

From: sue stewart [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 November 2022 18:53
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2022/9912

From Susan Stewart
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Secretary of State

I would like to object to the above planning application.

It seems that the applicants are completely ignoring (and have previously ignored) the Secretary of State's refusal decision in 2016 for 800 dwellings. This was based on the finding that the location is not sustainable. And the only reason that this application is on the table is the lack of a local plan for Uttlesford, thereby allowing land owners and developers the right to try and profit from each and every part of the countryside.

Since the 2016 decision, there have been more and more local sites resulting in well over 1000 new dwellings, making the situation progressively worse. Whilst appreciating that new houses are sometimes necessary, this cannot be so in this area which has already been over developed beyond what was considered sustainable.

There has been very little or no improvement in the local or district infrastructure. The local amenities have not changed at all: the school, traffic, doctors, shopping etc are all clearly unable to cope with the massive increase in people and traffic. Our access roads are chaotic, crowded and in bad repair; they cannot take any more housing. Traffic jams on the main access road to Elsenham up through Grove Hill traffic lights cause traffic jams, gridlocking the area. Some can even go as far back as onto the B1383 for about a mile or more towards Bishops Stortford. I do not exaggerate – I have been stuck in such a jam. The school is full, the one general store cannot cope with the needs of the population and the only doctor's surgery is oversubscribed. Most residents have to use their cars for shopping, commuting and school runs to, for instance, Bishops Stortford or Saffron Walden. The public transport system is simply inadequate

The site is Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land. It surely cannot be considered it sustainable to lose this land? Housing should only be located only when there is sufficient or planned development of sustainable infrastructure which does no harm to either the environment or the local communities in which it is located. This application would harm the environment and local communities with the loss of the countryside being carved up simply for land owners and developers profit, and is unsustainable and unnecessary. It should also be borne in mind that this land grows our food and with our current economic situation, such land should not be lost.

Mr. Gove has said "What we critically need to do is to make sure we have local communities consenting to development"

As part of this community, I do not consent to this or other future developments by these (or other) developers and land owners. I would request that this application is refused.

Kind regards
Susan Stewart