

From: Ruth Bonino [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 November 2022 15:07
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: ref S62A/2022/0012 Land east of Station, Elsenham.

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to oppose this planning application on the basis that it is totally inappropriate for the area and is unsustainable - it will only serve to increase the already difficult traffic problems and pressure on public services we have been experiencing due to many other developments in the area.

We moved to this village in 2006 loving the peace and quiet of the countryside and enjoying the country roads. Gradually this enjoyment has been eroded away year by year by piecemeal development. We are tired of having to object but if we don't, we feel that our way of life and beautiful countryside will be ruined forever. We would like it to stop please.

I understand that the 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.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Bonino
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]