

**From:** Matthew Palmer [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 November 2022 21:33  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** S62A/2022/0012 Land East of Station, Elsenham

Ref: S62A/2022/0012 Land East of Station, Elsenham

Representation from:  
Matthew Palmer

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dear Madam / Sir,

Ref: S62A/2022/0012 Land East of Station, Elsenham

Matthew & Rafal Palmer

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

We would like to raise our objections to the above planning application.

Elsenham has been subject to a large number of newly approved developments in recent years. This latest development would take the total to well over 1000 homes. In 2016 the secretary of state considered a development of 800 homes on this same land to be unsustainable. There has been zero investment in infrastructure in the meantime and it is overrun in many ways. How can it be sustainable to approve these additional homes.

We are in cost-of-living and climate crises. It has never been more important that we are able to grow and source food sustainably, domestically and locally. This proposed development would represent a loss of quality grade 1 and grade 2 agricultural land and is clearly contrary to the direction in which we need to be headed as a district, county, and country.

The area around the station and just north of the station on North Hall Road regularly floods. The land on which these homes are proposed to be built slopes significantly down towards this area. Concreting this over with an impermeable surface will result in a high risk of flooding to the roads and to the railway line leading to additional disruption to travel. We are and will be experiencing more extreme weather events due to the climate crises and this development poses further unacceptable environmental risk to the existing communities and transport infrastructure. The proposed two storage ponds will be inadequate to eliminate this risk.

See the pictures in the local paper for an example of recent flooding in the station area

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] in later October 2022.

In 2016 the planning inspector considered that 800 dwellings would bring significant volumes of additional traffic to a village lying a significant distance from employment and services. Nothing has changed in the meantime, so how could this position be different with piecemeal development of upwards of 1000 homes.

Local roads are unsuitable for the additional volume of road traffic these homes would generate. These were built as country roads and are not to handle the volume of traffic these additional developments bring. While there is a train service in the area and a very limited bus service, in practice the vast majority of residents drive (including to access train services in Bishop's Stortford which have a faster and more frequent service). Key access roads like those through Stansted Mountfitchet - Grove Hill, Lower Street and Chapel Hill already suffer from extensive delays at key times of the day. Other access roads such as that through Ugley Green are rural roads, narrow and without footways.

There is already massive stress on local schools. Elsenham Primary School is already full even before the large number of houses already approved and not yet built or occupied are taken into consideration let alone this latest development of 200 additional houses. The inevitable result is yet more car journeys.

Elsenham Surgery is already stretched with the existing number of homes in the area. The inevitable result of more homes will be that patients will need to travel elsewhere for GP services, resulting in additional car journeys enhancing greenhouse effect.

Other facilities in the village such as shops are too limited to serve the number of additional homes in Elsenham and will result in more car journeys.

Children attending clubs and societies in the area will inevitably be ferried by their parents to nearby conurbations such as Saffron Walden, Bishop's Stortford and beyond.

Overall, this development represents an unacceptable and unsustainable urbanisation of the countryside. We strongly urge you to reject this speculative monetisation of our countryside environment.

Thank you for giving time to my representation.

Yours faithfully,

Matthew Palmer

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