

From: Jacqui Irvine-Fynn [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 November 2023 13:17
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: UTT/23/2193/PINS S62A/2023/0023

UTT/23/2193/PINS S62A/2023/0023

Eastfield Stables, May Walk, Elsenham Road, Stansted
5 residential dwellings

Applications for this site have used several property names, Eastfield - Eastfield Stables - The Stables, this is one site.

This site has never been included in any form of Local Plan being on the very outskirts of the village, in a rural setting/area. This is a green field site outside the Stansted village envelope and development area. It is close to Alsa Wood, an ancient woodland, Aubrey Buxton Nature Reserve and open farm land.

The photo from 1988 is misleading because of the angle. (Design and Access Statement page 14) The northern side of the B1051 was and still is, farmed fields, with the recent conversions at Eastfield / The Stables. To the south of the B1051, is a farmed field and two houses, Down Farm and Park House. This will be seen on Google maps and/or a site visit. This makes the site somewhat isolated and would be car dependent. It is not on the edge of a housing area.

The traffic survey does not take into account of about 1000 houses in Elsenham, with planning permission yet to be built. The main exit from the Elsenham is by car via the B1051 through Stansted. The survey appears to have been done close to the 30mph zone.

The bus service Route 7/7a is at risk, it is under review. I question how many residents of Eastfield would use this, making these properties totally car dependent.

Much is made of the Maywalk. This is in fact a PROW, Bridleway 25 Stansted. A very well used and important leisure area for both Elsenham and Stansted residents for walking, running, riding etc. It is already overused by vehicles particularly those visiting Eastfield/The Stables. This is becoming dangerous for leisure users, vehicles from Eastfield should not be allowed to use it. There is potential for a circular route through this site being used/created. All vehicular accesses onto the Bridleway should be permanently closed for safety reasons of leisure users.

The application states there are 3 accesses off Bridleway 25 (Maywalk). The northerly one is used for access to the dwellings already built. The middle one is just a small 'gap' in the bunds, has never been used and is now blocked by shrubs and trees. The southerly one nearest the B1051 was constructed without permission when the present owner was running an illegal Car Boot Sale on the site, this is very close to the road and should be permanently closed for safety reasons. Only the northerly access has been shown on previous applications. The bridleway is single track and has very poor visibility with the junction onto the B1051. This is a fast stretch of derestricted road between the villages. The new access directly off the B1051 has yet to be completed in accordance with Essex Highways, and a condition for the Wellness hub UTT/21/2687/FUL.

The tree bank along the southern/road edge is being eroded as some trees have been removed and others are suffering with earth spoil being built up around them without permission. According to the original planning permission UTT/1105/90, this was for bunds on only 3 sides of the site and not on the south/road side or within 30m of the southern boundary. Even more trees will probably have to be removed to improve the direct vehicle access from the B1051 which was/is a field gate entrance.

The land to the east of this site (New Farm) is still agricultural with a contamination order on it I believe. The agricultural barn was built in the 1990's to service a mink farm, it was never completed or used. Land to the west is farmed fields.

In 2016 according to the planning application for this site UTT/16/1278/FUL there was a stable, a barn, a field shelter (4 poles and a roof). There are now 8 'conversions' into dwellings together with a workshop/store built like a house and the Wellness Hub which appears to be a 2 story house looking at the plans attached to UTT/23/2215/FUL several of the other buildings on this site appear to be two story. What is the guarantee these will be single story.

There have been at least 48 applications by the developer since the land was purchased as a Commercial Livery in December 2016. Buildings and houses have been refused by Uttlesford and at appeal as being an unsuitable site and a detriment to open countryside. Stansted and Elsenham Parish Councils have objected to the development of this site. This application should be refused.

This is yet another 'drip fed' application possibly avoiding some regulations for larger developments. Eastfield/The Stables should be viewed as one greenfield site.

UTT/20/1643/FUL - C1570/W/21/3271985 for 11 houses was dismissed at appeal, this should also be dismissed for similar reasons. UTT/23/0178/FUL was refused and is under Appeal for stables and grazing using the land now in this application, UTT/23/1105/FUL for the relocation of an agricultural rabbit breeding building was refused and now under appeal, there appears to be no agricultural need. The applicant seems to view this site as domestic dwelling, agricultural, equestrian/grazing and commercial, what does the applicant actually want, it is very unclear?

There is no mains sewers for the existing 8 dwellings, the 3 'Wellness Hub' units let alone these 5 dwellings, together with all the other applications and appeals currently on this site. There is a potential for environmental issues and flooding of the B1051 as the land slopes towards the road.

This development would cause urbanisation and harm to an area of open countryside in a rural location and a separation between the villages. This will result in a development out of character with the site and surrounding area and contrary to ULP Policies S7, GEN1 GEN2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

This development should be refused.

Mrs J Irvine-Fynn

████████████████████
████████████████
██████████
████████████████████