

From: Claire & Simon Gomez [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 November 2022 14:27
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2022/0012 Land east of Station, Elsenham

To whom it may concern,

Our reasons to object!

A Secretary of State considered a 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.

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. The roads are grid locked at school run!

Trying to get a doctors appointment now is near impossible! I held for 45 minutes yesterday, to then be told the surgery is now closed and to call tomorrow. I called and after 35 minutes I gave up!

Its completely unacceptable promiscuous development opportunity in a unsuitable location with already severe traffic problems.