

J Redfern

I am here to speak on behalf of the ward I represent and to ask just some of the questions I have on these papers.

On page 140 of the WYG Conclusions point 7.2.2, the roads that exceed their capacity without additional housing in the local plan, M11 Junctions 7-9 is listed. And on page 371, point 5.6, options to improve this are suggested.

None of these seem to have made it into our own report – why not? Again, on page 140, the B1383 is noted as being at capacity and no improvements have made it into our report.

My ward is impacted by both of these roads. The M11 is just two lanes from Junction 8 north to Junction 9 and there is no access north at Junction 9. At one end, we have Stansted Airport with its potential to dramatically increase passenger numbers, and, at the other, NUGC. Both will have a huge impact on this motorway, and as we all know, this regularly falls over now and is shut. This, being one of the longest stretches of motorway without an exit in the country, then pushes all this traffic onto the B1383 down through Great Chesterford, Little Chesterford, Littlebury, Wendon, and onwards to Stansted. To ignore this problem is not acceptable to me or to the residents I represent.

In Grosvenor's Transport report, there are also a series of alterations they feel need to be made to Great Chesterford to enable this development. Peter Bretts mention in their document that they have engaged with Great Chesterford Parish Council on this. This is simply not true. If they had, they would understand that much of what they suggest is not feasible or acceptable to Great Chesterford. Why should Great Chesterford pick up the pieces to make NUGC sustainable when it has a negative impact on this historic village?

The heritage impact assessment recognises that there are a number of areas of potential harm and the site is

constrained. It says no development between the temple and Roman town but the current plan supplied by Grosvenor shows new ground modelling and balancing lake in that very location. If the balancing lake, cannot be at the bottom of the hill, where can it be? The report states that more work on heritage is required. Surely this should be done before the allocation of such a sensitive site?

Great Chesterford Parish Council provided Grosvenor and UDC with a considered version of SP7 some time ago. Grosvenor responded passing much of it back to UDC but we have heard nothing on this to date, except in the last few days that our red lines will be addressed in Regulation 19. We have seen nothing of the new SP7 that is to go into Reg.19 and whilst UDC is confident that details will be dealt with by a DPD, I am led to believe leaving important detail to DPD's is dangerous. South Cambs backed away from this idea and included all detail in the initial policies, as have Chelmsford City. The concern is that the scheme cannot deliver the numbers needed in a sympathetic way, for example, clear landscape separation buffer between new houses and Great Chesterford, which is not currently proposed on the master plan; and the balancing lake issue. These conflicts need to be sorted out now so that a proper assessment can be carried out. Leaving it to DPDs could result in Uttlesford delivering a sub-standard development and not providing the housing numbers needed.

So for Great Chesterford Parish, it is clear we need our red lines in regulation 19 to have any confidence that these will be delivered. The road network improvements are essential and the buffer zone as a protection to the historic environment should be stated in policy so that they can be picked up and delivered by the DPD. The red lines are key to my ward and, as such, key to me as their member. I am extremely uncomfortable with jam tomorrow.