

From: Robert Stokely [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 November 2022 21:20
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2022/0012 Land east of Station, Elsenham

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Robert Stokely and I live [REDACTED]

I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for a further 200 houses in addition to the 350 houses already approved.

The developer is looking to take advantage of the fact that Uttlesford District Council have lost their role in hearing planning applications over 10 houses and I am very concerned that this could lead to further inappropriate and over development in this predominately rural area.

An application for 800 units was rejected in 2016 and yet by stealth more than 1,000 units could potentially be built now looking at the accumulated total of this and the other applications that have already been approved.

I write as someone with two daughters, one in her mid-20's and one in her late teens, both of whom are living at home and hoping to buy their first homes in the area. I therefore understand the need for new housing and I support it being built in appropriate areas. I accept that it was probably right that some new houses were built in our area despite the change to the character of our area that this has brought about. However, this proposal is excessive and I am certain would not be allowed by a proper functioning local planning authority.

Our roads are currently congested with the traffic associated with the construction of the existing housing developments in the area. The congestion in Stansted Mountfichet, around Grove Hill and Chapel Hill especially, must be intolerable for the residents of that small town. On completion of these developments, traffic levels will of course be much higher as a result of the new residents moving in who will be some distance from employment, schools, shopping and other amenities. Public transport is lamentable in the area - again I speak as someone with experience of this, my wife chooses not to drive (other than to the station at Elsenham) and my youngest daughter (17) does not have a driving licence. Whilst the train service from Elsenham is better than nothing, two trains an hour at peak times and one train an hour at off peak times is not good by any measure. A further factor is that the station car park at Elsenham is privately owned and faces an uncertain future in it's current ownership. As far as I am aware there is no provision in this proposal to provide public car parking for people using the station which will be necessary if the existing station car park ceases to exist.

I am further concerned about the loss of prime agricultural land and with this the destruction of the unique and valued character of this part of rural north-west Essex. In addition, I understand that the local schools are full. Again, I know this from personal experience as my daughters attended primary and secondary schools in Bishop's Stortford and Saffron Walden.

For decades, in fact more than 40 years, we have been concerned about the growth of Stansted Airport and the impact the expansion of the airport has had on the character of the area. This has been carefully controlled by consecutive national governments and the adjoining local authorities (Uttlesford and East Herts) who have allowed the airport to grow in a controlled and generally sensitive way. However, in the last five years, the sheer number of new houses that have been consented in the area around the airport, especially in Elsenham, have done far more damage to the

character and amenity of area than the airport has in 40 years of controlled expansion because of the complete breakdown of the planning process.

Please do not allow this application to proceed any further. Common sense says that we should allow the already consented schemes to be completed and fully occupied before carrying out a further assessment as to whether the infrastructure can cope with any more housing. My strong contention, based on my experience of living in this area day by day, is that it can't.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Stokely FRICS