

Elsenham Parish Council
Planning Committee Meeting
held on 30 October 2019 at 1.30pm
in the Memorial Hall, Elsenham.

Minutes

Representatives from Wallace Land Investments

Lewis Brown (Wallace Land Investments), Ian Bryant (TPA, Planning and Environment), Andy Pankhurst (SES Ecology) and Nichola Traverse-Healy (Turley, Associate Director).

(All meetings are open to the public and press)

Present: Elsenham Parish Council Planning Committee

Dr. G Mott (Chairman GM), Mrs. M Jackson (MJ), Mr. P Snow (PS)
and Mrs. L Johnson (Parish Clerk LJ).

Members of the public 33.

1. Apologies for absence – Ms. J Rayment (JR), Mr. P Johnson (PJ) and Mrs. A Warwick (AW).

2. Declarations of interest – none.

3. Approval of the minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2019 were signed by the Chairman as a true record.

4. Presentation by Wallace Land Investments (WLI), 61 homes off Isabel Drive and 38 homes adjacent to the M11.

The planning application which was submitted to UDC at the end of September 2019, is for all matters reserved apart from access. The application is for two parcels of land which are referred to as A and B. A is for 61 new houses off Isabel Drive, and B is for 38 new houses off Stansted Road. WLI have also submitted an Environmental Statement, and an Ecological Statement, covering noise pollution, air quality, health and education. 40% of the houses will be affordable homes. There would be a contribution to education and health care within the section 106 agreement.

MJ asked about the Highways Report.

WLI said that a development of 99 new houses would not have a big impact on the traffic flow in and around the village. They had calculated that 99 houses would result in 6 vehicles leaving and entering the site per hour.

WLI had carried out two traffic surveys, one during September 2018, the other during December 2018. This assessment was carried out at 2 levels, one with the number of houses in the village at the present time, the other, including the

planning applications that had planning approval. A model was constructed showing the flow of traffic from Elsenham into Stansted. The model showed that a better control system was needed to help stop the queues on Grove Hill. WLI would be willing to pay some monies towards the cost of a better control system, if other developers contributed.

WLI said the model had shown the queues of sometimes up to 30 vehicles waiting at the lights, but if the lights were working at their optimum this would help reduce the waiting time.

PS said it was not only Grove Hill that had traffic problems. The High Street during drop off and pick up times for the school, was always chaotic.

GM asked, if the application was successful, would WLI develop the land or would they sell it on?

WLI said it would be sold to a building developer.

GM said it was suspicious that the application was for one site when it was clearly two different sites, did WLI have designs on Alsa Wood? The distance between the two sites is about 650 metres, going through the woods reduces the distance by about half, would the construction workers use this shorter route to go from site A to site B?

WLI said they had no designs on Alsa Wood, and the workers would not use the short-cut through the wood.

Members of the public asked the following questions:

Why this site?

WLI said it was considered by UDC to be on sustainable land, and at present UDC do not have a 5-year land supply. There was also a shop, school, doctor surgery and railway station.

It would be a good idea to have a slip road onto the M11 which would reduce the traffic in the surrounding villages.

WLI said this was beyond the remit of an application of this size.

The boundary fence and the ditch on parcel A, is maintained by the David Wilson Homes estate's management company, the plans show no room for the management company to gain access to this area.

WLI said this was only an outline plan and therefore was unable to answer that question at this time.

Alsa Wood already has a ten-year management plan in place which commenced two years ago. The Crown Estate set up the management plan and it formed part of the section 106 agreement. When the Crown Estate sold the development onto Barret/David Wilson Homes, Barret/David Wilson Homes inherited the section 106 agreements which included the responsibility of Alsa Wood, they do not however, own Alsa Wood. How can two management plans work simultaneously?

WLI said the management plan that was currently in use was not very precise, 'one size fits all'. WLI management plan would last for 20 years and would complement the existing plan.

When the current Alsa Wood management plan was drawn up, despite asking UDC if Elsenham Right of Way and Open Spaces Committee could give some input, they were not consulted, would WLI talk to the committee before drawing up their plan?

WLI said yes, they would, local people would have more background and knowledge regarding Alsa Wood.

There are already 175 houses on the Kingswood Place, if permission was granted for a further 61 houses, it would take the total to 236. Any development with more than 200 houses on, must have two roads leading to the main road, in this case Stansted Road. Kingswood Place only has the one entrance/exit, Isabel Drive, this is illegal.

WLI did not comment.

If the development was approved, it would require all the heavy construction vehicles using Isabel Drive. This road was not made to take such vehicles, the road was not completed until all the construction vehicles had left the site for that very reason. There is also a children's play area just opposite the entrance to the purposed development, this puts children in danger.

WLI replied that a traffic warden may be required to keep the children safe, when construction vehicles were on the move; this would all form part of the Construction Management Plan.

The current plan only shows white squares, there were no gardens or parking allocations marked out, plus a lot of houses on Parcel A were not shown at all. How did they know 99 houses could fit in? When the land was sold could the builder increase the number of houses?

WLI replied that this was only an indicative plan. There was a detailed plan in the Design and Access Statement which shows the houses and garden sizes. The number of houses and garden sizes are part of the reserve matters with UDC. A builder could not increase the number of houses that had been approved by UDC.

Would there be any bungalows for people to buy?

WLI said that this would be in the reserve matters with UDC.

How wide is the buffer?

WLI said the buffer to protect Alsa Wood is to be 20 metres in width and would provide more habitat for the wildlife.

What is the density of the sites?

WLI said an average of the two sites together was 20 dwellings per hectare.

GM asked why part of an established hedge plus trees, which ran between the two fields in Parcel A, was being removed.

WLI said it was to enable the road layout.

GM thanked WLI for coming to the meeting, saying that Elsenham needed extra amenities, shops, employment, better infrastructure and a new cemetery, Elsenham however, did not need any further houses.

A member of the public stated the noise from the motorway would not be stopped by a bank or trees, the noise would bounce off and land in other parts of the village.

GM asked for a show of hands;
Those in favour of the application 0
Those against the application 37.

5. UDC Planning Committee meetings

Both UTT/19/0437/OP 40 homes off Rush Lane, Elsenham and UTT/19/0462/FUL 130 homes off Hall Road, Elsenham, are to be included at UDC Planning Committee meeting on 6 November 2019.

GM would like to speak on both applications. Points GM would raise on the Rush Lane application would include; access, parked cars making it single traffic and potential damage to listed buildings.

LJ to inform UDC that GM as Chairman of EPC, would like to speak on both applications.

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

a) UTT/19/2614/FUL Demolition of existing commercial buildings & erection of 2 detached and 2 semi-detached dwellings with associated off-street parking. Apple Tree Yard Fullers End. **The objections that EPC made on the original application were still valid. LJ to change the reference number and re-submit.**

b) UTT/19/2651/FUL Demolition of existing bungalow and connected buildings and erection of 1 detached dwelling. Little Glebe, Station Road, Elsenham. **GM to review the previous objections, removing 5.12 as this was no longer applicable, and adding that if UDC were mindful to approve this application, EPC would welcome a full height laurel hedge along the length of the boundary.**

7. Response agreed at the Planning Committee meeting held on 21 October 2019.

UTT/19/2545/FUL Proposed demolition of existing house and erection of 3 x 4-bedroom dwellings. Crossways, Station Road, Elsenham. GM will edit the response to the previous application, with the objections including, 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. **LJ to ask District Cllr. Lees to 'call it in'.**

8. Crest Nicholson (CN) - Allotments

Carried over from the Planning Committee meeting held on 27 September 2019
An e-mail from CN had been sent to Emma Barry on 23/8/19 stating

'Allotments – All the allotments have been set out. The weeds have been sprayed this week and will die off in the next few days. The fencing is almost complete and will be finalised next week. The paths will be seeded by 9th Sept (in season). The planting around the allotments will be done in the planting season in November due to all the plants being root ball planting'. However, weeds are still growing on the allotments, the bank is full of thistles, the standpipes have been boxed in such a way that a hose cannot be fitted in and an inferior fencing has been installed.

MJ has taken photographs of the allotments and prepared an email to send to Emma Barry. However, since the photographs were taken the weeds on the bank against the allotments have been cleared, (although the stalks remain). MJ said she would take up-to-date photos and liaise with Cllr. Lees on whether she would like the email to go through her.

9. Community Hall Land

Carried over from the Planning Committee meeting on 27 September 2019

This is in the hands of UDC. The latest plans show the community land as being landlocked, EPC will not accept the transfer of the land until this has been resolved.

Emma Barry has said that UDC had commissioned a quantity surveyor to ascertain an update on the costings for a community hall.

Nigel Brown, 23/09/19: Email "*I would be more than happy to meet up with you as we also have the Community Facility matter which we have been quietly progressing*".

Financial contributions need to be collected.

Emma Barry, 22/08/19: Email "*We will be updated on costings when they are finalized*".

There had still been no further correspondence regarding the Community Hall land. GM to ask Cllr. Lees at the Parish Council meeting on Monday 4 November 2019.

10. UTT/19/2266 - Gladman, up to 220 dwellings, North of Bedwell Road.

Carried over from the Planning Committee meeting on 21 October 2019

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 Barker (Chairman of Henham Parish Council) the amount of the invoice and to put this decision to Ugley Parish Council. Deadline for representations extended to 29 November 2019.

Ugley Parish Council have agreed to pay one third towards the cost of Geoff Gardner's fee.

11. David Wilson Homes

Confirmation has been sent to UDC that EPC will take over the LAP and LEAP areas. **An acknowledgment had been received from Emma Barry with the promise that the 'No Dogs' sign will be installed and the see-saw re-balanced.**

12. Local Plan

EPC are still awaiting dates for the Phase 2 Public Hearings.

13. Crest Nicholson - Stansted Road

An email regarding EPC's concerns about the new cycleway and bus stops in Stansted Road had been sent to Cllr. Lees, who had forwarded it on to Emma Barry. Emma Barry had replied saying that despite it being part of the S106 agreement with CN, this is now a Highways matter. GM had sent an email to Cllr. Gooding asking for his view.

GM to ask Cllr Gooding at the Parish Council meeting on Monday 4 November if any progress has been made.

14. Fairfield response

Fairfield have gone dormant again. An extension has been agreed with UDC for submitting objections until after Highways response received.

15. TPOs and other applications not notified to Parish Councils

UDC has supplied EPC with a document showing when UDC need to consult Parish Councils (legislation sets out which applications they are required to send to Parish Councils). It was agreed to send a reply to Cllr's. Lees, LeCount and Gerard, suggesting that there are good reasons why notification of some proposals, which are not notified at present, should be.

EPC have not received a reply, GM to ask Cllr. Lees at the Parish Council meeting on 4 November 2019.

16. AOB

Date of next meeting

To be advised.

In accordance with section 1 of the Public Bodies (admissions to meeting) Act 1960, the public and press will be excluded from the remainder of the meeting because publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted

17. Planning Application

GM proposed that EPC accepts Geoff Gardner's fee of £1,350 and Bruce Bamber's fee of £1,250 plus travel expenses, for preparing and submitting to UDC objections to planning application, UTT/19/2470/OP Land to the West of Isabel Drive.

MJ seconded; the vote was carried unanimously.

The meeting finished at 4.00pm.