

From: Andrew Chattaway [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 March 2023 07:14
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2022/0014

Good Evening,

Thank you for the update regarding this approach.

I would like to raise the following points:

1 - The argument on the 5 year HLS is deeply flawed. Whilst it represents an excellent example of bluff ab bluster, it comes to the simple point that the local council have determined their shortfall, and the applicant disagrees as it doesn't suit them. Unfortunately, we must trust the local council to do their job and be confident in their findings. The applicants dispute is therefore invalid.

2 - there is a 5 year housing supply, the applicant merely disputes this.

3 - The argument that the land has no other value is subjective and incorrect.

4 - The applicant believes that development provides heritage enhancement and biodiversity benefits, again subjective without evidential support.

5 - The applicant claims there are no adverse impacts, failing to address the issues if increased traffic on thaxted road, associated increase air pollution, oversubscribed health and school facilities.

6 - The applicant placed great emphasis on the development of a 'Southern Link Road' as the solution to additional traffic, this was contested as frankly unrealistic and without evidence as being able to reduce traffic burden.

Kind Regards

Andrew Chattaway