

Oliver Bigaignon

From: Martin Hockfield [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 August 2025 15:23
To: Planning Policy (SADC)
Subject: Response to Additional Documents Consultation - Document SADCED80/A

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.



To whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the additional documents published on 4th July 2025 – this is a response to Document SADC/ED80A.

The document in question has added several extra sites for consideration including Site M14 (Land adjacent to Beesonend Lane). This land is currently largely hidden from public view by several banks of mature vegetation. As such and providing this vegetation is retained it could be developed without any great impact on the surrounding countryside and properties. However I share the Council's concerns regarding access to the site given that Beesonend Lane will be largely unsuitable. The only possible access to the site would be from the existing street pattern namely The Deerings or Penny Croft which would be challenging and would require careful review of the traffic safety implications of adding a junction into a fairly serpentine road network. As such I would **Oppose** the development of this site.

Further I would like to add my **Support** of the Council's position in Paragraph 23 of the SADC Position document. The land proposed by Jarvis Homes in addition to site M14 was proposed for further assessment by the 2013 Green Belt Review, but the subsequent 2023 Review put the proposed additional site into Site SA-12 which contributed strongly towards Green Belt purposes. A cursory assessment of the two parcels of land shows them to be very different in nature with site M14 being partly developed and with clear boundaries as well as being largely hidden from view by established vegetation. The land proposed by Jarvis Homes is agricultural in nature with no defined boundary on one side. It is open in nature allowing clear views over surrounding countryside which are enjoyed by dog walkers and ramblers alike. Apart from its physical proximity it has almost nothing in common with Site M14 – any attempt to adjust its Green Belt designation should be strongly opposed.

Kind regards

Martin Hockfield
[REDACTED]