From: Steve Mather Sent: 27 May 2023 21:13 To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk> Subject: UTT/23/0966/PINS

Comments regarding UTT/23/0966/PINS PINS reference: S62A/2023/0018

Land East of Pines Hill Stansted.

My first and foremost objection against the proposal as described is still that it is on green belt. This is meant to preserve land as it is between Stansted Mountfitchet and Bishops Stortford. The adjusted plan still constitutes removal of this protection and goes against the original policy of what green belt set out to do with significant loss of trees, plants and wildlife from the area that will never return.

The density and number of dwellings in this proposal is still too much for such a small area, where only a few houses exist currently. It will have a huge impact on the character of this area, adding possible noise and disturbance with the increased traffic.

No specific extra facilities for local people are planned as part of the development. Stansted Mountfitchet has already been subject to an influx of new homes at multiple sites. Pressure on local services has increased as a result and are struggling to provide them reliably. The GP practice in particular is struggling, having already taken on a large number of new patients. They are trying their best to accommodate the needs of the already increased local population. But by their own admission are finding that difficult as it is. The arrival of new residents, who will invariably use the local services will push them into further decline for the existing residents.

Traffic will still increase on Pines Hill which is already extremely busy and the site of many accidents. Noise and air pollution levels would go up with extra vehicles. The surrounding roads will invariably receive higher numbers of parked cars where there are already problems with lack of parking spaces and airport parking.

There will also be increased pressure on public transport such as the local train and bus services in Stansted. There is no plans to improve either as far as I can tell.

There really must be a commitment to substantially improving services for existing locals in return for allowing such developments, especially where sacrifice of green belt is involved. This plan still offers nothing of the sort.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Mather

