

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 16 November 2022 20:28

**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

**Subject:** S62A/2022/0012 Land east of Station, Elsenham - David & Speranza Richey, Prompt Corner Woodend Green, Henham, Bishop's Stortford, CM22 6AZ

Dear Sir,

We refer to the above proposed development.

We are extremely disappointed that further homes are planned.

It was confirmed previously by a Secretary of State that a proposal for 800 homes on the land included in the current application was not sustainable in 2016 and planning permission was declined. Yet how can with piecemeal applications already allowed or applied for of potentially 1000 dwellings be sustainable. Makes no sense whatsoever.

We totally question the accuracy of the transport assessments and they are not realistic. The traffic we experience in Elsenham and Stansted is already well beyond the maximum the roads can cope with. Grove Hill, Lower Street and Chapel Hill already has excessive queues and delays and rural roads in Ugley and Ugley Green cannot accommodate further growth and have no street lighting and footpaths.

The primary school in Elsenham is already full. Further houses would mean existing children's education would suffer unnecessarily and the new residents' children would need to travel to other schools putting further pressure on delays on the local roads.

It is claimed that Elsenham has excellent transport facilities. We cannot see how this is correct when the bus services are limited, trains not that frequent and you need to use a car for most activities which again would put further pressure on the overloaded roads.

The facilities in Elsenham are extremely limited and would certainly not be able to cope with the proposed development and would be beyond walking distance for most residents.

We note also that the site is Grade 1 and Grade 2 agriculture land. We cannot comprehend how it would be sustainable to lose such high grade productive agricultural land.

We feel the whole proposal is not sustainable in an area of limited amenities and an overloaded infrastructure.

Therefore, we wish to totally reject the above proposed development.

Kind regards

David and Speranza Richey  
[REDACTED]