

Elsenham Parish Council

Planning Committee Meeting

held on 21 October 2019 at 12.30pm

The Memorial Hall, Elsenham.

Minutes

Representatives from Phillips Planning Services, planning application for 40 homes off Rush Lane.

Mr. Nick Carr (Rosconn, NC), Mr. Frazer Hickling (director of Phillips Planning, FH) and Orla (Phillips Planning).

(All meetings are open to the public and press)

Present:

Dr. G Mott (Chairman GM), Mr. P Johnson (PJ), Mrs. M Jackson (MJ),
Mrs. A Warwick (AW) and Mrs. L Johnson (Parish Clerk LJ).
Members of the public 17.

1. Apologies for absence – Ms. J Rayment (JR) and Mr. P Snow (PS).

2. Declarations of interest – none.

3. Approval of the minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2019 were signed by the Chairman as a true record.

4. Presentation by Phillips Planning Services, 40 homes off Rush Lane

FH explained that their planning application formed part of UDC's draft Local Plan, it was therefore considered by UDC to be on sustainable land, and at present UDC do not have a 5-year land supply.

This is an outline application for up to 40 dwellings, with all matters reserved except for access. It shows the open spaces, drainage system and rights of way, but gives no indication as to how the 40 dwellings would be distributed on the site, there is also no housing mix.

The first application that had been submitted had included layout, but had been withdrawn on the request of UDC.

PJ asked, if the outline application was approved would Rosconn develop the site or sell it on? This was common practice for a developer, like Rosconn, to submit a planning application and agree a S106 agreement with UDC and then sell the land, with planning permission, to a house builder, who would inherit the agreed S106 agreements and would often find them unworkable: which was not very satisfactory for the Parish Council.

NC said that if the outline planning application was approved, Rosconn would be selling the land.

GM asked about the lack of housing details. FH explained that all the new dwellings would be built within the area of land on the map which was in yellow. 40 houses were compliant with UDC's policies, which was 28 dwellings per hectare. It was also at UDC's request that the detailed application showing the detailed layout had been withdrawn.

GM said all the documents were out of date, with different numbers of dwellings ranging from 40 – 45.

NC agreed, it was not perfect, but it was not a legal requirement to change the documents.

MJ asked if the developers had been to the site and looked at the problems that large construction lorries would cause to Robin Hood Road and the difficulties accessing the proposed site. NC said that he had been several times to the site, and the access had now been increased from 4.8 metres to 5.5 metres, which would allow the refuse lorries to access the site. The path would remain. Essex Highways and County Council were both satisfied with the new layout. This was disputed by members of the public as refuse lorries have to mount the pavement in Robin Hood Road, and commercial vehicles are even wider. NC repeated that Essex Highways had no objections and the Transport Statement was in the public domain.

A member of the public asked about the listed buildings in Robin Hood Road. These buildings had very little foundations and the vibrations from construction vehicles could cause considerable damage.

NF said if houses were damaged this would be between the homeowner and Highways.

GM said that the Transport Statement was the worst he had ever read. It was evident that the writer had no perception of Elsenham and the infrastructure of access to the village; it looked like a tick box exercise only.

GM asked what advantages the development would bring to the village. NC said the development would contribute to the roads, schools and NHS. It was pointed out that with all the developments in the village payments of over £144,000 had been given to NHS, unfortunately, none had gone directly to the village surgery, which was beyond its capacity.

GM said that Elsenham had more than their share of new housing, in 2011 Elsenham had 980 houses, if you add the houses built since then, plus the ones in the pipeline, Elsenham could have 2,300 houses, an increase of 130%.

GM pointed out that in the Phillips Planning application it stated; *"New homes which will contribute to addressing local demand"*.

NC said this statement was aimed at UDC, not Elsenham.

GM said in Elsenham there was a need for bungalows.

NC said that the Housing Officer at UDC had not relayed this to them and said the EPC should conduct a local survey.

PJ said that EPC had tried to educate UDC on Elsenham's needs in their responses to previous planning applications.

GM pointed out that Elsenham needed a new cemetery, shops, larger premises for the doctor's surgery and sports facilities, but Elsenham did not want, or need, any further housing.

Part of the hedge in Rush Lane is to be removed to make access for the site, which is opposite number 14 Rush Lane. A resident stated that it was shameful that part of a well-established hedge was going to be removed; this was home to various wildlife.

A show of hands was taken;
Those in favour of the new development 0.

Those against the new development 21.

GM said that UDC welcomed members of the public to speak at their Planning Committee meetings. A Councillor from a Town/Parish Council would be allowed 5 minutes to speak and up to 5 members of the public 4 minutes each, the developer would then be given a fixed time to respond, regardless of the number of objections. If any resident would like to speak at UDC Planning meeting when this application is heard, would they please contact the Parish Clerk.

Although the official time for responses had now past, UDC would sometimes accept comments/objections up to the time the Planning Officer considered the application. If any resident wanted to submit further comments regarding this application, they should send an email to UDC Planning, with reference UTT/19/0437/OP.

A resident asked if the Parish Council could commission an independent highways survey, to discredit the transport survey carried out on behalf of Phillips Planning.

GM said that he had argued against the development at four UDC meetings when the Local Plan was being developed. EPC had commissioned a report from Geoff Gardner as the first of four representations at different stages of the Local Plan process. EPC had commissioned a further report from Geoff Gardner when the application was submitted and also made supplementary objections and further comments when the application was revised.

5. UDC Planning Committee meetings

The next Planning Committee meeting is to be held on Wednesday 30 October 2019, at 1.30pm. This meeting will be attended by Wallace Land Investments, who have submitted a planning application for 61 homes off Isabel Drive and 38 homes off Stansted Road.

UTT/19/0462/FUL Full application for 130 dwellings, Bovis Homes, Hall Road. It was agreed that representation by EPC on this application should take the approach that, despite Bovis having met with EPC four times and had taken on board the comments and objections raised by EPC in response to their previous

planning application, plus the significant advantages of one third towards the cost of a new Community Hall, and land for educational purpose, EPC still had reservations.

Grove Hill was still causing major problems, and further developments would only add to the poor air quality. The majority of residents in Elsenham were against any further new developments in the village.

GM asked NC and FH if their planning application and Bovis Homes application, were both approved, would they join Elsenham to object to any further developments in the village?

6. **UTT/19/2266** - Gladman, up to 220 dwellings, North of Bedwell Road. Henham Parish Council have commissioned Geoff Gardner to compose a report objecting to this planning application. It was agreed that if Ugley Parish Council contribute a third of Geoff Gardner's fee, EPC would also contribute a third. LJ to ask Nick Baker (Chairman of Henham Parish Council) the amount of the invoice and to put this decision to Ugley Parish Council.

Due to time restraints it was agreed to move to item 10 on the agenda.

7. To discuss and agree responses to the following planning applications

- a) **UTT/19/2427/HHF** Single storey side extension, 3 De Mandeville Road. **No Comment.**
- b) **UTT/19/2271/FUL** Section 73A Retrospective application for change of use of land for the keeping of horses and proposed erection of stables. Brook House, Fullers End. **No Comment.**
- c) **UTT/19/2545/FUL** Proposed demolition of existing house and erection of 3 x 4-bedroom dwellings. Crossways, Station Road, Elsenham. It was agreed that **GM would edit the response to the previous application, the objections would include that Crossways is in a well-established, central part of Elsenham Village, which contributes to the street scene of Station Road; there is also an issue with visitor parking,**
- d) **UTT/19/2470/OP** Outline application with all matters reserved except access for residential development of up to 99 dwellings, including affordable homes, with areas of landscaping and public open spaces, including points of access of Stansted Road and Isabel Drive and associated infrastructure works. Land to the West of Isabel Drive and land off Stansted Road. **LJ to contact Geoff Gardner for a quote on responding to the application.**

The meeting closed at 3.00pm.