

Hatfield Parish Council Review

Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the UDC Local Plan

(Baseline Review of Infrastructure Context)

This paper expresses the views of Hatfield Heath Parish Council with respect to the published data and supplies a local context to the contents relevant to the SW corner of the District and site HBO 005 'Land at the Forest' in particular. Our comments are as follows.

General

Appendix A is wrong:

Great Hallingbury is missing, Only one allotment in Hatfield Heath.

It is also too general and simplistic if proposals for 'garden villages' are to be properly considered.

Saffron Walden at 7,739 dwellings and a full and developed support structure would be considerably smaller than HBO 005 at 10,000 dwellings, yet measurements are limited to the very basic facilities required for existence in the appendix and do not address the fact that apart from Great Dunmow and Stansted Mountfichet none of the Parishes/Villages listed can boast more than just these basics.

The SW of the district hardly rely on services within Uttlesford at all yet interaction with other districts plans is only briefly mentioned and there is no quantification of the necessary interaction and resulting macro regional issues

Specifically, Bishop's Stortford, Harlow and Sawbridgeworth between them provide

- The hospital
- The shopping centres
- Nearly all secondary schooling and sixth form education.
- Railway links
- Motorway links

The Uttlesford IDP Context

We agree the following elements;

- Takeley is best sited to serve Stansted Airport, the major employer in the SW corner of the county, but affordability restricts this since the airport comprises 100% service business paying low wages and requiring attendance (no working from home). Given the very bullish projection that Stansted could provide up to 2600 jobs in the plan period, we consider the airport future requirements to be limited and therefore any

large development in the SW corner dependant on 'other' employment, which the local plan has projected but not so far defined in terms of location, nature, capital outlay, salary levels etc etc)

- On zero carbon we agree that public transport in the larger settlements has potential, but the suggestion that smaller settlements should switch to cycling and e bikes is not tenable given that pavements and lighting are virtually non-existent, roads ill maintained and treacherous and facilities as outlined above minimal, requiring load carrying transport. We therefore believe the only safe and reasonable option to meet this aim will be a mixture of electric cars, vans and buses, **which would by the way further stress the existing poor infrastructure.**
- We agree that infrastructure should be centred around existing networks, which we unfortunately do not have, the A1060 and B183 being our most major routes. We rely on neighbouring districts for the majority of our other infrastructure needs and while their plans are mentioned there is no discussion on integration with these or what their impact will be. Certainly it would appear that East Herts Education plans mean that there will be increased pressure on the SW corner rather than relief and M11 junction 7a will overload an already congested local road system rather than help it.
- We finally have yet to understand how many new jobs are to be created in Uttlesford, where these will be, of what nature and at what wage/salary levels, which must surely influence where the centre of gravity for infrastructure development should (or should not) be. Other districts have estimated these, but frankly also leave them as a wish list rather than providing concrete plans..

Infrastructure Baseline

- We agree with the sections Overview, Air Travel, Rail Network, but are puzzled by the section on The Bus Network. The only reasonable local transport that we presently have is the Number 15 from Harlow to Chelmsford, which we assume is jointly franchised by ECC and Harlow. The number 5 service operated by Stevenson's is a disaster with an inappropriate and unreliable timetable which has never kept to. These are the only two services. We see no real proposal to address either the present poor situation or potential increase in demand. We do however have good school bus links with the major secondary schools in East Herts, which we believe are funded by them.
- On The Road Network we agree that Junction 8 is a mess, but are concerned that 'supporting future plans for housing, employment and business developments' as a partial reason is putting horses before carts.
- When it comes to walking and cycling all we would like to say that while it is a noble objective, the likelihood of people using this as their main form of transport will remain largely that for practical reasons. The increase will be in recreational use,

with a small increase in commuting (when it is not inclement). To assume the sort of major increase required to make any appreciable difference given the present use of 1% of the population is in our view fantasy for all the reasons put forward already in this document.

- On Key delivery organisations, what about Stevenson's?
- On funding we have no comment.
- On Critical issues and implications we disagree with the statement on more home working. While undoubtedly true it is not exclusive and becoming less popular with companies because of the inherent inefficiency and difficulty in managing output and connectivity. It also applies to a limited number of people.
- 'Linking villages with a high quality cycling structure' (VeloCity) is also in our view completely impractical given the existing infrastructure in the SW corner.
- 20 minute neighbourhoods mirror the Harlow concept but have increased the time to work by five minutes. They also presuppose a massive increase in local business to support such a concept which we have not been privy to and is not mooted in this document.
- We agree that developing existing centres is the best way forward.

Education

- We agree there will be increased pressure on our primary schools in general.
- We are already struggling to get secondary school placements in East Herts as discussed and this is a well-known issue and not as stated 'cross boundary movements between Uttlesford and Bishop's Stortford are not known'. It should also be noted that E Herts education plans **ONLY** cater for their own expansions and **NOT** Uttlesford SW.
- HBO 005 would destroy the existing strategy we have in the SWcorner completely at all levels of education.

Green Infrastructure

- It is impossible for us to comment when HBO 005 would take out many hectares of prime agricultural land, wild habitat, ancient hedgerows and wildlife including several herds of deer to replace it with parks. We simply cannot understand that this issue is not addressed as a major factor of future sustainable infrastructure, particularly when it abuts Hatfield Forest and further threatens that.
- Sports facilities are completely inadequate (not 'broadly adequate') and the Friends School no longer exists (see swimming pools).

Health and Wellbeing

- Based on extrapolation from the Appendix, HBO 005 would require a minimum of 4 new doctor's surgeries and (unbelievably) 8 dentists.

- There is no spare capacity in the SW corner.
- Please add Harlow hospital, which everyone in our village uses.
- This document states that **‘There is an overall capacity deficit of social care services throughout the district, due to population growth and FROM THE REMOVAL OF THE PROPOSED GARDEN COMMUNITIES (WHICH WERE IN THE PREVIOUS DRAFT LOCALPLAN) WHICH WOULD HAVE PROVIDED A HEALTH PACKAGE AS PART OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE).’**
- Surely a mistake? But also we have looked at all of the broken promises by the developers in the rest of the district and believe such a scenario to be highly unlikely.

Utilities

- Under Water Supply, it would appear that there is no more water until 2035, which rather begs the question of how to support any major development.
- Under Water Treatment we are concerned that HBO 005 would have no alternative but to discharge through Little Hallingbury into the Stort which is already overloaded and subject to major flooding (EPA limits are being exceeded right now. Local issues such as these must be addressed as a consequence of the plan rather than pushed to the water companies to resolve. The report should also address the fact that a very high proportion of homes in the SW corner do not even have mains drainage.
- On Electricity we are puzzled that while the electric companies are already turning to V2G (vehicle to grid) measures to keep up with demand, this plan is still pushing aggressive use of electricity for transport but leaving the consequences of the strategy for these same companies to resolve.
- On Gas the statement is true but the consequences of the plan presumably being centred around electricity supply are not addressed.
- On Internet and broadband we have no comment apart from the fact that it offers people the opportunity to access services and employment from home and makes sure that businesses in Uttlesford can reach a wide clientele and engage in global collaboration. It doesn't. It allows people to simply keep pace with the rest of the world who are doing the same thing..

Waste Management

- We use Harlow!

Flooding and Drainage

- The local drainage system is unmaintained and a total disgrace and developers are not liable for anything outside their specific planning limits

Community

- Under Community centres and youth spaces it is not satisfactory to substitute 'local hall' for community centres that deliver such service. We have specific problems with 'in-betweeners' that are not served and therefore create community stress and minor criminality issues.
- On libraries. Does Uttlesford seriously consider one and a half libraries with no easy access from the majority of the district is adequate?
- Under Critical issues and implications it is not satisfactory to accuse Covid for causing a drop off in the use of cultural facilities when these are so sparse and diminishing (four library closures as an example)

Emergency services

- No comment

NR260222