

The draft local plan published last Friday had clearly been written and completed prior to last Thursday night's meeting. Interestingly very few councillors were present and no residents from the discounted sites attended – They clearly saw no need.

The 3 recommended sites have been the preferred options for many months and each piece of "evidence" has been nicely tailored to fit the required outcomes. The transport study presentation even went as far as to recommend these 3 sites for development rather than, as it should have done, just present the impact of each scenario for consideration by the committee alongside a host of other evidence.

The Takeley site, right next to the A120 and adjacent to existing development, was dismissed because building a new junction onto the A120 might be "challenging to deliver", whilst recommending the Easton Park site with no junction improvements, despite the fact that the 10,000 homes will share the junction with a new business park and existing Dunmow traffic. An option to create a new access point onto the A120 has been ignored due to cost, without even identifying what that cost would be, who would pay for it and what the net benefit would be. Surely this type of infrastructure investment is what Garden Cities are about?

Councillor Lodge has said this week that key evidence is still missing to prove the case for these Garden Settlements – I would be interested to hear this evening what that evidence is.

Where is the evidence to confirm that the development of two major sites along the A120 corridor – 20,000 new houses and an additional 6000 car journeys at peak time – will not totally overwhelm our road network and bring the area grinding to a halt.

I asked a number of questions at last week's meeting as to why a fundamentally different approach was taken to Easton Park in the heritage impact assessments. These could not be answered and an action was taken by Mr Fox to respond to my questions – **Could you please confirm when I will receive these answers?**

The Draft Local Plan states that Proposals should demonstrate how they respond to the landscape, the environment and historic assets. Can you please detail where and how the current Land Securities proposal demonstrates a response to any of these items?

At the meeting last week, it was stated that there was further input and clarification available from Land Securities on their proposal. **Can you please confirm whether this has now been received, whether it has been made available to the public and, if not, when it will be?**

Little Easton Parish are determined to preserve our heritage for future generations.

As things stand:

A wonderful dark sky landscape will be blighted by light pollution

A historic deer park will be concreted over by 10,000 homes

Valuable agricultural land will be gone forever

The settings of a large number of our heritage assets will be destroyed.

You are merely the current caretakers of our district and what you do now will affect this area long after you are gone. What a legacy to be proud of!