

From: Victoria Farrall [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 November 2022 03:44
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: reference number S62A/2022/0012

Dear central planning inspectorate,

I am writing today to object to the planning reference stated in the subject of this email for the following location: Land East of Station Road, Elsenham. I object to it in its current state.

I am a local resident of Elsenham for the past 5 years and Ugley 2 years prior to this. I am also a local small business owner.

This is an application for 200 houses, as a bolt on to the 350 houses already approved on the Bloor site abutting Elsenham on Henham Parish Land.

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.

Additionally to this there is already a dangerous situation around school pick up and drop off times at Elsenham primary school on the Elsenham high street. The increase in traffic past the school for the already approved 350 homes will only worsen this situation so an additional 200 on top of this will not improve it.

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. Residents of Elsenham and Henham tend to travel to Bishop Stortford and Saffron Walden to shop.

The Developer states that Elsenham has excellent public transport facilities. The buses are limited and residents need to use a car for most activities. We have a train station with a manned crossing, not a free-flowing situation. Already at certain points in the day traffic is backed up and causes chaos unsafely past my house on station road. As a main route out of the village to ugley green, ugley, Newport and saffron Walden and an alternative route to Stansted, this pressure will only grow when new people move into the approved 350 homes and worsen further if the 200 get approved. The infrastructure of this manned rail crossed cannot cope. Lack of integrated approach between planning inspectorate and local infrastructure providers is disgraceful and not serving the public. Central planning simply ignoring all these road infrastructure problems is shameful. And shows real lack of experience and due diligence to the public service role.

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 approved 350 houses on the site has provision for a new nursery and primary school yet no commitment has been made by Essex county council for this to be built and staffed and funded. This shocking lack of connection between central government and county is disgraceful and not serving the public. Traffic will only increase further with school runs having to be made through the village to schools outside the village for the new residents of the 350 approved let alone the 200 if approved in the applications current state.

Additionally there is no provisions on the approved 350 dwellings on the adjoining site or this 200 dwelling site for local businesses retail or other commercial space. This lack of local community thought because of a central planning process is very frustrating for the local commercial community. Firstly the local residential community would be positive to more well considered facilities and secondly local businesses who live in these communities would like to have the opportunity to buy or rent commercial properties in the village. The village community is excellent at supporting local enterprise. The lack of proper planning thought to look at what a growing community would need to make it community and not a mega estate with no soul and no proper varied facilities is disgraceful and again shows lack of robust intelligent planning thought. Safe Parking to serve businesses and their customers must be considered also in this application around any commercial infrastructure/facilities. We are a Rural community after all, public transport is not connected or reliable as is with a big town or city.

Can the civil service please show us their best in reviewing this application and not simply approve the application in its current state because it meets the governments building quota agenda as is painfully obvious is what has occurred over the past 7 years. The application desperately needs more thought and consideration for it's impact on the whole village, which honestly now cannot be called a village as it's got so big. No faculties we're built on other large estates we've had built in the past 7 years. Please therefore look at the needs of the whole village as any proper robust planning process should. Get a map out and look at how it's grown and compare with facilities / infrastructure built.

Yours sincerely

Victoria farrall

