

**Committee:** Environment  
**Date:** 17 June 2008  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation  
**Author:** Sarah Nicholas, Senior Planning Officer  
ext 454

**Agenda Item**

**7**

Item for  
information

---

## Summary

This report provides members with an overview of the representations received on the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. Accompanying this report is an overview of the representations received. It lists the reasons for support and objection to the Core Strategy Preferred Option policies and the four growth options. A more detailed Report of Representations with officer recommendations will be presented to Members in the autumn.

## Recommendations

For Members Information

## Background Papers

Uttlesford Core Strategy – Preferred Options Consultation November 2007

Letters and emails of representation

## Impact

Communication/Consultation	The feedback of the results of consultation is an essential element in the preparation of the DPD documents
Community Safety	N/A
Equalities	All representations made are captured
Finance	N/A
Human Rights	N/A
Legal implications	Effective consultation on the Core Strategy is a statutory requirement
Sustainability	Sustainability implications are assessed
Ward-specific impacts	All

Workforce/Workplace	N/A
---------------------	-----

### Situation

- 1 All the representations received on the Core Strategy Preferred Options can now be viewed on the Limehouse on-line consultation system apart from the majority of letters objecting to the Chelmer Mead proposal at Little Dunmow. Most of these were standard letters and they have not been logged on the Limehouse system, unless additional comments have been made. The standard objections to this proposal are reported in the accompanying overview. The names and addresses of the people making the representations have been logged separately so that they can be kept informed of future stages of the consultation.
- 2 A total of 5401 representations made by 1671 people have been recorded on Limehouse. In addition, we have received: in the order of 760 letters of objection to the Chelmer Mead proposal; a petition signed by more than 500 children objecting to Options 3 and 4; and eight letters objecting to the Boxted Wood proposal, Stebbing following the consultation carried out by Galliard Homes in February 2008. The details of these latter representations have been logged in a similar way to the representations on Chelmer Mead.
- 3 There have been a few problems with the data input, mainly to do with the difficulty of categorising the comments in the letters. These have mainly arisen where people have stated in their letter that they object to any development in Elsenham yet the grounds given in their letter have specifically related to a new settlement or 3000 dwellings. This has been interpreted as an objection to option 4. In assessing the overall response, however, Members should note that there may well also be objection to development on a smaller scale in Elsenham or to development extending beyond the plan period as in Option 3, although the reasons have not been articulated in representations received.
- 4 Some people raised specific questions in their representations. The questions are noted and the issues raised will be addressed in a *Comparative Sustainability Assessment* which will be presented to Members in the autumn. For each sustainability objective it is intended to set out the current situation as a base line, the issues of concern (i.e. the questions raised), solutions and mitigation. An assessment will also be made on the likely impact on the sustainability objective of switching to one of the other options. The LDF Task Group felt that presenting the information in this way would be helpful.

### Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
None identified			

