

Response to the Council's Landscape Review

Planning application UTT/26/1635/OP | Submitted to Uttlesford District Council on 12 September 2026

Dear Ms Beale,

Please treat this email as a further supplementary representation concerning application UTT/26/1635/OP and place it on the public planning file.

I have reviewed the Landscape Review published on 11 September 2026, portal document 4812428. Although the Council's consultant identifies several significant deficiencies in the applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, the review itself appears to have overlooked an important group of views from the western side of the Chelmer Valley.

These include the connected sequence of views experienced from:

- Beaumont Hill;
- The Causeway and Lime Tree Hill;
- the public right of way crossing the elevated field towards St Mary's Church;
- the descent towards the churchyard;
- the churchyard edge; and
- the continuation towards the River Chelmer.

These should not be treated as one isolated viewpoint. Together they form a dynamic and sequential experience of the open Chelmer Valley, Church End, St Mary's Church and the surrounding agricultural landscape. The proposed development would be experienced repeatedly as people travel along this route.

The importance of these locations is supported by the applicant's own documents.

The applicant's LVIA records that the view east from Beaumont Hill across the river valley to Church End is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal and is of higher sensitivity. The applicant's heritage assessment also identifies:

- views from Beaumont Hill and The Causeway towards the church as important;
- the approach to Church End from Beaumont Hill as an important approach;
- the approach to and from Clock House using Beaumont Hill, Lime Tree Hill and The Causeway;
- co-visibility between the application site and St Mary's Church from the public footpath west of the church; and
- key views from the public footpath on higher ground west of the church.

Despite this, Beaumont Hill and Lime Tree Hill do not appear among the applicant's five verified photomontage locations. Nor does the Council's Landscape Review expressly require a complete

assessment of the sequential views along the public path from the higher ground, across the field, towards the churchyard and down to the river.

This is particularly concerning because the Landscape Review accepts that some of the applicant's residual effects have been understated and that planting would not restore the existing open agricultural outlook. The same issue applies to these omitted western and elevated views. Screening parts of the development with planting would create a permanently altered and more enclosed landscape; it would not preserve the present open relationship between Beaumont Hill, Church End and the Chelmer Valley.

Please therefore confirm:

1. Whether the Council's landscape consultant visited Beaumont Hill, The Causeway, Lime Tree Hill and the public right of way leading towards the churchyard and river.
2. Whether photographs were taken from these locations and, if so, whether they will be published.
3. Why no verified Beaumont Hill or Lime Tree Hill viewpoint was required.
4. Whether the applicant will be required to provide representative ground-level photomontages showing the existing view, Year 1 and Year 15 from these locations.
5. Whether the entire public-footpath route will be assessed as a sequential visual experience, rather than relying upon a single selected viewpoint.
6. Whether this omission will be referred back to the Council's landscape and conservation advisers for a coordinated response.

The landscape and heritage consequences cannot be assessed robustly using viewpoints predominantly selected by the applicant while omitting publicly accessible elevated approaches which the applicant's own evidence recognises as important.

I respectfully request that the application is not determined until these views have been properly assessed and the resulting evidence has been published for scrutiny.

Kind regards,

Carl Rolph
Save Church End