

**From:** Chris Clarke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 October 2022 19:31  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Planning application S62A/22/0007 - Land to the south of Henham Rd Elsenham

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Chris Clarke  
**Date:** Thu, Sep 22, 2022 at 7:50 PM  
**Subject:** Planning application S62A/22/0007 - Land to the south of Henham Rd Elsenham  
**To:** <[section62@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:section62@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

We wish to register our opposition to the above planning request for 130 houses on this ancient piece of land that has been central to the village of Elsenham for hundreds of years. It is the last remaining green space within the village and is a valuable asset which is part of the heritage of the village and its history.

The field is surrounded by the church and many listed buildings and in close proximity to the junction known as Elsenham Cross.

This junction is already congested with the current levels of traffic and will be more so with the 350 houses already being constructed to the north of Henham rd, and the 130 which have been approved to the west of Hall road. The road infrastructure around Elsenham is also entirely unsuitable for the increased level of traffic that will be generated by this and other ongoing developments. Notably the single carriageway Grove Hill junction in lower Stansted which is already at capacity.

The already approved new houses will mean that Elsenham has doubled in size over the past 10 years or so with NO infrastructure improvements. It seems as if there is really no strategy whatsoever to the approval of housing in this village. This would be a good opportunity to provide some actual planning control to this unrestricted free-for-all development.

The land is also part of the Stansted Airport Countryside Protection Zone. to quote from that :-  
'The CPZ stated purpose to maintain a local belt of countryside around the airport that will not be eroded by coalescing development.'  
Is the CPZ a meaningless entity to be overridden by rampant development?

The site is unsuitable in many ways to a development of this size. Half of it falls away steeply towards Stansted brook and the Daisy May farm. It also borders the ancient Elsenham Place which has several listed buildings which would be endangered by such close development.

In short - this is an entirely unsuitable site for a large development and the planning request should be refused.

C and L Clarke  
[REDACTED]

