

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 16 November 2023 11:27

To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Ref: S62A/2023/0023 - Land at Eastfield Stables, May Walk, Elsenham Road, Stansted CM24 8SS

I live on the Elsenham Road and am a neighbour of this site. I strongly object to this application for the following reasons:

1. This land should not be granted a change of use from agricultural to residential as this is not residential land. The land should remain as such and enhance the countryside. It is not a brown field site. This land was used for a livery stable and prior to that it was farmed land.
2. The land is within the area considered necessary to be a delineation between Stansted and Elsenham village.
3. The development would open up the area to development and lead to the coalescence of Stansted and Elsenham, putting further pressure on the Aubrey Buxton Reserve and Alsa Wood.
4. The land is in the Countryside Protection Zone and is outside the Stansted village development area.
5. The area is void of services and facilities and sustainable transport options within easy reach, raising sustainability concerns and the proposal would fail to comply with policies S7, GEN1(e) and GEN2 of the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan (2005).
6. The application contravenes NPPF 15 (2023) conserving and enhancing the natural environment
7. The area is bordered by May Walk, which is a regularly used bridleway and a well used route for local exercise and appreciation of nature. The development will cause extra danger for walkers, people in wheelchairs, runners, horses and riders.
8. The area is very important for wildlife and local buzzards, red kites, sparrow hawks and kestrels hunt on this land.
9. Stansted has a low level of open space for its population and it is important that that this area is maintained as open land for the physical enjoyment of its residents and local wildlife.

There are already 7+ dwellings on this site which is more than the permitted number for redundant agricultural buildings. This site is not suitable for development - it is rural grazing / agriculture land not a brown field site.

This application should be refused on the same grounds as UTT/20/1643/FUL – ‘an inappropriate form of development within the countryside, having an urbanising effect that would be out of context with the existing pattern of development harmful to the setting and character of the rural location. This will result in a development out of character with the site and surrounding area in conflict with ULP Policies S7, GEN2 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.’

Highway Dangers

1. Given the speed limit on the B1051 Elsenham Road is 60mph and traffic often moves at a high speed along this road, any vehicle entering and leaving the proposed development would be at risk, particularly as the road is not that wide, there is a bend in the vicinity of the bridge over the M11 and there is no street lighting.
2. Vehicles passing along the B1051 Elsenham Road would also be at risk from interference from vehicles entering and leaving the proposed development.
3. The footpath on the B1051 Elsenham Road is very narrow and is not a safe walking route for new residents. It is a dangerous footpath for people with children, push chairs and dogs on leads and

children should not use it due to the dangers from the speed of passing vehicles, air turbulence created by large vehicles and lack of street lighting.

Access to Services

1. Grove Hill does not have the capacity to accommodate more vehicles from more houses. Grove Hill is already a major bottleneck and well over capacity and consequently has very high air pollution. Queues regularly form on Grove Hill at the traffic lights and it can often take 15 minutes to go up or down Grove Hill in rush hour.
2. Given the bus service is minimal and is not available during the evening or on Sundays, residents are likely to travel by car to Stansted via Grove Hill to access the services and train station in Stansted, which has better services, faster trains and more parking than Elsenham.

Past Appeal Decisions

Two appeal decisions that relate to the site are key issues for this proposal.

The first appeal (APP/C1570/W/21/3271985 (UTT/20/1643/FUL) for improvements to existing site access, formation of new internal road, tree planting and landscaping, construction of 11 dwellings and associated infrastructure – Appeal dismissed 30 October 2021) site overlaps with the current application site and extends further to the north and south. The Inspector found the location inappropriate as the appeal site's distance and separation from Stansted and Elsenham would not promote sustainable housing development in rural areas where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and particularly where it would support local services in a village or a group of settlements, contrary to paragraph 79 of the NPPF14. In addition, "the M11 acts as a physical and visual boundary separating the main built-up area of Elsenham from the appeal site and with intervening countryside between the motorway and the site it does not relate well to the built form of the settlement, its character and function."

For the issue of character and appearance, the same Inspector confirmed that "The impact of development on the rural character of an area is not simply restricted to whether it can be seen or not or its detailed design but about how that use would impact on the rural setting", and as such, the appeal site plays a part in the flow of open countryside separating Elsenham from Stansted and preventing their coalescence. The issue of visibility from the public realm was also confirmed in other appeal decisions in the wider site and a very recent appeal within the current application site, where the Inspector confirmed that "just because the site is screened does not mean that it makes no contribution to the character of the surrounding countryside or would be suitable for new development."

The second appeal (APP/C1570/W/19/3228484 (UTT/18/2351/OP) for residential development within a section of brownfield land (outline application for 5 no. dwellings) – Appeal dismissed 05 September 2019) site was north of the current application site (slightly overlapping its upper part, see image) and contained a menage and grassed areas. Discussing the character and appearance issue, the Inspector reaffirmed the role of the M11 as a physical and visual boundary, separating the appeal site from Elsenham and concluded that the appeal scheme "would erode the openness and harmfully alter the intrinsic character of this part of the countryside."

Regards

Patrick Hearne

██████████
██████████
██████████

