

Report of Alan Storah to The Sampfords Parish Council

5th March 2020

1. Local Plan

The council has not yet determined how to proceed in response to the Inspectors' letter. This is likely to be decided by the end of the month.

2. Stansted Airport

In November 2018 Uttlesford District Council's Planning Committee resolved to grant approval of the Manchester Airports Group's (MAG) planning application for: 'Airfield works comprising two new taxiway links to the existing runway (a Rapid Access Taxiway and a Rapid Exit Taxiway), six additional remote aircraft stands (adjacent Yankee taxiway); and three additional aircraft stands (extension of the Echo Apron) to enable combined airfield operations of 274,000 aircraft movements (of which not more than 16,000 movements would be Cargo Air Transport Movements (CATM)) and a throughput of 43 million terminal passengers, in a 12-month calendar period', subject to the S106 Agreement.

The Planning Committee met in January to consider the adequacy of the S106 Agreement as well as any potential new material considerations and/or changes in circumstance since the committee resolved to grant planning permission. The meeting was held over two days - Friday 17 January and Friday 24 January. The first day was the formal public speaking part of the meeting, including representations from town and parish councils. The meeting was then adjourned until 24 January when the Planning Committee heard representations from a number of district councillors, Stop Stansted Expansion (SSE) and MAG. The committee then considered the recommendations made in the officer's report and all of the representations made before deciding whether to authorise the release of a decision notice formally approving the application. The committee determined to refuse permission for reasons relating to noise, air quality and climate change and associated infrastructure provision as specified below:

1. "The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the additional flights would not result in an increased detrimental effect from aircraft noise, contrary to Uttlesford Local Plan Policy ENV11 and the NPPF.
2. The application has failed to demonstrate that the additional flights would not result in a detrimental effect on air quality, specifically but not exclusively PM2.5 and ultrafine particulates contrary to Uttlesford Local Plan Policy ENV13 and paragraph 181 of the NPPF.
3. The additional emissions from increased international flights are incompatible with the Committee on Climate Change's recommendation that emissions from all UK departing Page 2 of 4 flights should be at or below 2005 levels in 2050. This is against the backdrop of the amendment to the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) to reduce the net UK carbon account for the year 2050 to net zero from the 1990 baseline. This is therefore contrary to the general accepted perceptions and understandings of the importance of

climate change and the time within which it must be addressed. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to approve the application at a time whereby the Government has been unable to resolve its policy on international aviation climate emissions.

4. The application fails to provide the necessary infrastructure to support the application, or the necessary mitigation to address the detrimental impact of the proposal contrary to Uttlesford Local Plan Policies GEN6, GEN1, GEN7, ENV7, ENV11 and ENV13.”

3. Sparepenny Lane North

In response to a complaint from a resident, I am seeking to bring about improvements to the condition of the road surface at Sparepenny Lane North, the condition of which has apparently deteriorated over the years. County Cllr. Walsh kindly provided me with a statement, produced by ECC, relating to its status as a ‘byway’ (such that ECC is not responsible for maintaining it to the same standard that it would if it were a regular carriageway) and referred me to a page on their web-site on which the public could report ‘potholes and road surface issues’. I passed this information on to the resident but with a warning that, given the status of the road, it seemed unlikely that ECC would be willing to undertake the works. This was acknowledged but the information given was nonetheless gratefully received.

4. Howe Lane

Cllr. Adye contacted me with regard to Howe Lane in Great Sampford about which she has been in touch with Highways regarding on a number of occasions, but so far with no response. Her concern is a safety issue given the nature of the road users (including cars, dog walkers and horse riders) and the apparent increase in traffic and associated increase in the risk of an accident. This applies in particular where there is, at one point, a blind corner which results in road-users having no way of knowing who or what is approaching from the other direction on the same side of the road. Cllr. Adye feels strongly that another passing place, and a mirror so drivers can see what is coming, is essential to ensure that this is a safe road for all its users.

The ECC officer’s informative response to my approach was as follows:

- Traffic mirrors on the highway are not a measure which Essex Highways can consent to as they can create confusion when lights reflect off them.
- A passing place is something that could possibly be considered but an initial look into this indicates that the highway boundary only goes as far as the edge of the carriageway which means that land acquisition would likely be required. It is also apparent that there are ditches running alongside the carriageway meaning that engineering measures would not be straightforward and liable to be outside the financial capabilities of the Uttlesford panel.
- As a consequence of the above, any forthcoming planning applications may offer the opportunity to address this issue at the time.

I therefore asked how the matter would be progressed in practice (i.e. would it be through the parish council commenting and copying that to ECC ?) The response was that, whilst there are no imminent developments in Howe Lane, ECC officers have noted the concerns about the width of the road and will recommend measures to deal with this in the event of an application coming forward.