

UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden, Essex CB11 4ER
Telephone (01799) 510510, Fax (01799) 510550
Textphone Users 18001
DX 200307 Saffron Walden
Email uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk Website www.uttlesford.gov.uk

Member for Stansted North: Councillor Alan Dean



Planning Department
Uttlesford District Council

3 September 2015

Your ref: UTT/15/1666/FUL

Our ref:AD03091502

Telephone: 01279 813 579
email: cllrdean@uttlesford.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

REPRESENTATION TO APPLICATION UTT/15/1666/FUL, 14 CAMBRIDGE ROAD, STANSTED CM24 8BZ FOR TEN DWELLINGS AND TWO COMMERCIAL PREMISES.

I am opposed to the revised version of this planning application. I wish to protest that Essex Highways has not provided a transparent evaluation of the application and has responded in an inconsistent manner compared with other applications of a lesser scale in the immediate vicinity.

I am opposing this application as district councillor for Stansted North and I write in support of representations by some 200 residents and business people prepared for them by Barker Parry Town Planners and by Rowland Bisland Traffic Planners. I am appending these Community Reports (a term I will continue to use below) with this representation letter.


The reasons for my objection to this application are nine-fold:

1. The site would be over-developed if the application were approved; the houses and the commercial buildings are together too big and the development would not function properly as described in detail in the Community Reports;
2. Parking is under-provided by around 15 spaces, or around 50%, and includes impractical tandem parking. This would put an intolerable burden on the public's nearby Crafton Green Car Park because of a connecting pedestrian link and on parking demand in Cambridge Road. Further detail is contained in the Community Reports;

3. The entrance to the site and exit from it into Cambridge Road is too narrow with poor sight lines; there would be a dangerous conflict with pedestrians and with passing vehicles and with parked lorries outside Tesco and with buses at the stop immediately outside the site. This is illustrated in more detail in the Community Reports.
4. Essex Highways has failed in its representation to provide any assessment of the impact of this proposed development on parking, traffic congestion, highway safety, pedestrian safety, on-site turning space and capacity for servicing the residential and commercial buildings, as described in greater detail in the Community Reports. It has responded inconsistently compared with other recent planning applications in the immediate vicinity, viz. Yuva, 21 Cambridge Road, Stansted, for 3 dwellings, UTT/14/1549/FUL and UTT/14/0064/FUL and Geneva Motors, 10 Cambridge Road, Stansted, for tyre and exhaust repair workshop, UTT/13/1456/FUL. This inconsistency is cause for community concern about the objectivity and transparency of the planning process. The application should be evaluated against current policies, guidelines and standards including the requirement for sight lines and access splays.
5. The site has no existing use. This was mostly ceased several years ago and was completely extinguished by total demolition and site clearance nearly three years ago; there is no practical basis for anyone claiming that this latest proposal is no worse than what exists and has permission; nothing exists and nothing has permission! Past uses are extinct according to legal advice from a planning barrister consulted by community members.
6. There are flaws and inaccuracies in the applicant's description of his proposal. These are spelled out in the Community Reports. They should be scrutinized and not accepted at face value;
7. The applicant claims that he has addressed weaknesses in the last scheme dismissed at appeal. But this is a different and denser development that must be made to stand or fall on its own merits and should not be supported for approval based on shaky claims that some features are better than those the Planning Inspector previously rejected. The council's focus should be on whether the current application complies with current policy, guidelines etc. and with current safety requirements for a scheme of this complexity;
8. The effects of the development would be to damage the vitality and economic success of the Cambridge Road retail and business area by creating greater traffic and parking congestion, increasing safety hazards to pedestrians and motorists whilst bringing little to outweigh those detrimental impacts;
9. The applicant has carried out no public consultation, contrary to past precedent in line with procedural expectations. There is minimal community support for his application.

I urge refusal of this application.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alan Dean', with a large, loopy initial 'A'.

Alan Dean