

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 4:05 PM
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Representation/objection - S62A/2024/2058 - land adjacent Village hall Ugley

[REDACTED]

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 the Square
Temple Quay,
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Sirs/Madam

20

Ref Land Adj to Village Hall Ugley , East of Cambridge rd – ref
S62A/2024/2058 (UTT/24/1958/PINS)

We wish to make representations and objections/comments regarding this application for the building of 16 new dwellings on the land at Ugley Village Hall.

1. The development will result increased traffic and resultant damage to the environment and locality plus adding to pollution and subsequent environmental impacts – @25 vehicles with subsequent daily movements should not be underestimated.
2. The development will result in such traffic and movements at a busy and dangerous junction onto the main road and adding to dangerous rat runs as the surrounding roads are all country lanes.
3. The Development will affect the parking availability of the local village hall.- and enjoyment of such by others.- in time the loss of the village hall may need to be considered.
4. The Development is immediately adjacent to and therefore impacting Protected Woods, National trust lands and reducing green space and access to such spaces for public and well being of the such users. It having a impact on the enjoyment of open spaces and country life.
5. The development is some 30 minutes' walk to Stanstead Mountfitchet train station (and facilities) and 20 minutes' walk to Elsenham Station (via a twisty back road of pound lane) with very limited if any parking for any commuters.- Elsenham services is some 10/15 minutes' walk further.- making it an unsuitable location for such a development
6. The bus service to services are infrequent to both stations mostly not suitable for commuters due to running during school times/days only.
7. There is no street lighting in the area (which is in keeping with the rural nature of the area and in keeping with reducing light pollution) for increased pedestrian traffic.
8. There are no pavements from the site along pound lane (single unmarked country road) to Elsenham station. (nor lighting)
9. There is limited pavements from the site down to Stanstead Mountfitchet (no lighting)
10. The development is not close to any facilities/school/shops for the use of resident.-

11. The increase in population to the area just from this development @ 50+ resident and the impact on schools, services, health providers needs to be considered due to pushed services in the area already.
12. The area toward Stanstead Mountfitchet has already been subject to extended housing with a second phase due to go ahead- meaning any impact assessment of this development should be taken into account with other such developments due.
13. The development will impact the rural nature of the site /area.
14. The development suggests the local learning facility is adjacent to the site – this is incorrect and gives a false impression of current buildings on /to be on this site!
15. The development will impact the listed buildings of the orford hall estate and barns, not only detracting from them but having immediate impact due to the very close vicinity.
16. It should be considered that any small development such as this, by its nature, and experience, becomes a drip effect to open more widespread planning and building.
17. The planners are asked to be considered that the any push to build houses and pressures from government etc is considered in the whole as in the real need for housing the type and moreover it being built where people wish to live which is not in rural isolated locations.

I do trust you can consider the many problems of this rural site, the effect on the green space (and loss of such) and the impact on the environment, when the location for the enjoyment of the proposed residents given its lack of facilities and their access to amenities, but resulting impact on infrastructures and services far outweighs its merits.

Thank you for your considerations.

Elizabeth Stoodley and Paul Cooper

