

**MR HEARNE**

1. The change of use is a valid when consideration of all the new sites put forward in the Regulation 18 consultation are outside of the old out of date development limits.
2. The land is not specifically designated.
3. This application site is not related to nor connected to any other land west of May Walk. The nature reserve and Alsa Wood are there for everyone to enjoy.
4. The land is NOT within the CPZ. This has been pointed out to the objector on previous occasions. The development limits were set prior to 2005 and are out of date.
5. All the amenities of Elsenham are within reasonable walking distance. The site is sustainable.
6. An Ecological Assessment has been submitted.
7. May Walk is not relevant to this application in as much as it not the point that the development is accessed from.
8. This application will not stop birds flying or hunting.
9. This is not public land. It will still be very much open when this development is completed.

The conversion of the redundant buildings was not subject to any limiting number. The objector confuses policies.

**Highway dangers**

Essex Highways, the authority on these matters, are entirely content with the proposals.

**Access to services**

Essex Highways, the authority on traffic related matters, are entirely content with the proposals.

**Past appeal decisions**

Since the decisions on those cases quoted, an appeal Inspector has allowed development that extends Elsenham right up to the M11. As a result, there are bus stops within 200 metres of the Eastfield Stables site.

**MRS J IRVING-FYNN**

- Why is the 1988 photograph misleading? Everything the objector describes is quite clearly shown. The point being made is that the changes to Eastfield Stables as we know the site is entirely man made and all approved by the LPA.
- The traffic survey cannot possibly forecast the future! The survey location is entirely appropriate, Essex Highways, the authority on such matters, are satisfied.
- Use of the bus service is reliant on many more people than will occupy these 5 new dwellings.
- May Walk is not relevant to this application in as much as it is not the point that the development is accessed from.
- The area of trees to the south of Eastfield Stables immediately north of the B1051 does not form a part of the application site.
- New Farm has consent for commercial use. That site contains a commercial building.

- The dwellings proposed are single storey. Any change to two storey dwellings would require a separate planning application.
- The application is quite clear, it is for the rection of 5 residential dwellings. Eastfield Stables is already a mixed-use site.
- Drainage details have been provided that deal with all environmental and flood risk concerns.

### **ELSENHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

#### **1. Location**

Essex Highways, the authority on traffic related matters, are entirely content with the proposals.

#### **2. Five-year housing land supply**

The LPA will need to continue approve sustainable development applications.

There is windfall allowance within the 5 - year breakdown that must be met.

There is no certainty, given the current economic situation, that development across the district will be maintained at the required rate, several sites are already behind schedule as the applicant has pointed out in his Design and Access statement.

#### **3. Local Plan**

##### Elsenham

Paragraph 52 relates to strategic sites. As noted in response to point 2 above, the need for windfall sites and the downturn currently happening in production and completions needs to be monitored. The Local Plan should be updated every 5 years.

If the amenities of Elsenham have not kept pace with the “rapid expansion” have the Parish Council requested any new amenities when consulted upon those developments?

Eastfield Stable is providing new amenities by developing the Wellness Hub. It could possible provide more?

##### Stansted Mountfitchet

It could well be that Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council will object to the Regulation 18 proposals. After all, those two sites are divorced from the centre as the applicant has demonstrated within this application.

#### **4. Economic and social objectives**

It must be said and the applicant makes no apology for saying it, this response from a Parish Council is systematic of a council that is not exhibiting the right approach to development proposals that have a direct or indirect effect on their community.

If the local shop is struggling and is casing conflict with local residents, where are the demands for new shops in their responses to planning applications?

If local groups do not accept new members there will be a natural fall off in membership.

#### **5. Previous applications**

Since the cases noted, an appeal Inspector has allowed development that extends Elsenham right up to the M11.

The emerging draft Local Plan carries no planning weight.

### **STANSTED MOUNTFITCHET PARISH COUNCIL**

The development limits as set out in the 205 Local Plan are out of date.

The site is sustainable as illustrated within the Design and Access Statement.

Previous applications for development have always been met with objections from the Parish Council without any suggestion as to what would be acceptable therefore any pre-

application engagement with the Parish Council, and there is no absolute requirement for there to be any, would be to little effect, unless the Parish Council now want to say otherwise.

The financial contribution proposed will be used by the District Council to provide affordable housing and the Parish Council should be considering where best to provide it within the parish.

Construction access for this development will most definitely not be from May Walk. The applicant expects the consent to contain a Construction Management Plan condition for submission and approval of such plan gained prior to commencement.



V F Ranger

On behalf of NB Investments UK Limited.