

From: p.stuartrobinson [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 November 2022 16:03
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: s62a/2022/0012

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing in regard to the planning ref above, the land East of Elsenham station. I find it very strange that in 2016, the inspectorate refused planning permission for 800 houses on this same site, as it would not be sustainable. It was also agreed at the time by the secretary of state that, it would bring volumes of traffic to villages that are a significant distance from employment and amenities.

How can it be possible for 800 dwellings to be too many for the already weakening road infrastructure, yet with piecemeal development already built, or applied for, with a potential of 1000 homes, is allowed and considered to be sustainable. The several hundred houses built in the last five years, have caused considerable damage and traffic chaos to the roads at Grove Hill, Lower Street, and Chapel Hill, and the wider surrounding area.

The range of facilities in Elsenham were struggling (shops surgery etc) before the last couple of hundred were built, with 350 being built now, and more already in the pipeline, these extra 200 will complete the destruction of a once viable rural area.

How the developer can state that Elsenham has excellent public services, is a very uninformed and unintelligent comment. The bus service is at best intermittent, the rail line is already straining, and there are regular problems on this Liverpool street line.

To exit this area by public service, at a time that is convenient is difficult at best, and as for workers of our major employer Stansted Airport, it is of no use at all

I also find it very short sighted. that we will easily give up Grade 1&2 agricultural land when the need to grow our own food is more urgent than ever, especially since the Ukraine war/

Mr P.Stuart-Robinson
[REDACTED]

ref S62A/2022/0012