

From: Sue Balmain [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 November 2022 09:00
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RefS62A/2022/0012 land east of station Elsenham

Susan Balmain
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I would like to record my objection to the additional 200 houses on the previous planning application on the following grounds

General

This is systematic of the continuing creep of development in a rural area, The Secretary of state made it very clear that overdevelopment of this area is not acceptable and unsustainable when the large development of 1000 homes was rejected a few years ago. Since that event development has continued to creep and the secretary of state's concerns have been surpassed as the applications granted are nearing the 1000 homes that was objectionable.

Change of use of agricultural land

With the focus on climate change and food security the continued developer's preference to build on agricultural land is madness.

The Cost-of-living crisis and conflict in Europe shows us that as a country we must be more food secure and developing on agricultural land must stop

Developers ignoring planning obligations

Recent developments have not fulfilled their 106 obligations community centres have not been built at Isobel drive and landscaping has been reduced to an extent that it is unrecognisable from the planning applications. Developers are taking liberties and extending the number of houses in an application is an example of their disregard for the planning process

With all the development around Elsenham there has been **no** contribution to local amenities, School, Doctor surgery, shopping or recreation.

Transport

Whilst we do have a train station nearby, the train is all stops Service from Cambridge to London that runs twice in the hour at peak time.

Largescale development is occurring along this line from Cambridge will overcrowd this service and the transport providers have no appetite for increasing the service or investing in longer platforms for larger trains.

The Bus service is infrequent and does not coordinate with the train service so it cannot be used as a sustainable form of transport

Flooding

The Flood risk analysis is flawed and entirely inaccurate

The application states that ***There are no records of flooding within the site or nearby proximity***

This is not correct and local knowledge and experience shows that this area regularly floods as despite the Flood risk analysis statement this site sits below the incline that separate Henham from Elsenham. The soil in this area is impervious and has a high run off see below

Siting the attenuation in this area will render it ineffective as it will be overcome with surface water and will exacerbate the flooding along station and old mead road which regularly floods.





Site access

The logic of placing a site access on a bend in the rural road is flawed and to add the increase the frequency of use of this dangerous access would be a staggering decision.

Location and overlooking

This site is not discrete it will detrimentally effect the view asthe station is approached from new road as the development will occupy the incline out of the village

Conclusion

This application for an additional 200 homes should be rejected because

- The Development on Eisenham has been disproportional
- There should be no further development on agricultural land
- The access to and from the site is dangerous
- The development will increase the considerable flooding of this area
- The Development is obtrusive

- This Development and all the others have not contributed to the community
- The Development will contribute to the already overstretched transport system

Sue Balmain