

**From:** Paola Bier Holmes [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 September 2022 12:27  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Ref S62A/22/0007 - Land South of Henham Road, Elsenham

Dear Sir,

I am writing to object to planning application S62A/22/0007 by Countryside for 130 homes (Land to the south of Henham Road, Elsenham, Essex).

The grounds for my objection are as follows:

**1. Inadequate road infrastructure, access in/out of village**

The road system in, out and through Elsenham depends upon B or unclassified roads and winding lanes. One access point at Grove Hill, Stansted, is single file controlled by traffic lights with a 7.5-ton restriction, which is often blocked, causing significant traffic tailbacks. Another at Bedwell Road, towards Ugley, has a width restriction and dangerous blind corners. Hall Road which abuts the site is the designated HGV route into and out of Elsenham – a badly lit, pot-holed, narrow road with little/no footpath for pedestrians.

One of the sites already approved for housing in Elsenham, 130 dwellings, shortly to commence construction, will discharge onto Hall Road near the Old Vicarage, opposite the site. Additionally, traffic from the Fairfield 350 dwelling site currently under construction will use Henham Road and Hall Road for access. The new development will surely pose significant dangers for any pedestrians using this access.

There has been no significant road improvement work in Elsenham in the last 15 years, despite the additional houses already built or approved. The road system can definitely not cope with any more developments. Inadequate consideration has been given by the developers of the impact of additional road users within and around Elsenham.

**2. Inadequate infrastructure, facilities, resources**

Elsenham does not have the infrastructure to support an additional 130 properties. This proposed development is, of course, in addition to the housing developments already approved and underway in Elsenham: from Fairfield, 350 houses under construction north of Henham Road, with approval for another 200 more; another application for 150 properties further east along Henham Road; 130 houses to be built to the west of Hall Road.

No planning consideration has been given to the additional need for and provision of nursery/junior/senior schools, GP surgeries, dentists, retail and leisure facilities, etc. and as noted above, the impact on road usage of these additional houses. Since these facilities and infrastructure do not exist in the village or within walking distance, people will be forced into using their cars to travel further afield to access them, thereby contributing to increased traffic.

**3. Impact on listed buildings in immediate vicinity of site**

There are 15 listed properties in the immediate vicinity of this site and the new buildings will have a **significant negative** impact on the nature of their settings. Vistas within the village and especially for – and of - these properties, will be entirely lost.

Also note that the **Grade 1** listed St Mary's Church, Church Lane, is very close to the edges of the development at the Stansted Brook end. It is possible that in some areas the development is actually within the permitted 250m radius of this church and its grounds – something which UDC should investigate.

Certainly, village views of this Church will be compromised by the development, regardless of 'key views' efforts proposed by Countryside.

The Built Heritage Statement, Section 4.5, indicates that 'impact to some degree will be unavoidable due to the proximity of the Site to the listed buildings and the historic functional connection with the Site'. Section 4.8 indicates that the 'proposed development would cause a moderate level of harm' for Elsenham Place, Barns and Dovecote at Elsenham Place and Gardeners Cottage.

Section 5.3 concludes that 'impacts to the identified listed buildings vary between negligible and a low-moderate level of less than substantial harm'. I disagree; these impacts do not, in my view, outweigh the public benefits of the scheme.

Whilst also being used as grazing/agricultural land, this last patch of green in the centre of Elsenham determines the historic identity of the village. Together with surrounding building sites, it represents the gross over-development of this whole village.

I would urge UDC to reject this application.

Regards,

Paola Bier Holmes (Mrs)

██████████

██████████