

4 Sept 2023
By email to section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Planning Inspectorate
3rd Floor, Temple Quay House
2, The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: UTT/23/1583/PINS – S62A/2023/0019 – 96 dwellings on Bulls Field Takeley, plus access to Parsonage Road, Essex

I object to this application in the strongest terms for the following reasons:

- The A120 motorway was constructed to reduce traffic congestion on the previous B road between Takeley and Braintree. Initially it did that, but since then the green fields along almost the entire length of the B road in Canfield and Takeley have been covered with huge housing estates contributing vast numbers of additional vehicles, with no direct access to the A120. We now have a situation where the A120 is extremely busy with traffic to/from further east (if you build it, they will come) and the B road is building up to its former gridlocked state too. A double whammy of traffic.
- Many houses have been built along the Flitch Way, destroying the few wild areas left, and this new application is adjacent to a wood. Even setting aside the further environmental degradation which would ensue, the location of this development is not sustainable. Ninety six dwellings equate to around 200 additional cars and the expansion of Roseacres School would add a further vehicular burden on local roads (of which there are only 2 – north-south and east-west). Whether the access is onto the east-west B road or onto Parsonage Lane, the result will be the same. Total gridlock. The only changes to the existing roads to cope with the influx of traffic from the developments already built is the construction of a few mini roundabouts. Parsonage Lane has recently been given a large mini roundabout at a huge new development which, astonishingly given its location, was given the go ahead, but the small and winding Parsonage Road leads down to a tiny roundabout at Stansted Airport and cars have to drive through the airport area, which is very busy already, before they eventually come out onto the A120. In the opposite, southerly direction there is a crossroads and the road passes through residential areas, unsuited to such a huge volume of traffic.
- Canfield/Takeley have been ravaged by the Conservative government's housing targets and 5-year land supply. I have read however that Uttlesford has increased its housing stock by 36 per cent, more than twice the national average. With the government no longer insisting on such punishing targets for fear of losing voters in the southeast, now is the time to put a stop to the further destruction of our local area. Stansted Airport was built as an airport within the countryside, but this is deliberately being eroded at such a pace that very soon we will resemble Hounslow. This is a political decision and has nothing to do with the public interest.
- In terms of public transport, there is not nearly enough capacity, and everybody who can will drive, as they do now. Existing bus timetables are stretched to the limit as bus drivers are unable to stick to them due to all the traffic. This makes getting to and from Stansted Airport (our local railway and bus depot) on our way to/from work very difficult at times.
- The location of this application would also subject new residents to noise and pollution from Stansted Airport and the very busy A120 and would further coalesce Takeley and the airport estate, when they are supposed to be separated by a green zone.

I urge you to take the catastrophic impact of yet hundreds more speeding SUVs on our small village roads into account. My village is also suffering from the vast influx of traffic, all driving at great speed. The whole area has become unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists, and of course wildlife, who are mown down in huge numbers. So far, no developer has been obliged to fund speed bumps, which do work. Enough is enough.

Yours faithfully,

Rosalind Sudlow