

Address to PPWG, 31 May 2018

Mr Chairman, I speak on behalf of Elsenham Parish Council.

Yes! Elsenham! **Not** one of the three new garden settlements.

Perhaps members are thinking, but surely: Elsenham is not in the Plan now.

But it is. The proposals include a site in Robin Hood Road scheduled for 40 (four zero) dwellings.

As we all know, Sir, a leading reason for the rejection of the previous local plan was the unsuitable road links to Elsenham, particularly the wholly unsatisfactory main route through Stansted Mountfitchet via Grove Hill, Lower Street and Chapel Hill; and the same conclusion was reached by a second Inspector, and confirmed by the Secretary of State in 2016, when rejecting the appeal by Fairfield against refusal of 800 homes between Elsenham and Henham.

Fairfield put in a recent application to build 350 houses on the same site, not part of this Plan; BUT some of the responses were surprising, for they reveal the extent to which local residents, weary of the intractable traffic problems through Stansted, already make use of wholly unsuitable alternative routes via narrow, twisting country lanes with width limits of 6 foot 6. In other words, access through Stansted is is now effectively beyond capacity; and there are about 230 houses approved but not yet occupied.

The total number of dwellings across the district in the Plan until 2033 is now 14,700, as against the 14,100 required. Using the 'Liverpool methodology' the 5-year housing supply stands at very nearly six years. Thus there is now spare capacity in the Plan. The smaller allocations should not just go through on the nod. The volume of new homes already committed in Elsenham will result in an increase in the village of about 60% since 2011 and these further 40 houses must be the leading candidates for total exclusion from the plan.

To conclude. When this plan goes before an inspector, one obvious question will be, what new housing is proposed for Elsenham. It would help greatly if the answer was 'none at all', rather than an allocation which is unsustainable because Elsenham has already been favoured with an excessively large amount of new housing. And, finally, new information from local residents shows that the village is even more unsuitable now on transport grounds than it was when the previous Local Plan Inspector concluded, in his words, that it cannot 'overcome the connectivity disadvantages of its location'. He certainly knew what he was talking about, Mr Chairman.

My thanks to you, Sir, and the members of the Working Group for your attention.

Dr Graham Mott
Elsenham

[Not yet built: 30 DWH; 50 CN; 116 Bovis; 40 Nursery = 236