

From: Jane Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 September 2023 23:46
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Bull Field Smith Green Takeley

Dear Sirs

I am emailing to voice my objection to this development once again.

My previous correspondence highlighted concerns such as : loss of habitat, congestion adding to the already heavily congested crossroads. I would also like to add that the single track road this is proposed on, is NOT suitable for an army of heavy goods vehicles or an abundance of everyday vehicles and as such currently struggle when they need to be used for circumstances that include but not limited to : farm machinery to attend the fields, when there has been an accident on the A120 OR B1256 this road becomes a rat run. Adding to an over populated crowded area will ensure the roads cease to withstand the extra pressure placed upon it.

I have very grave concerns that as a community we are suffering the continued blight of airport parking, littering and not just by crisp packet waste, yes human waste is a regular occurrence and adding more unsustainable housing whichever amount you look at it is going to add to this. Please speak to Uttlesford and local councillors regarding this matter for validation.

There is also the concerning issue over drainage as after a moderate downpour, the drains around the area are incapable of taking the flow of water to where it needs to go due to the fact the fields have drainage and too much development leads to issues (Stortford Fields is a prime example of inadequate drainage therefore regular flooding).

There is simply not the need nor sufficient utilities ranging from: living space, inside the CPZ (why do we even have this if it just to be ignored??) Dr's, shops, schooling or road space to cope with all the extra traffic this would generate.

I also wonder how with the destruction of arable fields such as this, will food prices stay sane?

I urge you to carefully consider the reasons outlined from the residents for any number of dwellings proposed and why this should not go ahead. It has been refused on more than one occasion now, so why should this change the outcome?

Kind regards

Jane