

# Planning Objection – Executive Summary and Reasons for Refusal

## Land North of Taylors Farm, Takeley Street

### Application Ref: UTT/25/2786/OP

This statement is submitted on behalf of local residents and the Takeley Street Action Group (TSAG) for consideration by Uttlesford District Council Planning Officers and Members of the Planning Committee. It is intended to be read alongside the detailed technical evidence submitted and referenced below.

This letter should be read alongside the following documents:

- TSAG – Solicitor – Richard Buxton Solicitors – Legal Objection
- TSAG – Consultant – John Russell Transport Planning – Transport Objection
- TSAG – Consultant – RF Environmental - Noise and Vibration Objection
- TSAG – Members – Ecology Objection
- TSAG – Members – Flood Risk and Drainage
- TSAG – Members – Landscape and Visual Objection
- TSAG – Members – Transport Objection

#### 1 Introduction

Takeley Street Action Group (TSAG) **strongly object** to this Planning Application and believe that there are sufficient grounds for a **refusal forthwith**.

The application is inadequate in many respects. It is not simply a matter of minor clarification in some areas, but missing data and inaccurate statements across a number of key areas all of which need to be properly addressed by the Developer.

Planning Officers, Statutory Consultees and the Planning Committee rely on complete and accurate detail to make judgements on Planning Applications and do not want to find themselves open to legal redress when inaccurate documents have been submitted by the Developer and used as a basis for the decision-making process.

Statutory Consultees and Planning Officers are effectively being expected to do the Developer's job for them by highlighting the many deficiencies.

Some of the numerous examples are:

- Transport – missing and inaccurate data noted by both National Highways and Essex Highways.
- Preliminary Ecological Statement out of date and no longer valid.

- Claims in their Biodiversity Validation Checklist that Air Quality does not affect Hatfield Forest when it is more than double the load. Note that severely underestimated traffic flows will further seriously impact on Air Quality.
- Old and inaccurate maps – one has 16 residential properties missing and homes opposite the proposed site are pixelated out. (See Appendix A - Takeley Street Action Group Flood and Drainage response 15<sup>th</sup> Dec 2025).
- Pre-planning advice referenced in the Planning Statement but not available on the Planning Portal ie The Planning Statement refers to three pre-application meetings, a quality review panel and a members briefing. The relevant documentation such as the minutes to which it refers are not published on the planning portal, so that there is no evidence at all to support the Developer assertions made in this section of the Planning Statement

## 2 Independent Professional Evidence Submitted

In addition to resident-led technical reviews, the following independent consultants have been formally engaged to review the application documents and provide professional opinion:

- Richard Buxton Environmental & Planning – Planning Counsel  
Richard Buxton Environmental & Planning have been instructed to provide planning advice and review the proposal against national policy, the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan and the emerging Local Plan. Their advice addresses the application of the tilted balance, countryside protection, landscape harm, heritage impacts, procedural fairness and the overall planning balance.
- John Russell Transport Planning – Independent Transport Consultant  
John Russell Transport Planning has reviewed the Transport Assessment, Environmental Statement transport chapters and traffic modelling methodology. Their work highlights fundamental deficiencies including incomplete modelling, underestimation of HGV movements arising from B2/B8 flexibility, unrealistic routing assumptions and failure to assess cumulative impacts at M11 Junction 8, Four Ashes and along the B1256.
- RF Environmental Ltd – Noise and Vibration Specialists  
RF Environmental Ltd, led by Richard Fenton BSc (Hons) MSc MCIEH MIOA, has undertaken a detailed desktop review of the Noise and Vibration chapter of the Environmental Statement. RF Environmental identifies systematic under-assessment of both construction and operational noise and vibration, particularly from HGV movements, night-time activity and access-related impacts. The review concludes that predicted impacts may reach Significant Observed Adverse Effect Levels (SOAEL), including sleep disturbance at nearby residential properties.

## 3 Key Matters for Determination

### **3.1 Reason 1 – Unacceptable Highway Safety Impact (NPPF paragraph 116)**

The proposed development would result in a Moderate Adverse (Significant) operational road safety impact on the B1256, as identified within the applicant's own Environmental Statement. Insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that this impact would be avoided or reduced to a non-significant level.

The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that it would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and is contrary to paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires refusal in such circumstances.

### **3.2 Reason 2 – Incomplete and Unsound Transport Assessment**

The submitted Transport Assessment is incomplete and unsound. It relies on B2-only trip generation rates despite the application seeking unrestricted B8 warehouse and distribution use, materially underestimating HGV movements. It fails to assess 24-hour operation and omits required microsimulation modelling for closely spaced signalised junctions.

As a result, the Local Planning Authority cannot lawfully conclude that the residual cumulative impacts of the development would not be severe, contrary to paragraphs 110, 111 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **3.3 Reason 3 – Unsafe and Unjustified Access Arrangements Fixed at Outline Stage**

The application seeks approval in outline with access fixed, yet fails to demonstrate that the proposed access arrangements are safe and suitable. No Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, and no robust assessment of pedestrian–cyclist–HGV interaction have been provided.

As access is not a reserved matter, these deficiencies cannot be deferred to a later stage and render the proposal contrary to paragraphs 110 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **3.4 Reason 4 – Absence of a Deliverable Foul Water and Surface Water Strategy**

The application fails to provide a proven or deliverable foul water and surface water drainage strategy. Thames Water has confirmed that there is no existing foul water capacity to serve the development and no certainty that a future connection will be achievable.

In the absence of a lawful and deliverable solution, the proposal risks being undeliverable or reliant on indefinite restrictions, contrary to paragraphs 173 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **3.5 Reason 5 – Unacceptable Noise and Vibration Impacts on Residential Amenity**

The assessment of noise and vibration impacts materially underestimates the effects of the development, particularly from regular HGV movements and night-time operation. Independent acoustic review identifies a credible risk of Significant Observed Adverse Effects (SOAEL), including sleep disturbance and long-term vibration impacts at nearby residential properties.

The proposal therefore fails to avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life, contrary to paragraphs 198–199 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Noise Policy Statement for England.

### **3.6 Reason 6 – Inadequate Environmental Statement and Failure to Assess Cumulative Impacts**

The Environmental Statement is not robust. Key chapters, including transport, noise and air quality, rely on materially underestimated traffic and HGV forecasts and omit assessment of night-time operation. In addition, the proposal relies on highway mitigation at M11 Junction 8 that is the subject of a separate application seeking its removal, resulting in a failure to assess cumulative impacts.

The Local Planning Authority is therefore unable to reach a reasoned conclusion on the likely significant environmental effects of the development, contrary to the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **4 Overall Conclusion**

For the reasons set out above, the proposed development conflicts with national planning policy, fails to meet mandatory safety and environmental tests, and would result in unacceptable impacts that cannot be mitigated by condition or reserved matters. Planning permission should therefore be refused at this stage.

Documentation should not be returned to the Developer for further input because there are so many errors and omissions.

**This Application is not fit for purpose.**

**Takeley Street Action Group and its +600 members object to this application.**

*Takeley Street Action Group reserve the right to make further representations in response to any additional, revised or replacement information submitted by the applicant, including but not limited to amended plans, technical assessments, Environmental Statement updates or consultee responses, whether submitted during the current consultation period or thereafter.*