

From: Linda Peake [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 November 2022 17:54
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Ref: S62A/2022/0012 Land east of Station Elsenham

Dear sirs,

We are saddened to learn of yet another application for housing in an area where in 2016 the Secretary of State refused planning permission for 800 houses saying that it was not sustainable. This request for 200 houses is in addition to existing developments the most recent of which was for 300 houses. It seems to us that the developers are seeking to build their original development of 800 houses by stealth by this piecemeal process of applying for permission.

If the area cannot sustain 800 houses then 500 plus the 3 large estates already given permission in Elsenham makes it very much over the 800 houses in the original refusal. The village has already been doubled in size in the last few years with no increase in facilities (roads, surgery, shops, hospitals, secondary schools etc).

The roads around Elsenham are already unable to cope with the increased traffic and people from the surrounding villages find it frustrating trying to get through Grove Hill, Lower Street and Chapel Hill in Stansted which is the main way to travel to Bishops Stortford the next large town. The other road towards Saffron Walden had been closed for 2 years for essential maintenance but even that road is very narrow and passes under a single track rightangle bridge under the railway and is damaged by the heavy traffic.

Elsenham has limited facilities to service the high number of families already living there and apart from the train station there is very poor public transport meaning that most journeys have to be by car. The primary school is already full in spite of having doubled in size a few years ago.

We are surrounded by good agricultural land and it seems very wrong to build on it when we are all becoming more aware of the need to have a secure food supply.

Please do not allow this development and please do visit the area to see the problems we have with transport links which are unable to sustain any more development.

Mr & Mrs Richard Peake

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