

From: lew channing [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 November 2022 09:30
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2022/0012 Land east of Station, Elsenham

Dear Sirs,

We write to strongly object to the latest planning application which will further blight one of England's loveliest villages and have a detrimental affect on our way of life. To add insult to injury our local elected council is being arbitrarily bypassed and a decision will be taken by a Minister who is not elected by local people and given the track record of this Government, will not be in the position for any length of time. This individual does not have the knowledge of the issues raised below and quite honestly does not care less. This is clear from the decision to over ride our elected council when they refused the current development of 350 houses on same the site as this new application. This development is already causing huge disruption and we will have to live this for many years. Specifically our objections are as follows:
A Secretary of State considered a proposal for 800 dwellings on land included in the current application was not sustainable in 2016 and refused planning permission.

The Secretary of State also agreed with his Inspector on traffic issues. The Inspector considered that 800 dwellings would bring significant volumes of additional traffic to a village at a significant distance from employment and services.

How is it possible that 800 dwellings are not sustainable, but, that piecemeal developments already allowed, or applied for, of potentially over 1000 dwellings is? Piecemeal development has been allowed and considered to be sustainable. If this development is allowed the total will exceed the number that the Secretary of State considered unsustainable.

Local people daily experience a totally different situation on the roads around Elsenham and Stansted than that modelled in the Transport assessments. The situation at Grove Hill, Lower street and Chapel Hill is already completely unacceptable with extensive queues and delays. The rural roads through Ugley, Ugley Green suffer from poor highway alignment, have no footpaths or street lighting and cannot satisfactorily accommodate further growth.

The range of facilities in Elsenham is limited and insufficient to meet the daily needs of the proposed development and beyond walking distance for most residents. Residents of Elsenham and Henham tend to travel to Bishop Stortford and Saffron Walden to shop.

The Developer states that Elsenham has excellent public transport facilities. The buses are limited and residents need to use a car for most activities.

The site is Grade 1 and Grade 2 agriculture land. How is it sustainable to lose such high grade productive agriculture land.

The primary school in Elsenham is already full.

The infrastructure of our villages cannot support such development which is more suited to towns than villages. Aside from inadequate roads for such a development of this size, and the lack of school places, the pressure on local GP services cannot cope now with all the new houses yet alone 800 more homes.

The number of houses in the village of Elsenham has more than doubled in the last 15 years and there have been several substantial developments in Henham. This objection is therefore made not because we are "Nimbys"

but enough is enough and I am really upset the democratic process is being abused by not allowing the usual planning process to be respected with this application.

Yours faithfully,

L.E and J.Channing

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