

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 22:57  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** S62A/2022/0012 land east of station, Elsenham

We wish to object to the planning application referenced above.

This development is additional to several large developments in the local area and will exacerbate problems with the already overstretched amenities and local transport infrastructure. At particular times we already experience regular queues and snarl-ups on roads at local “pinch-points”, the trains are often full and a new development will throw more traffic on both transport facilities as there is very little local employment. Both the local primary school and Doctor’s surgery are close to maximum subscription which will cause further traffic, as no other facility is within walking distance and the current shopping outlet is far too small for the existing level of housing, let alone the development now under construction and this additional proposal. The shop is beyond walking distance for most of these proposed dwellings anyway, increasing car journeys. The roads themselves are inadequate for the level of development in process and proposed, with poor lighting, no footpaths and are too small and winding for large volumes of modern traffic. The bus service currently offered is a “once-an-hour” service in each direction so there is no encouragement to use it instead of private transport.

In 2016 The Secretary of State considered a proposal for 800 dwellings around Elsenham and refused planning permission, agreeing with his Inspector regarding the traffic issues. Due to smaller subsequent applications being passed and with current applications applied for (including this one) we are in a situation where over 1000 dwellings may be present shortly with no change in local roads around them.

Finally, how can it be sustainable to build on Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land when we are supposed to be backing green initiatives, producing locally-grown, food preserving the environment for subsequent generations?

We therefore strongly object to this proposal and wish our objections to be noted.

John and Lynn Hodgson

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]