

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 November 2022 19:45  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Ref S62A/2022/0012 - Strong objection

Ref S62A/2022/0012 Land east of Station, Elsenham

Please refuse this planning application.

The proposal fails multiple basic planning requirements, including for adequate transport provision to and from the village, adequate public transport, adequate local schooling, adequate other basic services within walking distance, suitability of site for encouraging employment or community cohesion.

The same is true for its sustainability - whether that be of the environment, communities, employment, or farming.

Transport is the most glaring weakness, with tiny local roads and already-congested, polluted and dangerous, unlit villages already bearing the brunt of traffic levels well beyond what they can handle satisfactorily.

That is one of the main reasons why previous applications to develop this and similar sites have been refused over the years - including by the Secretary of State in 2016, who agreed with his Inspector's assessment that this volume of additional traffic was inappropriate for a village sited some distance from employment and services. (Most current residents have to travel to access both).

Whatsoever, at that time, the proposed housing numbers which were rejected was 800.

This proposal - added to a series of other subsequent development approvals since then (approved bit by bit, in an itchy, itchy way, with it would seem no overview), and other current planning applications - would take the total number of additional homes to over 1000.

This is not only completely unsuitable, it is verging on the criminal that "the system" allows developers to ignore clear Local authority, Planning Inspectorate and national government conclusions, and keep on asking the same question, in slightly different ways, to try to get a different answer.

There are suitable sites out there, with credible infrastructure options; this is not one of them.

Yours sincerely,

Sara Johnson

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