

## 25<sup>th</sup> March. Extraordinary Council Meeting

Whatever I think of this plan, PINS and Councillors have been dependent on **accurate** advice being given to them by Officers and of course Developers.

In the case of Land North of Taylors Farm, there are multiple inaccuracies.

The minutes of a pre-planning meeting on 11 October 2024 between Officers and the Developer state “**UDC are supportive of the site coming forward in line with Local Plan**”.

EXCEPT

**The Local Plan 2021-2041 was submitted for independent examination 18 December 2024 – nearly 2 months later.**

At this point, Officers had no idea that PINS would accept the plan or the site. Modifications that directly affect the site had not seen the light of day and the site was still in the CPZ. It didn't fit the policies.

**WHY** were Officers/ the LP team so keen to put forward a contentious site - **a technical oversupply** with so many constraints -- in the plan?

I like to think that the site would **NEVER** have been accepted had Cllrs or indeed PINS known that the Developer planned to put the access points with up to 12000 traffic movements 24/7 **directly opposite people's houses, particularly when it cannot be mitigated.**

One reason for support for this site might be that according to the report by the pre-planning QR panel 12 December 2024 - attended by UDC Officers and **one week** before submission, you were told “**there is no housing south of the Takeley Road frontage in this location**”.

**I live in one of those houses directly opposite the main access and there is no doubt that myself and other residents will be subjected to noise, vibration and light disturbance 24/7 - all from a Technical Oversupply**

When the site was included in the plan, you were told that there were multiple access points. **Untrue.**

There has been discussion that an A120 access offered a viable alternative to the B1256, but at the QR panel that met in December 24 Officers advised the Developer “**it would not be prudent for the applicant to compromise their layout to allow for a North Eastern A120 access**”.

The scale of the site is staggering. An influx of at least 1100 workers and they will demonstrably NOT be coming from Takeley or UDC for the most part. Socio Economic benefits to the district have been seriously exaggerated.

Finally a word on the valuable work of the Scouts.

A Scout Camp serving circa 3000 children, some vulnerable, per year is right next to the site. IF this site is built, it would likely have to close for safeguarding reasons, let alone light noise etc. This Camp was never mentioned at the site selection. Perhaps 3000 young people are not considered to be a material planning reason or a constraint.

Dr Jean Johnson