

Having read the suite of evidence attempting to justify the blueprint I can't understand how in its present form this supports the site selection. This is clearly driven by commercial avarice without consideration of residents, Hatfield Forest SSSI, archaeological assessments or environmental concerns, not least the impact of nitrous oxide pollutants and noise from the A120 on kids attending the proposed school.

All of the transport assessments highlight how stressed the A120, B1256 corridor is. Yet there are NO infrastructure improvements proposed.

Since 2021 Mark Norman of National Highways has repeatedly expressed concerns that the road infrastructure can not cope, junction 8 of the m11 will require significant upgrade. UDCs own objections for the 1200 homes at Little Easton centred around traffic levels. NPPF 73 and 105 prescribe genuine choice of travel modes. This plan places transport exclusively on roads.

Transport is targeted to Stansted AirPort, yet there is no agreement with MAG. Proposed cycle ways don't comply with DfT's Gear Change specifications. Train fares from Stansted carry a significant premium.

The mitigation for all the additional traffic is unrealistic and can only increase traffic levels through Takeley village, welcome to Takeley lorry and car park

In their Preliminary Outline Strategy Report, September 2021, item CAB39 UDC cabinet endorsed the following statement "Development should avoid altering the Countryside Protection Zone (CPZ) boundaries, particularly where this would harm the purposes of the CPZ." Unelected officials choose to ignore this policy. The CPZ is not defined by a road. For nearly 40 years the CPZ is the countryside forming a barrier between the airport and local villages. Realigning the southern border removes that barrier. Promoting coalescence.

The opportunity to support the government's initiative to create a science hub around South Cambridge with high quality high paid jobs is rejected as being to challenging.

The consultation process includes all interested parties. Those same developers and landowners who benefit financially from this plan, will employ a team of experts to write their own justifications. Against which residents views will be drowned out.

R4U election manifesto pledges, included the following At any council there are many priorities, competing view points, and difficult decisions to be

made, but we will always seek to put residents first. We will work to a deliver a new local plan to protect our communities from predatory development. In all conscientious can you support this seriously flawed plan.