[redacted]

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Dear Sir/ Madam,
I refer to the Planning Application 26/01956. I strongly object to this application. I have copied the entire content of the attachment to this email just in case you have problems opening my document.

Objection to Planning Application ref: 26/01956/PIP

I wish to state clearly that I object to the building of any houses on the land associated with Planning application in the reference above.

Sustainability is most important to me and it should be high on the agenda of any new Local Plan. It is certainly at the core of the latest National Planning Policy Framework. It is almost impossible for the applicant or agent to make a strong case that this application fully embraces a policy of sustainability for this village in the wider context. I am prepared to believe that the construction of the house will endorse as many aspects of sustainability as possible through material, design, energy management etc; but building houses in a village without amenities and facilities means that the residents are wholly reliant on car transportation. Any new building development in a village which is not served by adequate and appropriate public transport results in more cars on the road. This does not comply with Government aims and objectives in driving to net zero carbon sustainability. The Government's desire is to focus on placing housing developments within easy reach of public transport and rail hubs. We cannot ignore the framework entirely because of a lack of a valid Local Plan – the new Plan must be signed off in just over a month. Sustainability means "supporting efforts to mitigate and adapt to climate change" (NPPF Aug 2026).. including "moving to a low carbon economy". The objective in the new framework is to "protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment". HDC must not become so blinkered that they concentrate their focus on their house building shortfall to the exclusion of the larger and more critical aim of achieving a sustainable future for our children.

The land within which this housing development will take place is in Open Countryside and outside the settlement of Easton. The village is built around a central agricultural field with a church dating back to the 12th century to the south of this field. A 'horseshoe' of houses define the shape of the village surrounding the central field which is separated from the field of the planning application by the main village road from the A14. These characteristics of this village typify rural living and foster a deep sense of ownership. Too many villages in our local area are blighted by unsympathetic development which rips the heart out of village life. This application is for just 2 houses, but it follows quickly on the back of another house application which you have already approved. We are fully cognisant and deeply concerned by the undoubtable desire of the applicant to expand building in

this field. The likelihood of an estate of houses is very real. As more of this field is built upon it becomes too small to farm at a viable scale. This is important to consider. I appreciate your desire to dismiss speculation over the future, but proper strategic planning does necessitate a thorough assessment of how your decision for this application may affect or encourage the applicant to apply for more houses and irreversibly and adversely affect the rural nature of Easton, and the strong community that we have now. I am very aware that the agent and the applicant are cynically 'playing' the planning system and are hoping to press this application through before the Local Plan is approved and guidance is directed more to the August 2026 NPPF.

'Tilted Balance' is a phrase that has been heard many times in the past few months, but I would ask you to consider carefully how this policy is applied in this case. I believe I read that the previous application from this applicant was only approved because of the policy of 'Tilted Balance', but I also uncovered a judgment from the Appeal Court that ruled that 'Tilted Balance' must not be applied in isolation. Relevant elements of the existing Development Plan/Local Plan must be considered even when there isn't a 5-year building plan and the Local Plan is out of date. This would suggest that the previous approval may actually be unsafe. I suspect that this Appeal Court ruling has not been fully considered.

The application is for 2 houses, but I note that some of the points used by the applicant to secure this approval rely entirely on the premise that the first house has been built. There are a number of requirements, stipulated by HDC, that need to be met before this house may be built. There is no guarantee that this will happen.

The field in question has a significant portion designated as Flood Risk 3B. The cottage to the south of the field is a 16th century listed building. Any building in this field which alters the current drainage in this field poses a potential risk to this building. It will be very hard to model the movement or drainage of water in this field to ensure that Crown Cottage remains unaffected by a rising water table. The projection of increasing flood risk in this area over the next 60 years, in particular the area draining into Ellington Brook, is significant and should be an overriding concern and consideration when deciding on this application.

I sincerely hope that the voice of the village is heard. We have a strong and vibrant community that looks after the elderly, sick and the children in the village. It is a balance that is easily upset by unwelcome and inappropriate developments. The strength of Easton's community represents a strong measure of sustainability which should be celebrated and endorsed by HDC. I strongly object to this application.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]