



## **Elsenham Parish Council Extraordinary Meeting**

**Minutes of the Parish Council meeting  
held in The Memorial Hall at 7.30p.m on 15 March 2024**

### **Members of Elsenham Parish Council (EPC) present:**

Cllr. G Mott (Chair GM), Cllr. G Bentley (GB),  
Cllr. B Burlton (BB), Cllr. P Davis (PD), Cllr. R Franklin (RF),  
Cllr. F Lambert (FL), Cllr. J Minor (JM),  
and Mrs. L Johnson (Parish Clerk LJ).

### **Members of the public present:**

None.

**Apologies for absence:** Cllr. B Donald (BD), Cllr. P Jarvis (PJ), Cllr. A Mowbray (AM), and Cllr. S Waite (SW).

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**22403. UTT/24/0543/OP Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 240 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point. Land North of Bedwell Road and East of Old Mead Road Ugley And Henham.**

Deadline for representations to UDC is 4 April.

This application, also by Gladman, on the same site, was refused by UDC Planning Committee in April 2021. The Appeal was heard via Zoom 14 - 24 September 2021 and dismissed 25 October 2021. Noise was the determinative factor for the previous application being refused, the noise coming from the motorway and the railway line. As noise was the determinative factor for the previous application, it would make sense to object to this application on the grounds of noise.

UDC did defend their decision at the appeal and engaged Steve Gosling from 24acoustics Ltd. Steve Gosling gave an excellent report.

It is unusual for noise to be an issue in this area, and it becomes very technical very quickly, therefore if EPC agreed to object to the application, they would need to engage a consultant and now that UDC have confirmed that they will not be engaging Stephen Gosling from 24acoustics Ltd., EPC could do so.

Steve Gosling fees are;

- Review latest submission - £1500+VAT.
- Prepare a report for submission to UDC - £5400+VAT.

The Chair of Henham PC is going to ask Henham PC if they would help with the costs of hiring a noise consultant, hopefully 50%.

Henham PC had asked Alison Hutchinson, a partner of Hutchinsons, Planning & Development Consultants, to help defend against this application. However, Alison replied that the only way to get this application refused was on noise.

This application is half in Henham and half in Ugley although the major impact would be on Elsenham.

GM mentioned other possible issues which EPC could raise.

- The site is not included in UDC's current Local Plan. But the Plan is still at a preliminary stage - in other words, it could still be altered radically - and so this would carry limited weight.
- The large volume of recent developments in Elsenham, including those approved since Gladman 220 was refused. Whatever the level of demand elsewhere in the district, there is no demand for yet more houses here.
- Impact on the landscape.
- Roads. There is a Transport Assessment, it was generally allowed last time that most traffic would go via Ugley Green, but some would go through Elsenham and then via Grove Hill.
- No socio-economic benefits.
- We need: employment; shops; surgery; sporting facilities; cemetery; community centre.
- Development here would not benefit the rest of Elsenham, their play areas would be too far away for other residents to use.
- Distance from other amenities in the village.
- The LEAPs would be subject to noise, if placed where illustrated. They're both shown in areas marked 'Noise - Area unsuitable for residential development'.
- Possibility of badgers in ruderal vegetation close to the site entrance.
- There is insufficient parking provision. See *Design and Access Statement*, 6.4 They are not aware of *UDC's Local Residential Parking Standards* (2013) according to which house with 4+ bedrooms need 3 spaces per dwelling, rather than 2.
- Sufficient garden provision.
- If their solution was adopted, there would be limited interaction with the neighbours for those houses closest to the motorway as the road outside would be noisy - something which the previous Gladman Appeal Inspector mentioned.

BB said the first thing to agree is, does EPC want to object to this application.

If EPC are successful and stop this application, EPC will lose any Section 106 money for the new community centre.

GM explained that with the previous Gladman application in 2021, Gladman had approached EPC asking for a meeting. At the meeting Gladman were happy to give a payment to the new community centre.

With the present application there has been no contact from Gladman. Although UDC should arrange a meeting as stated in their Statement of Community Involvement Policy, between the developers and the parish councils to discuss Section 106. There is no mention of a contribution in the draft S106 for the present application. However, it states that the developer is to provide an offsite sports provision.

Ugley PC would like a payment to their Village Hall in the Section 106. The hall is over 100 years old and requires modernizing.

RF said that a payment to the No. 7 village bus service should be included in the Section 106. Residents in Gold Close have been asking that the bus route is changed to include Gold Close, at present the bus does not travel up New Road.

JM asked for a payment from the Section 106 to go directly to the Elsenham Surgery, not to the NHS. Or even to build a new doctor surgery.

BB asked, as it was refused on noise before have Gladman changed their design to deal with the noise mitigation.

GM said Gladman are proposing three-storey houses with the kitchen and bathroom on the motorway side, and the living room and bedrooms on the other side away from the motorway.

**Proposal:** EPC commission 24acousits, at a cost of £1500+VAT, to review the application.

BB proposed, FL seconded, the vote was carried unanimously.

**Proposal:** EPC request UDC to hold a face-to-face meeting with Gladman and EPC as stated in UDC's *Statement of Community Involvement* policy, to discuss the Section 106. EPC will ask for three localised contributions, the new community centre, the Elsenham Doctor's surgery and the number 7 bus route.

BB proposed, JM seconded, the vote was carried unanimously.

**Proposal:** EPC ask Nigel Brown for an extension to the deadline for representations to 15 May 2024.

BB proposed, RF seconded, the vote was carried unanimously.

LJ to ask Stephen Gosling if it would be possible to have his report before the next Parish Council meeting on 8 April. On the outcome of the report councillors can decide whether to engage Stephen Gosling to prepare a report for submission to UDC at a cost of £5,400+VAT.

If UDC do not grant an extension the time scale will be tight, an extra meeting may have to be called. Gladman have had 2-years to prepare their application, EPC are only given a few weeks.

LJ to email Nigel Brown asking for an extension to 15 May. Stating that as the application was in Henham and Ugley with the major impact on Elsenham the three villages were collaborating. Plus, EPC had to wait for a response from UDC as to whether they would be engaging Stephen Gosling.

Also to ask UDC to arrange a meeting with the developer, UDC and EPC.

LJ to contact Stephen Gosling, commissioning him to review the application and if possible, for EPC to have his report before 8th April 2024.

The meeting finished at 9.00pm.