

Against: Cllr Mrs J Liversage
Cllr W O'Neill
Abstained: Cllr Mrs P Taylor
Not present at the previous meeting:
Cllr Mrs M O'Neill
Cllr K Twort
Cllr C Thompson

The Chairman applied her casting vote to vote for the amendment.

Subject to the amendment above, RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 6th June 2017 be accepted as a correct record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chairman.

17/108. REPORTS ON OUTSTANDING MATTERS

Report on outstanding matters noted and further updates will be made as part of the following agenda items.

In addition, Cllr W O'Neill reported that the damaged wooden posts had been reported to Ringway. Specific locations are Kettle Green Lane (1), Ash Meadow (1) and the parking area at the back of the school (2).

17/109. MEMBERS' REPORTS

(i) Community

Village Hall

Cllr W O'Neill reported that the car parking working group would be meeting soon. The ensuing discussion raised the following points:

- All residents that make use of the car park, both front and rear, should be asked to make a modest contribution to the repair and maintenance of the car park;
- The Village Hall Management Committee have raised concerns regarding the car park for many years, particularly as, not being the owner, they cannot take any enforcement action; and
- Overnight parking allows prescriptive rights to be claimed.

It was agreed that the working party (Cllrs W O'Neill and C Thompson, N Clarke and a resident) to meet and report back to the next meeting.

Pavilion

Cllr K Twort reported that EMC Contracts has been formally notified that it was awarded the Pavilion contract. Work is due to start on site next week. In response to a question, it was confirmed that the works will be completed before the Fete, with a deadline set of the 14th August.

(ii) Environment (inc Public Rights of Way)

Public Rights of Way

Cllr B Morris reported that there are a number of footpaths that are inaccessible due to the encroachment of undergrowth, particularly Footpath 39. This had been reported to Herts County Council and the Ramblers, and has now been reported to Hertfordshire Countryside Management who have stated that the contractor has been instructed to cut back.

(iii) Highways

Cllr W O'Neill reported that the situation in the hamlets continues and that there is little that the Parish Council can do. An official notice has been received of a proposed road closure of the B1004, between the junction with the High Street and Snells Corner, at some time during the next 18 months.

Cllr B Morris highlighted that there were issues with the remains of fallen trees being left on verges making it unsafe in Danebridge Lane and by Chaldeans in Kettle Green Lane. This will be reported.

(iv) Media

No matters to report.

(v) Neighbourhood Plan

In Cllr I Hunt's absence, the Chairman read the report provided.

The next public consultation will be on Sunday the 17th September in the main room of the Village Hall. An important purpose of this event is to present those housing development sites that have passed the technical evaluations. It is up to residents to state their preferences.

An equally important purpose of the consultation in September is to present the sites proposed to be listed as Open Spaces, Local Green Spaces and Priority Views. The selection of these sites has been heavily influenced by the comments received at the last consultation.

As details of the consultation are finalised, these will be announced.

(vi) Security

Cllr Mrs J Liversage reported on the latest crime statistics which remain very low in comparison to the number in East Herts.

Cllr B Morris drew attention to the increased usage of gas cylinders for getting "high" as evidenced by discarded capsules found in the village.

(vii) Other

No matters to report.

17/110. GILSTON SCOPING OPINION (PLANNING APPLICATION 3/17/1366/SCOPE)

Cllr B Morris outlined what a scoping report relates to. Following discussion, it was RESOLVED to approve, as provided by Cllr B Morris, subject to formalising presentation, the Parish Council's response as detailed in Appendix A.

17/111. STANSTED SCOPING

The Chairman explained the background to the response to the Stansted Scoping Opinion, as provided by Martin Dillon. RESOLVED to approve the draft letter as the Parish Council's response. (See Appendix B)

It was agreed to thank Martin Dillon for his continued interest and work regarding the SSE.

17/112. REPORT FROM DISTRICT COUNCILLOR

There were no reports as both Cllr I Devonshire (EHC) and Cllr G McAndrew (HCC) were not present but had sent their apologies.

17/113. RESIDENTS' COMMENTS

(i) Burial Authority volunteer

The Chairman apologised for the confusion regarding the need for a volunteer from residents to sit on the Burial Authority raised at the last meeting. Subsequent to the meeting, it was found that sufficient Cllrs were available for the Authority. The volunteer was thanked again for offering and should assistance be needed on the future, she will be contacted.

(ii) Bench at Perry Green Burial Ground

A resident was thanked for highlighting that a bench at the burial ground was unsafe.

(iii) Feedback

A resident highlighted that it would be his last meeting as he is moving out of the area. He thanked Cllrs for standing for the Parish Council but reflected that it was sad to have witnessed the bitter infighting in recent years. He suggested that Cllrs think of the residents as opposed to themselves.

17/114. MUCH HADHAM SPORTS ASSOCIATION ACCOUNTS

RESOLVED to receive the Sports Association Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2016. The Sports Association were thanked for their work.

17/115. PAROCHIAL CHARITIES ACCOUNTS (known as Much Hadham Almshouse Charity

RESOLVED to receive the Parochial Charities Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2016. Thanks were given to the Trustees for their work.

17/116. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

RESOLVED that the membership of the Parish Council Committees be as follows:

Councillor	Planning Committee	Burial Authority	Staffing Committee
W Compton	✓		
I Hunt	✓		✓
Mrs J Liversage		✓	✓
B Morris	✓		
Mrs M O'Neill		✓	
W O'Neill	✓	✓	
Mrs P Taylor		✓	✓
C Thompson	✓		
K Twort	✓	✓	

RESOLVED that the Committee Chairs will be Cllr C Thompson for the Planning Committee and Cllr Mrs P Taylor for the Burial Authority and Staffing Committee.

The Chairman also suggested that the Burial Authority meet before the Parish Council meeting in future, at 7 pm.

17/117. GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTATION

RESOLVED to approve the revised Standing Orders.

RESOLVED to defer the approval of the Protocol on the recording and filming of Council and Committee Meetings. The Clerk highlighted that some further information had come to light, in terms of the specific requirements of the Regulations, that could lead this draft policy being revised.

17/118. PLANNING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 6th June 2017 be received and the decisions taken be ratified.

17/119. PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT

(i) Payment of Accounts

Following a question regarding cheque number 777, the Clerk outlined the work that had been invoiced by Ruth Fleetwood in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Clerk also confirmed that both Ruth Fleetwood and Jacqueline Veater were not employees of the Parish Council.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that the grounds maintenance work at the Burial Grounds would be discussed at the Burial Authority meeting later this evening. The Clerk is to identify which contractor is undertaking work in Church Lane.

RESOLVED that the accounts, as shown below, be duly authorised for payment.

RESOLVED that the payment to East Herts Council, once invoice received, of £51.05 for the playground inspection be authorised for payment.

PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS - JULY 2017

Chq	Payable to	For	Amount
768	MH Landscapes Ltd	BA Churchyard maintenance Jul-Dec 2016	1,080.00
	Subject to cheque release only on receipt of amended invoice		
777	Ruth Fleetwood	Project Manager (NP)	600.00
778	HAPTC	Delegate fee	40.00
779	MH Sports Assoc	Annual support charge - net offset by SA	181.20
780	C Copper	Cut hedges & trim grass verges Much Hadham Park	210.00
781	CDA Herts	Annual membership	35.00
782	Richard Kidger	Repair oak bench - Tower Hill	480.00
783	Green Tye Mission Hall	Hall hire 6th June	27.00
784	Govresources Ltd	NP support (NP)	1,200.00
785	MH Bowling Club	Mower repair - net offset by SA	139.36
786	HAPTC	Delegate fee	40.00
Total payments			<u>4,032.56</u>

Cheques will be signed and despatched at the conclusion of the meeting.

(ii) Financial Statement

The financial statement for 2017/18 was received. There were no matters to highlight.

17/120. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

17/121. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 1st August 2017, at 7.30 pm in the Green Tye Mission Hall.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8:35 pm.

**PARISH COUNCIL SUBMISSION RE GILSTON SCOPING OPINION
PLANNING APPLICATION 3/17/1366/SCOPE**

Gilston Garden Village circa 3,000 homes, a development north of Harlow which is planned to become at least 10,000 homes.

This report is asking for response/feedback on the scope of work Places for People need to do to fulfil their obligations under the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations. It is not the assessment itself. This would need to accompany their Planning Application.

Reference is made as per paragraph numbers in the report

2.2.2 This sentence refers to “power lines to the north west of the site”. This is confusing based on the definition of the site in 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 and Figure 1. The power lines run through the site as defined in prior paragraphs.

2.3.9 This paragraph refers to ecological designations surrounding the site. It is factually correct but rather superficial and the report seems to gloss over potential impact to these sites in later chapters.

3.2.3 We object to the removal of pockets of woodland to enable new vehicular infrastructure routes. The design should be altered to accommodate these woodlands not destroy them. The demolition of perfectly good buildings at Eastwick Lodge and Over Hall Farm has not been sufficiently justified.

3.2.9 The exclusion of Hunsdon Airfield and the Stort valley from the proposed developable area is supported but there is little definition of the small scale recreation/leisure related facilities that would be allowed and this could lead to excessive development.

3.2.13 It is correct to highlight the concern over building the Eastern Stort Crossing across a historic landfill site. There needs to be much more work on the extent and cost of work to implement this idea if it is even feasible at all. The application is premature.

3.2.15 It is disappointing at this early stage a Combined Heat and Power energy solution has been ruled out.

3.2.16 It appears the drainage strategy is still subject to consultation and may not be feasible. Any application is premature

3.5.1 (see 5.5.7) Construction of homes in 2020 does not align with the East Herts District Plan which indicates the site should only come forward until at the latter end of the plan period to 2033.

5.5.1 The applicant is asking for flexibility over completion date but the application is predicted on meeting pressing housing demand. The two are incompatible.

5.5.7 (see 3.5.1) Work starting in 2019 and construction of homes in 2020 does not align with the East Herts District Plan which indicates the site should only come forward at the latter end of the plan period to 2022.

- 6.1.4 The impact Areas are too small based of the scale of development. There is no reference to impact onwards in Essex outside Harlow or in Uttlesford. Socio Economic effects of such a large development will be very far ranging and spread up and down the M11.
- 6.3.4 The current deficit in primary healthcare provision is not acknowledged
- 8.1.8 The rail capacity opinion from Greater Anglia is three years old - dated 2014
- 8.1.9 The paragraph on bus services appears to be totally incorrect.
- 8.1.11 Cycling provision on the Stort crossings is not mentioned
- 8.3.5 The extent of the traffic model in Figure 8 is too limited. The model needs to extend further back along the A414 towards Hertford and also include Church Lane from the A414 toward Hunsdon. Queuing is expected on the latter in particular.
- 12.1.5. This paragraph omits Cock Robin Lane as a key rural pedestrian route
- 12.3.3 One baseline study mentioned is 14 years old (2003). Others are more than 10 years old. More recent studies are required..
- 12.3.18 We are pleased we will get some screen planting to hide the blocks of flats!!
- 13.3.10 The impacts to the Lee Valley SPA and Ramsar have been glossed over. More detailed work is required.
- 17.1.1 Inconsistent description of power line location compared to 2.2.2
- 17.3.1 The known limited water supply is glossed over. More work required.
- 20.1.6 Further upgrades to Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works are likely beyond 2014 to accommodate housing growth! The applicant only intends to discuss the assumptions! Extensive work is required here to see if development in this location is even feasible.
- 21.3.3 The applicant has failed to consider a major aircraft crash even though they are building below the flight path into Stansted Airport.
- 21.15.3 Seven storey buildings being proposed is noted.

LETTER TO UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL ON BEHALF OF THE PARISH COUNCIL

Scoping Opinion (“SC”) relating to Stansted Airport

1. I am writing on behalf of Much Hadham Parish Council with some comments relating to the SC sent to you on 1 June 2017 by London Stansted Airport.
2. We do not agree with the assertion in London Stansted Airport's letter to you of 1 June 2017 that “no significant adverse environmental effects are predicted as a consequence of the proposed development”. We shall, however, leave it to others to comment on the issues of surface access, air quality, climate change and socio-economics and apart from some introductory comments we will concentrate on aircraft noise.
3. As a general comment we should like to emphasise that comparing the position on the assumption that the mppa and the ATMs authorised by the October 2008 planning permission have occurred (which the SC describes as the “Do Minimum” position - see for example para 4.13 of the SC) and the projected position on the assumption that the planning application has been successful (described as the “Do Something” position) is a false and unhelpful comparison. As the mppa and ATMs authorised in October 2008 have not occurred, it is impossible to state what will be the effect of their occurrence. All that you can do is to conjecture what will be the position and the conjecture may well turn out to be wrong.

The Proposed Planning Application is premature

4. We consider that the proposed planning application is premature.
5. The planning permission granted in May 2003 authorised 25 mppa and 241,000 annual ATMs, and the planning permission granted in October 2008 authorised 35 mppa and 264,000 ATMs (ignoring GAs). Each application was supported by projections for growth in the number of passengers which have turned out to be grossly overestimated; this is emphasised by the fact that total mppa has never so far reached 25 mppa. Para 2.6 of the SC has annual passenger projections showing 35 mppa being reached in 2024. The projections and the rest of para 2 rest on assertions and are not supported by any evidence, and as in the past the projections may turn out to be gross overestimates.
6. There are a number of reasons why this may occur. Stansted is predominantly a holiday airport used by UK residents going back and forth on holiday. In the near future they may have less money to spend on holidays because, first, average earnings are not keeping pace with inflation, which the latest figures show has reached 2.9%; because, secondly, sterling has fallen in value against both against the Euro and the US dollar and may well fall further; and because, thirdly, it is uncertain what will be the outcome of the Brexit negotiations, which could result in another recession. If UK residents have less money to spend on holidays, then passenger numbers at Stansted are likely to fall and certainly not to increase at the rate projected, without supporting evidence, in para 2.6 of the SC.
7. Around 80% of the flights at Stansted are operated by Ryanair. Ryanair has threatened to withdraw flights from Stansted if by the time in 2018 when Ryanair has to announce its timetable as from March 2019, agreement has not been reached in the Brexit negotiations regarding flights from the UK to and from the EU. Nobody has any idea whether such agreement will be reached.
8. The latest figures produced by Stansted Airport show totals of 24.7 mppa in the year to May 2017 and of 166,055 ATMs in the year to April 2017. There is still therefore considerable headroom before the mppa and ATMs authorised in October 2008 are reached. Would it not make sense in the

circumstances to defer a planning application until it is clear what effect the matters mentioned in paras 6 and 7 may have on passenger numbers? Furthermore, according to para 3.15 of the SC the Government's Aviation National Policy Statement is expected in 2018 and will no doubt be relevant to the future of Stansted.

Why 44.5 mppa?

9. The last two planning applications have asked for increases in passenger numbers of 10 mppa. Why is an increase of 9.5 mppa now contemplated instead of 10 mppa? The SC has not provided any explanation. Is the answer perhaps that London Stansted Airport wish to avoid the application being considered by the National Infrastructure Commission?

Aircraft Noise

10. The residents of Much Hadham are affected by noise from planes departing from Stansted using the BUZAD flight path, which are supposed to pass to the east of the village, and by those landing at Stansted, which are supposed to fly in a broad swathe to the west of the village. In both cases planes fly off track resulting in increased annoyance to the residents.

11. Para 8.2 of the SC states: "It is recognised that noise from aircraft operations in flight is considered to be amongst the most, if not the single most, significant of the environmental effects associated with airports". Having started with a statement that those living under flight paths would agree with, the SC then promises a "detailed and robust assessment" of any forecast changes in noise levels. The approach in Section 8 of the SC does not inspire confidence that this aim will be achieved. We appreciate that the list in para 8.3 is not exhaustive but it does not, for example, mention the recent survey in the journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine based on flights from Athens International Airport which adds to the evidence that aircraft noise increases the risk of heart disease and high blood pressure where noise exceeds 55 dB between 7.00 am and 11.00 pm and exceeds 45 dB at night time.

12. Para 8.13 of the SC mentions that it is proposed to carry out noise monitoring at a number of locations all of which are in Essex and none (apart from Bishop's Stortford which is not under a flight path) in East Herts. Anyone reading para 8.13, who is not aware of current flight paths, would probably assume that they do not pass over any other part of East Herts. This is not of course the case.

13. The Leq contours are not an adequate method of measuring aircraft noise. They are based on averages and therefore take periods of silence into account. Nobody complains about aircraft noise when aircraft are not overhead. It is decibels which interrupt conversation in the garden and disturb sleep at night, and it is decibels which cause annoyance and risk damage to health.

14. Para 8.18 of the SC refers to N65 and N60 which contemplate measuring noise events over 65dB between 7.00 am and 23.00 pm in summer and over 60dB between 23.00 pm and 7.00 am in summer. The monitoring should take place at lower decibel levels – we suggest at 55dB and 45dB – because Stansted is in a rural area with low ambient noise. There is no reason for also not carrying out monitoring in winter.

15. In our view noise monitoring should take place at each residential area under flight paths until planes reach a height of 7000 feet, which is the level at which the Government considers that aircraft will no longer cause annoyance. The noise monitoring should also continue for the medium term. We suggest that there should be a noise monitoring machine in Green Tye where monitoring has taken place before.

16. Current noise monitoring will produce results on the basis of the number of current flights per annum (166,055 for the year to April 2017). Calculations should then be made on the assumption both of 274,000 ATMs (including GA flights) and of 285,000 ATMs, so that UDC will be able to assess the impact of the projected increased flights on local communities. In this respect it should be noted that a 41% increase in flights at current levels is already permitted under the October 2008 planning permission.

17. Para 8.17 indicates that more modern aircraft are quieter. This is true but the difference is only between 1dB and 3dB. This is too small to be noticed by human hearing.

18. Another consideration regarding aircraft noise is the ongoing redesign of aircraft space. If the third runway at Heathrow proceeds, then there is likely to be greater pressure on the skies around Stansted. With flights from both Luton and Heathrow competing for air space a likely outcome is more concentration within flight paths and less dispersal, resulting in those residents immediately under the centre point of flight paths being overflown more regularly. The unfortunate effect of this can be seen for the residents under the existing Clacton 04 route as a result of the switch from Detling 04; this has resulted in many more complaints about aircraft noise from those under the Clacton 04 route.

19. The SC has only presented forecasts to 2029. The practice for aviation forecasts has been to use 5 yearly intervals. The Department for Transport's practice has been to use 5 yearly intervals for medium/long term forecasts and 10 yearly intervals for very long term forecasts. The Airports Commission has also used this approach. The SC does not contain any explanation for not providing forecasts beyond 2029, and we suggest that UDC should ask London Stansted Airport to provide such forecasts. All the forecasts for PATMS should include:

- (a) How many flights are forecast to be by No Frills Airlines and how many by Scheduled Airlines;
- (b) How many short haul flights and how many long haul flights;
- (c) How many flights are expected during the Night Quota Period;
- (d) What are the likely stacking arrangements and where stacking is forecast; and
- (e) How many flights are projected to use each flight path (both for landing and taking off) giving hourly breakdowns.

20. Another point is that on the basis of the tables in para 2.9 mppa on the "Do Something Scenario" will reach 35 mppa in 2023 but ATMS will only reach 246,000. The proposed application is for 285,000 ATMs. This is an increase of 39,000 flights per annum on the projected annual flights in 2023, an issue not mentioned in the SC.

21. There is no mention in para 5.2 of the possibility of consulting the Parish Councils of Parishes under flight paths. This consultation should take place.

I hope that you will find the comments in this letter helpful, but if you have any questions or would like any further information, please let me know.

Your sincerely

Mrs Penelope Taylor

Charman of Much Hadham Parish Council