planning to be attending the Planning Committee meeting tomorrow. I wish to raise several significant concerns as to the Officer's Report which I believe must be addressed before any decision is made. The decision to recommend it for approval goes against the residents of the village and of those who live in the road and surround the site in question and I think this should be considered and there has been considerable opposition to it.

#### **1. Access to the Park and Ride and A12**

The report states "Additionally, there is convenient access to the A12 and Park and Ride" This statement is unsubstantiated as the only access to the A12 or Park and Ride is in a vehicle down a single track lane which already has congestion I can't see how this is described as convenient.

#### **2. Proximity to Bus Services**

The report states: "The site is approximately 1km north of a bus stop which has regular buses to Chelmsford, Witham and Southend."

This is misleading. The officer on many points is more making it fit rather than the fact. 'Bus stop 1 km north' this is incorrect, it is 1.6km. Service is not regular, no its not. Bus 513 Witham to Southend. It goes to girls school southend. comes from Witham into Sandon about 07.30. Then returns in afternoon , its the school run and term time only. Bus 99 comes from Maldon to Broomfield hosp, it comes twice in morning going to Broomfield and then twice in afternoon going back to Maldon. Bus no 3 is every 2 hours if lucky. NO WAY is that regular. Park and ride to far to walk!

### 3. Respect the rural nature

The report states that the “proposal should respect the rural nature and open landscapes of the Parish.”

This point is categorically wrong, I cannot see how Caravans respect the rural nature especially as there is no precedent for this, the surrounding area consists of mainly detached rural properties, previously the Council has refused repeatedly applications for Caravans in this road and I see no way how this is any better and would contradict any other previous applications.

### 4. Highway/Road

I would like to point out the road is a single track road with little or few passing places for cars and highlights the extra danger with the increased vehicle movements

### 5. Local Facilities and Services

In reality, there are no local facilities within a reasonable distance. Access to shops, doctors, dentists, hospitals and other essential services requires either a car or genuinely reliable public transport. Walking to the nearest facilities would take approximately 45 minutes.

### 8. Public Footpath Access

Section 2.3 states there is a footpath providing “easy access” to Sandon. There is no pathway on the road! In reality, the walk takes around 30 minutes and the path is only usable during daylight hours. Furthermore, Sandon offers just a public house and a primary school—no shops, medical facilities, or other essential services.

### 9. Gypsy and Traveller Policy Assumptions

The report relies heavily on Gypsy and Traveller planning policy despite stating that “the applicant has not provided information to confirm Gypsy or Traveller status.” It then suggests that a condition could be imposed to ensure the site is used by persons who meet the PPTS definition. This is highly concerning and procedurally questionable. It is not appropriate to apply a planning policy category that the applicant has not demonstrated they fall within.

## **Question from Mr and Mrs K**

The report places significant weight on Gypsy and Traveller planning policy, despite acknowledging that “the applicant has not provided information to confirm Gypsy or Traveller status.” It even suggests imposing a condition to ensure the site is used only by individuals who meet the PPTS definition, which is highly concerning and procedurally questionable. It is not appropriate to apply a planning policy category that the applicant has not demonstrated they fall within.

Furthermore, it is difficult to understand how the planning officer can disregard so many valid concerns raised by a large number of residents, particularly when the application still contains numerous unresolved issues and unanswered questions.

## **Question from Mr B**

This application is being discussed by the planning committee on Tuesday evening and I wish to add my objection on the following grounds .

1/ The bus service is lamentable ,two hourly and unreliable. The bus stop is exactly 1.6 km away and not 1km as the officer states.The councils own policy for good bus facilities state 400m .

2/ There is is poor access, both Mayes and Sporhams lanes are single track for the most part with no pavement or lighting ,it takes 40 minutes to walk to park and ride 45 minutes to shops in Great Baddow and 30 minutes via a muddy prow to get to Sandon where there are no facilities except a pub.The road opposite the site entrance cannot be described as wide and these three roads struggle to cope especially early and late in the day.

3/As the applicant is relying on GandT planning policy I ask that as the applicant is not from this area and has mobile homes in Oxfordshire, why is it incumbent on CCC to provide for the applicant, in any event no proof has been given that the applicant has GandT status. Are we sure that this is not subterfuge ?

4/As this land is not PDL and the proposals should respect the rural nature and open landscape of the parish,how can these be reconciled with two caravans and a wash house potentially forced upon a very united local community where such structures are totally alien.

### **Question from Sandon Parish Council**

Please listen to local residents concerns, regarding this application, having read expert comments and local facts (known only to locals) this application does not follow NPPF guideline on G and T rules etc.....you all having read these need to decide and may wish to take a site visit to see the problems this will cause" thankyou for listening