

**From:** CAVAN ROBERTS [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 13:05  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Planning application S62a/2022/0012

Re Planning application by Bloor Homes ref. 62a/2022/0012

I am writing to urge the Planning Inspectorate to reject the application by Bloor Homes to build a further 200 houses on the site between Elsenham and Henham on which they are already building 350 houses.

In 2016 and subsequently there were two studies by Government Planning Inspectors of the site in question, and their recommendations that development of the whole area was neither sustainable nor desirable resulted in the Secretary of State averring that there should be no development of the area.

Since then, development of other sites in Elsenham has mushroomed exponentially rendering the S of S's decision even more valid. Elsenham is now about 40% larger than it was in 2016 with further builds already in progress which will take the figure to close to 60%. There has been less development in Henham, but developers are constantly applying to build on land around the village, jumping on the "anything goes" band wagon.

**THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL RURAL AREA AND IT'S BEAUTY IS BEING DESTROYED!**

I urge you to consider the undisputable facts - not what Bloor is offering in its application.

#### 1. Traffic

The situation in this area is becoming beyond unsustainable. The access to Bishops Stortford, the main shopping and amenity place for the people of Henham and Elsenham, is through Stansted Mountfitchet. Unfortunately transit has for years rapidly become almost impossible to negotiate in a reasonable time frame. The daily impasses for vehicles on Grove Hill and Chapel Hill are frequent. This is unacceptable for Henham and Elsenham residents but how appalling must it be for the residents of Stansted? With 550 new Bloor houses either approved or applied for we can expect another 700 or so cars plus service vehicles to appear on this route. The result will be full stop for everybody - old and new residents. If you do not believe this, come and have a look. The Inspectors did and were appalled.

#### 2. Public Transport

Contrary to the submission by Bloor that there are excellent public transport facilities, there are very limited options. There is one train per hour each to Bishops Stortford and Cambridge and an erratic bus service operating 11 times a day if all the roads are open. Residents are forced to use their cars for all purposes and this, as stated, is becoming increasingly more difficult.

#### 3. Infrastructure

Elsenham has one small primary school, already over-subscribed, one small GP surgery, already over-subscribed, and two small amenity shops. Henham has one small primary school, already over-subscribed and a small shop. Where will all the newly incoming children go to school and the people go to shop? Bloor have stated that in the past that they are going to provide a school, a GP surgery and public recreation facilities. This claim is misleading if not blatantly untrue. In conversation with a Bloor site foreman in the Summer I raised this question. He just laughed and

said no such development would be considered for less than 1500 houses and even then it would be the last thing to be built after all the houses were built and sold.

This highlights two things. First that Bloor's ambition stretches beyond the existing 350 and the applied for 200 homes. This is the tip of the iceberg and they are not likely to stop at 550 homes. Secondly, that like their public transport claims, this promise is also likely to be false.

#### 4. Employment

This is an area with very few available jobs and a low level of unemployment. There are no industrial facilities in the area, and the airport is likely to contract rather than grow so people will have to commute out of the area. As stated in items 1 and 2 above this will place an impossible strain on the existing transport structure.

#### 5. Land use

The current Bloor development and the new application are on top grade agricultural land. We are living in a time when we are, as a nation, struggling to feed ourselves, let alone helping others in the world. How can we sanction this building all over the productive land that we still have to satisfy a developer's greed? And this is not about needed housing - we are awash with new houses in this area with few local people to fill them.

Please, we urge you to reject this and any future applications on this and the surrounding land.

Cavan Roberts