



Uttlesford District Council Local Development Framework

**Core Strategy
Preferred Options Consultation
November 2007**

**Overview of Representations Received in
Response to the Consultation
June 2008**

Introduction

The consultation on the Council's Preferred Options for the Uttlesford Core Strategy started in November 2007 the closing date for representations was 11 January 2008. The purpose of this document is to give an overview of the representations received on the Policies and the Options for Growth. This is **not** a full summary of all the representations received on all aspects of the document. A further, more detailed report will be made to members in the autumn. The first part of this document looks at the Core Strategy Policies under the three main themes:

- Theme 1 – Economy and Employment
- Theme 2 – Getting Around
- Theme 3 – District Character
- Theme 4 – Living in Communities

The second part of this document looks at the representations received on the Growth Options including the previously dismissed options.

Theme 1- Economy and Employment

Policy E1 – Employment Strategy

- ✓ Policy E1 is supported by a number of developers promoting sites covered by the strategy

The main objections to policy E1 are:

- ✗ Not reflecting the possible outcomes for the development of the airport (including the second runway scheme). In particular the Employment Strategy should recognise the potential benefits of the development of a business hub at Stansted Airport as a focus for world class business investment.
- ✗ Ignores the need to identify additional sites and land outside of the airport boundary to provide for firms and businesses that could provide airport-related employment opportunities
- ✗ Great Dunmow should be identified as a location for allocation of employment land in future site allocations DPDs
- ✗ Should allow for dispersed development in other settlements such as Newport
- ✗ Concerns about the policy allowing the relocation and growth of firms to take place beyond development limits
- ✗ Policy omits reference to preferred strategy and should allocate up to 12 hectares of land in DPDs for B1 and B2 uses as part of the new settlement on land north-east of Elsenham
- ✗ A developer objects to Policy E1 for not including the A120 corridor as an area for economic development, along with a new settlement at Boxted Wood.
- ✗ The Strategy should refer to the need for regular monitoring and review of employment allocations to ensure that a suitable supply of employment sites is maintained at all times
- ✗ Essex County Council wish to see more emphasis on employment of people with disabilities/mental health/learning difficulties as part of the strategy
- ✗ When safeguarding the most sustainable sites the Council must make sure that any retention is shown to be the most appropriate in sustainable terms having regard to the planning considerations including those relating to layout, design, highways etc.

The locations being promoted for employment development are listed in the following table:

Parish	Site	Size of Site	Uses
Birchanger	Site 1 – West of Birchanger Hall Lane Site 2 – East of Birchanger Hall Lane	Site 1 = 5.45ha Site 2= 6.26ha	Employment
Birchanger?	Northern edge of Bishop's Stortford	10ha	Employment Park and Ride
Elsenham	North East of Elsenham	250ha (total area under Fairfield Control)	40,000m2 Employment 3,000 homes Range of tenures and types inc affordable housing New secondary school if required 2 New primary schools Mixed use town centre Open space Sports Provision Community and Health Facilities
Elsenham	Land west of Elsenham	13.23ha plus 3.1ha	300-400 homes, community facilities and local centre plus additional 3.1ha for commercial development next to M11
Elsenham	Tye Green Farm, Elsenham		Land to be considered within the economic and employment strategy.
Great Dunmow	Land west and south west of Great Dunmow	98ha	2,500 homes in mixed use scheme with employment, leisure and community facilities with schools and shops. Substantial areas of public open land for recreation, including providing dedicated public access to the protected woodland areas.
Great Dunmow	Great Dunmow Business Park		650 dwellings 500-700 jobs
Great Hallingbury	South of the B1256 at Start Hill		Employment Uses
Great Hallingbury /	Land East of Thremhall	6.11ha	Employment

Takeley ?	Priory		
Little Canfield	Land at Hale's Farm		Employment
Little Canfield/ Takeley ?	Little Canfield (Extension to Priors Green)	Not specified	Not specified New family homes inc significant proportion of affordable homes Small scale employment opportunities Open space Education New local community facilities
Little Easton	Easton Park	655ha	3,000 to 4,000 homes as part of Core Strategy, 7,500 – 9,000 dwellings total beyond 2024 2-5 bed family homes No more than 25% apartments 30-50% affordable housing 100,000m2 commercial floorspace Primary schools and secondary school Foodstore Local Support Services Health Centre Creche Community Centre(s) Leisure Facilities A hotel Country Park
Newport	The Quarry, Newport	10ha	Housing, Employment and Leisure
Saffron Walden	Saffron Walden East	58ha	1050 homes 1ha Employment Retail/Employment 2.3ha Primary School Community Facilities/Local Centre Sports Provision Country Park
Saffron Walden	West of Thaxted Road,		Office Park
Stansted Mountfitchet	Parsonage Farm East of existing employment site	6.67ha Net 3-4ha (due to proposed roundabout on M11)	Employment
Stansted Mountfitchet	Warmans Farm, Burtons End	Not specified	Employment land for airport related uses

Stebbing	Boxted Wood	113ha in Utt 22ha in Braintree	4,500 homes, 3,000 in Utt, 1500 in Braintree Potential increase to 10,000 60% 2-4 bed homes At least 40% affordable 4 Primary Schools Secondary School 2 Doctor's surgeries 2 neighbourhood retail centres 7ha employment land 7ha playing fields 25ha amenity/play space
Takeley	Near balancing ponds, Takeley Street	6.62 and 2.06? (two parcels)	Commercial Allocation
Takeley	West of Church Lane, Takeley Street	2.06ha	Employment
Takeley	Prior's Green, Takeley	81.66ha	1400 homes Appropriate amount of employment land, open space, community facilities, and a new primary school (if required).
Takeley ?	East of Stansted Airport		Strategic Employment Location

Theme 2 – Getting Around

Policy GA1 – Accessible Development

- ✓ The policy is supported by Natural England, the Highways Agency and a number of developers

Representations objecting to GA1 include the following comments:

- ✗ Policy should make reference to the provision of urban and rural pedestrian and cycle routes
- ✗ Accessible development should be defined and the policy should specifically refer to links between new development and residential areas as well as services and facilities.
- ✗ The Council has no control over the provision of public transport (mainly related to development at Elsenham)
- ✗ Although it is recognised in para 5.5 Policy GA1 fails to recognise the importance of the car in rural areas and the importance of new development in rural areas to sustain rural settlements.

Theme 3 – District Character

Housing

Policy DC1 – Meeting Housing Need

Overall Housing Provision

- ✓ Support for the assessment of the overall requirement and the need to continue provision beyond 2021 by a number of developers.
- ✗ Objections that the overall number of houses is not needed/not justified
- ✗ No need to include an additional 10% contingency
- ✗ No need to continue the annual rate beyond 2021
- ✗ Some developers say that the total figure is not high enough and other figures are suggested or suggest that the policy should say this is a minimum requirement
- ✗ The requirements in policy DC1 are not justified without a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment having been carried out.

Affordable Housing

- ✓ Overall support for the requirements for affordable housing from Swan Housing
- ✗ Some support for target of 40% but suggestions that the thresholds should be lowered to 10 or 5 dwellings
- ✗ Suggestions that financial contributions should be sought for affordable housing on sites below the threshold
- ✗ Some developers feel that the 40% is excessive and there should be more flexibility/negotiation
- ✗ Some suggestions that a higher requirement should be applied to all sites
- ✗ Policy should be more specific in defining types of affordable housing and the split between shared ownership and rented with 60-65% being suggested as an appropriate level of social rented.
- ✗ West Essex PCT consider that a proportion of affordable units should include an element of key worker accommodation and other special housing.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group, the Dunmow Town Design Statement Group and Dunmow Town Council consider that sites where general housing would be unacceptable should be identified for affordable housing.
- ✗ Concentrating all affordable housing in one location would be a mistake.
- ✗ Sites for 100% affordable housing should be small scale/adjacent to existing communities with suitable amenities.

Other Points

- ✓ Defence Estates support the policy and the recognition of the need to provide for the operational needs of military personnel at the Carver Barracks
- ✗ No need to make provision for travellers, gypsies and travelling show people

Policy DC2 – Housing Strategy

- ✓ Support for the policy from various developers.
- ✓ Some representations support the strategy as set out in bullet points 1-4 but object to the element of the policy relating to the new settlement at Elsenham

- ✓ Developers promoting sites in specific villages welcome the fact that policy does allow for new development in villages.
- ✓ Further growth at key service centres is important to sustain these settlements

The locations being promoted for residential development are listed in the table in Appendix 1.

- ✗ Objections to the policy on the basis of inclusion of the new settlement element are made by residents and developers promoting alternative sites both for new settlements and smaller sites which could contribute to housing delivery. Objections are made on the basis that alternatives have not been properly tested, the policy is not supported by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and up to date information about urban land availability and lack of consistency with other policies and objectives in the plan.
- ✗ Some objections to total number of houses required and the timeframe in DC1 are also carried forward to DC2
- ✗ Not clear whether the bullet points are expressing a sequential approach. There should be a more balanced strategy with a clear sequence of development locations based on a well defined settlement hierarchy.
- ✗ Policy should make clear that the 750 homes on the edge of Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden are in addition to urban capacity
- ✗ Urban extensions should provide at least 700 homes in each location where it is necessary to provide a new primary school.
- ✗ Defence Estates objects to policy because it fails to address how all the key issues identified in the Policy DC1 will be delivered.
- ✗ Requests that Hatfield Heath, Clavering and Oakwood Park should be added to the list of key service centres.
- ✗ Stansted Mountfitchet should not be a key service centre but should be defined as a main settlement along with Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden
- ✗ Cross boundary issues have not been addressed
- ✗ There should be a policy seeking to maximise the use of brownfield land and setting a minimum target of 60% to comply with RSS policy SS3
- ✗ Some housing could be provided in settlements without development limits to contribute to mixed and balanced communities
- ✗ Rural sustainability benefits should be defined. There should also be more flexibility to say suitable or sustainable sites which could include sites within or on the edge of settlements. Sites should reduce the need to travel by car.
- ✗ Villages that may be suitable for development should be listed following a full appraisal of development options in all settlements.
- ✗ Any significant growth option will need to provide for all forms of physical and social infrastructure including primary health care facilities and not just education requirements.

Policy DC3 – Infrastructure

- ✓ There is support for this policy from Swan Housing Group, Sport England, Highways Agency, RSPB and developers who explain how their development proposal would meet the requirements. It is essential that there is provision for infrastructure to support housing development and that it meets the needs of new and existing populations.
- ✓ National Trust support the policy but ask that consideration be given to development contributing towards the enhancement of facilities at Hatfield Forest

- ✗ Electricity supply capacity, sustainable energy, transport and access should also be included. Essex County say that waste facilities should be part of the infrastructure required.
- ✗ Thames Water Property Services say more specific policy support is necessary in respect of water and sewerage infrastructure. Essential to ensure that such infrastructure is in place to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property.
- ✗ Urgent need for land to be set aside for public worship/religious instruction (Use Class D1(h))
- ✗ Important that there is a specific policy relating to the protection of existing open spaces and sport and recreation facilities
- ✗ Sport England question the absence of a specific policy relating to the economic development of rural areas which could cover farm diversification to which sport and recreation can make an invaluable contribution.
- ✗ Infrastructure provision needs to take into account the need for low carbon emissions.
- ✗ Policy should be clear that a proper assessment of needs should be carried out and necessary action taken before planning permission is given.
- ✗ Policy should make it clear that the developer will be required to fund the provision of the infrastructure.
- ✗ Strict milestones/timetable need to be set for the provision of infrastructure.
- ✗ No indication of what infrastructure is needed for option 4 – unlikely that a development of the proposed size would support necessary infrastructure
- ✗ Development should be located in areas/settlements where existing facilities are underused.
- ✗ Go-East feel there is some duplication between this policy and LC1
- ✗ Natural England think that this is a good policy but needs broadening to include green infrastructure.
- ✗ HBF are concerned that all matters of fundamental importance should be clearly set out in a DPD rather than an SPD.

Protecting the Countryside

Policy DC4 – Metropolitan Green Belt

- ✓ A number of parish councils support the green belt remaining unchanged
- ✓ CPRE supports this policy
- ✓ RSPB supports the green belt remaining unchanged and reinforces the invaluable contribution to wildlife
- ✓ Developers support this policy stating that housing figures can be achieved without the need to change the MGB boundaries
- ✗ Natural England wants a review of the role of the greenbelt and wants reference to improving the environmental quality of the greenbelt.
- ✗ Objected to by landowners and developers who have an interest in land within the MGB
- ✗ A review is needed so that exception sites can be provided near key service centres and to enable Uttlesford to meet the housing demand

Policy DC5 – Protecting the Countryside

- ✓ Natural England generally supports this policy, however, they feel it is duplicating what is said in PPS 7 and question its inclusion

- × Land outside of settlement boundaries may need to be used for development to contribute to sustainable development
- × Underutilised land and land not suitable for farming should be considered for development
- × Repeats national policy
- × Include criteria which would allow development in certain cases
- × An assessment of the land within the countryside should be carried out to identify land that could be developed

Policy DC6 – Agricultural Land

- ✓ Developers generally support this policy, however they want it to be more flexible if no other suitable sites can be found for development
- ✓ Parish Councils support the protection of agricultural land
- × Small scale housing developments should be encouraged in this policy on underutilised agricultural land
- × Land in the countryside may need to be given over to other uses in order to contribute to sustainable development
- × Natural England want the policy to recognise the potential value of PDL to biodiversity.
- × Questions the inclusion of this policy as it repeats PPS7 guidance
- × Friends of the Earth suggest that agricultural land should be included in policy DC5 and this policy deleted
- × Define what is meant by the best and most versatile land
- × Development on agricultural land should be permitted after other options have been discounted

Policy DC7 – Countryside Protection Zone

- ✓ CPREssex, Natural England and others support this policy
- ✓ A number of representation, including BAA support the policy but say that it is not clear whether under the proposed two runway airport "retaining" the zone means the zone gets smaller or that the boundary will be expanded to compensate.
- ✓ In defining the broad area of the CPZ, regard should be had to the potential expansion at the airport (a second runway in particular), and the associated need to identify land outside of the current boundary for airport-related uses.
- ✓ Whilst some developers/landowners do not object to the principle of the CPZ they seek the exclusion of land they control from the Zone
- ×
- × The preferred housing strategy will create coalescence between the airport and development.
- × There is no clear justification within the Core Strategy consultation document as to why such a zone, requiring a separate and stringent policy is needed.
- × Government Guidance in PPS7 outlines the limited weight to be given to local landscape policies of this nature and states that the justification for their inclusion in development plans needs to be reconsidered when reviewing these documents
- × The policy should be expanded expecting the land to be managed to an agreed master plan to improve the biodiversity, visual character and public access through contributions by the airport operator.
- × There should be an aspirational measurement (½mile, 1 mile, 2 miles?) around the airport where development is not permitted. Currently the CPZ is pretty meaningless – especially when it is full of roads

Policy DC8 – Landscape Character

- ✓ CPREssex supports this policy
- ✗ Natural England suggest that the policy would benefit from specific reference to the particular landscape types that are present within the District and the type of management required to protect and enhance these landscapes
- ✗ Remove let out words ', where possible, ' as they allow for argument about the policy.
- ✗ The policy is meaningless and impossible to interpret. There should be a criteria based policy locally specific as required by the RSS. which would broadly identify locally distinctive landscapes; seek enhancements of the urban fringe; and seek more tree planting of native species.
- ✗ Policy should be deleted and replaced with policy to provide a similar criteria-based approach to the one recommended in the Joint Landscape Character Appraisal (2006) for Uttlesford, Braintree, Chelmsford, Maldon and Brentwood. Policy is insufficiently prescriptive and should be supplemented by an Uttlesford Design Guide as an SPD. The need for a criteria based approach as recommended by the Character Appraisal is supported by English Heritage.

Protecting Special Features

Policy DC9 – Protecting the Historic Environment

- ✓ Natural England generally support the policy but feel that protection of open space should be in a separate policy.
- ✗ Essex County Council feel that the policy should be split into bullet points and that one of the points should refer to development affecting nationally important heritage assets and that development should protect and enhance the historic environment.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Council, The Town Design Statement Group and the Town Strategy group have all suggested changes to this policy to make the policy more responsive to assessments of local character and distinctiveness through tools like the Town Design Statement.

Policy DC10 – Protecting Nature Conservation and Geological Sites

- ✓ Natural England generally support the policy but consider there should be further policy guidance on nature conservation and enhancement of biodiversity.
- ✗ Cambridgeshire County Council seek changes to the policy to remove duplication with PPS and additional policy for the provision of strategic green infrastructure.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group, Dunmow Town Design Statement and Great Dunmow Town Council think that the policy should include reference to BAP species and mitigation where habitats or features are lost.
- ✗ English Heritage consider the policy should be expanded to reflect the importance of the District's heritage and refer to recent Conservation Area appraisals.
- ✗ Uttlesford Local Agenda 21 would like the scope of the policy to be widened to include protection of natural resources, including water.

The Market Towns

Policy DC11 – Function of the Market Towns

- ✓ Support policy however this will not be assisted by setting up competing centres in new settlements which will draw away population and spending power.
- ✓ Supported by developers who see residential development as complementing the policy.
- ✓ Highways Agency support an approach which concentrates development within the market towns however the impact that edge of town expansion may have on the trunk road network in the District will need to be considered.
- ✓ Retailers support the encouragement of new development

- ✗ There is an inconsistency between a retail policy that seeks to attract additional capacity to the edges of Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden and a preferred housing policy that says the towns are in effect saturated and unable to attract additional residents
- ✗ Along with preferred housing strategy this policy will lead to additional road traffic journeys and increased congestion.
- ✗ Object to allowing new edge of town development, especially supermarkets. Friends of the Earth and Dunmow Town Council want the policy reworded to ensure greater control over edge of town development.
- ✗ Policy not sufficiently specific.
- ✗ Policy does not recognise the role of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow as niche markets as a way of competing with urban settlements. Policy should refer to the need for town centre management policies to protect small retailers.
- ✗ Fails to identify the need for new retail to support a new settlement on land north-east of Elsenham.
- ✗ Policy should be expanded to promote retail, commercial and other development in Stansted Mountfitchet, Thaxted and in the other key service centres.
- ✗ English Heritage seek additional text to policy to make sure development is of an appropriate scale and character
- ✗ EERA consider that the policy does not provide a clear retail hierarchy and more detailed is required in this area.

Policy DC12 – Character of the Market Towns

- ✓ The policy is supported by CPRESsex and some house builders
- ✓ Support policy and this contradicts the proposal for extended out-of-town development in the preceding objective/policy.
- ✓ Supported by residential developers

- ✗ Policy is not sufficiently specific.
- ✗ Policy should state commitment to achieving sustainable communities
- ✗ English Heritage suggest a more detailed policy
- ✗ Great Dunmow Town Council, Strategy Group and Design Statement group seek additional text setting out how development should meet specific design and other criteria.

Resources and Renewable Energy

Policy DC13 – Use of Natural Resources

- ✓ Supported by Natural England, British Wind Energy Association and by Essex County Council subject to minor rewording
- ✓ Supported by a number of representations subject to some minor rewording to 'ensure' rather than 'encourage' that development 'minimises' rather than 'reduces' the use of resources
- ✗ Policy should be strengthened to ensure that development maximises recycling and reuse of resources, and reduces pollution and waste
- ✗ Policy should be more positive and set targets.
- ✗ Policy should include a new bullet points stating that :-
 - development uses building materials that are sustainable.
 - development should maximise the use of previously developed land.
- ✗ Policy not sufficiently specific
- ✗ EERA object saying that detailed policies should be included to address the sustainable management and minimisation of waste during development to achieve consistency with the Further Proposed Changes document.
- ✗ Question the possibility of meeting all the perceived needs of potential users sustainably. Therefore suggest that a better aim for bullet point one would be for development to "Provide adequate standards of comfort, safety and health."

Policy DC14 - Renewable Energy

- ✓ Supported by Natural England provided that important wildlife, habitats and landscape character are not adversely affected.
- ✓ Policy supported but suggest that renewable energy and low carbon technologies should be 'encouraged' or even 'required'.
- ✓ Supported by RSPB
- ✗ Additional text is suggested stating that the policy should not be used to prevent the erection of turbines and the installation of solar technologies on buildings.
- ✗ Policy too vague. Need to set criteria for where the benefits outweigh the other considerations otherwise the caveat makes the policy too weak. A target should be considered.
- ✗ Fails to recognise the need for a District wide strategy aimed at reducing carbon emissions overall.
- ✗ The policy as drafted confuses the issues of renewable energy and "low carbon technologies".
- ✗ EERA object to the policy saying that there is no policy consistent with policy ENV7 in the EEP on sustainable construction.
- ✗ Policy should be concerned solely with removing barriers to the siting or development of new innovations such as wind turbines, CHP plants and other energy generation development. It should not seek to control the use of power within dwellings or be concerned with the fabric of the building which is covered adequately by the Code for Sustainable Homes.
- ✗ No reason or evidence base why the Council should seek financial compensation from developers of new housing for carbon reduction programmes within the existing housing stock elsewhere in the District.
- ✗ British Wind Energy Association recommend that DC14 be revised in order to make the policy more concise: - reference to single buildings and neighbourhoods is removed due to the unnecessary "catch all" nature of the phrase; latter section

of the policy be refined, referring specifically to concerns relating to landscapes, ecological conservation issues or residential and recreational amenity.

Flooding

DC15 – Reducing the Flood Risk

- ✓ Policy supported by Anglian Water Services, Natural England and others but recommend that it should mention Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs)
- ✗ Policy should be more strongly worded to 'only' allocate development beyond the floodplain as defined by EA guidance other than in most exceptional circumstances, seek management and mitigation measures if development is exceptionally approved and show that the run off will have no detrimental effect on watercourses or ground conditions.
- ✗ There can be no justification for allowing developments on any recognised floodplain.
- ✗ The policy is objected to by the Environment Agency.
 - The aim of PPS25 is to steer all development, regardless of vulnerability, to areas of lowest flood risk' and not just the 'most vulnerable development. The policy wording does not conform to national guidance and, in our view, would be unsound. The Council may wish to delete the wording 'the most vulnerable' from the second sentence of Policy DC 15, which would overcome this issue of unsoundness. There is insufficient reference in the Core Strategy to the SFRA however you may feel that the detail is more appropriate at the more detailed Development Control Policy level rather than the Core Strategy level.
 - A separate policy should also be included to promote sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) to reduce flood risk in line with the work done in the SFRA. However it is appreciated that a separate policy on SUDS may be too detailed for the Core Strategy level and would be more appropriate at the Development Control Policy level.
 - The Core Strategy states several times that allocations can be provided within areas of low flood risk (Flood Zone 1). It is not considered the approach for any windfall sites which may be in the high risk Flood Zone 2 and 3. Our recommend approach to windfall sites is that the Sequential Test issue should be dealt with up front ready for when windfall sites come up. A policy could be applied, at the strategic level, which states when a windfall site may/may not be appropriate.

Stansted Airport

Policy DC16 – Land within the Airport

- ✗ The policy needs to be developed further to consider and plan for land in close proximity to the airport. It should advise that proposals for airport-related and supporting uses (such as business, accommodation, leisure and tourism, surface access etc) will most appropriately be located at sites in close proximity to the airport.
- ✗ Natural England object to the policy stating that the policy wording should more fully reflect the Objectives 15 to 19 if it is to successfully establish a sustainable development framework for the future growth of the airport.
- ✗ EEDA object to the policy as it underplays the potential role of the airport for the wider region and the positive effects that its growth could have through an

integrated response particularly in relation to some of the regions most deprived areas such as Harlow, Luton and the Thames Gateway

- ✗ Policy should be reworded to ensure that the employment and economic potential of the site is maximised and that the operator will prepare a master plan and business plan prior to submitting proposals for new employment generating development.
- ✗ BAA object to the policy stating that it should refer to making efficient use of land within both the existing and future expanded airport boundary.
- ✗ SSE object to the policy stating that it could be read as supporting further airport capacity and should be amended referring only to essential development supporting the operational needs of the airport.
- ✗ Policy DC16 is not considered necessary as it appears to repeat national and regional planning guidance on making efficient use of land, protection of environmental assets, and securing high quality design.
- ✗ West Essex PCT seeks the rewording of the policy to ensure any significant expansion of the Airport provides for suitable social infrastructure including community facilities.
- ✗ Need to explicitly define those activities directly related to the airport.

Policy DC17 – Development at the Airport

- ✓ The policy is supported in seeking high quality design.
- ✓ Supported by English Heritage who consider it may be appropriate to seek stronger controls over ancillary buildings.
- ✗ Natural England considers that the policy wording should more fully reflect the Objectives 15 to 19 if it is to successfully establish a sustainable development framework for the future growth of the airport.
- ✗ EEDA object to the policy as it underplays the potential role of the airport for the wider region and the positive effects that its growth could have through an integrated response particularly in relation to some of the regions most deprived areas such as Harlow, Luton and the Thames Gateway
- ✗ Policy DC17 should be amended to recognise the importance of securing high quality design and landscaping to re-enforce the role of Stansted Airport as an international gateway, key employment location, and to secure future investment and economic development in the area.

Policy DC18 – Transport

- ✓ The West Essex PCT generally support the policy but expresses the need for Para 5.40 to make reference to the need for developer contributions to be made towards health and community facilities.
- ✓ Sport England East generally support this policy, however, suggest that there is a need for a specific policy relating to the protection of existing open spaces, sport and recreation facilities
- ✓ Supported by developers who are promoting development with these facilities included
- ✗ SSE object to the policy because there is an implicit assumption that the airport will be expanding.
- ✗ The policy needs to be far more specific, identifying schemes, linking to passenger growth thresholds and with a CO2 limit.
- ✗ UDC cannot make decisions on transport. Transport is a County level issue. The document demonstrates no joined up thinking or requirements being placed upon developers to benefit the occupiers of properties in terms of transport.

- ✘ Policy should take a district-wide view of the subject – the airport is not the only destination in Uttlesford. This whole policy needs revision.

Theme 4 – Living in Communities

Policy LC1 – Health and Community Facilities

- ✘ Government Office for the East of England suggests that this policy repeats parts of policy DC3 relating to the developer providing health and community facilities. They suggest deletion of material that repeats other policies. More detail is also needed about how regard has been had to other plans and strategies.
- ✘ Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Dunmow Town Council have suggested changes to this policy to include partnership working with other stakeholders, not just the PCT. Reference should be made to delivery mechanisms to make sure facilities are brought forward in the right locations at the right time.
- ✘ Friends of the Earth suggest that there is inadequate description of facilities that should be required and details of standards should be included or there should be reference to an SPD on the subject
- ✘ The policy should make reference to specific recreational and community facilities
- ✘ East of England Regional Assembly considers more detail is required on culture/leisure for consistency with policies C1 and C2 in the RSS

Policy LC2 – Health Impacts

- ✘ Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Dunmow Town Council have suggested that reference to developers carrying out EIA or a Health Impact Assessment to demonstrate how significant health impacts have been mitigated should be included in this policy.
- ✘ The policy should be more specific

Policy LC3 – Accessibility

- ✓ The PCT and others support this policy
- ✘ Great Dunmow Town Council questions the need for this policy as the issue is captured in other policies. If the policy was to remain they wish to see set criteria and specific types of development identified.

The Spatial Strategy

Growth Option 1

Development to be split between Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and Stansted Mountfitchet

The following lists the arguments made in favour of option 1

- ✓ Expansion of existing towns, with established infrastructure and services could grow at a similar pace of development if required to meet the needs of their expansion. This is both deliverable and sustainable.
- ✓ Organic and proportionate expansion of existing settlements.
- ✓ It is more likely to achieve employment opportunities.
- ✓ The implications that this option would seriously affect the character of the existing towns is not based on evidence.
- ✓ The impact of option 1 on the landscape around the main towns has been inadequately assessed.
- ✓ Would provide schooling incrementally with the rate of development of the modest urban expansions and also minimise travel to school.
- ✓ Existing towns are already connected to the main road network.
- ✓ Fairer distribution of affordable housing.

Representations objecting to Option 1 make the following comments.

Traffic

- × Limited capacity for additional traffic
- × Narrow historic streets
- × Significant development will require major traffic management which cannot be done without compromising the character of the town
- × Lead to the need for outer link roads and development of satellite suburbs with congested access to town centre.
- × Exacerbate Air quality issues in Saffron Walden
- × Unlikely to reduce reliance on car. Only Stansted Mountfitchet has direct access to rail station.
- × Development to north of Stansted Mountfitchet is not conducive to people walking to the Station or School.

Character

- × Detrimental impact on the historic fabric and distinctive character of the three settlements

Infrastructure

- × Place strain on existing infrastructure which is already overstretched.
- × Additional supporting infrastructure and facilities would be needed.
- × Capacity issues at Saffron Walden County High School and Helena Romanes School.
- × Scale of development in each settlement is too small to justify commensurate matched provision of services, and would only serve to add to the limitations of those existing towns.

Existing Developments

- × Towns have and are experiencing significant development and need a period of consolidation/assimilation. Much of this development has taken place without infrastructure in place.

Countryside

- × Loss of countryside
- × The landscape surrounding these towns has a high sensitivity to change.
- × No natural constraint to limit more significant development intruding into the countryside to the north of Stansted Mountfitchet.
- × Development to north of Stansted Mountfitchet would be highly intrusive and dominate approach to village

Impact on Rural Areas

- × Does not allow adequate development to support rural sustainability
- × Restricts development in too few locations to the detriment of the rest of the district.
- × This option does not cater for the housing needs and demands of Uttlesford residents in communities outside the three main population centres;
- × It does not support the retention of community facilities in smaller centres of population through the encouragement of organic growth of those communities;
- × Reduces the provision of affordable housing in other areas in the District.

Growth Option 2

Development located over a hierarchy of settlements from the towns to the villages.

Representations Supporting Option 2 made the following comments:

General

- ✓ Provides a sustainable future for these settlements by encouraging young people to stay in them, keeping local businesses (pubs, shops etc) alive and communities able to exist
- ✓ This option would build upon the existing towns and villages that have identifiable centres and recognised communities

Employment

- ✓ Would support local businesses across the district and reduce need for people to travel.

Traffic

- ✓ Spreads traffic generation
- ✓ Identifies settlements with good access to road network.

Services and Facilities

- ✓ Gives increased recognition to the role of larger villages which benefit from a decent range of facilities and services, including shops, school and public transport accessibility, including railway links.

Rural Character

- ✓ Provides for more sympathetic growth that is better able to safeguard the character and setting of these settlements, whilst also placing less pressure on the existing infrastructure

- ✓ By adding small numbers to each village this will preserve the rural and semi rural communities.
- ✓ This can be done with minimal environmental and heritage impact in the areas of least value identified in the Historic Settlement Character Assessment
- ✓ Allows for greater social integration
- ✓ Minimal impact on the sense of place and distinctiveness of the historic character of the villages.

Housing

- ✓ Spreads housing across District
- ✓ Many villages could sustain a small housing development
- ✓ Reduces risks associated with reliance on single sites
- ✓ Provides for affordable housing in a variety of towns and villages
- ✓ Spreads housing across a wider range of settlements which could reduce the total amount of green field land required within the District.

Representations objecting to Option 2 made the following comments

General

- ✗ Totally change the face of three historic settlements and their surrounding villages and put an intolerable strain on existing infrastructure which is already stretched by recent development.
- ✗ The towns and villages in Option 2 are not suited to the additional development. They have narrow streets which will not cope with dramatic traffic increases. There is limited space for increased parking to accommodate the extra traffic. There is limited space for extra commercial enterprises and shops. The quality of life of existing townspeople and villagers will be adversely affected, not to mention the new residents.
- ✗ As opposed to Option 1, by allocating some houses to other larger villages the pressure is relieved on the three larger towns especially Stansted. However the numbers for Saffron Walden & Dunmow are still too high to be assimilated into a sustainable whole town and the traffic problems would still be insuperable
- ✗ Many of the residents of Elsenham and Henham who objected to Option 4 also objected to the scale of development proposed at Elsenham in Option 2 for reasons of:
 - detrimental impact on services and infrastructure
 - lack of local employment
 - detrimental impact on the character of Elsenham and Henham
 - loss of landscape
 - inadequacy of public transport
 - impact on schools, and
 - inadequacy of road access

Infrastructure

- ✗ Option 2 effectively recommends a piecemeal solution in which no one element is large enough to justify new infrastructure solutions. Each of the settlements would be pushed to and beyond its capability to integrate new residents, while not able to add to schools, roads, retail facilities. All areas would suffer as a consequence.

Character

- ✗ Option 2 would destroy the distinctiveness of so many existing towns and villages
- ✗ Spreading the load compromises the rural character of the District, and further threatens the countryside,

Traffic

- × The roads cannot manage any more traffic
- × The railway is already at capacity

Growth Option 3

Development located over a hierarchy of settlements from the towns to the villages but with significant development at Elsenham as the start of a new settlement.

Representations supporting Option 3 were in the most part made by landowners or their agents promoting land in the settlements identified in this option.

The reasons for support of option 3 are similar to those supporting option 2 i.e.

- ✓ Provides a sustainable future for these settlements by encouraging young people to stay in them, keeping local businesses (pubs, shops etc) alive and communities able to exist
- ✓ Builds upon the existing towns and villages that have identifiable centres and recognised communities
- ✓ Spreads housing across the District
- ✓ Provides for affordable housing in a variety of towns and villages
- ✓ Spreads the total number across a wider range of settlements which could reduce the total amount of green field land required within the District.
- ✓ Avoids too much pressure being placed on roads and services in any particular location
- ✓ Expansion of existing villages will keep them viable. Public transport can be maintained between settlements

Objections raised against option 3 reiterate many of the objections to Options 1 and 2 and 4.

- × Totally change the face of three historic settlements and their surrounding villages and put an intolerable strain on existing infrastructure which is already stretched by recent development.
- × Destroy the distinctiveness of so many existing towns and villages
- × Spreading the load compromises the rural character of the District, and further threatens the countryside,
- × The roads cannot manage any more traffic
- × The railway is already at capacity

- × Many of the residents of Elsenham and Henham who objected to Option 4 also objected to the scale of development proposed at Elsenham in Option 3 for reasons of:
 - expansion of Elsenham in the long term to a new settlement
 - detrimental impact on services and infrastructure
 - lack of local employment
 - detrimental impact on the character of Elsenham and Henham
 - loss of landscape
 - inadequacy of public transport
 - new shopping developments would detract from existing facilities in Elsenham and Henham
 - impact on schools, and
 - inadequacy of road access.

Growth Option 4

Development of a new settlement to the north east of Elsenham with limited development in the towns and villages.

Representations in favour of option 4 made the following points.

Infrastructure

- ✓ Opportunity to create a well planned settlement with the appropriate infrastructure.
- ✓ Infrastructure can be planned from the start and developed as settlement expands.
- ✓ Well planned new development with new facilities, shops and enhanced infrastructure will benefit Elsenham.
- ✓ Enables a greater contribution of infrastructure costs
- ✓ Adequate size to justify the provision of primary and secondary schools and other community services.
- ✓ If developed properly it could be the model of a low carbon, high tech modern town.

Employment

- ✓ Well located for people working at Stansted Airport or commuting to London or Cambridge.
- ✓ A new settlement at Elsenham is uniquely placed as it is within the catchment of towns with business sites but will also benefit from being self sufficient on a local level.
- ✓ Close to Stansted Airport which has an expanding labour force.

Transport

- ✓ Good transport links. Well located for public transport, particularly rail, minimising the amount of car travel needed on local roads.

District Character

- ✓ Least destructive for the general character of the District as a whole. Keeps housing impact on the villages to a minimum.
- ✓ Relieve pressure on the services and facilitates of existing towns and villages.
- ✓ Protects the historical and unique characteristics of Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and Stansted Mountfitchet.
- ✓ Inability of the infrastructure in Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow to cope with large scale development.
- ✓ Minimises harm to the distinctiveness and historic character of Uttlesford's towns and villages.
- ✓ Elsenham is a fairly unassuming village and is not particularly attractive or historic.
- ✓ Low landscape and ecological value and low agricultural classification.
- ✓ Other new towns such as Bar Hill and Camborne in Cambridgeshire have worked well.

The following list the main reasons for objection put forward by residents of Elsenham and Henham.

Process for selecting option 4

- * Sustainability appraisal was produced after option 4 was selected
- * Not based on robust or credible evidence.
- * Why were no other options for a single development of this scale considered?
- * Coalescence of Elsenham and Henham resulting from Option 4 is contrary to 8th point of District Vision which is inconsistent. [“The local distinctiveness and historic character of our towns and villages will be preserved and enhanced and they will continue to be separate entities with green space between them”]
- * Goes against results of previous public consultation and assessment of 9 growth options against strategic objectives.

Expansion of Elsenham and Henham

- * What is meant by a “New Settlement”?
- * A new settlement of 3000 houses would go against the advice of the East of England Plan Panel Report on size thresholds.
- * Rather than a new settlement it is clearly an expansion of Elsenham and Henham.
- * No documentary evidence that open green spaces will be provided between Henham and Elsenham so they would merge to become one urban area.
- * Lack of flexibility should circumstances change and over reliance on one location for the majority of the development needs of the district could lead to high risk of failure should anything arise that affects the developer’s ability to deliver.

Services and Infrastructure

- * Development of 3000 houses is of insufficient size to make provision of secondary school, GP Services, shops viable. Residents would still look to nearby towns for such services.
- * Concerns about distance of development from emergency services – hospitals; police, fire and ambulance.
- * Concerns about current low water pressure and frequent power cuts which would be made worse by development.
- * Old Mead Lane and level crossing liable to flooding which would become worse with development
- * Goes against advice given in previous consultation Policy Choices and Options for Growth consultation which stated that It is unlikely that a new settlement of 3000 homes would support significant services and facilities and the residents would *have to use existing services and facilities in nearby towns and larger villages.*

Employment

- * Because of the rail link, new residents would be more likely to commute rather than work locally and thereby discourage local employment and local services.
- * Local employment would be more likely in existing larger settlements, where there are jobs locally.

Affordable Housing

- * Creation of a single settlement would locate all affordable housing in one place which would not be of benefit to the rest of Uttlesford

Character of Towns and Villages

- * The effect on the important village character of Henham and Elsenham has been insufficiently assessed.

- × Henham has conservation area and many listed buildings and has been named as a Village of Special English Character.
- × Development would cause loss of community spirit.
- × Significant fear of an increase in crime resulting from the additional population
- × Noise and disturbance during construction.

Landscape

- × The special landscape of the area will be damaged.
- × The landscape at present is valued for walking, local beauty and wildlife.
- × The impact on the sensitive landscape between Elsenham and Henham has been given too little weight.

Public Transport

- × The railway transport is already far too overcrowded and certainly could not cope with any more commuters. The claimed advantage of Option 4 in terms of the railway station is more likely to be a disadvantage, producing a 'commuter settlement' with long distance travel to London and Cambridge for employment and shopping, thus discouraging local provision
- × Roads are too narrow to safely accommodate more buses

Mixed Developments

- × If there are new shops in the proposed development then they would detract from existing facilities in Elsenham and Henham

Education

- × Existing primary schools are at capacity and are liked for being small village schools
- × Question whether development would support a new secondary school. Even if development did include new secondary school, phasing of housing development would mean children would have to travel to existing schools, placing them under strain until new school was built.

Road Access

- × Local roads cannot cope with present traffic let alone any more. Inadequate road infrastructure to cope with construction traffic and additional population.
- × No adequate road access to the site. Particular issues being Grove Hill into Stansted, North Hall Road and rail bridge (toot toot bridge), closure of level crossing for a total of 3 hours a day; village road through Henham.
- × No documented evidence that there will be the necessary roads for the new settlement.

Tests of Soundness

- × Fails 4th 6th 7th 8th 9th tests of soundness

Dismissed Options

Paragraph 5.65 (Limehouse) Para 6.65 (Written Document)

All development to take place in villages

- ✓ Representations supporting the dismissal of this option suggest that this would help to protect the character of the smaller villages
- ✗ Many of the people who object to the dismissal of this option are objectors to a new settlement at Elsenham and see the dispersal of the housing as a better option for the following reasons:
 - Each village would benefit from the addition of affordable homes, allowing young people to stay near families
 - Smaller developments would allow people to integrate into the community
 - Impact would be minimised
 - More natural form of gradual growth
 - Social benefits would be spread more widely
 - More local control by residents and parish councils
 - Existing services would cope better and could be expanded in a sustainable way.
 - Less environmental impact
 - A fairer solution
 - More easily built on brownfield sites or smaller areas of farmland and reduce the need to use large areas of prime farmland.
 - Maintain the rural and historic character of the area
 - Create economic benefit for the settlements through support for local businesses, shops and schools.

Paragraph 5.66 (Limehouse) Para 6.66 (Written Document)

All development to take place in the A120 corridor or the West Anglia rail corridor

- ✓ Many of the representations supporting the dismissal of development in the A120 corridor are objecting to the Chater Homes proposal for a new settlement known as Chelmer Mead between Great and Little Dunmow. The main reasons for the objections are:
 - The proposed development would engulf and destroy the ancient village of Little Dunmow cutting it off from its historical landscape and destroying its local distinctiveness and historic character.
 - The proposed Chelmer Mead scheme destroys and urbanises the countryside replacing its open spaces (fields, footpaths, bridleways and the Flitch Way) with a man-made country park. There is no requirement for a man-made country park as open countryside currently exists for the enjoyment of all.
 - The proposed development would destroy green lanes and bridleways home to foxes, badgers, deer, weasels, newts, snakes, stoats, hedgehogs, woodpeckers, jays and many other species of wild birds, animals, reptiles and insects as well as flora many hundreds of years old.
 - The proposed development would put a further and unacceptable burden on local roads and significantly increase car usage in an area where the existing roads struggle to cope with the increased traffic resulting from the Oakwood Park development.

- The proposed development of Chelmer Mead would put unacceptable pressure on existing services and facilities.
 - The proposed Chelmer Mead development is not self-sustaining, puts pressure on rather than enhancing existing infrastructure and attempts to rely on provision of facilities long awaited but yet to be provided as part of the development of Oakwood Park.
 - The Little Dunmow area has already endured substantial development whilst promised community facilities remain to be provided.
 - The proposed Chelmer Mead development will result in ribbon development along the A120 which, as has been acknowledged, is simply a road and would destroy not only the distinct historic settlements of Little Dunmow, Felsted and Barnston but swamp Great Dunmow itself.
 - The population growth of Little Dunmow and Oakwood Park consequent on the Chelmer Mead development would rival and exceed that of Great Dunmow.
- ✗ People objecting to the dismissal of the A120 option consider the following points to be the positive advantages. A significant number of people who think this option should not be dismissed are objectors to the Elsenham proposal.
- The A120 can accommodate growth without causing detrimental traffic congestion
 - Easy access to the airport
 - Good access to centres outside the district like Bishops Stortford and Chelmsford.
 - Good access to employment locations
 - A120 is the only real piece of new infrastructure in the district that can support commercial and residential growth
 - No evidence to suggest that the historic core of the main towns will be destroyed or damaged by further growth along the A120
 - Good road links will be more attractive to potential residents than a railway station.
 - Opportunity to introduce a guided bus/tram route along the track bed of the old railway line.
 - Alternative sites are being suggested i.e. Easton Park, Boxted Wood and Chelmer Mead
- ✓ People support the dismissal of the option concentrating development in the West Anglia Rail corridor because of limited capacity on the line and limited ability to link into the transport network and improve public transport
- ✗ Supporters of option 4 and people who are promoting sites e.g. in Newport support development in the West Anglian rail corridor and therefore object to this Option being dismissed.
- ✗ There is also some support for large scale development in Great Chesterford

Paragraph 5.67 (Limehouse) Para 6.67 (Written Document)
All development to take place in Saffron Walden or Great Dunmow or Stansted Mountfitchet

There are no representations of support for the dismissal of this option.

- ✗ People objecting to this option being dismissed have listed the following advantages of concentrating development in one of the three main centres:

- The centres need to remain commercially viable.
- Employment and affordable housing is needed in these locations
- Discriminatory against the smaller developments
- If development is well designed and properly integrated there is no reason why it should have a detrimental impact on the sense of place and local distinctiveness of the town and could positively contribute to sense of place
- Large expansion could generate significant planning gain to address the current shortcomings of the town in terms of open space, shopping facilities, employment, cycle routes and bus services.
- Infrastructure is already available

**Paragraph 5.68 (Limehouse) Para 6.68 (Written Document)
New settlements in locations other than Elsenham**

Representations in support of the dismissal of this option made the following points:

- ✓ The clear benefit suggested for Elsenham is the sustainability of a larger settlement due to its closeness to nearby centres for employment, shopping and leisure and its public transport connections. This would need to be subject to infrastructure investment at the outset.
- ✓ Each of the alternative new settlement locations being promoted are remote from rail links and would fail to deliver the sustainable patterns of movement as Elsenham.
- ✓ Support paragraph objecting to Chelmer Mead proposal for the reasons listed in support of paragraph 5.66
- ✓ Support the decision not to pursue development of a new settlement near Stebbing. Reasons for objection to the Boxted Wood proposal are as follows:-
 - Farm land should not be used for housing developments, it should be preserved
 - The settlement would urbanise the area, a ribbon development that would see our towns and villages merge
 - The local distinctiveness and historic character of Stebbing Green will be destroyed. It is an area with a number of listed buildings and a County Wildlife Site
 - Increase in pollution from cars and lights
 - The wildlife will be driven out by the new development
 - The proposed development would put further and unacceptable burden on local roads with significantly increased car usage
 - The development will be totally reliant on the car
 - Concern over flooding problems if the fields were turned into concrete
 - The proposed development is in an area described as “an area of gently rolling hills with wide flat tops and valleys covered by predominantly medium to large arable fields” and “long distance views over the large fields.” in the Landscape Character Assessment by Chris Blandford Associations 2006
 - No detail on how jobs will be created in the area, people will commute
 - The inclusion of Boxted Wood as an amenity area would permanently damage the ancient woodland
 - How can the development and Andrewsfield Airfield peacefully and safely co-exist
 - Eco claims are made, but it is not an eco development

Representations objecting to the dismissal of other locations for new settlements made the following comments:-

General

- * Other sites should be considered due to the reasons of objection listed against option 4.
- * The right approach would be to establish a brand new settlement away from existing villages. In other words create a new large village. This has the particular benefit of not swamping and changing significantly the character of an existing village.
- * If the Council wished to consider a single settlement, it should have looked at ALL the possible sites throughout the district and consulted on all these sites.
- * Council should propose an Option 5, namely one new settlement providing all the 4.200 new homes, however do not wish to express a view on whether the whole new settlement should be at Elsenham or at another location in the district.
- * An area of brownfield land should be sought for a new town.
- * The Council should not be developer led
- * Should be looking for a site at least 5 miles away from these polluted areas, providing good public services to the railway and good road links to the major roads.

Great Dunmow/Little Dunmow

- * Consider an alternative location between Little Dunmow and Great Dunmow (Chelmer Mead) It would have easy access to the A120, Stansted Airport, Dunmow and all points east. If in future there is the demand then a guided bus or tram route could be installed along the track bed of the old railway line to Bishops Stortford and/or Braintree for onward journeys. This site could then be enlarged in keeping with the government's proposals for new towns without disruption to the existing local communities

Stebbing

- * Rather see this new settlement located in the South of the District, possibly linked to other development from the Braintree District to provide a larger settlement of perhaps 6000 homes with completely new infrastructure. This would give the planners freedom to design a low carbon footprint settlement with properly designed infrastructure, as opposed to "add-on" infrastructure at Elsenham. What an opportunity to design and build something worthwhile for the future rather than scratching around looking for excuses not to build homes worth living in.
- * The Council must consider all reasonable and available locations for a new settlement and fully evaluate the Boxted Wood proposal
- * Support the Stebbing Green single Settlement option because it has good links to bus and road networks, does not link up with existing settlements, has potential for expansion, with contribution of houses from Braintree DC it would be even more viable as eco-settlement, a new secondary school would make better sense in this location.

Great Chesterford

- * Great Chesterford appears to meet the listed criteria far better than Elsenham. It is near the railway, closer to motorway exits and the existing main roads and indeed to Cambridge itself and the employment opportunities associated with it.

A120

- * Uttlesford District Council is wrong to dismiss options to build one, large, new settlement along the A120 corridor which could be used with little disruption to other communities

West Anglia Rail Corridor

- * Uttlesford District Council is wrong to dismiss options to build one, large, new settlement along the West Anglia Rail corridor.

Takeley/Little Canfield

- * Consideration should be given to Takeley/Little Canfield to become a small town with all necessary infrastructure provision. It is better located to the road network, centrally located within the district and a new secondary school would relieve schools at Stansted and Great Dunmow.

Audley End/Wendens Ambo

- * Suggest land near Audley End Station/Wendens Ambo as a site for a new village. There are already good road and rail transport links and secondary schools within easy reach.

Newport; Ugley/Ugley Green

- * Why not build our "new settlement" on the other side of the Motorway to Newport? It is approximately half way between the 2 M11 junctions and so a new on and off ramp system could be built thus alleviating the B1383 (yes I know that costs lots but this section needs widening anyway so it could be a "job lot" paid for by the Government - they want the houses after all). It is near all the major employment areas (Cambridge, Stansted, Stortford), has an existing railway station and schools. If the Estate was built in the general area of the Three Corner Plantation it would not be visible by any of the existing villages and several new wooded areas could be built into the planning permissions.

B184

- * A location east of the B184 with easy access to the recently improved A120 would give good access to Braintree and Chelmsford. Partnership with one or more neighbouring Councils would still count within the Eastern Region allocation and would present a once in a lifetime opportunity to develop an eco-town.

Great Dunmow/Saffron Walden

- * Surely a new settlement would be better suited to an existing larger settlement? These places would already have plenty of jobs etc, also there is no evidence that the historic nature of larger settlements is severely affected by extra development. Towns are already prepared for new settlements and would be able to accommodate them in all aspects; they also would not be so dramatically changed.

Appendix 1: Table listing locations being promoted for residential development

Parish	Site	Size of Site	Uses
	Not Specific		Developer with portfolio of land which includes sites within Uttlesford District – not specified
Arkesden	Arkesden		No specific site – generally supporting development in villages for example Arkesden
Barnston	Chelmsford Road, Barnston	1.9ha	Housing
Clavering	2 sites at Clavering		Housing
Elsenham	Land south of Stansted Road, Elsenham		Residential
Elsenham	Land north of the Crown Inn, Henham Road, Elsenham	1.325ha	50 homes
Elsenham	The Orchard, Station Road, Elsenham	1.6ha	80homes 40% affordable
Elsenham	Land West of Elsenham		
Elsenham	North East of Elsenham	250ha (total area under Fairfield Control)	3,000 homes Range of tenures and types inc affordable housing New secondary school if required 2 New primary schools Mixed use town centre 40,000m2 Employment Open space Sports Provision Community and Health Facilities
Elsenham	Various parcels of land at Old Mead Road, Elsenham		
Elsenham	Land west of Elsenham	13.23ha plus 3.1ha	300-400 homes, community facilities and local centre plus additional 3.1ha for commercial development next to M11
Elsenham	Land at Alsa Leys		Include within development limits
Felsted	The Bury, Felsted School		
Felsted	Mill Road, Felsted	0.17ha	Housing
Great	Great Chesterford		No specific site but scale greater

Parish	Site	Size of Site	Uses
Chesterford			than that suggested in Option2
Great Dunmow	Land west and south west of Great Dunmow	98ha	2,500 homes in mixed use scheme with employment, leisure and community facilities with schools and shops. Substantial areas of public open land for recreation, including providing dedicated public access to the protected woodland areas.
Great Dunmow	St Edmunds Lane, Great Dunmow	1.13ha	Total number of homes not specified But breakdown is: 25% Market Rented 25% for people of limited mobility 25% Shared Ownership 25% open market
Great Dunmow	Staggs Farm, Great Dunmow	4.85ha plus 5.8ha public access formal/informal open space	195 homes 40% affordable
Great Dunmow	South of Ongar Road, Great Dunmow	3.89ha 3.67ha – housing 0.22ha woodland planting	120 homes
Great Dunmow	St Edmunds Lane, Great Dunmow		Residential development including a retirement village. Up to 500 homes
Great Dunmow	Church End, Great Dunmow		
Great Dunmow	Sector 4 Woodlands Park	5.85ha	175-200homes Appropriate amount of open space/amenity area
Great Dunmow	Brick Kiln Farm 1	0.9ha	
Great Dunmow	Brick Kiln Farm 2	12ha	New housing area and transfer substantial amount of public open space in the Chelmer Valley amount and location of housing and open space subject to further discussion at appropriate stage.
Great Dunmow	Ongar Road Trading Estate	1.55ha	idential

Parish	Site	Size of Site	Uses
Great Dunmow	Land to the West Of Great Dunmow		Residential
Great Dunmow	Great Dunmow Business Park		650 dwellings 500-700 jobs
Great Dunmow	Dunmow Park		180 homes
Great Easton	Little Brocks, Great Easton		
Great Easton	Land adj Gunns Mead, Great Easton		
Great Hallingbury	The Old Elm, Start Hill		
Great Hallingbury	Church Road, Great Hallingbury	Approx 0.4ha	Infill residential
Hatfield Heath	Matching Road, Hatfield Heath		
Hatfield Heath	Sawbridgeworth Road, Hatfield Heath		Housing
Hatfield Heath	Land off Cox Ley, Hatfield Heath		Housing, open space and play area
Henham	Land off Hall Close, Henham	1.83ha	
High Easter	Land at High Easter	0.8ha 0.07ha	
Leaden Roding	Stortford Road, Leaden Roding	1.3ha	
Little Canfield	North View, Dunmow Road, Little Canfield		Further intensification of a suitably well contained site on the old A120
Little Canfield	Little Canfield Village Hall	1.18ha	15 private det and semi det homes. 10 affordable cottages and flats New Village Hall Village Green Play Area Allotments
Little Canfield/ Takelely ?	Little Canfield (Extension to Priors Green)	Not specified	Not specified New family homes inc significant proportion of affordable homes Small scale employment opportunities Open space

Parish	Site	Size of Site	Uses
			Education New local community facilities
Little Dunmow	Chelmer Mead, Land between Great Dunmow and Little Dunmow	300ha	3,000homes Shops and community facilities Secondary School Country Park Golf Course and other sports facilities (smaller proposal of around 1,000 or 1,500homes could be taken forward on part of this land with smaller level of facilities and infrastructure)
Little Dunmow/ Felsted	Extensions to Oakwood Park		120 homes
Little Easton	Easton Park	655ha	3,000 to 4,000 homes as part of Core Strategy, 7,500 – 9,000 dwellings total beyond 2024 2-5 bed family homes No more than 25% apartments 30-50% affordable housing 100,000m2 commercial floorspace Primary schools and secondary school Foodstore Local Support Services Health Centre Creche Community Centre(s) Leisure Facilities A hotel Country Park
Little Hallingbury	Lower Road, Little Hallingbury	4.09ha	2.4ha open Market and affordable housing and 1.7ha open space
Newport	The Quarry, Newport	10ha	Housing, Employment and Leisure
Newport	London Road, Newport		
Newport	Bury Water Nursery Bury Water Lane, Newport	2.2ha	
Newport	Land at Bury Water Lane	2.5ha	

Parish	Site	Size of Site	Uses
Newport	Bury Water Nursery and Land adjoining Wyndhams Croft, Newport	2.83ha nursery and 2.63 ha Wyndhams Croft	
Newport	land south and west of Newport. Greater emphasis on Newport.		
Newport	Land off Wicken Road, Newport	2ha	200 homes in conjunction with land adjacent to Primary School south of Fambury Lane
Newport	Newport		Landowners in the Newport area – no specific site identified.
Quendon & Rickling Green	Foxley House, Rickling Green		Affordable Housing?
Quendon and Rickling	Adj Quendon Cottage	0.2ha	
Saffron Walden	Land owned by Audley End Estate, Saffron Walden		No specific site identified – general rep putting forward their land around Saffron Walden that might be suitable for allocation without detrimental effect on the character of the town.
Saffron Walden	Herberts Farm, Saffron Walden	12ha	Comprehensive scheme
Saffron Walden	Thaxted Road Saffron Walden		
Saffron Walden	Saffron Walden East	58ha	1050 homes 1ha Employment Retail/Employment 2.3ha Primary School Community Facilities/Local Centre Sports Provision Country Parkl
Stansted Mountfitchet	Bentfield Bury Farm, Stansted		Scale of development to be determined
Stansted Mountfitchet	Land north of Stansted Mountfitchet		
Stansted Mountfitchet	Elms Farm, Stansted Mountfitchet		
Stebbing	Andrewsfield Airfield		3,000 new homes. Facilitate larger eco town of 5,000 at least 40% affordable

Parish	Site	Size of Site	Uses
	Stebbing		
Stebbing	Boxted Wood	113ha in Utt 22ha in Braintree	4,500 homes, 3,000 in Utt, 1500 in Braintree Potential increase to 10,000 60% 2-4 bed homes At least 40% affordable 4 Primary Schools Secondary School 2 Doctor's surgeries 2 neighbourhood retail centres 7ha employment land 7ha playing fields 25ha amenity/play space
Stebbing	Church End Stebbing		Residential
Takeley	Land in Takeley Street		
Takeley	Taylor's Farm, Takeley		
Takeley	Land west of Morrells Green, Brewers End, Takeley	1.35ha	40 Homes
Takeley	Land east of Takeley Mobile Home Park	23ha	
Takeley	Cricket Ground, Brewer's End, Takeley		
Takeley	Prior's Green, Takeley	81.66ha	1400 homes Appropriate amount of employment land, open space, community facilities, and a new primary school (if required).
Takeley	Takeley Street	0.07ha	1 home
Takeley	Land at Takeley Street		
Thaxted	Sampford Road, Thaxted	No site details provided	100-150 homes
Thaxted	Land off Wedow Road, Thaxted		75-100 homes. Mix of market and affordable with some retirement housing

Parish	Site	Size of Site	Uses
Thaxted	Claypits Farm Buildings, Thaxted Barnards Field Bardfield Road Thaxted.		58 dwellings Playing Fields
Thaxted	Thaxted Hall Thaxted		