

Planning rejection for another 200 properties (plus the allotted 350 dwellings already approved).

Inspectorates. Uttlesford District Council I hear, have been over ruled, noted to be anything above 10 dwellings. If this is the case, why do Development Companies actually apply for planning permission if objections are to be over ruled by Planning Inspectorates who support mass over development? Another method to de fund and waste Local Councils of Parish funds, against the billionaire developers, who just done care. Who receives the extra long brown envelopes?? It's peanuts to Developers.

Why are so many (550) houses additionally required in a village savaged by recent and on going over development? This is noted to be a free housing market for London overspill and outside occupiers

To whom this may concern.

I have come to note another large and unsustainable proposition for a further 200 plus dwellings on 'Parish Land' between Elsenham and Henham. To note, the recent application is in acknowledgement of a recent 350 dwelling commencement that has already been approved. Multiple greedy developers are out of control and on a mission to make as much money as possible in conjunction with the Planning moving to the area, not that what was proposed initially as a stealth 'local houses for local people at an affordable price'. It's only affordable to the highest bidder.

So my objections are as follows:

Elsenham has suffered mass housing development building over the past 15 years, when the initial planning matters came to light in 2007. Development hasn't stopped since.

An 800 planned development was rejected in 2016 as not sustainable and with the ever increasing traffic congestion matters however, since then further applications have been made, totalling to more than this rejection. Your sums in the numbers of dwellings don't add up. How can a Planner actually be in this post if previous objections have been rejected? $400 + 400 = 800$. $350 + 200 (+ \text{another } 250) = 800$ dwellings....It's simple to see the stealth approach to over development rejections. If only 'Planners' could note this as well. Has any previous planning objection actually been read, acknowledged and objections heeded? We are forever requested to make objections to these mass building projects, but they go ahead all the same. The congestion on the roads is terrible, we have had three recent accidents, two (2) of which were FATAL with 2 deaths within a 1-2 week period on the main LGV route from the Airport to the Village of Elsenham (Hall Road). Records will be held with Essex Police. Lives have been pointlessly lost, families have to live with these losses and the over development applications continue to be placed and accepted by faceless bureaucrats. The main traffic routes namely Lower Street, Grove Hill in Stansted Mountfichet should any worthy planner take a moment to come and view the congestion and mayhem at priority times, not a Bank Holiday Monday morning between 07.30 - 08.00 for 5 minutes. Priority time is the mayhem of the school and commuter runs on a Thursday morning with bin collections (AM) in Stansted. Add a road closure, Delivery / Removals truck on the main road or a diversion of traffic on the M11 as has been seen recently. Cambridge Road in Stansted was closed both

directions and all vehicles including LGVs were coming through High Lane, Lower Street and Chappel Hill in Stansted Mountfichet. Ask your planners how to about turn a stuck artic unit and trailer on a closed road with a local diversion with nowhere to go. The Low bridge in Newport prevents appropriate diversions. No doubt, these planners will have all the answers. 550 new dwellings mean 1000 extra vehicles for residents, multiple additional development related traffic matters for this over development (LGVs) who use the incorrect routes to and from these developments, causing multiple traffic issues as has been seen over the past 15 years. The roads are in a terrible state and no signs of any appropriate repairs made, however many times an application is submitted. Ask your planners about the routine to get down and up Grove Hill, Stansted Mountfichet with the two way, narrow lane traffic lights which permit only a number of vehicles to go down. Exceed this by 1 vehicle and you have gridlock. Two tippers trying to pass is severe gridlock. However, your planners have all the answers and are nowhere to be seen. I've seen 3 Tippers pass by the weight limit in convoy, you only need another one or a school coach coming the other way and it's grid lock. It's easy to see if your Planners actually take time to observe the routes in and out, and actually accept that this is not suitable. 1000 extra vehicles passing through this traffic light pass is gridlock before you go any further and is NOT SUITABLE. This exact problem was stated to the Planning Department in 2007 and i'm still informing the Planning Department in 2022, with little or any acknowledgement or change, just more traffic. The footpaths are so narrow you can't walk on them without being taken out. The road surface is dangerous on Grove Hill for m/cycles due to the 3" deep gouges approx 1 - 2 foot long (in line) with the direction of traffic flow on this unlit road, another fatal accident waiting to happen on Essex Highways. What have your planners to say with the deaths on the local roads? North Hall Road outside of Henham to Newport has been closed for almost 3 years with no work until the past few months, now at mass expense. All local traffic has had to be diverted along narrow track routes creating severely damaged road surfaces and edges resulting in damaged tyres and congestion with little or no repairs. Ugley Green is a Tipper Truck rat run with 25 - 30 tippers regularly speeding through this quaint little hamlet on a daily basis. Nothing has been done to assist with this matter. Schools are at capacity in both Henham and Elsenham Primaries, There are no local Secondary Schools present so where will these young students attend and how will they get to and from these schools? By road, creating more traffic mayhem on the roads in their hundreds with a free for all, sometimes with abusive drivers parking where they like each day. What will your planners have to support and assist with this problem? Nothing. The Elsenham Surgery is small and the 1000s of extra residents will only create more waiting times and appointments at this lovely surgery. What will your planners have in place for the infrastructure here? Nothing. Policing, what resources will be added to cover the thousands of extra residents and potential new problems? You only need specific issues or persons to create mayhem in a rural location with little or no resources or patrols to cover and with the railway so close, imported issues are another unseen problem to your planners do not acknowledge and chose to ignore like everything else, with a: "It's nothing to do with us" attitude. County Lines Drug dealing is here and rural areas are an easy target for drug supply. It happens regularly in Elsenham, it's only a matter of time before this gets out of hand, like all large developments. What will your planners have in place to support the Essex Police in dealing with matters and low numbers of staff? Nothing. Local residents have had to pay extra, on top of their Council Tax bills, for a single PCSO to cover multiple locations by day. Council Tax was implemented to pay for Policing. How time helps you to forget this. Employment, where is the local employment for these 1000s of new residents? Nil. They

will have to travel to find employment, by Road and Rail. More congestion. Anything in place to provide local employment from your planners? I guess not, but this contributes to excess road congestion which is caused by over development. The site where these 200 dwellings is, has a Protected Badger Sett that has been there for years? Are your planners aware and that that Badgers are protected? Are you aware of the local Deer herd being displaced from their habitat? Probably not, this then causes accidents on the roads with multiple vehicle and deer collisions resulting in dead local wildlife, damaged vehicles, injuries to persons on these roads and hopefully no more deaths on the already dangerous road network. It has to STOP. Your planners probably don't see wildlife as anything but a hindrance, kill them, pay a small fine if it even comes to that, but that's another million in the bank for the developers who state they are creating a sustainable green development with lush green areas and amenities. In reality, you create excess parking issues, traffic congestion, excess pressure on the little on no resources and local services available. Developers have little or no responsibility and are not bothered with or for the aftermath of their developments or the local infrastructure, where you promise to create certain local amenities but in actual fact, this doesn't always happen or if it does, it's after a long struggle. When will this over development actually ever come to an end and stop? Who is actually monitoring the local area and the pressures, the over development? Government? Planning inspectors / Inspectorate? Who are these planners? Have they made themselves available to the community to justify their actions and agreements with these mass developments? Have any Planners actually made site visits apart from earmarking the next mass development?

Kind regards.

N Platt.