

Response to Planning Applications to be determined by Maldon District Council.

Response from: Woodham Walter Parish Council

Planning Application Reference: 20/00519/FUL

Location: The Warren Golf Club, Woodham Walter

Our views on the above application are:

Please tick the appropriate box

1. We recommend the granting of planning permission, for the reasons listed below:

*

or

2. We recommend the refusal of planning permission, for the reasons listed below:

*

Please see supplementary information to support our argument.

Please note this submission is in addition to our full response dated 10th August 2020 and is regarding the submission of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as well as the amended Noise Report.

or

3i. We have no comment

3ii. We raise no objection but wish to make the following comment:

***Reasons for response (Please include the relevant policy in the Submission version of the Local Development Plan i.e. Policy D1 – Design Quality and built Environment, Policy S8 Settlement Boundaries and the Countryside)**

Signed: *Bannerman*

Date: 16 October 2020

Woodham Walter Parish Council's Response to Planning Application For:

Additional tourism and interrelated leisure development, comprising 70 holiday lodges with associated change of use of the land within two areas of the site, alterations to existing Bunsay clubhouse, extension of Bunsay car park and new golf academy.

Reference: MAL/20/00519/FUL

Comments on the Amended Arboriculture Impact Assessment and Amended Noise Report

1. Amended Arboriculture Impact Assessment.

- 1.1. There is nothing in this amended report that changes the opinion expressed in the Parish Council's original consultation response and the strong recommendation that the application be refused remains extant.
- 1.2. The Clive Simpson arboriculture report clearly states that 2 trees will require removal with the possibility of some smaller trees requiring transplanting. It is also stated that there will be mitigation for the removal by the planting of 100 new trees across the estate but does not define the areas for planting.
- 1.3. The latest Arboriculture Impact Statement quantifies the number of trees to be removed as 22 (a significant increase from the original 2) being 6 of category U (not worthy of retention), 4 of category B (trees of moderate quality) and 12 of category C 12 (trees of low quality). In addition, it is proposed to remove entirely 3 category C groups and parts of 2 other category C groups all as necessitated by the proposed development. Although stated as being based on British Standards, this Council takes the view that the selection for each category is subjective.
- 1.4. The report states that the removals represent a very small part of the Warren Estate that extends to 325 acres (131.5 ha.). However, the loss of such a large number of trees on this small section of the overall estate will be of significance and will impact on the intrinsic merit of this high value landscaped area to the detriment of the countryside and this part of the Village.
- 1.5. Recognition of the adverse impact on bio-diversity that the removal of the significant number of trees will have does not appear to have been considered.
- 1.6. There is no reference to the planting of 100 trees in mitigation mentioned in the Planning Consultant's report and therefore it is assumed that there is no mitigation and therefore an adverse affect on the landscape and bio-diversity.
- 1.7. There is no reference on tree reference drawings to the external multi-use games area and therefore no assessment as to the impact on trees within the proposed location.
- 1.8. This Council places reliance upon the confirmation of the outstanding Tree Preservation Notice as the trees subject of the TPO make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area due to the size, density and attractive nature of the trees and the prominent locations. Removal any of these trees or carrying out any inappropriate works to them to compromise their integrity would harm the amenity value of the overall area.
- 1.9. This Council has concern over the effect of the urbanisation with the construction of pathways, roadways and drainage will have on the existing tree roots and the damage that may be caused during and after the construction period. Although mitigation measures are detailed, the extent of the development must place many of the remaining trees at risk.
- 1.10. This Council therefore urges that these observations and objections are added to those already submitted and the recommendation for refusal.

2. Amended Noise Impact Assessment

- 2.1. There is nothing in this amended report that changes the opinion expressed in the Parish Council's original consultation response and the strong recommendation that the application be refused remains extant.
- 2.2. It is believed that the external multi-use games area was omitted from the original application. The report however refers to an external multi-use games area being relocated from the north side of Little Baddow Road to an area to the west of the proposed development, nearer in real terms to the properties in Common Lane. The plan illustration appears to be inaccurate as the lodge layout on the main application drawings differs from what is shown in this report. This will impact on the suggested location of the games area, in effect moving it westwards and bringing it closer to the properties in Common Lane. These properties appear to have not been considered.
- 2.3. The report also refers to the external multi-use games area having restricted hours of use between 08:00 and 20:00. This will still impact on the surrounding properties particularly at weekends and no measures have been stated on how this is to be managed to prevent noise nuisance and pollution.
- 2.4. The outside seating area is stated as being in use between 19:00 and 23:30. However the proposed development by its very nature will be required to afford access 24/7 hours and therefore no proposal has been noted for managing the outside area outside of the stated hours so as to prevent a noise nuisance and overall noise pollution.
- 2.5. It is noted at 1.7 of the report that the noise assessment is for daytime only and for 25 people whereas the development has a considerably larger capacity with 2 and up to 4-bedrooms in 50 units and therefore the levels of occupancy calculations may well be significantly understated and therefore the noise levels underestimated.
- 2.6. It is also considered that this area is likely to be used during the evening and early night when airborne noise has a greater impact especially for adjoining properties. The calculations do not appear to have encompassed this. The mitigation referred to will be operationally difficult to control as the Village currently experiences regularly from the main Warren building during weddings and parties.
- 2.7. There is nothing in the report that changes the recommendation of the Parish Council to refuse planning permission. It is the view of this Council that there is no mitigation that will relieve the noise pollution that will affect the surrounding areas and particularly the properties in Common Lane and Gunhill.
- 2.8. It has also to be stated that there are a variety of drawings within the submission that do not appear to accord with each other and somewhat confuse the application.