

From: David Marsh <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2024 12:14 PM
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: S62A/2024/0058

Dear Leanne,

With reference to the above application and your email of the 29th October concerning the additional information submitted please find below my comments.

(1) The developer makes strong claims about the sustainability of the proposed development site. This is very questionable? There is a strong lack of amenities and transport

(a) the nearest shops are 1.5 miles away (30 minutes walk)

(b) the nearest schools, doctors and train stations are 2 miles away (40 minutes walk) with no public transport directly to these amenities

(2) Local transport. The developer makes strong comments about existing and potential new bus routes.

(a) There is currently one bus route along the B1383 supposedly every hour but often it is cancelled largely due to a lack of demand. Even at "busy morning and evening times" there are no more than a handful of passengers.

(b) For over 10 years there has been weak discussion about a new bus route along Pound Lane. In all this time nothing has come to fruition due to a total lack of demand for a new route.

(c) In the last 12 months Essec CC have imposed tighter access restrictions on Pound Lane due to its rural, narrow route with numerous dangerous 90 degree bends along its entire route.

(d) Due to the potentially dangerous character of Pound Lane and the 50 mph speed signs on the B1383 the opportunity for cycling is greatly reduced as evidenced by the lack of cyclists currently using these two routes.

(e) Cars are therefore likely to remain the predominant form of transport for the residents of the development, with all the inherent challenges this causes.

(3) Brownfield site. The developer emphasises strongly the brownfield character of the site.

(a) A gravel pit was located here and although the records are not precise as to when it ceased to be used it is very likely it was nearly a century ago that it was last used.

(b) Since its closure it appears the site has been left to nature which has become a safe haven for numerous forms of wildlife, insects, birds and vegetation.

(c) It therefore stretches credibility to call it a brownfield site.

(4) Following a meeting with many local residents in February the developer appears to have ignored all the comments, questions and suggestions that were made to them and none appear in their proposal. A total lack of listening to the local residents. eg

(a) We were informed that all houses would be placed on a main sewerage system; they are now proposed on waste digester systems with the inherent issues they cause.

(b) We requested that the main entrance to the site be moved from Pound Lane with its inherent problems directly to the B1383 which would be safer and reduce the increase of traffic using Pound Lane.

I'm sure the Inspector on his impending site visit will see this point.

(5) Heritage and listed properties.

(a)The properties directly adjacent to the north of the development contain a number of grade 2 properties eg. the Old Post Office, and directly to the south two grade 2 properties, a listed Dovecote and a Grade 2* property are situated.

Conclusion.

Overall the benefits to the site are greatly outweighed by the above points along with the loss of the openness of the countryside and loss of rural character to the village of Ugley, with a population of under 500 people, the loss of wildlife and possible protected species. No new developments have taken place in Ugley due to its rural and open countryside character, while opportunities for large sustainable developments have been made available and no doubt will continue to be made available in nearby Stansted Mountfitchet and Elsenham with their proximity to schools, shops, doctors and transport facilities.

Kind regards

David Marsh