

Submission for Deadline 6

I have restricted my response to the LEMP August 2026 & the Outline PROW MP., and the concern highlighted by the recent fire that happened on part of Site A which required the Fire Service to come out to on two occasions.

The applicant has again made additional changes to its documentation. These however in my opinion still omit all the details required for a valuable decision on this proposal to be made by anyone.

Planning applications for less significant proposals always have to provide details of everything that is proposed to be carried out.

This of course does not apply to an outline only application, so does this mean we can assume that the entire application is an outline only and if work does not commence within 3 years it will no longer be valid? It will also mean that the applicant will have to submit details and that work will not commence until these have been submitted, available publicly and go through the same procedure as any application. This is an important and valid query, deserving a response.

Outline LEMP Aug. 2026.

1.1.4. There is no indication of when the final LEMP will be submitted and to whether it will be before or after a decision has been made.

4.2.1. The EPL and EMP need to be approved and available for public scrutiny and comments before works start on the site. Approval 6 months after commencement could mean that valuable habitats are lost forever.

5.3.6. Great detail is given regarding how trees and hedgerows should be planted, but the most important information is missing – what species are proposed for the area and are they suitable?

5.3.9. Species of grass and wildflowers need to be specified. The last thing that is required is invasive non native species to be used and then spread to the wider area.

5.3.48. The surfacing materials for the existing PROWS need to be stated. The use of hoggin and other harsh materials should not be permitted as they are not walker or horse friendly, to accommodate dual use for vehicles is not acceptable. All Prows should be separate from vehicular movements, even if they are shared by agricultural vehicles at present. Fencing would make PROW users very vulnerable if this were permitted.

6.5.44. Nowhere does it state how many sheep will be grazing, where and how many farmers would be involved. Neither does it state how they will be accessed on a daily basis for water and to check their well being, again generating vehicular movements through the area.

PROW Management Plan

1.1.2. The details of this plan needs to be available to everyone, discussed in detail and permission approved.

2.4/ Hours of work need to be restricted to those stated NOT 'generally adhered to'. This is too open a statement to ensure certainty for residence who will suffer from any working.

Comments on the table

Site A FP2 is a very dangerous crossing point for dual use. This was referred to at the last examination and has not been addressed. There is not room on the bridge and in addition the bridge is not suitable for multiple HGVs.

5.1.4. Any diversions during construction need to be made clear at this stage NOT after approval has been given.

5.1.11. Technical standards to be applied need to be available prior to any permission being granted.

Monitoring and Recording

The audit of this needs to be shown in detail at this stage to ensure it is carried out in a manner that keeps all users safe.

Appendix Pertenhall 29 needs to be a permanent diversion to avoid vehicle/user conflict.

Fire Hazard in dry weather.

This has now become a very serious reality in this area. There have been many wildfires in the local area over this summer, all of them accidents due to the incredibly dry vegetation. One of these was within site A. The fire brigade had to come out twice to this fire at the rear of Chadwell End and many members of the local community also got involved. It was very close to houses and agricultural buildings. It was extinguished before it got to property, but did burn the rear hedgerow.

The scenario could have been very different if the area had been fenced off and people were on the footpath – there would have been no escape for them and it would have been difficult for firefighters to gain access.

There is no documentation in for EPE regarding what would be the protocol in case of a fire. This is not acceptable. All fenced off areas should be equipped for potential outbreaks of fire.