

## Councillor Graham Mott (Elsenham Parish Council)

Mr Chairman, I am Dr Graham Mott and I speak on behalf of Elsenham Parish Council, of which I am the Chairman.

First, administrative problems. The deadline for submissions to the Regulation 18 consultation was as long ago as 15 December, but it was not until 20 March that the results were available. The long delay was justified in terms of planning officers preparing responses to the various representations, grouped if necessary. That has not happened, and the failure has not been explained, as far as I'm aware. Unfortunately we have only recently been able to see that, for unknown reasons, the various submissions made by Elsenham Parish Council have all been rolled up together and placed in Chapter 1 under a single reference. It is obvious that others have had similar difficulties with the system.

But that is not the only problem. At your last meeting, Cllr Evans reported that the system now available for viewing submissions had been described as (and I quote) 'impenetrable and clunky' (end of quote). The whole process must be improved for the Regulation 19 consultation. The Limehouse system which was used for previous attempts at a Local Plan was not perfect, but it was much superior to the systems used this time.

I will mention briefly some of the matters included in the Parish Council's Regulation 18 responses. We support the proposal that there should be no new housing allocations to Elsenham. Indeed, it could scarcely be otherwise, given that, as stated, there are already over 1,000 homes approved in the village. But the commitment and explanation should be included within Core Policy 2, and **not** left in the subsidiary *Housing Selection Topic Paper*. The impact on the inadequate local road system of the large amount of housing approved but not yet delivered in Elsenham must be taken into account in the significant allocations to our neighbours in Stansted Mountfitchet and in Henham.

**Core Policy 12** has resulted in representations regarding the CPZ. However, it is not correct to assert that the CPZ has been sacrosanct or consistently maintained since 1995. In Elsenham, no fewer than 470 new dwellings have been approved within the CPZ since 2015, under both the previous and the current administrations, without the benefit of a policy proposal put out for consultation; and in June 2023, a site within the CPZ was approved under the S62A regulations, with the Inspector shrugging the CPZ policy aside. (That's 130 dwellings south of Henham Road, Elsenham, and I won't read out the full reference: UTT/22/2174/PINS, S62A/22/0007, *Decision Notice and Statement of Reasons*, 14 June 2023, 105-06).

With regard to Core Policy 5, 'Providing Support Infrastructure and Services', it is much to be regretted that there is no commitment to improvements in Elsenham, on the grounds that development has already occurred. **Consultation** regarding new development proposals is key. There are provisions in the SCI for discussions with town or parish councils during the application process, but these do not always occur. There is not so much as a **commitment** to consultation with Essex Highways. They sometimes include S106 provisions for new developments which are inappropriate, and opportunities can be lost for improvements which would be of real benefit to the local community. The Local Plan will not be viable unless it includes enforceable provisions for genuine consultation by both UDC and Essex Highways with town and parish councils for all new planning applications.

Briefly to summarise, Sir, there are several other matters dealt with in our representations. As I mentioned at the start, they have all been rolled up together in Chapter 1, Ref 402, and the Parish Council requests access to the system so that they can be allocated to their correct policies and places. Thank you