From: Margaret Shaw [redacted]
Sent: 18 September 2022 12:22
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/22/0007 Land to the South of Henham Road, Elsenham, Essex

section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/22/0007 Land to the South of Henham Road, Elsenham, Essex

I wish to object to this application on the grounds listed, principally the unsuitability of this village for further development, the poor road links and the totally unsustainable nature of the application.

1. The Secretary of State rejected further building in the Elsenham area when it was proposed by UDC in its 2014 Local Plan. Despite this, Planning Permission has been granted for >1000 more and there are another 250 plus this 130 that are not yet determined. At the time of the 2011 Census, Elsenham had a population of 2,446, which was little changed from 2,403 in the 2001 census. Since then, the village has undergone significant development, Now it is on course to almost triple the population in 10 years.

2. The comprehensive report by the planning inspector [redacted] into the Uttlesford Local Plan dated December 2014, makes it abundantly clear that Elsenham is unsuitable for development as the "village lies at some distance from the strategic network in a location embedded within a network of rural roads acknowledged as currently unfit to serve expansion", & he "doubts that Elsenham could overcome the connectivity disadvantages of its location sufficiently to be regarded as consistent with national policy or effective in being able to secure sustainable development".

3. The 2016 Local Plan did not include this site.

4. The emerging Local Plan does not include this site.

5. The application relies almost exclusively on the lack of a 5-year housing supply, but as these figures are greatly overstated that is not a legitimate reason to build on yet more greenfield sites.

Development on this greenfield site & loss of amenity land is unnecessary when there are plenty of brownfield sites that should be used before the countryside is encroached upon.

6. Contrary to Local Plan Policy S7, development here, within the Countryside Protection Zone, does not enhance or preserve the character of the countryside in which it is set. Countryside is to be valued, in planning decisions, for its own sake as well as being considered a resource/amenity - this development would lead to a significant loss of countryside with all its intrinsic value.

7. The main route from Elsenham is via Grove Hill, Lower Street, Chapel Hill Stansted. This route has reached saturation point. Despite claims to the contrary by Essex County Council, recent adjustments to the traffic light phasing at Grove Hill have simply moved the traffic problem into Lower Street Stansted Mountfitchet.

Air Quality here is demonstrably at illegal levels. An inspectorate that ignores the pollution issues that are arising in this respect is failing in its duty.

8. No consideration has been given to the pressure on services such as water supply.

9. The site is not served by sustainable transportation. Cycling to the 'outside world' is currently non-existent as it is far too dangerous. Most people will not use local bus services as they are inconsistent and the train service is poor. This means that most residents will use their cars, which is a poor judgment on sustainability credentials.

10. It is becoming apparent that the current infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the pressures upon it. It is not Elsenham's job to accommodate the high level of growth that the government is erroneously imposing on Uttlesford. The village character is being eroded and services such as schools and doctors are suffering. [redacted] We have fewer facilities now than we had then. There used to be 2 food shops & 2 pubs, we used to have a greengrocer, butcher, newsagent, market garden and petrol station, the train journey to London is now 10 minutes longer and we have fewer buses. The claim that "The village is served by local buses with regular services to Bishop's Stortford and Saffron Walden" is contradicted in the applicant's own Transport assessment. There is no bus to Saffron Walden.

11. FP13 (13/13) is a well used Public Right of Way. Over-development in Elsenham has resulted in loss of large areas of land used by dog walkers. This has put enormous pressure on the local Ancient Woodland of Alsa Wood, Aubrey Buxton Nature Reserve and the SSSI of nearby Hatfield Forest.

It appears that the developer plans to incorporate the footpath into pavements alongside estate roads. Thus losing the rural nature of the footpath.

12. Community facilities available in Elsenham are woefully inadequate to cope with the pressures upon it.

Elsenham Village Hall is a joint use Hall with Elsenham School and Elsenham Church and as such is only available to the village in evenings and on Saturday. Elsenham Memorial Hall is only licensed to hold 80 people.

The village has grown so significantly since 2010 such that the Memorial Hall is often fully booked.

All the youth organisations in Elsenham have waiting lists as the facilities are inadequate.

13. Despite claims in in the application there has been no meaningful consultation - a glossy brochure that apparently went to some (not all) residents. There has been NO public meeting.

Should you be minded to allow this application then I would ask that you take the following points into account:

14. There are not enough bungalows in Elsenham. Most houses in Elsenham are under-occupied as there has been insufficient provision of high-quality bungalows for existing residents to down-size to.

15. As part of planning consents given in 2012/2013/2019 Developers were required to contribute towards a new Community Hall to be built on land given by David Wilson Homes, adjacent to Elsenham Playing Field. As the expansion of the village by a further 130 houses will make this facility, as originally envisaged, inadequate, and as building costs have increased significantly since 2012, I suggest that under S106 requirements the applicant be asked to contribute towards the new

Community Hall. Additional money will mean that the hall can expand commensurate with the expansion of the village.

16. There have been repeated requests to ECC for many years to install pedestrian controlled traffic lights outside Elsenham Primary school. There is no longer a school crossing person at Elsenham Primary school and the situation is becoming increasingly dangerous. ECC have refused to install lights on the grounds of cost.

17. Local bus service are due to be expanded by ECC as part of another planning application, where ECC was bribed into reversing its objections when the developer promised £1m to improve bus services. However there was no requirement for the revised service to be extended into the early morning & evening so that people working shifts at Stansted airport could travel by bus.

18. This developer should be asked to fund a safe cycle route to the airport as the current road is far too dangerous.

19. All dwellings should be built to passive-haus standards - there should be electric car charging points for every dwelling, every roof should have solar panels and there should be NO provision of gas or oil heating.

And, finally, I object to the politically motivated decision to take Planning decision making away from Uttlesford District Council. The current council, that I did not vote for, was elected on a platform of opposing Stansted Airport expansion and the unsustainable amount of new houses demanded by national government. This government is seeking to undermine organisations that do not agree with it or their paymasters in the construction industry. The integrity of the Planning Inspectorate has seriously been called into question by this action. Time to reassert you independence!

Thank You

Margaret Shaw

[redacted]