

## **Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Section 62A Applications)**

Planning Application for Construction of 16 Dwellings including 40% affordable housing and associated infrastructure at Land east of Ugley Village Hall, east of Cambridge Road, Ugley, Bishop's Stortford, CM22 6HR.

### **Response to this application from Ugley Parish Council**

Ugley Parish Council has considered this application and objects to it for the following reasons.

#### **1. Inappropriate and over-development in the countryside**

Ugley is in a very rural location, albeit with a former trunk road (A11, now B1383) running through it. Over the last 40 years there has been very little development in Ugley which has meant that the village has retained its character. What development there has been have mainly been single property 'infill' projects or re-building of dilapidated or derelict properties.

The only development immediately adjacent to the site was the conversion of barns and outbuildings in the grounds of Orford Hall to the south approximately 20 years ago.

The immediate area has changed very little since the Village Hall was built just over 100 years ago.

In the considerations for the currently developing Uttlesford Local Plan it was decided to exclude developments in smaller villages and concentrate them in larger villages and in towns. This was in part to preserve the character of the smaller villages which are a feature in the district and typically have not seen significant development over the past 50 years.

If this development went ahead it would cause a distinct urbanisation of this part of the village. Ugley only has one housing development which is Patmore Fields at Patmore End which is a development of 8 houses built in the late 1970s. The proposed development would be out of keeping with the rest of the village.

The site was not proposed as a location for housing development in the call for sites for the current Local Plan and would probably have been rejected if it had been proposed.

## 2. Sustainability

Ugley has no shops, no school, no doctors' surgery and very little employment. There is a bus service along the B1383 which would be accessible to residents of this development, but its frequency and reliability make it unsuitable for work and education purposes. In reality virtually every journey for work, school, shopping and leisure would be made by private car.

Nearby villages of Elsenham and Stansted Mountfitchet have mainline railway stations approximately 1.5 miles away which could be accessed by walking or cycling. However, the road routes to both are largely unlit and the road through Ugley to Elsenham has no footway, sharp bends and poor visibility until you reach Elsenham. Most people wanting to use the railway would drive to the station car parks particularly in the winter months.

The designated primary school for Ugley is in Henham, but Essex County Council does not provide transport for children living in Ugley. As a result every journey to primary school would be by car.

## 3. Foul Sewage

The applicant goes into considerable detail about how surface water would be dealt with. The more difficult subject of foul sewage is covered in two sentences. There is no foul sewage in the vicinity of the site. An appropriate engineered designed sewage system comprising of either septic tanks or packaged sewage treatment plants (whichever is deemed most suitable) will be the means to dispose of foul waste.

This is unacceptable. Both septic tanks and packaged sewage treatment plants produce liquid effluent which needs to be discharged into either a watercourse or soakaway. There are no watercourses adjacent to the site, and soakaways would not be suitable for septic tank effluent.

The applicant is wrong in their claim that there is no foul sewer. A rising (pressurised) sewer runs under the B1383. Individual properties cannot access this because gravity discharges are not possible. Discharges into it have to be made under equal or greater pressure.

When Patmore Fields (see above) was developed in the 1970s the developer was required to install a pumping station and pipeline so that foul sewage from the development could be discharged to the main sewer. A similar system should be the only option for this proposed development.

#### 4. Impact on Village Hall

Due to the location of the Village Hall and the spread-out nature of the village most users of the Village Hall access it by private car. This includes both villagers and those using the Hall from further afield.

The car park is currently quite large because it includes land at the southern end owned by the applicant and included in the application as the location for plots 6 and 7. If the development is permitted the car park will be reduced in size to accommodate only 14-17 cars. This would not be a problem for weekly and monthly clubs and activities that use the Hall or if the Hall was at the centre of a compact village. It will be a problem for potential users of the Hall wanting to hold birthday parties for example. It will particularly be a problem for the popular monthly farmers' market. Stallholders will occupy eight of the parking spaces leaving very few for visitors to the market. Cars will end up being parked on the edge of the B1383 or in Pound Lane.

#### 5. Planning Policy GEN 2

The proposed development does not adhere to the requirements of policy GEN2, in particular in respect of a) in that it is not compatible with the scale, form, layout, appearance and materials of surrounding buildings, many of which are listed.

#### 6. Section 106 Agreement

Notwithstanding the Parish Council's objection to this development, as it would surround the Village Hall we would ask that a payment be included in the Section 106 Agreement for the modernisation of the Hall.