

From: Kevin Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 November 2022 18:03
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Response to consultation ref S62A/2022/0012 (Land East of Station, Elsenham)

FAO Planning Inspectorate re S52A/2022/0012 (Land East of Station, Elsenham)

Dear team - I've just become aware of this application to build 200 more houses in our neighbourhood. Please register my objection to this in the strongest possible terms.

Suitable housing developments, with adequate infrastructure to support them, are absolutely necessary and have my full support.

However this is not one of those. It is, instead completely inappropriate, and appears to be yet another case of a developer "trying it on".

Traffic on the narrow neighbouring roads, and through neighbouring villages, is already a daily challenge for those of us who live here.

Stansted Mountfitchet, and the much smaller villages of Ugley and Ugley Green in particular, are not designed for - or adequate for - current traffic levels, never mind that incurred by 200 more houses.

6 years ago, a developer applied to build 800 houses in a similar location.

On that occasion, it reached the Secretary of State, who agreed with his Inspector that this was not sustainable - primarily for the traffic this would bring to neighbouring roads and the consequences thereof - and refused planning permission.

Piecemeal development since then has however sneaked through - allowing housing numbers, and traffic to ramp up.

Now, if this new application were to be successful, this - along with other houses either already approved or currently going through the application process - would take additional house numbers since 2016 to **>1000** (ie more than 25% ABOVE the +800 level that was deemed unsustainable by the SOS in 2016).

No structural changes have been made to the local roads in that time - and these are simply not possible, given the nature of village geography and layout.

And there's more:

- The local Primary School in Elsenham is full already
- Public transport is inadequate for widespread use by current residents (never mind new ones)
- Other local facilities are very limited too, meaning cars are used by most residents for work, leisure and to access basic services (congesting roads further, and making a mockery of any sustainable environmental objectives)

In short this is a wholly inappropriate application - for all the reasons that *previous* such attempts were rejected, and as blatant a piece of attempted opportunism as I have ever seen.

It is wasting valuable Planning Inspectorate time, and that of residents who have - yet again - to respond to a developer trying to slip something unsuitable in through the back door.

This is not about 200 houses - it is about the gridlock, pollution, danger to children and adults, road damage, swamping of local services ... etc etc ... that it would bring (as well as the mockery it would make to a planning system, were this to be approved).

I trust you will not look at this in isolation. The facts are stark, alternatives for *suitable* housing sites many, and there is ample precedent to draw on in assessing the merits of this particular, grossly unsuitable site!

My best wishes, Kevin

Kevin Neil Johnson

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