

# Little Hadham Parish Council

Minutes of the fourteenth meeting of the Little Hadham Parish Council (2007 – 2011 Session)  
held on Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2008 at 8:40 p.m. in the Village Hall, Little Hadham.

<b>Present:</b>	<b>Mr M Fairchild</b>	<b>Chairman</b>
	<b>Mr A Morris</b>	)
	<b>Mrs C Piccolo</b>	)
	<b>Mr J Purvis</b>	) <b>Councillors</b>
	<b>Mr T Skidmore</b>	)
	<b>Mrs M Wilkinson</b>	)
	<b>Mr G Williamson</b>	)

Mr B Evans – Clerk, and 8 members of the public.

## 14.1 Public session.

A resident asked if the Council had any democratic say over changes to the bypass. The Chairman said the matter would be discussed later in the meeting.

## 14.2 Absent None.

## 14.3 Declarations of interest. None.

**14.4 Minutes of the Parish Council** meeting held on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2008 having been previously circulated were agreed as accurate. Proposed by Cllr Purvis and seconded by Cllr Mrs Piccolo.

## 14.5 Matters arising from the Council minutes.

**14.5.1 Traffic speed indicator.** Cllr Mrs Wilkinson said that she would enquire when the PCSO expected to check on traffic speed through the parish. Cllr Mrs Piccolo proposed that she should tell residents who asked about the mobile speed indicator equipment that the Council was not in favour of its use. Agreed.

**14.5.2 Litter bin at the Ford.** The Chairman said that EHC had agreed to move the bin to replace the damaged bin near the bus shelter on the C15. He asked the Clerk to resend the letter showing possible sites for extra bins.

## 14.6 Possible locations for gypsy and traveller sites.

The Chairman outlined a draft written submission to the public enquiry into the provision of sites in the East of England [enclosed]. The Council had asked to speak at the enquiry but had been refused. Graham Farrant from the parish would be speaking on his own behalf and would also give the views of the Little Hadham Conservation Society, which was authorised at the parish assembly to speak on behalf of the village. Cllr Mrs Wilkinson asked what evidence there was that there was little local demand for sites from the travelling community. The Chairman said that there was little historic evidence and there were few local incidents of illegal sites. He noted that the enquiry could hear evidence about the Scott Wilson Report but not about specific sites. The Chairman proposed that the draft be sent as the formal Council submission. Agreed.

## 14.7 Road works.

**14.7.1** Cllr Morris reported that new 30MPH signs had been installed in Chapel Lane though the anomalous signs had still to be removed. Cllr Mrs Wilkinson spoke of an overgrown hedge on the C15 that obstructed the view for traffic. Cllr Williamson said that he would ask the owners to cut the hedge.

**14.7.2 Traffic calming for the road from Cradle End via Bury Green, Ford Hill, Chapel Lane and Westland Green to Wellpond Green.** Cllr Morris said it had been too late to include as part of a s106 agreement to the planning application for the data centre at Bury Green, provision of funding that might have made it possible to carry out the feasibility study into rat running. He would try to get an agreement as a condition for any other application for the site.

**14.7.3 Proposed changes to the bypass route.** The Chairman read a draft paper describing the Council's position on the changes to the bypass route [enclosed]. He also distributed plans of the proposed new routes. The Chairman proposed that the Council accept the draft as the official Council policy. Agreed. The Chairman asked the Clerk to send a copy of the document to Mr Jordan who had raised the matter at the previous meeting.

**14.7.4 Rutting to the edge of Chapel Lane.** Cllr Purvis said that he would report ruts in the Chapel Lane roadway and ruts to the edge of the road to Herts Highways. Cllr Morris said that he would make enquiries about extending the weight restrictions on the road past the Kick and Dicky pub to include Westland Green.

**14.7.5 Vehicles parked on the C15.** The Chairman said that residents on the C15 near to Shellands had parked a number of commercial vans outside their properties. These made it difficult for cars to get by and seriously restricted the view of people joining the road from their drives. The Council would investigate the problem and report back at the next meeting.

#### **14.8 Works in the village hall playground.**

**14.8.1** The Chairman said that the new five-a-side goals had been used for the football event organised for young people. He said that the new playground notice board was ready to be installed. The new village hall sign was still awaited. The Clerk said that the playground hedges were due to be cut within the next two weeks. The Chairman and Cllr Williamson agreed to investigate how the hedges might be kept trimmed between the annual cuts.

**14.8.2** The Clerk explained that EHC would only allow the items listed in the original application to qualify for a 50% grant. He presented the revised costings to the Council [enclosed]. The Chairman proposed that the Council accept the new costings. Agreed.

**14.9 Repairs to the war memorial surround wall.** The Chairman said a traffic management scheme, to be put in place while any work was done, would cost about £1,500. Cllr Skidmore agreed to talk to EHC officers to see if there were any available grants. Cllr Mrs Piccolo proposed that the war memorial should become the next Council priority. Agreed.

#### **14.10 Stansted Airport.**

##### **14.10.1 Response to consultation on expansion including a second runway.**

The Chairman outlined a draft objection to the BAA application for expansion of the airport including a second runway [enclosed]. He proposed that the draft be sent as the formal Council response. Agreed.

**14.10.2 NATs proposed changes to flight paths.** Cllr Morris said that local interest had been concentrated on trying to divert the proposed flight paths away from Bishop's Stortford. Few seem to have noticed that the flight path over Little Hadham was planned to be lowered from 4,400 ft to 3,000 ft to allow for a relocated flight path for Luton. Cllr Morris said that he wanted to involve local councils and politicians in

objecting to these plans. The Chairman said that he would consult with SSE experts. Cllr Morris agreed to contact Cllr Bayes and would try to talk to Mr Oliver Heald MP at one of his surgeries to gauge support for an objection to the proposed lower heights.

- 14.11 Parish Plan Group.** The Chairman reported on a successful football event held at the village hall playground.
- 14.12 Post office consultation on closure of Post Offices.** Cllr Skidmore reported that the parish post office had not been chosen for closure.
- 14.13 Chairman's report.**
- 14.13.1 The death of former councillor Mr Tom Feather.** The Chairman proposed that a donation of £50 should be made to the Alzheimer's Society in memory of Tom Feather's contribution to the Council and the parish. Agreed.
- 14.13.2 The death of Miss Caroline Johnstone.** The Council agreed to a donation of £50 to CRY - Cardiac Risk in the Young - in memory of Caroline Johnstone who had died recently.
- 14.13.3 East of England Regional Plan consultation on draft Project Plan.** The Chairman said he was consulting with Cllrs Bayes and Tindall as to whether there were any substantive alterations that required comment. He understood that HCC was legally challenging the report.
- 14.13.4 Future status of doctor's surgery.** Cllr Skidmore said that there was no risk to the local health surgery and pharmacy. Only one 'polyclinic' was planned for East Herts and this would be in Welwyn Garden City. Cllr Skidmore said that the Minor Injuries Unit at the Herts and Essex Hospital already offered many of the facilities of a polyclinic for local residents.
- 14.13.5 Department of Health Change4Life initiative.** Cllr Mrs Piccolo said that she would investigate the initiative.
- 14.13.6 EHC Community Safety Partnership workshop. 7:00 p.m. Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> September 2008 The Priory, Ware.** The Chairman said the topics did not seem particularly appropriate to Little Hadham and it was agreed that the council would not be represented.
- 14.13.7 Three Valleys Water consultation on Water Resources Management Plan.** Cllr Mrs Wilkinson presented a draft response [enclosed] and proposed the draft be sent as the official Council response. Agreed.
- 14.14 Democratic 10 minutes**
- The meeting closed at 10:05 p.m.**
- A resident said that the bypass had been moved closer to Lime Kiln Cottage on the Albury Road [from 255m away to 145m] without consultation with the owner. There was some considerable discussion about the merits of the alternative routes for the eastern end of the bypass.
- The Chairman said that he would discuss Lime Kiln Cottage, together with issues concerning the eastern end of the bypass, with Cllr Bayes.
- The meeting reopened at 10:08 p.m.**

**14.15 Clerk's Report****14.15.1 Financial statement****Period ending 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2008**

Barclay's Bank C/Acc	£6,251.89
High Rate BP Acc	£5.15
BP Acc	£169.22
Petty cash	-£10.80
<b>Total</b>	<b>£6,415.46</b>

**Include above****Received**

EHC - Litter picker salary [received 7/7/08]	£1,170.37
EHC - Community Grant [received 17/7/08]	£1,449.18

**Paid**

Mynott & Son - works in Village Hall playground [paid 25/7/08]	£1,605.14
Boyd Sport & Play Ltd - goals and nets [paid 4/8/08]	£375.41
Mower Services - Grass cutting July [paid 4/8/08]	£366.61
Neptune Outdoor Furniture - picnic tables & litter bin [paid 4/8/08]	£1,437.02

**To be approved for payment**

Mr B Evans	P/Clerk - (August)	£289.69	
	Exp (August)	£25.04	
	Float	£50.00	£364.73
Mrs K Green	Grass & bins (August)		£43.11
Miss A Windmill	Litter picking (August)		£113.05
CRY(Cardiac Risk in the Young) in memory of Caroline Johnson			£50.00
Alzheimer's Society in memory of Mr Tom Feather			£50.00
Little Hadham Village Hall - rent April to June			£68.75
Mr Mike Fairchild - gift to Mike Smith for internal audit		£9.92	
	Posters for Out2Play	£9.60	£19.52
Mrs E Booth	PO cleaning		£30.00
Green Barnes Ltd - noticeboard handle			£15.69
Mower Services - Grass cutting August			£244.40
Little Hadham PCC - 2007/08 Parish News contribution			£90.00
	<b>Total payments</b>		<b>£1,089.25</b>

**Total in all accounts and petty cash after payment of this month's bills £5,376.21**

**14.15.2** Proposed to accept payment of accounts. Agreed.

**14.15.3** Proposed to accept the accuracy of the financial statement. Proposed Cllr Mrs Piccolo, seconded Cllr Purvis. Agreed.

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

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

HAPTC Newsletters	<b>MF/AM</b>
CPRE Herts Yearbook	<b>CP</b>
CPRE Fieldwork newsletter	<b>MF</b>
Clerks & Council Direct magazine	<b>MF</b>
NALC LRC magazine	<b>MF</b>
SSE Newsletter	<b>MF</b>
CDA for Herts Newsletter	<b>MF</b>

**14.18 Any other business.** None

**14.19 Date of the next meeting Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> October 2008.**

**14.20 The Chairman closed the meeting to the Public and the Press at 10:13 p.m.**

## **Appendix 1 – Submission to the enquiry into gypsy and travelers sites in the eastern Region**

### **Matter 1B Regional Distribution and Guidance for Local Development**

#### **1.7**

**i)** The Gypsy Council has stated that there are some 40 sites in various locations that have been closed because they were in places where gypsies and travellers did not want to live. This underlines the absolute necessity to ensure that sites are located where there is need. Little Hadham fails this test because it is not a traditional location for gypsies and travellers – either for permanent sites or illegal ones – and there is no evidence to suggest this situation might change. A site in the ‘wrong’ location could easily be abandoned by gypsies and travellers because of the ease with which they could move on, or it could become an unauthorised transit site.

There is no evidence of employment opportunities for gypsies and travellers. Contraction of farming and mechanisation has reduced employment opportunities in agriculture; there are few businesses of any size in Little Hadham; and the area is generally one of low unemployment.

**ii)** The Parish Council considers Green Belt to be a precious resource that should be preserved at all costs. ‘Rural exception sites’ for gypsies and travellers set a dangerous precedent and endanger wildlife habitats that require Green Belt in order to be sustainable. While accepting that this stage of the consultation is not about particular sites, two potential sites indicated in the Scott Wilson report were in a green ‘buffer zone’ between the village of Little Hadham and the town of Bishop’s Stortford. This land is a vital rural separation zone for the benefit of all.

**iii)** Little Hadham lies in the valley of the river Ash, which is prone to flash flooding. All measures by the Environment Agency and the Highways agency to eradicate the problem have failed. Any additional settlement that might add to the cause of flooding or suffer from the consequences should be avoided. Given that the concreting over of gardens and other natural means of drainage is proven to be one of the major causes of flooding in the UK, concrete hard standing or similar structures would exacerbate flood risk. The likelihood that additional housing for settled communities would add to the risk of flooding in Little Hadham is minimal because of planning restrictions on further development.

**iv)** Little Hadham is made up of eight hamlets, each of which enjoys strong community cohesion. A gypsy and traveller site anywhere in Little Hadham would inevitably impinge on the privacy and way of life of the settled community. References to the need for a ‘buffer’ between a gypsy and traveller site and the surrounding area indicates a reluctance to integrate.

**v)** Little Hadham fails the test of making provision for a site within a major development opportunity. None are envisaged or permitted under planning rules.

vi) The proposal to broaden choice by attempting to create demand where none exists is ill-conceived and could result in the unfortunate consequences in i) above. The Single Issue Review proposed revision, “living in or resorting to their area” should not be removed.

**1.8** There is no logic behind designating 15 pitches as the minimum growth level. This implies an ‘even’ distribution of extra sites regardless of need. The result could be an under-supply in districts with an established gypsy and traveller population, and an artificial imposition in districts where there is no evidence of need. In the case of East Herts, an additional 15 sites would represent a percentage increase in allocation of more than 200%.

**1.9** In the view of the Parish Council, there are no sites in Little Hadham that would be suitable for a gypsy and traveller site, in particular because they would occupy or encroach on agricultural land. The two indicative sites in the Scott Wilson report, for example, are on productive farmland. A gypsy and traveller site would tend to undermine the agricultural viability of adjoining land.

**1.10** The Parish Council supports Policy H4 in promoting pitch provision as part of new major development and that this should be steered by district councils through Local Development Documents. In other words, number of pitches should be a local decision based on local knowledge and not one that is imposed.

## **Matter 2B Hertfordshire**

**2.4** The allocation for Hertfordshire is not appropriate. Research by district councils including East Herts Council indicated a lower level of allocation than proposed by EERA. For reasons stated under **1.8** (above), the justification for suggesting an allocation of 15 sites is to support an attempt to create artificially an ‘even’ spread across the region. The ‘evidence of local and regional needs’ shows that a maximum of five sites could be justified.

**2.5** Balance between districts based on need and capacity is covered in **2.4** (above). On revisions to Green Belt, Little Hadham Parish Council would vigorously defend any erosion of Green Belt in its parish. Such land is protected from development under existing planning regulations. We see no case for creating an exception with regard to a permanent site for gypsies and travellers.

**2.6** A transit site would create particular problems in Little Hadham. The only artery through the village is the A120, which is a notoriously congested and dangerous main road. Any additional vehicular traffic requiring regular access to the A120 would exacerbate an already serious situation.

### Appendix 3 Proposed changes to the bypass route

Following discussion at the July meeting about changes to the route of the proposed bypass, the parish council has examined minutes of HCC Highways and Transportation Panel, email correspondence between Mr John Jordan of Spindle Hill, Standon Road and Cty Cllr Mary Bayes, spoken to the head of transport programmes at HCC and to Cty Cllr Bayes, a member of the Highways and Transport Panel.

1. In September 2007, HCC Cabinet approved Option 5, the longer northern route, which was the choice of the majority of residents who responded to the public consultation. Cabinet asked for further investigation into the design of the route with regard to minimising the impact on local farms, on Standon and the environment, and to determine the alignment at each end of the route (the tie-ins). Re-examination of the tie-ins was at least partly due to concern by residents of Albury End (western tie-in) that the road would spoil the view, and from the owner of Hadham Lodge (eastern tie-in) over impact on his property.
2. Cabinet subsequently approved an alternative 'alignment', which moved the western roundabout some 650m closer to the Little Hadham lights and two alternative realignments at the eastern end, one of which allows the bypass to be moved further south from Hadham Lodge. The overall effect is to shorten the bypass and move the tie-ins further away from the Bishop's Stortford northern bypass roundabout and the Albury End junction. One result is more difficult access for landowners at Albury End including the owner of Tilekiln Farm.
3. Cabinet also approved 'the continuation of communication with Little Hadham Parish Council and affected landowners'. However, the Parish Council was not consulted on the changes, a fact which the Highways Panel acknowledges and for which Cty Cr Bayes has apologised. This was put down to an oversight.
4. In statements in the public forum at the July Parish Council meeting and in correspondence, Mr Jordan criticised the 'covert manner' in which the changes were approved; claimed that fewer landowners were consulted than HCC states; and called for the original route to be reinstated. Mr Jordan has been assured that his objections have been forwarded to relevant HCC officers.
5. Cty Cllr Bayes confirms that all landowners physically affected by the new route were consulted and she attended many of the meetings.
6. A further public consultation on the revised route would not have been affordable. Cty Cllr Bayes says it is important that while local opinion needs to be taken into account, it is also vital not to lose momentum of the project.
7. Funding: the bypass is dependent on funding from the Government, EERA and from BAA. HCC is preparing a business case to secure funding from the DfT that will be submitted in 2009. Detailed design won't start until the scheme gets government support ('programme entry' status). EERA's budget won't be known until December. No commitments have been given by any body at this stage. HCC has stressed that the bypass should not be dependent on Stansted expansion but that if expansion is approved it would strengthen the case for a bypass.

8. The next stage is land surveys, which will start shortly.
9. While it is unlikely that the decision to approve the shortened route with its revised tie-ins could be overturned, there will be further consultations at the design stage, at the planning application stage and if the scheme is 'called in' for a public inquiry. Any of these could result in amendments but probably not to the fundamental design. Compensation could be paid to landowners, or HCC could secure compulsory purchase orders.
10. HCC is considering a number of comments and suggestions from landowners including a new access road linking the bypass to the Albury Road north of the traffic lights to obviate the need for traffic heading for the Pelhams to go via the centre of the village.
11. The revised route retains the potential to incorporate a flood alleviation scheme for the River Ash.
12. Cty Cr Bayes will supply maps showing the amended route.

Summary:

- While regretting that it was not consulted over the changes due to an oversight, the Parish Council is satisfied that landowners directly affected were spoken to (their comments/suggestions are minuted for public scrutiny).
- Accepting that the revised route varies from the original Option 5 in some important respects, the proviso that further study should be carried out was included in the Cabinet's original decision. We are satisfied that the changes were made in the interests of landowners at both tie-ins and to minimise landtake, not to save money
- We have sought – and received – an assurance from HCC and Cty Cllr Bayes that the Parish Council will be fully consulted in future
- We do not consider it necessary to ask Cabinet to reverse its decision in favour of the amended scheme
- However, we recommend that Cllrs Morris and Williamson make a detailed study of the revised route, including maps to be provided by Cty Cllr Bayes, to fully understand the implications of the new tie-ins so the Parish Council can make informed input at future consultation stages.



### Appendix 3 Costings of works to the Village Hall Playground

		Ex VAT	VAT	Inc VAT		Qualify for grant
2 Litter bins	Earth Anchors	£484.00	£84.70	£568.70	Paid	No
Gates and fencing	Howe Fencing	£530.00	£92.75	£622.75	Paid	Yes
Hedge lowering	George Folly	£320.00	£0.00	£320.00	Paid	Yes
Gate fixing sundries	Howe Fencing	£28.77	£5.03	£33.80	Paid	Yes
Remove old goals	Mynott & Son	£50.00	£8.75	£58.75	Paid	No
VH sign and gateposts	LHVHMC	£659.16	£0.00	£659.16	Paid	Yes
Re-install basketball frame	Mynott & Son	£620.00	£108.50	£728.50	Paid	Yes
Picnic tables x 2 + fix kit	Neptune Furn.	£1,002.00	£175.35	£1,177.35	Paid	No
Litter bin	Neptune Furn.	£187.00	£32.73	£219.73	Paid	No
Install picnic tables	Mynott & Son	£230.00	£40.25	£270.25	Paid	No
5-aside goals, nets, anchors	Sports Equip	£319.50	£55.91	£375.41	Paid	Yes
Supp&install disabled gate	Mynott & Son	£696.08	£121.81	£817.89	Paid	Yes
Noticeboard, Biffa/EHC logos	Greenbarnes	£1,155.01	£202.13	£1,357.14	Invoiced	Yes
Install noticeb'd/VH sign/bin	Mynott & Sons	£300.00	£52.50	£352.50	Invoiced	Yes
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>£6,581.52</b>	<b>£980.41</b>	<b>£7,561.93</b>		
	<b>Available for grant</b>	<b>£4,628.52</b>				
<b>Funding</b>						
Final Biffaward payment	£690.27	Received				
EHC Community Capital Grant	£2,314.26	Half of cost to max of £4,302				
To be paid by Village Hall	£659.16					
To be paid from Council funds	£2,917.83					
<b>Total</b>	<b>£6,581.52</b>					
Council funds available	£4,500.00					
To pay for the playground	£2,917.83					
<b>Council funds for war memorial</b>	<b>£1,582.17</b>					

## **Appendix 4 Response to BAA application for expansion including a second runway.**

Dear Sirs

### **Re. BAA's application for a second runway at Stansted**

The following statement opposing BAA's planning applications for a second runway at Stansted Airport was approved by the Council at its meeting on 2 September 2008. Please bring our comments to the attention of the Inspector overseeing the public inquiry. Our statement reflects support for the stance that UDC has taken in opposing a second runway.

Before dealing with the specific Matters listed in Appendix B, we make the following general observations:

#### **General comments**

This Council has consistently opposed expansion of Stansted Airport not because we do not want it in our 'backyard' but because BAA has failed to demonstrate both in its application for maximum use of the existing runway and in the current application that expansion can be justified socially, economically or environmentally.

That the Inquiry is happening at all is illogical bearing in mind the following facts:

The Government has made no decision on the earlier application for maximum use of the existing runway. The two applications are inextricably linked and the issues are similar, albeit on a different scale. The reasons for the refusal or acceptance of the earlier planning application would have been fundamental to the written evidence required from respondents by the 26 September deadline.

- Factors mitigating against a second runway are continually mounting and are likely to increase further by the start of the Inquiry, namely:
  - The steady drop in passenger numbers at Stansted which means that it will be some years before the airport reaches the capacity on the existing runway for which it has permission currently
  - The fact that Stansted is dependent on short haul, low-cost leisure flights which for the foreseeable future will be restricted by economic and environmental considerations
  - Impact of the oil crisis on the aviation industry which, it is widely accepted, is here to stay
  - The fact that airport expansion is cancelling out efforts to reduce carbon emissions in other sectors, making it impossible for the Government to reach its carbon reduction emissions
- The sheer weight of opposition to expansion of Stansted Airport is the clearest demonstration that such development is wrong. Opposition is not based on emotion or nimbyism but hard facts – not least from BAA and Government sources – that demonstrate that expansion is not justified or sustainable
- It is clear from the preliminary report by the Competition Commission that BAA will be forced to sell off Stansted Airport. It is bizarre to say the least that the Inquiry will

consider an application from an operator who would not be in charge when the Inquiry decision is announced. Any future owner is likely to have plans for Stansted that would be radically different to the present owner. Opposition would be equally stiff but almost certainly on different grounds.

### **Comments on Statement of Matters**

#### **Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)**

Many aspects of the Regional Spatial Strategy are predicated on expansion of Stansted Airport, including massive housing development, eco-towns and road schemes. This is a case of the tail (the airport) wagging the dog (housing and roads).

On the one hand, if airport expansion (especially for a second runway) is refused, the arguments for residential expansion on the scale suggested under the RSS collapses. This would bring the volume of new housing more into line with levels indicated by local authorities, including Hertfordshire (our county council), who oppose the RSS. On the other hand, if airport expansion were allowed, massive new conurbations would be subjected to levels of noise and pollution that, together with inadequate infrastructure and poor employment prospects, would make them undesirable places in which to live and, potentially, the slums of the future.

### **Environmental considerations (items (i – viii))**

#### **Planning and the historic environment**

Little Hadham enjoys an historical heritage not dissimilar to many of the communities that would be affected by Stansted's expansion and therefore we share their distress at the thought that historic properties listed under v) would either be demolished or moved. Apart from the architectural vandalism involved, these actions would change for ever the 'character and integrity of the historic landscape'. Measured against the spurious 'benefits' of expansion, the cost is too high.

#### **Economic growth and employment**

While Stansted Airport is a significant local employer, it does not follow that expansion would produce more jobs. On the contrary, expansion would put pressure on the jobs market in an area of low unemployment. The business model of low-cost airlines, whose operations will for the foreseeable future dominate Stansted, is based on fewer staff than conventional carriers. Airport employment forecasts appear to take no account of this.

Stansted Airport, with its emphasis on low-cost holiday travel, is a major contributor to the UK's tourism deficit, currently £19 billion per annum.

For all these reasons, Stansted's contribution to the regional economy is over-stated.

#### **Environmental considerations**

A second runway would produce the equivalent of an additional 11 millions tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> a year. This would be an unacceptable and unjustified increase at a time when the UK is falling short of its carbon emission reduction targets. BAA's claims to be able to *reduce* its carbon emissions totally omits the impact of aircraft.

The nature of the impact of aviation pollution is that it is insidious and it is worrying that no effective assessment has been made on the impact of such pollution on the health of local communities.

#### **Natural resources and conservation**

As part of the rural community, Little Hadham is concerned about the impact that an expanded airport would have on the area's natural resources including countryside, woodland and wildlife. It is a fact that Hatfield Forest is already suffering irreparable damage, which means other ancient sites must be similarly affected.

This is one of the driest regions in the country. We noted in the course of our response to

Three Valleys Water in their recent consultation on future planning that any further expansion of Stansted Airport would add to the threat of a shrinking water supply in the region.

### **Travel**

It has become increasingly clear to this community that proposals to expand the airport are not supported by 'sustainable travel choices'. The absence of adequate road infrastructure would put added pressure on the roads in and around communities such as Little Hadham. The community already suffers from rat-running by cars avoiding congestion on the A120 that runs through the village. This has been worsened by airport-related traffic, especially coaches. Congestion would increase with an expanded airport. One solution is the proposed Little Hadham bypass but to date BAA has been reluctant to contribute to its cost. Herts County Council's Highways department has made it clear that construction of a Little Hadham bypass should not be dependent on the airport.

There is inadequate provision for improvements to rail services, especially to relieve the pressures that commuters from communities such as ours already suffer. BAA's continuing over-reliance on cars to get both passengers and staff to and from an expanded airport flies in the face of claims to be environmentally responsible and underlines the airport operator's reliance on revenue from parking.

### **Noise**

The biggest, most obvious and immediate threat to the residents of Little Hadham would be a massive increase in noise from aircraft using an airport that would become bigger than Heathrow today in terms of traffic movements, numbers of passengers, amount of land occupied and expansion in infrastructure that surrounds a major airport.

Overhead noise would be multiplied by the use of two runways, and worsened further if mixed mode were to be adopted. Little Hadham lies beneath the Buzad flight path, the busiest existing flight path.

Proposals by NATS for changes to flight paths, especially around Bishop's Stortford, would worsen the situation for Little Hadham in the short term and could be compounded by use of a second runway. We noted that the latest NATS' proposals took no account of Stansted expansion.

A summary of these points will form the basis of the evidence we will be giving to the Public Inquiry in 2009.

cc: Oliver Heald MP

## **Appendix 5 Three Valleys Water consultation on Water Resources Management Plan**

### **1. Reduced carbon emissions and water savings through efficiency measures:**

The Council favours option a). With regard to option b), this would necessitate importing water from other regions of the country with higher rainfall or converting non-potable water, including desalination. Either solution would be expensive and have major downsides including the building of plant and the creation of new pipe networks, which would impact on the countryside. Any of these measures would increase Three Valley Water's carbon footprint. We are concerned about the effects of global warming and would oppose solutions that would contribute to global warming through higher carbon emissions.

Option a) on the other hand, conserves existing water resources. The attraction of this range of solutions is that, potentially, it creates a partnership between supplier and consumer to tackle leakage, greater water usage efficiency and water saving through rain water harvesting, the use of low flush toilets, etc. It is also hugely more energy efficient.

The Council is not in favour of using higher prices as a way of reducing water use. This does nothing to discourage water usage efficiency among businesses and homes that can afford the higher charges, and severely penalises the poor and young families whose finances are already stretched by recent fuel and food price increases.

The water companies hope to cut water usage by 12% by making water metering compulsory. Ofwat's UK Water Industry Research report states that the average reduction of water usage by metering is only about 10%. If Ofwat is correct, this is a small but nonetheless worthwhile saving but one that will have to be improved in order to convince consumers of the benefit of metering.

### **2. Levels of Service:**

We favour a) in so far as it seems illogical arbitrarily to increase or reduce the frequency of hosepipe bans and drought orders and permits since severe shortages or unexpected surpluses would dictate supply rather than any amount of planning.

Hosepipe bans are unpopular and undesirable not only because of the inconvenience but also because they signal that other water conservation measures have failed.

However, if consumers were convinced through good communication that a water conservation strategy based on arguments in Q1 were in place, an occasional ban would be more acceptable if it were seen as a genuine measure of last resort.

### 3. Impact on the Environment:

The Council is very concerned about the impact of increased water extraction on the environment. The current extraction from rivers and aquifers has dramatically reduced water flow in local streams and rivers and may have contributed to the fact that the Ash that flows through the village of Little Hadham is dry for much of the year. The lowered water table is having an adverse effect on farm land.

Water companies should take active measures to encourage better farming practices so that water is retained on the land and replenishes the aquifers.

Despite the southeast being the driest area of the country, EERA plans to build many thousand new homes in the area. The proposed expansion of Stansted Airport would attract still more industry and housing. These will increase the demand for water as well as increasing rainwater runoff due to the amount of land that would be covered in concrete. The Council has objected to all these schemes partly because of the shortage of resources such as water. Three Valleys Water should make the point forcefully to government that there is insufficient water to sustain such developments.

### 4. Protection of our water sources from pollution:

We agree with a) with the proviso that a 'polluter pays' policy is better justified if it operates against a background of best practice by the water company together with strict guidelines, advice to industry and other potential polluters, and a fast and effective response in the event of a pollution incident.

### **Additional comments:**

Some of the issues surrounding conservation and protection of water supply are not dissimilar to those surrounding global warming, and there is a link between the two. Both have to be addressed at a macro level (internationally, nationally, governmentally and corporately), and a micro level (personal responsibility).

As parish councils operate at the lowest governmental level, they are closest to the communities in which domestic water consumers live. Three Valleys Water might consider a more proactive role with parish councils who could help to make people more aware of the issues and the steps that can be taken to conserve water and not take such a finite resource for granted.

Water companies could borrow an idea from the system that alerts the public to the degree of security threat by adopting a colour code or similar device to indicate the level of threat to water availability and what measures people should take to avert drastic economy measures. Parish councils could offer a fast and efficient alert system at grass roots to complement what water companies would be doing at a regional or national level.