

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
15 November 2022

By email to: [Section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:Section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

Dear Sir

**OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION**  
**Ref S62A/2022/0012 Land East of Station Elsenham**

I write to object to the above Planning Application on the following grounds:

1. **Excessive traffic congestion:** The route to Stansted and Bishop Stortford using Grove Hill is heavily congested already in the peak morning and evening travel times when people are going to and from work and taking children to and from school. Surveys to ascertain traffic flow through Grove Hill conducted between 10:30am and 3:30pm may well show no problem but this is definitely not the case in peak times. The addition of 200 more houses (on top of the 350 already approved and being built on the Bloor site abutting Elsenham on Henham Parish land) cannot be accommodated on this route. The problem cannot be solved by suggesting travellers should drive to Stansted via Ugley and Ugley Green. That route involves long wait times to pass through the level crossing, negotiating parked cars which effectively create a single file track, going through a small rural village and the main road through Stansted is already also heavily congested at most times of the day. Ugley and Ugley Green, as is usual for rural villages, have no street lighting. The road through them also suffers from poor highway alignment and any greater traffic flow would increase the risk to pedestrians as there are no footpaths.
2. **Excessive development:** Planning applications appear to be considered on their individual merits without due consideration being given to the detrimental cumulative impact of overall development in any given area. The Secretary of State considered that 800 dwellings was not sustainable but successive applications which have been applied for and those already granted suggest that the figure of 800 (considered unsustainable) will be exceeded. That is not acceptable.
3. **Inadequate facilities:**
  - a. **Shopping** Elsenham has a small parade of shops with very limited parking so many cars park on the main road – often across the bus stop area or in front of residents' houses. Delivery vans have to park outside on the road immediately before the mini-roundabout which further adds to the traffic hazard created. The proposed new development would inevitably add to the problem. Firstly, the shopping parade only has a limited range of facilities so potential residents in the proposed new development would be likely to drive to areas with larger shopping centres. Even if they did not all choose to go to Dunmow, Stansted or Bishops Stortford, a significantly higher traffic flow would be generated across the road immediately in front of the parade of shops. Secondly, the proposed new development is not within easy walking distance of the shopping parade and so any new residents seeking to use it for example for top-up shopping would most likely choose to go by car.

- b. **Public Transport** – The developer claims that public transport facilities are excellent. The reality is an hourly bus service (in the day) to Bishops Stortford and Stansted Airport and two trains an hour going to Cambridge and London in peak hours reducing to hourly at other times. A pedestrian access from the proposed new development to Elsenham station might encourage walking but only by those not deterred by the distance and time involved.
  - c. **School:** The primary school in Elsenham is already full. There are no secondary schools in Elsenham
4. **Change of use of land:** The site is Grade 1 and Grade 2 agriculture land. How is it sustainable to lose such high grade productive agriculture land.

Yours faithfully

Sheena Bigland