



ELSENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Application

Planning Inspectorate Reference: S62A/2023/0023

Uttlesford District Council Reference: UTT/23/2193/PINS

Response to the application for

**Proposed erection of 5 no. residential dwellings and associated
infrastructure**

**Land At Eastfield Stables May Walk Elsenham Road Stansted
Essex**

Elsenham Parish Council wishes to object to this application, for the reasons given below.

1. Location

The M11 motorway forms the boundary between the parishes of Elsenham and Stansted Mountfitchet. The application site is thus in Stansted Mountfitchet parish, between the two villages, and does not relate well to either settlement. Development would not be sustainable. Stansted Mountfitchet is much the larger of the two settlements, but it is at too great a distance for ready access by walking. The route is hazardous for cyclists and includes the steep Grove Hill, a notorious local bottleneck. The nearest bus stop for the infrequent and unreliable 7/7A service is at some distance from the site. Development would undoubtedly result in heavy dependence on private motor vehicles for access.

2. Five-year housing land supply

As shown in Appendix ii Part A of the application, Uttlesford District Council is now able to show a 5-Year Housing Land Supply of 5.14 years. There is thus no need for piecemeal development in order for Uttlesford to fulfil its planning obligations.

3. Local Plan

Elsenham

Uttlesford District Council has now published its Regulation 18 Local Plan for consultation. Elsenham is classified as a 'Local Rural Centre'. Unlike other settlements with the same classification, Elsenham has been allocated no further development, as explained below:

52. There are no proposed strategic allocations proposed at three of the Local Rural Centres of Elsenham, Great Chesterford or Hatfield Heath for the following reasons:

Elsenham: There are a number of suitable sites for development at Elsenham, but these already have planning permission and there are already over 1,000 homes committed at this settlement.

<https://uttlesford.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s33272/Report%20Local%20Plan%20Regulation%2018.pdf>

Development already committed in Elsenham is wholly disproportionate, amenities in the village have not kept pace with the rapid expansion which has taken place, and road traffic access routes are already at, or beyond, capacity.

It is exceedingly unlikely that any allocation of new housing in Elsenham will be made as part of the current Local Plan process.

Stansted Mountfitchet

Stansted Mountfitchet is classified as a 'Key Settlement' in the Regulation 18 Local Plan. Further development is proposed in the form of a total of 390 dwellings on two sites, both to the north of the village. It is thus evident that there is sufficient land available in Stansted Mountfitchet for development within the twenty-year period of the Local Plan (2021-41), with no need to rely on the site which is the subject of the present application.

It is exceedingly unlikely that any allocation of further new housing in Stansted Mountfitchet will be made as part of the current Local Plan process.

4. Economic and social objectives

It is claimed that the objectives stipulated in paragraphs 7 to 10 of the NPPF would be met (*Design & Access Statement*, 8).

The assertion is based on the mistaken belief that all development must in itself be a good thing. But that is not so. As far as supposed economic benefits are concerned, the small local general store is beyond capacity. It has to close regularly in order to receive deliveries; car parking space is inadequate and the cause of conflict with local residents.

Regarding the social objective, it is stated, 'When occupied the development will bring further support to local societies and groups by increase membership' (*Design & Access Statement*, 8). But they do not need further support - many are over-subscribed and the problem is lack of sufficient communal space and amenities rather than an inadequate supply of users. As with other developers, these applicants assume that the facilities are there and that they can merely make use of them, without making a contribution themselves.

5. Previous applications

There is a history of refused applications on the present and adjacent sites.

UTT/18/2351/OP for five dwellings to the north of the present site and with access off May Walk was refused by Uttlesford District Council and the appeal was dismissed, Reference APP/C1570/W/19/3228484. Application UTT/20/1643/FUL for eleven dwellings on the present site was refused by Uttlesford District Council and the appeal dismissed in October 2021, Reference APP/C1570/W/21/3271985.

The reasons for refusal cited by the Inspector in dismissing the latter appeal for eleven dwellings apply *a fortiori* to the present application, given that Uttlesford District Council is now able to demonstrate a

Five-Year Housing Land Supply, and given also that the site is not included in the emerging Local Plan. In this regard, the comparison drawn by the Inspector with the appeal into a site at Rush Lane, Elsenham (Reference APP/C1570/W/19/3228484) should be noted (Appeal Reference APP/C1570/W/21/3271985, paragraph 23). The Inspector regarded as relevant that the Rush Lane site was identified in the then emerging local plan, even though that version was later withdrawn.

6. Conclusion

This application has been made under the S62A provisions currently in force with regard to 'major applications' in the district of Uttlesford. The District Council has the status of consultees; the Report by the Planning Officer for consideration by the Planning Committee recommends that the Committee should recommend refusal:

https://publicaccess.uttlesford.gov.uk/online-applications/files/5697468CAAF56CD969BBEDA0412C591A/pdf/UTT_23_2193_PINS-COMMITTEE_REPORT-4165859.pdf. (Section 15).

Elsenham Parish Council concurs.