

# Little Hadham Parish Council

Minutes of the eleventh meeting of the Little Hadham Parish Council (2007 – 2011 Session)  
held on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2008 at 8:43 p.m. in the Village Hall, Little Hadham.

**Present:**        **Mr M Fairchild**                    **Chairman**  
                      **Mr A Morris**                        )  
                      **Mrs C Piccolo**                       ) **Councillors**  
                      **Mr G Williamson**                   )

Mr B Evans – Clerk, and 63 members of the public.

## 11.1 Public session.

Two residents spoke of hares, badgers and great crested newts that lived in the area near the proposed gypsy and traveller sites. Another resident said that the gypsy site near Cottenham had caused a serious lowering of property prices.

A resident asked why the preservation society had not got the local newspaper involved in its campaign. Cllr Fairchild said that this was planned for the future.

A resident asked about the danger of lorries waiting in the road to enter the McVeigh Parker site. Cllr Fairchild said that EHC had admitted making a mistake by not imposing conditions in the planning consent concerning the size of lorries using the site. He said the council would raise the matter again as a road safety issue.

A resident complained about the excessive speed of motor bikes near the traffic lights and asked if ‘average speed’ detectors could be installed. Cllr Fairchild said that the local police were keen to loan speed measuring equipment to local councils. Cllr Mrs Piccolo said that few drivers obeyed the 30 M.P.H. limit near the school. A resident said that the police would ‘deal with’ drivers found to be repeatedly breaking the speed limit by councils using the speed gun.

11.2 **Absent** Cllr Skidmore [on holiday] and Cllr Purvis [family event].

11.3 **Declarations of interest.** Cllrs Fairchild and Mrs Piccolo said they had an interest in the gypsy and traveller consultation as they were members of the Little Hadham Conservation Society that opposed the sites.

11.4 **Minutes of the Parish Council** meeting held on Tuesday 1st April 2008 having been previously circulated were agreed as accurate. Proposed by Cllr Mrs Piccolo and seconded by Cllr Morris.

11.5 **Matters arising from the Council minutes.** None.

11.6 **Possible locations for gypsy and traveller sites.**

### 11.6.1 Response to EERA consultation on Planning for Gypsy and Traveller

**Accommodation.** The Chairman encouraged all residents to reply and not just rely on the Council and the Preservation Society. The more individual replies received the better. He noted that responses deemed to be offensive would be rejected. The Council had included details on how to respond in the Parish News.

The Chairman presented a draft response to the consultation [Appendix 1]. Cllr Mrs Piccolo asked if a mention could be made about local wildlife and the fact that Green Street was an historic roadway. The Chairman said that there were general comments about habitats. He proposed that the draft response be sent as the Council’s response. Agreed.

**11.6.2 Plans of the Little Hadham Conservation Society.** The Chairman said that the Society was to meet next day to agree on its response to the consultation. He thought a second formal response from the parish would be helpful.

**11.7 Stansted Airport – Council response to NATS proposed changes to flight paths and ‘stacking’ areas**

Cllr Morris said that the new ‘Buzad’ flight path over the C15 would be 1000 feet lower than at present as it would be under a flight path for Luton Airport. He wanted the path to be realigned above the Luton path. He did not agree with assertions that this was not possible. The new flight paths would increase noise over Bishop’s Stortford and several other parishes in the area. He noted that STAC had asked for the routes to be reconsidered because of noise. The new routes, combined with modern technology meant that aircraft would stay in the centre of the flight paths for longer.

The Chairman outlined the proposed response from the Council [Appendix 2] and proposed that it be sent as the Council’s formal response. Agreed.

From the floor a resident asked if the response mentioned the effect of pollution on residents and crops. Cllr Morris said that longer flight paths would mean more fuel being burnt.

**11.8 Road works.**

**11.8.1** Cllr Morris noted that the major signage improvements near the school were being installed.

**11.8.2 Traffic calming for the road from Cradle End via Bury Green, Ford Hill, Chapel Lane and Westland Green to Wellpond Green.** Cllr Morris read a reply from Herts Highways to a letter from the Council asking about details of the investigation. Herts Highways had said that the investigation was into peak time control of traffic turning into Cradle End. There was no mention of Millfield Lane. Chapel Lane and Westland Green were not to be included. The Chairman asked the Clerk to write to Herts Highways to confirm that Millfield Lane was included.

**11.8.3 Proposed changes to the bypass route.** Cllr Morris said that the western end of the bypass had been moved 650m closer to the traffic lights. This would enable flood prevention works on the Albury tributary flowing into the River Ash as well as taking less farmland and reducing disturbance at Tile Kiln Farm. The eastern end of the bypass had been moved to a new roundabout near the Cradle End turning and the link to the small roundabout near Tesco had been removed. The bypass would be a mile and a half shorter. Cllr Morris said that on balance he preferred the new route.

**11.9 Village Hall playground.** Cllr Williamson mentioned the matched funding grant from EHC. However he thought there was no certainty that local residents would use some of the suggested changes such as improvements to the football pitch. Cllr Williamson said he and Cllr Purvis were considering proposing that the Council spend the money on erecting new picnic tables and a new gate onto the C15. The basketball stand would be moved to the north and rotated so that people were not shooting into the sun. There were plans to buy portable five-a-side football goals that could be used for a football tournament organised by the Parish Plan Group. Cllr Williamson said that he and Cllr Purvis would present detailed costings and quotations at the next meeting.

- 11.10 Repairs to the war memorial surround wall.** The Chairman said that he had spoken to a Herts Highways engineer who thought that an expensive traffic management system would be necessary during any repair. A local contractor was finding out the costs.
- 11.11 Parish Plan Group.** The Chairman said that he was disappointed that no new people had volunteered to help the group.  
The next event would be a Barn Dance on 31<sup>st</sup> May in the Village Hall.
- 11.12 Chairman's report.**
- 11.12.1 Council vacancy.** The Chairman said that there had been three applications for the vacancy. The three local people would meet councillors on 25<sup>th</sup> May after which the councillors would decide who should be co-opted. The result would be announced at the June meeting.
- 11.12.2 Parish Assembly Thursday 17th April 2008.**  
The Chairman said that he thought the Assembly a great success – about 100 residents had attended. He thought the Question Time format had worked well and the performance by the Young Ones was a great success.
- 11.12.3 EHC Rural Parish Conference. 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Thursday 29th May 2008 at Puckeridge.** The Chairman said that no councillor was able to attend but he would make sure that any presentations would be circulated to councillors.
- 11.12.4** The Chairman reported that lead had been stolen from the church roof and asked anyone with any information to contact the police.
- 11.12.5 East and North Hertfordshire NHS Trust. Consultation on Foundation Trust Application.** Postponed to the June meeting.
- 11.12.6 Consultation on removal of the payphone from Standon Road near the traffic lights.** Cllr Morris said that the need for payphones had reduced because of mobile phones. However a show of hands in the hall showed a clear majority for retaining the phone. The Chairman proposed the Council should object. Agreed.
- 11.13 Democratic 10 minutes**  
The meeting closed at 9:51 p.m.  
A resident complained that the changes to the bypass had been made without consultation – probably to save money. The Chairman asked the Clerk to write to HCC insisting that the Council be consulted before any further significant changes were made to the bypass plans.  
A resident said that he thought rat run traffic could be controlled by preventing traffic from entering Acreman Street from Bury Green at peak times.  
A resident asked if slip roads from the bypass onto the Albury Road were in the new plans. Cllr Morris said they were not.  
A resident thought that a home near the new eastern roundabout on the bypass would be badly affected by the route changes.  
A visiting Standon councillor asked if the parish should get together with Widford and other surrounding parishes to fight the gypsy and traveller sites. The Chairman said that there would be some areas of general agreement. However if the number of sites remained unchanged there would be some 'nimby' issues. A resident noted that other parishes had done little about the matter so far.  
A resident complained about the sales board erected by Romehold at Bury Green. He thought that it was too large and he thought it needed planning permission.  
**The meeting reopened at 9:57 p.m.**

**11.14 Clerk's Report****11.14.1 Financial statement****Period ending 6<sup>th</sup> May 2008**

Barclay's Bank C/Acc		£11,248.00
High Rate BP Acc		£5.12
BP Acc		£168.79
Petty cash		£21.49
	<b>Total</b>	<b>£11,443.40</b>

**Included above****Received**

EHC - half precept	[Received 24/4/08]	£5,943.00
--------------------	--------------------	-----------

**Paid**

HAPTC - annual subscription	[Paid 12/4/08]	£499.41
-----------------------------	----------------	---------

Mower Services - Hedge cutting	[Paid 12/4/08]	£122.21
--------------------------------	----------------	---------

**To be approved for payment**

Mr B Evans	P/Clerk - (Apr)	£289.69	
	Exp (Apr)	£23.30	£312.99
Mrs K Green	Grass bins (Apr)		£43.11
Miss A Windmill	Litter picking (Apr)		£93.65
Mower Services	Grass cutting		£275.03
Little Hadham Village Hall	Hall rental		£31.24

<b>Total payments</b>	<b>£756.02</b>
-----------------------	----------------

**Total in all accounts and petty cash after payment of this month's bills £10,687.38**

**11.14.2** Resolved to accept payment of accounts. Agreed.

**11.14.3** Resolved to accept the accuracy of the financial statement. Proposed Cllr Mrs Piccolo, seconded Cllr Morris. Agreed.

**11.14.4 Council insurers for the year 2008/09.** Cllr Williamson reported an email from Cllr Purvis in which he considered two quotations for the Council insurance for the year starting from 1st June 2008 from Norwich Union and Allianz. There were relatively minor differences including a larger excess for Norwich. However the premium for Norwich was significantly lower and he proposed that the Council accept the Norwich quotation. Agreed.

**11.15 Planning matters.** The transactions of the Planning Committee were noted.

**11.16 Correspondence.** The Clerk distributed items of correspondence to relevant councillors

HAPTC Newsletters	<b>MF/AM</b>
Three Valleys Water Consultation on water management	<b>AM</b>
NALC LCR magazine	<b>MF</b>
CPRE Fieldwork magazine	<b>CP</b>
Clerks & Council Direct magazine	<b>MF</b>
HALH Herts Past and Present magazine	<b>CP</b>
CDA for Herts newsletter	<b>MF</b>

**11.17 Any other business.** None.

**11.18 Date of the next meeting Tuesday 3rd June 2008.**

**11.19 The Chairman closed the meeting to the Public and the Press at 10:05 p.m.**

## Appendix 1

### Regional Spatial Strategy Single Issue Review: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the East of England RESPONSE FORM

- If possible, please submit your response using the online form at [www.goeast.gov.uk](http://www.goeast.gov.uk)
- If you wish to use this form instead, and run out of space, please continue on a separate sheet making it clear which question you are referring to. Forms should be sent by email to Barbara Bay, Panel Secretary at this email address: [greview@goeast.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:greview@goeast.gsi.gov.uk). Alternatively, by post to:

Barbara Bay  
Panel Secretary  
Planning Inspectorate  
4/02 Kite Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN

Please return this form by 5.00 pm on 16 May 2008

Comments submitted by/on behalf of:	
* Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss etc.):	Mr
* First name/Initial(s):	Bev
* Surname:	Evans
Organisation (if applicable):	Clerk to: Little Hadham Parish Council
Address: * Line 1:	Pryersfield, New Road
Line 2:	Little Hadham
Line 3:	Ware, Herts
* Post code:	SG11 2AW
E-mail:	<a href="mailto:clerklittlehadham@homecall.co.uk">clerklittlehadham@homecall.co.uk</a>
Telephone number:	01279 842803

\* - indicates mandatory field

Agent Details (if applicable):	
* Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss etc.)	
* First name/Initial(s):	
* Surname:	
Organisation:	
Address: * Line 1:	
Line 2:	
Line 3:	
* Post code:	
E-mail:	
Telephone number:	

\* - indicates mandatory field

#### IMPORTANT NOTES

- All responses will be publicly available and cannot be treated as confidential.
- Your address details will not be displayed online but may be made available to members of the public who request to see copies of representations.
- Your comments will be presented online along with your name. GO-East may also produce summarised versions of comments.
- Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers are recognised as distinct racial groups under the Race Relations Act 1976. We will not accept comments containing inappropriate or potentially offensive language.



**Q1. Comments relating to proposed new Policy H4 (including the pitch numbers in the table) and supporting text (paragraphs 5.14 to 5.20)**

Support   
 Object   
 Observation

Little Hadham Parish Council is of the view that Little Hadham fails to meet key sustainability criteria as set out in Q2.

The proposal to 'broaden choice' by artificial pitch distribution is likely to stimulate demand where none existed before.

A site in Little Hadham would fail the test that 'sensitive policies are developed at local level', especially over issues such as the threat of compulsory purchase.

It would also defeat the aim to 'achieve levels of provision ... in respect of major developments' since none exist in the village.

Recognising that this consultation is focused on number of pitches and not locations, publication of the Scott Wilson report, commissioned by six local authorities, which identified two potential sites in Little Hadham, has tended to pre-empt the consultation process.

**Q2. Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal?**

Support   
 Object   
 Observation

Little Hadham would fail five important tests: **prosperity** and **economic growth** as it is in a area of low unemployment; **attractiveness to travellers** as Little Hadham is not a traditional location for gypsies and travellers – even for illegal sites; **visual amenity** and impact on the landscape as a site would tend to disfigure the countryside, particularly either site indicated in the Scott Wilson report as potential locations, which would be a prominent feature in the 'green buffer' between Little Hadham and Bishop's Stortford outside the ring road; **sustainable land use** as any site in Little Hadham would tend to be agricultural in nature, and in the case of the two potential sites indicated in the Scott Wilson report would eliminate productive farm land and undermine the agricultural viability of adjoining land; **cut waste** since the likelihood is that a gypsy and traveller site would create additional waste.

We consider that the creation of 'rural exception sites' for gypsies and travellers and alterations to Green Belt boundaries would be a dangerous and unnecessary erosion of the countryside. Such a policy would also be likely to threaten flora and fauna and natural habitats of animals, some of them protected species.

There is a high risk that Policy H4 could be superseded by further revisions to the East of England Plan, making decisions at this time unsustainable in the future.

The possibility of a gypsy and traveller site in Little Hadham has already had a negative impact on the housing market and on local businesses, threatening long-term sustainability of the settled community.

Existing services including education and medical facilities could not sustain

additional demand from a gypsy and traveller community.

**Q3. Any other issues – please enter any general comments relating to the Single Issue Review**

Support

Object

Observation

A gypsy and traveller site requiring access to the A120 would increase congestion and the risk of more accidents on one of the most dangerous main roads in the county. The junction of the A120 and Millfield Lane, indicated in the Scott Wilson report as a potential site, is on the blind brow of a hill and close to the village school where there are already serious road safety issues.

The large number of small settled communities (eight different hamlets) distributed across the parish, means that wherever a site were located, it would deprive homeowners of their right to privacy. In the case of the two potential sites indicated in the Scott Wilson report, the privacy of one of the farms where a site is indicated, as well as the privacy of homes in Millfield Lane, Green Street, Cradle End and Bury Green, would be destroyed.

Pre-emptive publication of the Scott Wilson report has created anxiety in the community over the possibility of an increase in crime and a blight on property values. Anxiety and blight will worsen during a lengthy consultation period.

The historic nature of Little Hadham and the potential impact on its built environment, including listed buildings such as Hadham Hall should not be ignored (as appears to be the case with the Scott Wilson report).

Thank you for your interest in the Single Issue Review.



## Appendix 2

This letter was agreed at the Council meeting on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2008.

Little Hadham Parish Council would welcome any measures to alleviate noise and pollution from aircraft. However, on a 'winners and losers' basis, Little Hadham would be a loser under NATS' proposals.

Little Hadham, is already overflown by aircraft from 19 different flight paths and would be worse off overall under the new plans due to several factors:

- no relief from the volume or height of aircraft on the Buzad flight path (busiest Stansted NPR)
- likelihood of more concentrated noise from Stansted westerly departures because aircraft will fly closer to the NPR centre line
- new incursions into Little Hadham air space from Luton easterly and westerly departures
- additional noise 'spilling over' from the general increase in air traffic above nearby Bishop's Stortford including aircraft re-directed over the town from Luton, London City and Northolt. This would appear to contradict the aim of avoiding towns
- the likelihood that the tight turn around Bishop's Stortford and the climb to 4,000ft would add to the noise 'backwash'
- lowering of the average height of planes on the Buzad route due to new Luton flight path, with the associated increase in noise
- the continued presence of Luton traffic above Little Hadham that prevents Stansted departures from gaining height faster

### General comments

As a consequence of opposition to airport expansion that is not sustainable economically and environmentally, the parish council is opposed to changes designed to accommodate expansion in air traffic

The changes will introduce noise and pollution from air traffic in rural areas in East Anglia that previously enjoyed tranquillity

In rural areas already overflown, such as Little Hadham, any increase in noise will be felt disproportionately because of the low ambient noise levels between flights

The effect of noise is under-stated because NATS defines noise impact by the number of people overflown rather than by the noise they actually experience

Increased route mileage arising from these proposals means that increased fuel-burn, emissions and noise has been subordinated to NATS' main objective of accommodating more flights and reducing delays for airlines

The consultation process is complex to the point of being overwhelming for lay respondents

There are several shortcomings including:

- the omission of unchanged flight paths, making it difficult to gauge the overall and cumulative effect of the flight paths that have changed
- no indication of options considered (for example, whether putting holding areas over the sea was looked at)
- absence of methodology, eg for calculating emissions

- no allowance for the impact if expansion is allowed at either Stansted or Heathrow – or an opportunity to comment on such expansion – making the assumption of 3.5% annual growth to 2014 meaningless

The marginal change in the noise footprint is meaningless since the Leq average noise measurement is discredited and complaints currently come from a radius of up to 60 miles from Stansted.

No discussion has been included around previously published statements by NATS and the CAA that the technology does not exist to cope with the volume of air traffic predicted by government, which raises issues of safety.

### **Recommendations**

At its meeting on May 6 2008 the council agreed the following recommendations:

1. That NATS re-examines flight paths for Stansted departures with a view to relieving current weight of traffic overflying Little Hadham, especially early morning and at night
2. That it avoids adding to that volume by re-thinking the proposal to divert Luton easterly departures over Little Hadham
3. That it considers raising the height of Luton departure flight paths to enable Stansted departures to gain height more quickly
4. That it considers raising the height of the Buzad route to more than 6,000ft over Little Hadham (this is after nine miles flying). Currently, aircraft achieve 4,000ft over Hatfield Heath after just six miles of flying, as shown on the Webtrack system on the BAA Stansted website
5. That NATS provides reassurance that the proposed greatly increased total volume of traffic over Bishop's Stortford would not add to the noise that would be felt in Little Hadham
6. That NATS provides reassurance that despite previous comments, safety has not been compromised by submitting proposals that take no account of expansion that may be approved for Stansted's existing runway, a second runway, or planned expansion at Heathrow