

THE SIMPLE POINT

The homes are much more certain than many of the services and improvements shown with them. The application should be judged on what is properly checked, funded and protected now, not on what may be worked out later.

PLAIN-ENGLISH EXECUTIVE SUMMARY — FINAL SUBMISSION v4.38

Broadway development: why I believe this application should be refused

Planning application UTT/26/1635/OP - up to 850 homes around The Broadway and Church End

The central problem

Gladman seeks outline permission for up to 850 homes. The Local Plan figure for this land is about 715 homes, so the application seeks 135 additional homes. The Council must assess the full 850-home scheme together with other development already affecting Great Dunmow. The houses would be certain; many of the promised facilities are not.

The strongest objections

- **St Edmunds Lane and construction traffic** — This residential street is the proposed main lorry route. The applicant says parking would need to be moved to retain only a 5.5-metre carriageway, while acknowledging that Essex County Council guidance indicates 6.75 metres for a bus route. Up to 200 construction-vehicle movements a day, about 160 involving HGVs, would pass homes, pavements and pedestrians. The safety of the real vehicles and available clearances has not been demonstrated.
- **Strategic roads** — National Highways has issued a holding objection and told the Council not to approve the application before 2 October 2026. The Transport Assessment Addendum and strategic modelling are missing, so the effect of the development's traffic on the A120 cannot yet be verified.
- **Construction period**: The traffic, dust, noise and vibration effects would continue through the build-out. The Council must assess the full construction period, not just the completed estate.
- **Church End Bridge** - A 1994 assessment recorded a 7.5-tonne limit. The applicant has not published the current 40-tonne and construction-loading assessment now required by Essex County Council. The bridge and any necessary works must be demonstrated safe before construction traffic is accepted.
- **Emergency access** - The Fire Service has not checked whether fire engines can reach every proposed home when the estate is occupied and cars are parked. Road widths, turning, blocked routes and firefighting water supplies must be tested before the principle of 850 homes is approved.
- **Public transport and car dependence** — Active Travel England says the two regular-service bus stops are more than one kilometre from the centre of the site, only one walking route is lit, there is no convenient fully accessible and lit cycle route, and delivery of the proposed mobility hub is unclear. There is no regular bus through St Edmunds Lane or through the proposed estate. A usable service and safe routes must be funded and operating from first occupation.
- **Landscape and heritage** - Council evidence and the adopted Design Code protect Church End's rural character and valley views. A Planning Inspector rejected 50 homes on land within this site because they would urbanise the Chelmer Valley approach. Uttlesford also refused 115 homes on overlapping southern land in February 2020 after its conservation and landscape advisers identified harm to Church End's agricultural setting, St Mary's Church, Crouches and the broad bucolic approach. The new Local Plan allocation changes the old policy context, but not those factual site findings. Gladman's own current Planning Statement admits heritage harm. The development would be highly prominent from Beaumont Hill across the Chelmer Valley towards Church End and St Mary's Church. Buildings up to 12 metres high would create a major new built presence; planting cannot remove that harm.
- **Flooding, sewage and the River Chelmer** — The Environment Agency maintains an ecological holding objection and says important surface-water, reservoir, sewer, groundwater and emergency-access risks have not been considered in detail. Great Dunmow's sewage works and water network are already under pressure. Drainage, ditch, culvert, water-supply and wastewater capacity must be resolved before permission. Existing and proposed developments discharge through the same wider Chelmer catchment. Attenuation ponds delay rather than remove water, so overlapping releases may prolong high levels and reduce recovery time between storms.
- **Wildlife, archaeology and farmland** — The Environment Agency and Essex Wildlife Trust maintain ecological holding objections. The surveys record skylarks, bats, [REDACTED] inconclusive great crested newt evidence; nearby otter evidence confirms use of the connected River Chelmer corridor. The applicant's promised Agricultural Land Quality Report has not been published. Archaeological evaluation of the site's possible prehistoric and Roman remains must be completed before development.
- **Schools, healthcare and electricity** — Essex County Council Education says the required Land Compliance Study for the proposed school site is missing. Land or floorspace is not a funded, staffed and operating school or health service. The two GP practices already serve 26,671 registered patients, and no separately staffed practice is secured. The applicant has not provided a scheme-specific electricity-capacity statement for 850 homes, charging, heat pumps and community facilities. More healthcare

floorspace must not be mistaken for more healthcare: permission must secure additional funded doctors, nurses and appointments, with no loss or simple relocation of existing Great Dunmow provision.

- Policing — Essex Police identifies substantial additional demand and seeks a £589,664 mitigation package. Any agreement must secure identified resources, delivery dates and a direct local benefit for Great Dunmow, not merely an unrestricted payment.
- Town-centre parking and social facilities — No pub, restaurant or comparable evening venue is secured on the site. Many residents will drive into Great Dunmow to eat and socialise. Existing public parking is heavily used, and the Co-op customer car park cannot be counted as spare town-centre capacity for 850 homes. Evening, weekend and cumulative parking demand must be assessed.
- Housing, employment and population - The applicant has not provided a complete bedroom mix, tenure schedule or phasing plan, and leaves employee numbers blank. Without this information, population, service demand and commuting cannot be calculated reliably.
- Section 106 and delivery: A contribution is not the same as a delivered facility. Every payment must identify its purpose, timing, recipient and local benefit; money must not simply be available for wider-area spending.
- Contamination and open space - Public records identify former landfill and historic slaughterhouse-related features in the wider area. Site-specific checks, sampling and remediation evidence are required. The plans also do not identify who will own, manage or fund the proposed sports pitches and open space.
- Airport safeguarding - The applicant marked wildlife-hazard assessment as not applicable by reference to Cambridge aerodrome only. Stansted Airport has issued a formal holding objection (response ref. STN 2026-171, 27 July 2026) concerning ponds, reed beds, swales and drainage basins. The Council must resolve this and require any necessary Bird Hazard Management Plan.

What I am asking the Council to do

I believe the application should be refused. If the Council is not ready to refuse it, determination should be delayed until the missing transport, bridge, fire-access, flood, sewage, ecology, archaeology, contamination, housing, infrastructure and airport-safeguarding evidence is provided and independently tested. Every promised facility must have a named provider, funding, delivery date and binding long-term management arrangements.