



Uttlesford District Council Local Development Framework

**Summary of Representations received on the
Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation
November 2007 – January 2008**

**Submitted to the Environment Committee
18th November 2008**

Jargon Buster

AA – Appropriate Assessment
ANGSt – Accessible Natural Green Space Standards
DC - Development Control
DPD – Development Plan Document
EEDA – East of England Development Agency
EERA – East of England Regional Assembly
ECC – Essex County Council
EoE – East of England
Go East – Government Office for the Eastern Region
LDD – Local Development Document
LDF – Local Development Framework
MGB – Metropolitan Green Belt
NGSS – Natural Green Space Standards
NPFA – National Playing Fields Association
PC – Parish Council
PCT – Primary Care Trust
PPS – Planning policy Statement
RANCH – Road Traffic and Aircraft Noise Exposure and Children’s Cognition and Health
RPG – Regional Policy Guidance
RSS – Regional Spatial Strategy
SA – Sustainability Appraisal
SA DPD – Site Allocations Development Plan Document
SFRA – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHMA – Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SHLAA– Strategic Housing Land Availability
SuD’s – Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
TC – Town Council

Introduction

1. The consultation on the Council's Preferred Options for the Uttlesford Core Strategy started on 30 November 2007, the closing date for representations was 11 January 2008.
2. An overview of the representations received on the Policies and Options for Growth was submitted to the Environment Committee for information in June 2008. The overview did not contain details of representation on all aspects of the preferred options document but concentrated on the policies and the options for growth, including the dismissed options.
3. This document completes the summary of the representations received. It includes details of the representations received on the introductory sections and the objectives, policies and the supporting paragraphs under the themes identified in the preferred options document:
 - Theme 1 – Economy and Employment
 - Theme 2 – Getting Around
 - Theme 3 – District Character
 - Theme 4 – Living in Communities
4. The second part of this document summarises the representations received on the Growth Options including the sustainability appraisal and the previously dismissed options.
5. The representations are shown as either support (✓), objection (✖) or observations (o), Representations of support with conditions have been classified as support. Specific questions raised in relation to the new settlement proposal to the north east of Elsenham are not reported here. They will be dealt with separately in the Comparative Sustainability Assessment which the Council is preparing as part of the evidence base to support the Core Strategy.
6. The representations are an important element in the Council's further consideration of the Core Strategy and how it should be moved forward but there are other factors which also need to be taken into account in developing a sound Core Strategy namely:
 - The outcomes of study work
 - Ongoing Government consultation on the eco-town (see report)
 - The situation with regard to Stansted AirportUntil these have progressed further and more information becomes available officers will not be in a position to recommend appropriate responses to the issues raised in the representations. This document does not therefore contain any comment on or analysis of the representations or recommend any changes. These will be the subject of further reports to the Environment committee. Further consultation on some of the key issues raised in the representations will be held in the summer 2009. This will inform preparation of the submission Core Strategy which will be the subject of further consultation early in 2010.
7. The representations can be viewed in full on the on-line consultation system go to <http://consultation.limehouse.co.uk/uttlesford> or at the Council Offices in Saffron Walden. If you would like to look at any representations at the Council Offices please telephone the policy team in advance to arrange this on 01799 501461 or 510637

Note: When the preferred options document was published the paragraph numbering in the on line version was different to the published document. Both numbers are given in this report the number in the on-line version is given first with the hardcopy number following.

Summary of Representations on Uttlesford Core Strategy – Preferred Options Consultation,
November 2007

Purpose of this Document

Paragraph 1.3 (1.8 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- Go-East noted that for a number of the policies only the preferred option was indicated. There was no outline of whether alternative options were considered and appraised. They question whether the Council is satisfied its decisions are robust. They explain that where no other alternatives are presented the SA should have investigated the 'do nothing' option to compare the differences between the two.

Paragraph 1.4 (1.9 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Go East object to this paragraph as the document should include details of any options it is suggested be rejected as well as the reasons behind these choices. They point out that it is not clear that consultees still have an opportunity to express a preference for any of the options, including rejected ones.
- × Object to method of consultation
- × Preferred growth option is being put forward without prior consultation
- × Sustainability Appraisal undertaken after Option 4 identified as preferred option.

- Postpone submission of final Core Strategy until after G2 inquiry
- Consultation with utilities, infrastructure and other services should proceed wider public consultation

Paragraph 1.5 (1.10 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Lack of mapping to identify detail of proposals

How we reached this stage

Paragraph 1.6 (1.11 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- Thames Water Property Services express the need for realistic consultation periods with water and sewerage undertakers in the preparation of LDDs.

Paragraph 1.7 (1.12 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Preferred growth option has not taken into account the results of the preferred consultation. Process of selection is not transparent and lacks evidence.
- × Bridgefoot Trust and Walden Road Gospel Hall Trust request to be considered General Consultation Bodies.

Key Issues

Paragraph 1.9 (1.14 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Suggest additional Key Issues on improving quality of life, creating sustainable and inclusive communities and providing adequate social infrastructure and support community involvement.
- × West Essex Primary Care Trust objects. They would like the following bullet points added:
 - The concentration of development at the most sustainable locations
 - Ensuring the provision of adequate infrastructure is provided and phased in line with new development provision
- × Object in principle to level of development
- × Object to plans being made on assumption that a second runway will be built.
- × Preferred growth option would not meet key issues identified in paragraph 1.9.
- GO-East point out that there is little explanation or reference to other evidence such as studies to support the view that these are the key issues that need to be addressed

The Vision

Paragraph 2.1

Summary of Representations

- ✓ ECC and English Heritage support the vision
- ✓ Great Chesterford Supports the Vision
- ✓ Vision supported by some developers, landowners, Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance, Tesco, Essex Wildlife Trust and English Heritage.
- × GO-East objects to the vision pointing out that delivery of housing should be planned for at least 15 years from the date of adoption and suggests that the core strategy should have an end date beyond 2021.
- × ECC Spatial Planning objects stating that the vision should include a commitment to the mineral supply and waste hierarchy and make reference to sustainable waste management in the vision.

- × GO-East stress the importance of outlining how the vision relates to the community strategy as it is a requirement of one of the tests of soundness (v).
- × Newport PC states that a number of the points are out of the control of the Council.
- × The vision is basically a wish list. The Council has no control or money to achieve the vision.
- × Dunmow Town Design Group consider the vision is insufficiently forward looking, creative and imaginative to face the challenges of growth and of global warming and for a step change in sustainability.
- × Great Dunmow Town Council suggest an additional vision statements
 - “A significantly greater proportion of people will work either from home or closer to home”
“The economic base of the District will have diversified to offer a wider range of high quality employment and paid and unpaid rewarding opportunities”
 - “There will be a significantly greater proportion of journeys undertaken by sustainable means”
 - “All major development will be in accessible locations and will be accessed largely by sustainable means”
 - “The design and construction of all new development will be universally of high quality and will be mixed use wherever possible and will complement the existing character of our towns and villages and rural areas”
 - “Most housing will have been provided within a new sustainable settlement”
 - The biodiversity of the District will have improved significantly
 - The proportion of food grown and consumed locally will have increased significantly through new production and distribution systems
 - The extent of areas of tranquillity within the District will have been increased from their present extent
 - The level of education and skills in the District will have improved significantly so that no one is excluded by virtue of lack of appropriate skills.
- × The vision does not identify the local distinctive spatial issues as well as wider spatial context. It does not have regard to other plans, policies and strategies.
 - Braintree DC want Uttlesford’s support for improvement to the A120 between Braintree and Marks Tey as the strategy is likely to generate additional traffic on the A120.
 - Add a vision on architectural design.
 - Vision should make provision for buildings for public religious worship.
 - Cambridgeshire County Council suggest that the vision is revised to both protect and enhance the environment. It should include reference to addressing climate change, provision of a clean and healthy environment, reducing pollution, minimising environmental impact and resource efficiency.
 - Great Dunmow Town Council and others consider The Vision should relate to the period to 2024

Representations on specific Vision statements are:-

1. Uttlesford will enjoy a sustainably high quality of life in which the benefits of the unique character of the district are equally available to all residents, workers and visitors

- Who will be encouraged to become involved in delivery of this vision?

2. Facilities will exist for companies to grow in Uttlesford

- × Fails to recognise the area’s potential for growth and it does not reflect local and regional aspirations to improve economic performance.
- Unconstrained growth is not always good for companies or the rest of the community. Amend to “Facilities exist for companies to establish and function sustainably.”

3. There will be convenient, comfortable, safe and affordable alternatives to private transport, whether by bus or rail serving the settlements of Elsenham/Henham, Great Dunmow, Great Chesterford, Newport, Saffron Walden, Stansted Mountfitchet, Takeley and Thaxted and the regional interchange centre of Stansted Airport.

- × Littlebury PC objects to the vision stating that bullet point 3 should include “and the villages of Uttlesford.”
- × Include rural areas, particularly key service centres to be served by innovative public transport solutions.
- × Great Dunmow Town Council suggest a rewording “There will be convenient, comfortable, safe and affordable alternatives to private transport whether by bus or rail serving the settlements of..... A network of footpaths and cycle paths that is integrated with green infrastructure will exist throughout the District”
 - Need guarantees from public transport providers
 - Places equal weight on road based public transport and therefore there is no merit in locating development in relation to Elsenham Railway.
 - What is meant by the term Settlement of Elsenham/Henham?

4. A network of footpaths and cycleways will exist throughout the district

- × The preferred growth option will result in the loss of footpaths.

5. The houses and facilities people need will be available and affordable locally

- × Great Dunmow Town Council suggest amended wording “The houses and facilities people need will be available and affordable locally at a time they are needed”
 - Add “.. and supported by social and community infrastructure in order to create sustainable and inclusive communities”
 -

6. New housing developments have been concentrated on relatively few sites to enable the provision of maximum level of public service infrastructure.

- ✓ Great Canfield PC support the vision especially point 6 which prevents facilities in existing communities being overloaded.
 - × Council cannot provide range of services in short term
 - × Level of public service infrastructure can be maximised more if growth take place in areas of existing population concentration.
 - × Questionable whether the preferred growth option of a new settlement and expansion of existing towns and villages can be appropriately described as the use of relatively few sites.
 - × Limiting the number of development sites can lead to an undersupply of new houses.
 - × Amend to sequential approach from Previously Developed Land in the three largest settlements, urban extensions at largest settlements, limited development in the larger more sustainable rural centres and then only if there is not sufficient housing to look at the commencement of a new settlement.
 - Must avoid the development of a conurbation of Birchanger, Stansted, Elsenham and Takeley around the Airport.

7. Our countryside, its habitats, agriculture, cultural and visual qualities will be protected and accessible to all

- ✓ Natural England and EEDA generally support the vision. However, Natural England want bullet point 7 changed to “Our countryside, its habitats, agricultural, cultural and visual qualities will *be conserved and enhanced.*” EEDA want the economic and social advantages for business and communities associated with the growth of Stansted Airport more fully addressed by the vision and subsequent policies on Stansted Airport.

- ✓ CRPEssex want points 7 and 8 strengthened to refer to Landscape Character and Tranquillity
 - ✗ The preferred growth options will result in the loss of countryside.
 - Indiscriminate accessibility is not always compatible with protection. Amend to "...and made appropriately accessible to the whole community

- 8. 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.**
- ✓ CRPEssex want points 7 and 8 strengthened to refer to Landscape Character and Tranquillity
 - ✗ The preferred growth option will have a detrimental impact on the Elsenham and Henham and their separation will be lost

- 9. The district's high quality and historic environment and richness in biodiversity will have been maintained and environments requiring improvement will have been enhanced.**
- ✗ The preferred growth options will have detrimental impact on the natural and historic environment.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Council suggest additional text to include "and tree cover will have increased significantly"

- 10. The vitality and viability of our towns will have been maintained and enhanced and they will be safe, clean and attractive places.**
- ✗ Dunmow Town Council suggest additional text "The vitality and viability of our town centres will have been maintained and enhanced and they are safe, clean and attractive places where the pedestrian is always given priority and they will be better connected to residential areas through footpaths cycleways and green infrastructure"

- 11. All development will be as close to carbon neutral as possible**
- Gt Canfield PC considers Points 11 should be subject to acceptable impact on other parts of the vision.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Council suggest additional text "All development will be as close to carbon neutral as possible and the carbon output of the current built environment will have reduced significantly

- 12. Water supplies and demand will have been managed to a sustainable balance**
- Gt Canfield PC considers Points 12 should be subject to acceptable impact on other parts of the vision.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Council suggest additional text "...in all parts of the District"

- 13. The impact of Stansted Airport will have been managed to sustainable balance**
- ✗ This is unrealistic, the presence of the airport, although providing some local job opportunities, can only be detrimental to the District's environment.
- ✗ Fails to acknowledge the role of Stansted Airport as an international gateway, major employment centre and key driver of sub regional economy.
- ✗ Dunmow Town council suggest additional text "The impact of Stansted Airport will have been reduced by effective management or mitigated so that its presence is recognised as an asset to the district which attracts people to live, work and visit"
- Local Agenda 21 want to amend the wording from "recognised" to "manageable" so that the Council has an active rather than a passive relationship to the impact of the airport.

- 14. There will be accessible, high quality health services and effective promotion of healthy living will mean that healthy lifestyles are available to all**

- × West Essex Primary Care Trust objects to bullet point 14 and wants the wording changed to “There will be accessible, high quality health services and effective promotion of healthy living *which* will mean that healthy lifestyles are available to all.”

National, Regional and Local Context

Paragraph 3.1

Summary of Representations

- × The preferred option is broadly in line with national policy in respect of design, character. However do not consider that some of the policies add to National policy.
- × Preferred growth option does not provide the environmentally sustainable development required by National and regional and local policies.
- × Do not consider that the preferred option document sufficiently relates to the documents listed.
- × Local Agenda 21 wish reference be made to the Uttlesford Transport Forum as it contributes to thinking about transport issues.

Paragraph 3.2

Summary of Representations

- × Essex CC Spatial Planning objects to this paragraph stating that there are other initiatives which will impact on future development such as Code for Sustainable Homes and Site Waste Management Plans.
- × It is not appropriate to increase the number of houses needed by 10%.
- × The Council has not been honest and open about the long term implications of the options.
- × SSE recognise that the Council has a duty to conform to national and regional policies but object that provisions for meeting the implication of the proposed expansion of Stansted Airport appear to pre-empt the outcome of the planning process.
- × Does not identify key areas of government guidance and the Council should re-consult on all available locations for a new settlement, and they must publish the results of the SHLAA and SHMA.
- × Should include UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 and its five guiding principles.
 - Living within environmental limits;
 - Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society;
 - Achieving a sustainable economy;
 - Promoting good governance;
 - Using sound science responsibly.
- Anglian Water Services emphasises the importance of development and flood risk in spatial planning
- Go-East recommend reading and bearing in mind the new PPS12
- Conformity with national planning policy in overall terms is not at issue in the Core strategy.

Paragraph 3.3

Summary of Representations

- ✓ These policies are on the whole welcome but Option 4 would undermine the vitality of Stansted Mountfitchet. The only feasible new settlements might be in the orbit of Great Dunmow or Saffron Walden, but this has still to be demonstrated.
- ✗ None of the growth options meet the sustainable aims of the PPS1.
- ✗ Bridgefoot/Walden Road Gospel Trust suggest additional bullet point on the need to consider people's diverse needs and aim to break down unnecessary barriers and exclusions in a manner that benefits the whole community;
- ✗ Community Involvement is an essential element in delivering sustainable development and creating sustainable and safe communities.'
- ✗ The British Wind Energy Association want the summary expanded to include the Climate Change Supplement.
- Newport PC questions the practicalities of the last bullet point and the affect UDC can have on these issues. They ask the question "how can a single development support the existing communities?"
- National aims are good but not being delivered in much of this Core Strategy.

Paragraph 3.4

Summary of Representations

- ✗ The preferred growth option will not help to deliver sustainable communities, as there are not viable road connections
- ✗ Providing new houses for incomers and commuters and the growth of Stansted airport does little to promote sustainability.
- ✗ There is inadequate road capacity and other infrastructure to support new settlement.
- ✗ New settlement of 3000 is likely to be seen by regional planners as a nucleus for something three times larger.
- ✗ There is no proven link between the Council's stated view that there is pressure for additional housing in the District and the possible further development of Stansted Airport.
- ✗ SSE and others state that the document should not refer to the rapid increase in the use of Stansted airport as UDC is doubtful of the economic benefit of the airport.
- Delivery of adequate transport is critical to the success of any development in Uttlesford.
- Sustainable communities require a functional regional and local road transport infrastructure particularly as 66% of residents commute by car.
- Newport PC are surprised that the Sustainable Communities Plan does not express opposition to Stansted Airport.

Paragraph 3.5

Summary of Representations

- ✗ The fact that this is stated government policy surely does not mean that it should feature in the district council's Core Strategy when a majority of residents has indicated their opposition to further development at Stansted Airport.
- ✗ There is no proven link between the Council's stated view that there is pressure for additional housing in the District and the possible further development of Stansted Airport.
- ✗ Given the UDC opposition to a second runway it is disappointing that it appears to have been accepted as inevitable and plans made based on this assumption.
- ✗ Not convinced that in the not too distant future we will need extra airport capacity.
- ✗ SSE, Friends of the Earth and Local Agenda 21 wish additional text to state that this would be subject to the planning process. There is no reason to attribute more urgency to the government's wishes than is necessary in reporting their support for Runway 2.

Paragraph 3.6

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Note and generally agree with the sentiments expressed. It reflects the emphasis on delivery which is also the key theme of PPS12 and which should underpin the Core Strategy. The best mixed communities with the best established local facilities are the two principal towns of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow.
- ✓ Therefore any single development must insist on its green credential.
 - ✗ The preferred growth option is not large enough to fit this model.
 - ✗ The size of development under option 4 is not sufficient to be sustained as an eco-town so none of the proposed advantages would apply.
 - ✗ Andrewsfield is uniquely placed to provide a truly sustainable new settlement of 3000 plus homes with demonstrably lesser adverse environmental impacts than any other proposed location within Uttlesford.
 - ✗ Reference to the Green Paper is premature as it is emerging policy and still subject to consultation and should be referred to as such.
- Newport PC stresses the importance for any single development to have green credentials and specific details for them.
- Options 1, 2 and 3 can only have the effect, if implemented, of making the locations concerned very significantly LESS attractive than at present; Option 4 does at least provide the possibility of meeting all the necessary requirements listed, and clearly represents the least bad option of those proposed.
- Please explain why there is a reference to Eco Towns in this paragraph, if they are not relevant to the preferred options consultation?

Table 3.1 – List of Regional Strategies

Summary of Representations

- Anglian Water Services encourage Uttlesford to reflect the WAT policies in the EEP

Paragraph 3.7

Summary of Representations

- ✗ The Core Strategy should include a summary of the relevant components of the Regional Economic Strategy particularly the economic role of Stansted Airport and the need to capture these benefits whilst minimising and mitigating against the adverse impacts.

Paragraph 3.8

- ✓ The RSS is supported but Uttlesford risks not being in conformity with it if it retains the current Option 4.
- ✓ The Brigefoot/Walden Road Gospel Trust welcome reference to the RSS and draw attention to Secretary of States proposed change to add reference to 'the diversity of faith communities and places of worship.'

Paragraph 3.9

Summary of Representations

- ✓ The policies and principles are fine but the Council needs to change its preferred housing option to conform with them.
- ✓ Policy E8 and policy ENV6 from the RSS also affect Uttlesford Directly and should be included.
- ✓ Great Chesterford PC considers that the village is potentially vulnerable to excessive development close to the Essex/South Cambridgeshire border.
- ✗ The vast majority of residents do not want any more growth whether it be residential, airport expansion or additional gypsy/traveller pitches.
- ✗ A new settlement north of Great Chesterford or in the north of the District would meet the objectives concerning development at Cambridge.
- ✗ Policy H1 provides for more housing than required by the RSS.
- ✗ The low unemployment in Uttlesford will mean that it is unreasonable to expect Uttlesford to contribute to job growth.
- ✗ It is wrong to work on the bases of the 2003 White Paper as regards the development of Stansted Airport because there is now a greater awareness of the environmental impact of aviation.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Council and others consider the Core Strategy omits or insufficiently elaborates the RSS policies.
- ✗ Stansted Airport Ltd request that Bullet point 3 should more accurately state "Development of a 2nd runway at Stansted Airport as provided for in the 2003 Air Transport White Paper".
- ✗ SEE consider that the impression that Stansted Airport will grow in the penultimate bullet point needs to be corrected.
- ✗ FoE and LA21 wish reference to be made that airport growth will be subject to the planning process and that the international importance of Hatfield Forest is stressed. Additional Bullet point needed that highlights the aim to preserve the natural resources, the countryside, biodiversity, rivers and prime agricultural land, all of which are prominent in the RSS policies.
- ✗ Point 4 - there are many green spaces as important as Hatfield Forest which should be maintained.
Point 5 - there are other communities other than Saffron Walden in the Cambridge sub region - this document is discriminatory against other areas of the region in favour of preserving Saffron Walden

- Newport PC feel that there are many other important green spaces which should be mentioned in point 4. In relation to point 5 they state that there are other communities in the Cambridge Sub Region
- An extra planned 452000 jobs is silly for a region short of water supplies, infrastructure and waste disposal. Most of these jobs, if really needed, which I doubt, should go to regions where these facilities are underused and unemployment is higher

Paragraph 3.11

Summary of Representations

- ✓ These objectives are admirable but they will not be delivered to the existing communities by the creation of a new settlement in a relatively isolated location. The choice of the southern parts of the B1383 and the B1051 for significant housing growth is poor compared with the A120 and the northern parts of the B1383 close to the A11/M11 junction.
- ✗ The preferred growth option does not help the objective of tackling traffic congestion.
- ✗ Please supplement the bullet point list by adding:
"Reducing noise from motor cycles, lorries and other road traffic;
Reducing noise and emissions from aircraft"
- ✗ Friend of the Earth suggest an additional Bullet point needed in relation to the LTP and the fact that it highlights the need to reduce the use of the private car
- ✗ Development at Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow would better deal with these objectives.
- The rural nature of the district will be the challenge for achieving the District Vision. A new settlement at Elsenham will not assist in address the LTP. A more sustainable approach to delivering regional and national transport objectives would be to concentrate growth within walking and cycling distance

Paragraph 3.12

Summary of Representations

- ✗ The preferred growth option does not help achieve these objectives and does not improve access to the airport.
- ✗ LA21 suggest Delete "improving access to the airport" insert after "alternatives" "to the private car". At the end of the sentence add "and improving access to the airport" This changes the emphasis of priorities to those focussed on Uttlesford's needs.
- Newport PC feel that this paragraph is too vague and needs specifics. All our towns and villages are affected by congestion.
- The preferred option makes no contribution to address the air quality issues in Saffron Walden. However, considering development to the east of Saffron Walden, would offer a solution to air quality issues in the town, in addition to meeting the other Transport Plan objectives of tackling congestion and creating safer roads. Accessibility to key services for the existing and new population will be enhanced through the provision of services to meet the needs of the new population and meet deficits faced by the existing population

Paragraph 3.13

Summary of Representations

- ✓ ECC Spatial Planning fully support this paragraph
- Newport PC and others asks how the Essex Schools Organisation Plan and the Essex Biodiversity Action Plan are taken into account.

Paragraph 3.14

- ✗ The Council must ensure that the Core Strategy will coordinate and incorporate necessary elements of Shaping the Future of Essex 2004-2024 and Uttlesford Futures.
- Conclusions on work on the Community Strategy should precede and inform decisions on the LDF core strategy
- What are the outcomes of the consultations on the Uttlesford Community Strategy
- Friends of the Earth consider that the up to date Sustainable Community Strategy is in existence so should be included as such

Paragraph 3.15

- ✗ LA21 state that the results of the Community Strategy are a material consideration and that mention should be made of the Transport Forum.

District Profile

Paragraph 3.1 (4.1 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ The high percentage of people who commute into the District to work suggest that housing is not needed in this area and certainly not to provide for local employment.
- ✗ The District profile should acknowledge the role of Stansted Airport as important to the local and regional economy.
- ✗ The statistics indicate that employment opportunities should be created on or close to existing industrial estates. A new settlement is unlikely to be self sufficient in employment terms.
- Go-East point out that as progress is made we should ensure that links are made with other strategies, taking into account their main principles to inform the development of the core strategy.
- The population statistic does not accord with those in paragraph 7 of the LDS 2nd revision December 2006. How does the population growth affect core strategies and monitoring?
- Further explanation is needed of the statement about the high proportion of people working in the district who work outside the area. It may inform the strategy on the need for local housing. It may inform the strategy that local employment is the wrong type

- The statement on the un-affordability of house prices should be combined with background information of how the housing market works and what the drivers are for housing demand.
- Why has the percentage of people working from home not been highlighted as a sustainable economic activity to foster?
- What proportion of the population is included in the 'most deprived areas' who 'have problems with accessing services'? Surely these call for a more proactive and funded transport and access policy?
- Why do we need to build houses if there aren't the people to live in them or else why do we need to encourage people to move to Uttlesford? This is not compatible with the vision of maintaining the unique character of the district.

Paragraph 3.2 (4.2 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × The Environment Agency object and point out that a water cycle study should be carried out in relation to water resources and waste water capacity. Without this they would argue that the Core Strategy is unsound.
- × The Great Dunmow Town Council and others consider that there are some areas where evidence is not clear, weak or missing such as health, infrastructure, and the capacity of settlements, transport and traffic conditions, and historic character.
- × There are no linkages to specific elements of the evidence to demonstrate soundness of the Core strategy. Evidence of SHLAA and SHMA are absent.
- × Option 4 is not supported by evidence base or Sustainability Appraisal of Issues and Options. The Colin Buchanan report recognises the benefits of providing a new settlement along the A120 transport corridor. The East of England Plan sees the A120 corridor as strategic and a transport upgrade is already included in the Local Transport Plan. The PACEC report identifies the A120 as a key area for economic growth. The Council must re-consult on all reasonable and available locations for a new settlement supported by an appropriate Sustainability Appraisal. The Council must also have a complete evidence base, including SHMA and SHLAA.
- × The Home Builders Federation point out the absence of a SHLAA and SHMA.

- Go-East state that in relation to the Habitats Directive they would expect the council to undertake a screening and AA as necessary during the preparation of the DPD and regard must be had to the guidance. They also stress the need to refer to the evidence base in a more holistic way. They suggest using the table in Appendix 1 and cross referencing it to the issues, objectives and options that they relate to.
- Are there any statistics on what percentage of the local (Uttlesford) population work in Stansted Airport? I suspect this is quite low, which begs the question of whether the housing is needed in this area or elsewhere.
- Not enough information has been provided to comment on the growth options.
- I would urge UDC and all Essex authorities to have new habitat surveys conducted in order to ensure that all UK Priority Habitat is excluded from development and to meet the requirements of the SEA directive, as I understand it for robust and up-to-date environmental evidence base.

Paragraph 3.3 (4.3 in hardcopy)

- ✓ It would be more equitable for all new build to have a substantial levy for both 'affordable housing' and infrastructure provision rather than expect only development of more than 15 homes to provide it.
- ✗ There is a need for controlled affordable development in every village to keep the mix of population and skills. Extra housing is not needed and will only provide housing for airport employees.
- Affordable housing should be provided in most established settlements. It would revitalise villages without threatening district character. A well-considered relaxation of some development boundaries, done in conjunction with parish councils, would be welcome.
- How is affordable housing defined and is there any means of ensuring that people who need affordable housing can get it? In order to support existing communities, affordable housing needs to be available across the district. There is no mention of empty properties and how these will contribute to the numbers, or of the potential to develop any existing brown field sites.

Paragraph 3.4 (4.4 in hardcopy)

- ✗ It is not clear that a substantial amount of housing is needed near to the airport.
- ✗ If travel to work is reduced and housing numbers increased there will need to be more jobs locally.
- ✗ SSE object that the growth of an expanded Stansted Airport is referred to as if it has already been agreed.
- What percentage of the local population is actually employed by the airport at present? How many relocated because the job was at the airport rather than living here and taking a job at the airport? What percentage of the local population is employed in airport related activity? All these affect whether the housing is actually needed near the airport.

Paragraph 3.5 (4.5 in hardcopy)

- ✗ Dispute the hypothesis that the existing centres have little potential for expansion, if additional services are required the market will provide them.
- ✗ Our small shopping areas are fine and we don't want any more.
- ✗ People go to regional/sub regional centres for many reasons – retail and leisure. Need to accept that Uttlesford is always going to be a rural district with local retail subservient to these centres.
- ✗ Friends of the Earth consider that a more accurate summary of the study is required stressing the need for good town management measures and how important it is to retain additional choice offered by larger regional town shopping centres.
- ✗ Retail development at Elsenham will not perform adequately in comparison to development at or related to existing town centres.
- ✗ LA21 consider that Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow cannot sustain large retail outlets and leakage is inevitable.
- We must accept leakage to other centres unless we want the shopping streets to look like all other centres.
- Town centres need a better mix of retail businesses.
- Sainsbury's consider that the Retail Study underestimates retail capacity in the District.

Paragraph 3.6 (under title The Greenspace Audit in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ The amount of land for playing space is being eroded by applications and approvals of development on existing areas, especially in Saffron Walden. A very firm policy including the demands of the local Strategy needs to be put in place as an integral part of the Core Strategy to prevent it being overlooked when detailed Development Control policies are being devised.
- ✗ Building houses on all available spaces does little to promote the preservation or growth of green space. Green space should also be aware of rural land used for recreation.
- ✗ Shortfall of children's playing space and outdoor sports provision with Saffron Walden should not be weighed in the balance by the Council against the option for developing further housing at Saffron Walden.
- ✗ Green space (amenity) provision should be a mandatory requirement of planning policy.
- Natural England suggests that in presenting greenspace provision reference should be made to PPG17 and Natural England's ANGSt.
- Newport PC feels that this statement adds nothing unless it refers to the planning requirement within the options.
- Sport England welcome reference to the Greenspace Audit (2006) and its role in informing this plan. However, in addition we would like to see a brief review of the Council's Leisure and Culture Strategy (2006-2011) which contains important objectives and proposals relating to the provision of sport and recreation facilities along with wider recreational opportunities in the District. There are clear links to be made to the findings of the Greenspace Audit and the translation of both these documents into spatial policies for the District
- The greenspace shortfall in Saffron Walden will increase as a result of projected developments

Paragraph 3.7 (4.6 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ English Heritage generally supports this paragraph however they feel that reference should be made to the archaeological interest of Uttlesford.
- ✗ The Council should direct development to where there is demand for affordable housing.
- ✗ The effect of option 3 and 4 on the character of Henham village has not been sufficiently assessed. It would clearly have a detrimental effect and diminish the sense of place and distinctiveness.
- ✗ Study did not include Elsenham.
- ✗ Study states that Sector 5 in Great Dunmow provides a real development opportunity to accommodate new development. As such, it provides the basis upon which the Council should be considering the appropriate location for new development as part of their growth strategy. Where appropriate sites have been identified the text should say that these will be the focus for allocation within site specific DPD.
- ✗ No established settlement would benefit from Greenfield development.
- ✗ There may be other locations close to Saffron Walden that might be suitable for allocation without detrimental effect on the character of the town.

- ✗ There are appropriate sites for development on the edge of many settlements that would not harm the historic core.
- ✗ Include in this section an historic character assessment of the Council's proposed new settlement on Henham and Elsenham.

Paragraph 3.8 (4.7 in hardcopy)

- ✗ The impact of the proposed large scale development on land known to flood has been missed.
 - ✗ Large areas of land proposed for development in option 4 are known to flood.
 - ✗ Drainage issues have not been properly weighed into the balance.
- Has the effect on the water table been considered?

Core Policies

Paragraph 4.1 (5.1 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Little Hallingbury PC are in full support of the policy framework as a whole.
 - ✗ Go-East object to this paragraph stating that policies should be topic related and not use related. They recommend reviewing the document to ensure that it does not include DC polices which are not relevant to the core strategy and to consider whether all of the policies are necessary and where they repeat national guidance there is a need to make them apply to the local area.
 - Essex CC draw attention to mineral resources which are known to exist in the District stating that minerals of potential economic value are present in the area of the proposed new settlement. Measures should be adopted to prevent the sterilisation of these mineral assets in discussion with the MPA, in line with the safeguarding ambition of MPS1. They also state that the processing plant, secondary processing plant and recycling facilities in Uttlesford should be protected from development.
 - Natural England want to see additional policies on Green Infrastructure and suggest the following points are included in the policy wording
 - Protection and enhancement of multi-functional network of green space (i.e green infrastructure) resulting in an overall net gain.
 - Development proposals should improve the quality and quantity of accessible green space, where appropriate. All development should incorporate sufficient new green space in accordance with English Nature's natural green space standards of achieving natural greenspace within 300m of every home. In addition as many existing wildlife features as possible should be retained, and new features such as green roofs created.
- They also want to see a general design policy with the following points included :
- Encourage sustainable construction methods, sustainable drainage systems, the use of local construction materials and techniques;
 - Discouraging unnecessary demolition and encouraging energy efficient design and location for development;
 - Setting high standards of design in all new development, ensuring that development is good enough to approve, accessible to all, locally distinctive and makes a positive

contribution to the character of the area, utilising the opportunities presented by the location.

They consider there should be an overarching policy on Climate Change or that the following points could be added to policy DC13:

“preparation for climate change through land use planning should include increasing the network of green corridors and linking isolated sites with nature conservation interest, to aid the dispersal of species that will need to move as climate change renders their existing habitat unsuitable. Climate change can also be planned for by preventing any further development on the floodplain and accommodating future flood waters without harm to the built environment by creating natural flood water sinks such as wet woodlands, reed beds and low lying pastures in flood risk areas.”

Theme 1 – Economy and Employment

Paragraph 4.2 (5.2 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Go-East object to this paragraph as it is not clear how the key issues were arrived at and there is no evidence to the wider evidence base. No reference is made to the other options that have been considered and how they perform in sustainability terms. There is little reference to how this strategy relates to the housing growth strategy or transport strategy, you must make sure it is better related to other key aspects of the spatial strategy. Little or no mention of Stansted airport in terms of employment strategy or what the options are. They note that the airport is a major economic driver and needs proper consideration.
- Newport PC make the point that although the district is generally affluent there are many who suffer from poverty and destitution.

Paragraph 4.3 (5.3 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representation

- Newport PC question how the Council will achieve this point.

Objective 1 – Employment Growth

Summary of Representations

- ✓ The Defence Estates Operations North fully supports this objective.
- ✓ Swan Hill Homes, Weston Homes and Legal and General support this objective
- ✓ Twigden Homes and Taylor Wimpey support objective 1 but do not believe that providing employment land at Elsenham will address this aspiration as there will only be limited potential to attract new employment investment to Elsenham.
- × We do not need to encourage new employers to the area. There is already too much pressure on local infrastructure.

- ✗ If we need to provide new opportunities for employment why are we building extra housing. If the jobs are not here the houses will be unnecessary.
- ✗ Option 4 does not promote local employment and access to existing centres of employment is poor.
- ✗ The district needs a more diverse employment base to make sure the existing base does not stagnate through lack of new innovation. It must avoid the domination of the aviation industry. More focus needs to be given to the high value industries of the Chesterford Park quality especially in the north of the district.
- ✗ Great Canfield Parish Council think that the criteria for justification should be expanded to cover protection of the natural and historic environment and richness in biodiversity as the vision states.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group, The Design Statement Group and the Town Council suggest that the objective should be amended to read “To support a local economy which retains and encourages growth of existing and new employers by providing enough land and premises of the right type and in sustainable locations that will meet the anticipated needs and aspirations of businesses and offers a broader range of opportunities for rewarding employment contributing to a highly sustainable society”
- The Highways Agency point out that they will expect policies to include a requirement for consideration of likely employee travel patterns and demand management measures to reduce potential trunk road impacts including travel plans and parking management.
- Molecular Products of Thaxted suggest that making additional land in Uttlesford, preferably on the outskirts of Thaxted available for commercial/industrial activity and development of the unsuitable current sites for residential use, would fulfil the criteria of continued sustainable development of Thaxted whilst also making a significant contribution to the requirements for increased housing in Uttlesford.

Objective 2 – Employment Opportunities Related to the Airport

Summary of Representation

- ✓ The CEMEX site at Little Canfield could provide an element of employment space in a location which has good links to the airport.
- ✓ Swan Hill Homes support the objective and feel that provision should be made on and adjacent to the airport to accommodate all airport related employment needs.
- ✓ Weston Homes support the objective.
- ✗ Legal and General support the objective but consider there should be additional recognition of the opportunities for economic and social benefits relating to the airport in the supporting text. E.g. the role of Stansted as an international gateway and catalyst for business and enterprise development, economic and social benefits, Stansted as a focus for world class business investment.
- ✗ Growth from Stansted is not necessary
- ✗ Council preferred option is in direct contradiction of Policy E8 in the draft East of England Plan i.e. housing growth should be located at Harlow and nearby towns
- ✗ What does 'catalytic employment growth related to the airport' mean? Employees at the airport are housed already.
- ✗ Could be done more effectively from the area of Dunmow and the new A120 rather than Henham and Elsenham which have poor transport links.

- × LA21 feel that the objective repeats objective 2 and should be deleted. The word catalytic is meaningless in this context.
 - × Great Canfield Parish Council oppose all airport related development outside the airport boundary.
 - × Assumes significant increase in employment opportunities at the airport – is there any evidence of this?
 - × Cambridgeshire County Council and SSE request that the word catalytic should be removed from this objective as it implies above average patterns of growth.
 - × Great Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Great Dunmow Town Council suggest amending wording to read: Opportunities for significant and high density catalytic Employment Growth related to the airport will be pursued
- English Heritage express concern for the rural character of the District. They express the need to safeguard against a random distribution of development that de-values the rural character in the north of the District and the vicinity of the airport.

Policy E1- Employment Strategy

Summary of Representations

- ✓ EEDA supports this policy however they state that ideally the land should be broken down by sector as per RES Goal 4 – priority 3. They point out that a geographical breakdown of employment provision would also be helpful. Working from home could include a reference to the use of broadband technology. They note that there is little reference to the rural economy which they feel could be beneficially added in line with Goal 4 priority 3 of the RES.
 - ✓ The Defence Estates Operations North fully support this policy.
 - ✓ Policy E1 is also supported by a number of developers promoting sites covered by the strategy. The locations being promoted for employment development are listed in Appendix 1.
-
- × ECC Spatial Planning would like to see more emphasis on employment of people with disabilities/mental health/learning difficulties as part of the strategy.
 - × 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 the allocation of employment land in future site allocations DPDs
 - × The policy 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 the 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
 - ✗ 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.
 - ✗ Ongar Road Trading Estate has become under utilised and is no longer appropriate for employment use. E1 should list such sites and identify land uses that would be more appropriate on the site.
-
- ECC Spatial Planning request travel plans be undertaken on a site and area basis if development is to happen in existing locations. Suggest that sustainable transport solutions can be developed for example staff shuttle minibuses.
 - Highways Agency point out that access to the highway network should be a consideration when delivering suitable employment sites.

Theme 2 – Getting Around

Paragraph 4.5 (5.5 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Go-East object to theme 2 as no information is provided in relation to what the options are and how they relate to the growth strategy for employment, housing, Stansted or retailing and what this means for the places in the district, road and rail networks and how this will be addressed. They also point out that it is not clear what options have been considered and what alternative options were rejected. The impact of housing growth and the potential growth of Stansted has not been adequately considered in terms of the impact this is expected to have on the district, what the options are and what this means for current settlements and potential new ones.
- ✗ ECC Spatial Planning objects stating that it needs to include physical accessibility for people with disabilities and older people.
- ECC Spatial Planning point out that to reduce car dependency it is necessary to plan and incorporate facilities to encourage passenger transport use.

Objective 3 – Reducing Car Travel

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Support the objective - Folly to place most housing growth by a railway line in an area that is relatively inaccessible by road.
- ✓ Supported by Stansted Airport Limited and CEMEX
- ✓ The objective of reducing the need for car travel is supported by Twigden Homes, Bellwinch Homes and Taylor Wimpey but they do not believe that the creation of a new development node at Elsenham will support this objective.

- ✓ Weston Homes support the principle with recognition given to the fact that public transport networks will be relatively limited and options for sustainable development will need to be tailored accordingly with innovative alternative approaches.
- ✗ In a rural area like Uttlesford people need cars to get around. Public transport is erratic and unreliable.
- ✗ With options 1 and 4 car use will significantly increase.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Great Dunmow Town Council object and suggest amending the objective to read "Reduce the need to travel by car, promoting realistic alternatives to the car and locating new development so that journeys can be reduced and residents and employees can access public transport but recognising the continuing role that the car has in meeting transport and accessibility needs in this rural area" Need to set some targets. Adverse environmental impacts should be avoided, mitigated or compensated for. – re: airport expansion, the developer should pay for the full costs of new infrastructure based on 70% use of public transport by all workers and airport customers (including those travelling to / from the airport) in relation to any future expansion plans.
- Highways Agency state that they would not be supportive of increasing the level of car parking in the district and suggest that the core strategy provide guidance on car parking provision in line with PPS12 (para 4.24). They recommend that the Core Strategy should set out the requirements for a travel plan to accompany all employment developments and would support an objective encouraging sustainable transport through site layout design in major developments. They suggest a policy identifying that developers will mitigate any residual impact upon the network whether caused by a specific site or in combination. The supporting text will need to take account of Transport Assessment, which should be subject to circular 02/2007 and guidance on transport assessment.
- Need to reduce the need for parents to drive pupils to and from school
- Locations within Uttlesford District which can demonstrate strong sustainability credentials should be the focus for new growth since any variants from this would be inconsistent with the East of England Plan

Objective 4 – Walking and Cycling

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Natural England fully supports this objective
- ✓ Support objective but why does it not include horse riding/bridleways
- ✓ Sport England East support the objective and add that the principle of co-location of facilities is important encouraging the greater use of recreation facilities as part of an accessible pattern of service provision.
- ✓ Need more bridle paths also cycle routes but not at the expense of green land.
- ✓ Needs to be strengthened by addition of the creation of cycle routes and footpaths as well as simply the existing ones.
- ✓ Stansted Airport Limited, CEMEX and Weston Homes support this objective
- ✗ Cycling will not be encouraged by new settlement at Elsenham with the steep hill at Stansted Mountfitchet
- ✗ Cambridgeshire County Council – revise objective 4 and the related policy to include reference to the provision of both urban and rural pedestrian and cycleways as well as other public rights of way.

- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group, Great Dunmow Town Council and Dunmow Town Design Statement Group request objective is changed to read “Existing cycle routes and footpaths will be protected and improved so as to create a useable and practical network throughout the District. New routes will be provided as part of new developments which will be expected to contribute to the wider network where appropriate, which will improve network connectivity making it easier for people to walk and cycle” Need to set some targets – relating to actual use and to levels of physical activity (linked to health and obesity indicators)
- ✗ Objective requires new cycle routes and footpaths to be provided as part of new developments but there is no mention of encouraging the development of new routes in existing settlements and there is no likelihood of the development of a coherent network of cycle routes in the District.
- ✗ LA21 say objective should be "to protect and improve and create new cycle routes and footpaths" The current provision of cycle routes in particular is woefully inadequate
- ECC Spatial Planning express the need to ensure there is sufficient allocated space for walking and cycling routes to be developed, including shared use paths.
- The emerging Core Strategy must bring forward a pattern of development which reduces movements by non car modes and at the same time encourage walking and cycling both within and connecting to new developments.

Paragraph 5.6

Summary of Representations

- ✗ ECC Spatial Planning want a reference to safe/direct walking and cycling routes to schools made here.

Policy GA1 – Accessible Development

Summary of Representations

- ✓ The Highways Agency, Natural England and a number of developers support this policy
- ✗ The 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

Paragraph 4.7 (5.7 in hardcopy) and Para 4.8 (Para 5.8 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Natural England supports paragraph 4.7 but strongly suggests placing objective 8 directly after it to establish a clear context for following text under theme 3.
- ✓ This paragraph is consistent with national and regional policy so why is it being ignored in relation to the new settlement.
- ✓ Great Canfield PC support all the policies that protect the highly valued character of the district.
- ✓ CPREssex agree with the assessment in Para 4.8 but suggest that the objectives and policies which follow should be reordered with objectives 8 and 9 first in the section.
- ✗ Objectors to Option 4 consider that development at Elsenham is not consistent with paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8
- Protecting the countryside must not hinder making the best use of underutilised land on the edges of existing settlements.

Housing

Paragraph 4.9 (5.9 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Support the aim to enable a range of house types and tenures to meet needs and achieve more balanced communities.
- ✗ Little justification for the need for this housing
- ✗ Great Dunmow TC and the Great Dunmow Town Design Statement Group question the robustness of the calculation used to work out the figures and also that housing delivery is at the expense of other aspects like open space, recreation etc
- ✗ Galliard Homes object because the implementation, delivery and monitoring framework is not included
- ✗ Sworders on behalf of various clients are concerned that current delivery rates are not being met due to the reliance on a small number of major sites. This will be the same for Elsenham – added to the fact that housing delivery at Elsenham will not start for some time until the transport issues can be addressed.
- ✗ Uttlesford LA21 seek wording change. Insert “and sustain” between “achieve” and “more” in sentence 3.
- Reference is made to H2 but no policy H2 in the document.

Objective 5 – Meeting Housing Needs

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Swan Housing support objective but add that it is essential that an objective to provide affordable housing is incorporated in the Core Strategy
- ✓ Supported by Great Canfield PC, Great Dunmow Town Council, Stansted Airport Limited, CEMEX and others
- ✓ LA21 suggest addition of “and maintains” after “creates” in order to remember that existing communities can be better balanced with more housing added to them.

- ✓ Weston Homes support the objective but suggest wording should be changed to 'to meet the housing requirement for Uttlesford by planning for a continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption, in general conformity with the East of England Plan and.....'
- ✗ Affordable housing should be distributed rather than located in one corner of a large development.
- ✗ Do not need more housing
- ✗ Liberal Democrats (Saffron Walden Branch) are concerned that affordable housing will not be delivered, that it will be concentrated in one settlement, that district should be seeking affordable housing on sites below 15 units. What will be the cost of providing for the operational needs at Carver Barracks and shouldn't the MOD pay for this.
- ✗ Bellwinch Homes, Twigden Homes, Taylor Wimpey and Crest Nicholson and others consider that over concentration of housing in one location is unlikely to address the housing needs of the district, particularly in relation to affordable housing.
- ✗ Strutt and Parker suggest that the word "minimum" should be added before "housing requirement" to make the objective more consistent with the East of England Plan
- ✗ Ashwell Plc suggest the objective should be modified to read "to make sure that the combination of new development and the existing development within the District facilitates balanced communities and seeks to provide a good mix of housing within the District that overall reflects the different types of households that are likely to require housing over the plan period."
- ✗ Fail to understand how the strategy can actually deliver these aspirations.

Objective 6 – Infrastructure

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Natural England, Stansted Airport Limited, Swan Housing Group and Weston Homes support this objective.
- ✓ This must be done comprehensively and care must be taken that new infrastructure does not undermine existing infrastructure unless there is no alternative.
- ✓ Suggest that "To plan for provision" is replaced by "Provide for".
Add "existing and future" after "allow" to remember that all of this is for all people rather than just those who may come into the district with the new housing.
- ✓ CEMEX support objective but consider that the provision should be based upon need and credible evidence.
- ✓ Twigden Homes, Bellwinch Homes and Taylor Wimpey developments support objective but facilities should be provided in principal towns and not a new settlement at Elsenham
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group, Great Dunmow Town Council and Dunmow Town Design Statement Group suggest that objective should be reworded to read "To plan for and secure through developer contributions and public and private investment the provision of adequate levels of and high quality infrastructure that will allow people to conveniently access social, educational, health, employment, recreational, green space and cultural facilities within the district"
- ✗ A new settlement at Elsenham is contrary to the District's vision to provide high quality health services to all. Rail service and capacity is poor and it will require new power supply.
- ✗ LA21 suggest the following changes delete "provision" and insert "and provide" which strengthens the commitment.

- Provision of new infrastructure should be brought forward in parallel with new development and co-ordinated in the most effective way in terms of timing and cost.
- Friends of the Earth consider that to plan “for the provision of infrastructure” is not as firm as “To plan and provide for the necessary infrastructure” and we suggest that there should be no doubt that where new infrastructure is necessary it will need to precede housing development.
- In the short term development to the west of Elsenham has the potential to contribute towards strengthening the existing community and act as a complimentary expansion to the north east.

Paragraph 4.10 (5.10 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ The hidden housing need of migrant workers should be better understood. BAA and allied companies, as magnets for much migrant labour should take more responsibility for this issue.
- ✗ First sentence is unclear why not just say “house prices are high in relation to local household incomes” This allows for all sources of income. The adopted local plan does not seek 40% affordable housing it requires it.
- ✗ Go East object to the statement regarding the SHMA and suggesting a different approach in the DC DPD as it is for the core strategy to set out the key elements and all other DPDs need to be in conformity with it.
- ✗ Low paid jobs e.g at the airport are filled by migrant workers living in isolated multiple occupancy properties
- ✗ Amsgal Properties consider that the policy for affordable housing should not be set without reference to evidence that has been open to consultation
- ✗ Strategy should be more positive identifying sites for 100% affordable housing where housing would not normally be permitted e.g. in MGB
- ✗ Gleeson Homes suggest that 40% affordable housing is excessive and not justified by evidence. RSS has 30% requirement. Adopt a more general approach to affordable housing requirements.
- ✗ Galliard Homes suggest Uttlesford has not followed advice in PPS3 especially in regard to producing a SHMA and assessment of future housing supply. Objectives for achieving delivery are not included.
- ✗ The number of empty homes suggests that the new housing is not necessary. Not clear that the district could provide employment for such a large influx of people
- ✗ LA21 suggest a wording change – 1st sentence - delete "working" insert "who either live or work" and delete from "but also" to end of sentence. 4th sentence - delete "seeks" insert "requires".
- Part of this must be greater use of flats rather than detached or semi detached houses. We depend too much on detached houses for small family units.
- Conversion of brown field sites to residential will bring road and rail congestion.
- ECC Spatial Planning points out that occupants of affordable homes are less likely to have access to private transport therefore development in settlements should be prioritised where they are served by an hourly bus service.

Policy DC1 – Meeting Housing Need

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Hatfield Heath PC supports this policy but requires “affordable” to be unambiguously defined.
- ✓ Defence Estates Operations North fully support this policy and the recognition of the need to provide for the operational needs of military personnel at Carver Barracks
- ✓ Support for the assessment of the overall requirement and the need to continue provision beyond 2021 by a number of developers.
- ✓ Overall support for the requirements for affordable housing from Swan Housing

- ✗ English Heritage wants the figure of 9666 homes by 2024 to be explained since it exceeds the 8000 required by the RSS. They are concerned that by rolling annual growth allocations forward it circumvents assessment of the effects of such additional growth.
- ✗ Henham and Elsenham PC object to this policy stating that a total provision of 9,200 new homes should be made on the assumption that 5500 homes are already committed/completed.
- ✗ Some objectors question the need to add 10% to the regional housing figure and no need to continue the annual rate beyond 2021.
- ✗ Objections that the overall number of houses is not needed/not justified
- ✗ 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
- ✗ Felsted PC feel that the target of 9,666 homes by 2024 is not justified.
- ✗ The requirements in policy DC1 are not justified without a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment having been carried out.
- ✗ Newport PC and ECC Spatial Planning both have concerns regarding affordable housing. Both want references and considerations made to other forms of affordable housing with ECC stating that shared equity should be considered on exception sites.
- ✗ West Essex Primary Care Trust wants this policy to clarify that key worker and other special needs housing will be provided as part of the 40% affordable housing provision
- ✗ 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.
- ✗ 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.
- ✗ No need to make provision for travellers, gypsies and travelling show people

Paragraph 4.11 (5.11 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Strong support for this – focuses development in a very limited area while retaining the character of the surrounding areas.
- ✓ Strongly in favour of option 4 creating a new settlement near Stansted Airport with its expanding labour requirement does make sense.
- ✓ Braintree District Council supports the preferred option.
- ✓ Support the development of a new settlement with all the facilities identified as necessary for a vibrant living community.
- ✓ Supported by Weston Homes promoting a site in Takeley Street for residential development.
- ✓ Hatfield Heath PC supports the idea of a single settlement but considers proposed site to be inappropriate and suggests it would be better placed to the east of the district with suitable connections to the A120.
- ✓ ECC Spatial Planning support the paragraph, however, rather than referring to a new secondary school perhaps refer to a supporting a new or relocated secondary school.
- ✓ Twigden Homes and Taylor Wimpey welcome the inclusion of a margin to allow flexibility in delivery and against which the strategy can be managed. Twigden also welcome the recognition of Saffron Walden's position but disagree that an urban extension is likely to affect the historic character to the extent that it should be discounted. Taylor Wimpey say there is no reason to consider that more sustainable development forms, including zero carbon housing can only be provided by way of a new settlement. Planned urban extension on individual sites or related sites can as easily achieve the benefits of sustainable construction that are otherwise ascribed to the development of eco towns
- ✗ Go-East object saying that inclusion of housing trajectory is vital, probably in the form of a chart, setting out expected development rates and locations in each year that development is likely to be forthcoming. There is little information in this section and the housing growth options are considered later making the document confusing to follow. Little evidence to support the preferred option and other options on how they have been considered and how they performed. There are also concerns over ability to demonstrate soundness in relation to the evidence, must be satisfied that it is up to date and sufficiently strategic to support preferred approach.
- ✗ ECC Spatial Planning object due to a new settlement of this size not being able to sustain a new bus service and it is unlikely that it will be part of a through route. To make public transport a sustainable travel option consideration needs to be given to the location of key services.
- ✗ Newport PC objects to this paragraph as it does not provide enough detail, the centres with links to primary schools and transport should be listed. They dispute the statement that Saffron Walden does not have capacity to grow and suggest that all towns and villages will suffer from the issues not just Saffron Walden.
- ✗ Objectors to Elsenham suggest that other options should be considered
- ✗ Savills on behalf of clients suggest that just because Saffron Walden cannot accommodate significant expansion it does not mean that a new settlement is the most obvious solution and that other towns e.g. Stansted have not been properly assessed.
- ✗ CPRE say the sustainability assessment is not vigorous enough
- ✗ Friends of the Earth object to the figure of 9666 and say that only 9050 can be justified. They object to option 4 on the grounds of unsustainability and contrary to RSS policies.
- ✗ ASP says that making allowance for intensification and redevelopment is contrary to PPS3. Reference to windfall supply should be deleted and the figures adjusted. Housing figures are minimum. Delivery above these figures would bring significant benefits in terms of delivering more affordable housing.
- ✗ Audley End Estates say that the Historic Settlement Character Assessment suggests growth around SW would have a detrimental impact on the character of the town. This

precludes a full assessment of sites close to the town and prejudices the site allocation document.

- ✗ Bidwells on behalf of clients are concerned that the Core Strategy is flawed and does not take into account the amount of PDL which is available within SW
- ✗ Liberal Democrats (SW Branch) state that none of the four options relate the number of houses allocated to individual towns to housing need within any of the communities
- ✗ Taylor Wimpey suggest that the settlement options should be based on the settlement hierarchy.
- ✗ A number of objectors have suggested that there should be a reduction of 75% in the number of homes from 4,200 to 1,050
- ✗ The necessary infrastructure must be provided before homes are built.
- ✗ Jobs need to be created in parts of the country where jobs are needed and brownfield sites are available for homes,
- ✗ Gleeson Homes say that the 10% allowance for non delivery is not realistic. This approach does not comply with PPS12. The housing trajectory is lacking. A SHLAA should be carried out. Tables should be included in the document to make the presentation of housing land supply elements clearer.
- ✗ Bellwinch Homes welcome the inclusion of a margin to allow flexibility in delivery and against which the strategy can be managed. Do not accept that an urban extension to Saffron Walden is likely to affect it's historic character to the extent that it should be discounted.
- ✗ Galliard Homes objects to and questions the statement that Elsenham is of sufficient scale to support a new secondary school.
- ✗ Sworders and Pegasus Planning Groups on behalf of clients contest the housing requirements, say that the calculations are contrary to PPS3 and that further work is required to show that the figure of 3,435 can be substantiated.
- ✗ An additional 4,000 homes will be unsustainable. New housing must not increase climate change effects.
- ✗ Uttlesford LA21 seek wording change - Sentence 3 after "historic character" insert " and landscape". Before sentence 3 insert "Most of these considerations apply also to the other settlements of significant size in Uttlesford"
- ✗ The para explains why development should not take place in SW and then says therefore says it should be at Elsenham but there are not only two choices for growth, so this paragraph is misleading.
- ✗ Support the proposal for a new town but not in the location proposed by option 4.
- ✗ New settlement needs major road improvements to make it accessible. These are only going to be funded if the expansion of Stansted Airport goes ahead.

Policy DC2 – Housing Strategy

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Highways Agency generally supports this policy but state they would not allow any new access from the new development to the M11. The development would have to be subject to a Transport Assessment to assess the impact on junction 8 of the M11. Support the location of 1200 in existing settlements.
- ✓ Policy is supported by various developers, including those developers promoting sites in specific villages who welcome the fact that the policy does allow for new development in villages. Further growth at key service centres is important to sustain these settlements.
- ✓ 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

- × Defence Estates Operations North objects to this policy as it fails to address how all the key issues identified in policy DC1 will be delivered.
- × West Essex Primary Care Trust stresses the need for any growth option to provide primary health care facilities. They also state that any major housing development should contribute towards providing and funding healthcare facilities in a phased way. They request that the policy be reworded to take account of the above points.
- × 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
- × English Heritage consider the last 3 bullet points to be open to interpretation and express concern about development on the edge of Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden due to recent development not being well integrated or designed to respect the historic character of the towns.
- × 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.
- × 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 a minimum target of 60% should be set 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.
- Highways Agency is concerned that any sites emerging from this policy may become predominantly car based and the A120/M11 corridor could suffer as a result. To be consistent with national, regional and local policies the majority of development should be concentrated in market towns thus reducing the need to travel.

Paragraph 4.12 (5.12 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Essex CC Spatial Planning support this paragraph, however, they wish it to be reworded to “ other contributions may be sought by area e.g. within school priority admissions areas or groups thereof...”
- ✓ Cllr Alan Dean says statements have been made by office holding members of the council that infrastructure payments would be sought through the government's eco-towns initiative. This has subsequently been denied. Clarification is sought.
- ✗ Felsted PC object as the funding for infrastructure through developer contributions is inflexible and delays the provision of infrastructure. A levy on each completed home would facilitate a more acceptable distribution of new housing and more timely delivery of facilities.
- ✗ Go-East feel that more consideration needs to be given as to what infrastructure will be required related to development to 2021 to demonstrate that the strategy is realistic and deliverable. They expect the submission DPD to include framework setting out how, when and by whom the Core Strategy's vision and objectives will be delivered.
- ✗ CPREssex consider fuller detail is required of the infrastructure needed to sustain the proposed level of development and whether this is likely to be delivered.
- ✗ Galliard Homes object to the lack of reference to supportive evidence on required infrastructure. Reference to the preparation of an Area Action Plan for a new settlement that will ensure delivery of key infrastructure would be helpful.
- ✗ Taylor Wimpey say paragraph states that the necessary infrastructure will be achieved mainly through developer contributions and the mechanisms will be set out in the DC and SA DPD and/or SPD. Failure to address these mechanisms at this stage means there is no clear framework for securing developer contributions.
- ✗ HBF are concerned that reference is made to SPD. All matter of fundamental importance to development viability should be clearly set out in a DPD and subject to public scrutiny.
- ✗ LA21 suggest wording change - at the end of the second sentence add "or by a levy on each house built"

Policy DC3 - Infrastructure

Summary of Representations

- ✓ 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.
- ✓ Anglian Water Services support this policy, however they point out that provision of water and wastewater infrastructure is best guided by a Water Cycle Study and Strategy and capacity of the sewage systems must not be compromised and they will be seeking strategic sewerage solutions to Greenfield development. They express the need for policies to minimise discharges from brownfield development through water efficiency measures and SUDs.
- ✓ Thames Water Property Services generally supports this policy; however, they feel that more specific policy support is needed in accordance with PPS12 and RPG9, in respect of water and sewerage infrastructure. They point out that it is essential that the core strategy makes reference to the provision of adequate water and sewerage infrastructure and the following policies and subtext should be included:-
Water and sewerage infrastructure capacity:
Planning permission will only be granted for developments which increase the demand for off-site service infrastructure where:
 1. sufficient capacity already exists or
 2. extra capacity can be provided in time to serve the development which will ensure that the environment and the amenities of local residents are not adversely affected.

When there is a capacity problem and improvements in off-site infrastructure are not programmed, planning permission will only be granted where the developer funds appropriate improvements which will be completed prior to occupation of the development.”

Text along the following lines should be added to the Core Strategy to support the above proposed Policy:

“The Council will seek to ensure that there is adequate water supply, surface water, foul drainage and sewerage treatment capacity to serve all new developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, the Council will require the developer to fund appropriate improvements which must be completed prior to occupation of the development.”

To take account of paragraph B6 of PPS12 they suggest the following policy be included:
“UTILITIES DEVELOPMENT:

The development or expansion of water supply or waste water facilities will normally be permitted, either where needed to serve existing or proposed development in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan, or in the interests of long term water supply and waste water management, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact that any such adverse impact is minimised.”

- ✓ Natural England supports Policy DC3, however they express the need for a separate green infrastructure policy which links with objective 4/policy GA1 and Policy DC10. They feel that this policy needs broadening to link green infrastructure externally to a development site it also needs to refer to ANGSt and the multifunctional role of green infrastructure.
- ✓ National Trust support the policy but ask that consideration be given to development contributing towards the enhancement of facilities at Hatfield Forest
- ✓ Essex CC Spatial Planning generally supports this policy however suggest adding the words ‘facilities and outdoor areas’ after ‘school classrooms’.
- ✗ Felsted PC object as this policy and all the proposed options fail to address the impact of expansion on road and other transport infrastructure.
- ✗ West Essex Primary Care Trust express the need for close partnership working between themselves and the Council to ensure appropriate provision of health Infrastructure. They also suggest changes to the policy wording inserting the words ‘and contribute towards’ after ‘developers must take account of’.
- ✗ Go-East point out that a number of policies repeat what is stated in other policies and suggest that they are given further consideration to deletion of repeat or duplicated policies. This policy repeats some aspects of LC1.
- ✗ Electricity supply capacity, sustainable energy, transport and access should also be included.
- ✗ Urgent need for land to be set aside for public worship/religious instruction (Use Class D1(h))
- ✗ 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

- ✗ 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.
- ✗ Development should be located in areas/settlements where existing facilities are underused.
- ✗ HBF are concerned that all matters of fundamental importance should be clearly set out in a DPD rather than an SPD.

- Essex CC Spatial Planning point out that to enable public transport to serve areas supporting infrastructure can assist such as turning circles and pedestrian crossings. They consider waste facilities to be part of required infrastructure and suggest taking account of pages 91-94 of the Essex Design Guide as well as PPS 10 and its companion guide and RSS policy WM6.
- Newport PC questions how developers would take account of all populations and suggests a specific approach which answers the questions of affected populations would be best.

Protecting the Countryside

Paragraph 4.13 (5.13 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Supported by Great Canfield Parish – essential to protect the character of the district.
- ✗ Go-East object to this paragraph as it represents a business as usual approach rather than demonstrating it represents the preferred approach. Also states that it isn't clear what the evidence is to support this approach and what alternatives have been considered and/or rejected and how they perform in sustainability terms.
- ✗ ASP on behalf of clients consider that the detail of the paragraph is inflexible with the regard to the Council's preferred option and it should refer to the necessity to redefine existing settlement boundaries as part of the site allocation process.

Objective 7 – Metropolitan Green Belt

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Hatfield Heath PC, Great Canfield Parish Council, CRPEssex and others support this objective.
- ✓ Weston Homes support this as a general objective but it should not preclude individual DPDs review of detailed boundaries as specified in para 5.14

- ✗ Landowners promoting sites in the Green Belt suggest that green belt boundaries should be reviewed around Hatfield Heath
- ✗ Far too weekly expressed the basic policy should be no development in the greenbelt

- × LA 21 suggest change to wording - insert "new" before "building"
- British Waterways observe that outdoor recreation should be encouraged and supported in the Green Belt.

Objective 8 – District Character

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Supported by Natural England, Hatfield Heath PC, Weston Homes, Twigden Homes, Bellwinch Homes, CEMEX and CPRE. However, Natural England feels it would be better placed under Theme 3 District Character.
- ✓ English Heritage supports the objective but doesn't feel the policy coverage reflects it. They suggest it would be appropriate to include a policy here relating to the urban design of large developments.
- ✓ Remove let out words ', where possible, ' as they allow for argument about the policy.
- × Dunmow Town Strategy Group, Great Dunmow Town Council and Great Dunmow Design Statement Group suggest amending objective 8 to read: To preserve, conserve and enhance the locally distinctive and historic character of the market towns and rural settlements and their settings within Uttlesford and to retain the separation between settlements
- × People who object to the new settlement (Options 3 and 4) say it doesn't comply with this objective
- × The objective should be changed by adding to the end 'and to provide for housing need and services'.
- × LA 21 suggest rewording the objective as follows delete "where possible". Insert "materials" after "distinctive" Delete "and to retain the " and insert "including retention of adequate".
- × What is meant by the district character needs reassessment of the existing situation which has changed almost out of recognition over the past 20 years.

Objective 9 – Landscape Character

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Both Natural England, English Heritage, CEMEX and Weston Homes support this objective.
- ✓ CPREssex supports the policy subject to the addition of a reference to safeguarding the tranquillity of the district's countryside (acknowledging that the impact of Stansted already reduces tranquillity in some areas).
- ✓ Twigden and Bellwinch Homes and Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd support the objective but not consider that the Core Strategy Preferred Options document does not adequately set out how the objective is to be realised.
- × People who object to the new settlement (Options 3 and 4) say it doesn't comply with this objective
- × Remove let out words ', where possible, ' as they allow for argument about the policy.
- × Dunmow Town Strategy Group, Dunmow Town Design Statement Group and Great Dunmow Town Council suggest the following amendment "To protect, conserve and enhance the varied landscape character within Uttlesford reflecting landscape sensitivity

and promoting local distinctiveness and an understanding of the historic significance of landscape features” - this kind of objective is redundant in the light of RSS and national policy –it has to be more locally specific.

- It should be made clear in this document what are the criteria that are being used to assess the landscape character. It should be borne in mind that the housing and commercial development of the past ten or twenty years are now themselves part of the “character” of the area.

Paragraph 4.14 (5.14 in hard copy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Replace the last sentence by: 'Development proposals within the Green Belt will not be considered.' The existing part about national policy is redundant and covered in the introduction - all development is considered in relation to national policy.
- ✗ Friends of the Earth feel that development proposals should not be considered and the wording should read “development proposals in the Green Belt will not be approved”
- ✗ Box 22 consider that there is scope to enable limited provision within the Green Belt on land that is close to or adjacent to Key Service Centres. If this land is identified as been only suitable for affordable housing it will assist in controlling land values and make implementation more likely.
- ✗ Sworders object to Council’s position because it does not deal with specific issues at Hatfield Heath where an amendment to the Green Belt would be justified to meet needs for affordable housing.
- ✗ HBF consider that the operation of rigid and inflexible green belt restrictions is no longer sustainable.
- ✗ LA21 suggest wording change – Delete final sentence and substitute “development proposals within the green belt will not be approved”.
- ✗ Weston Homes seek the removal of a site in Little Hallingbury from the Green Belt.
- British Waterways made the observation that outdoor recreation should be encouraged and supported in the green belt.

Policy DC4 – Metropolitan Green Belt

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Hatfield Heath and Little Hallingbury PC fully support this policy.
- ✓ 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 believes there is a strong case for green belt review and to improve the environmental quality of the existing green belt. They suggest the following wording be included “all opportunities to improve the environmental quality of the green belt should be taken where appropriate.”

- × 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

Paragraph 4.15 (5.15 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Option 4 and probably option 3 is ruled out by this. The area will not be protected in any way.
- Observation that it's should be changed to its, twice (and elsewhere in this document).

Policy DC5 – Protecting the Countryside

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Hatfield Heath fully supports policy DC5
- ✓ Natural England supports this policy, but asks whether it is simply restating national policy (PPS7) without adding local value.
- × 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 – Protecting Agricultural Land

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Hatfield Heath fully supports this policy
- ✓ Natural England generally supports this policy but has concerns over the potential biodiversity value of previously developed land. They also question its inclusion as it seems to repeat national policy. When referring to PDL they request the core strategy clarify that it should be in used in preference to Greenfield sites provided there is no geological interest of local importance.
- ✓ 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

- ✗ 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

Para 4.16 – 5.16 in Hardcopy

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Stop Stansted Expansion support the continuation of the current countryside protection zone.
- ✗ Greenfield areas in Takeley Street should be part of the village envelope and allocated for housing development to suit the needs of the plan.
- ✗ Swan Hill Homes seeking to get land at Start Hill excluded from the CPZ.
- Option 2 would breach the CPZ thereby making the allocation of 750 houses at Elsenham unviable.

Policy DC7- Countryside Protection Zone

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Natural England, CPREssex, Hatfield Heath PC and others fully support this policy
- ✓ A number of representations, 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

Para 4.17 – 5.17 in hardcopy

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Suggest insert 'where much of the water of the region and North London arises' after 'river valleys'. Delete after 'expected' and replace by: 'maintain and enhance the special character of the landscape' which better accords with the positive policies at the beginning of the draft Core Strategy.
- ✗ Option 4 and probably option3 is ruled out by this para. The area will not be protected in any way.
- ✗ LA21 suggest a wording change - Delete "to take account of and respect these sensitivities" and replace with "maintain and enhance it's character" This strengthens the commitment

Policy DC8 – Landscape Character

Summary of Representations

- ✓ CPREssex supports this policy
- ✗ Natural England generally supports this policy but suggests that particular reference is made to the Uttlesford joint Landscape Character Assessment. They also state that the policy would benefit from reference to particular landscapes in the District and the management required to protect and enhance them.
- ✗ English Heritage suggest the addition of 'and historic qualities' after 'landscape character'
- ✗ 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

Para 4.18 – 5.18 in hardcopy

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Supported by Great Canfield Parish Council
- ✓ Page 9 of the published draft says there are 3751 listed buildings. The consequence of the penultimate sentence needs to be spelled out by adding: 'and need to be preserved'. There is no mention of Hatfield Forest as one of the last remaining ancient forests recognized both nationally and internationally. The only thing lacking at present is wild boar!

- ✓ I applaud this paragraph but feel that saying too much in the individual policies can lead to problems if something is not specifically mentioned: it could be assumed not to be included.
- ✗ LA21 suggest a wording change - add to the last sentence after "habitats are scarce" "and need to be preserved"
- Friends of the Earth feel it is important to emphasise that river sources must be protected and suggest inserting in the last sentence after the word "scarce" and need to be protected.

Objective 10 – Protecting the Environment

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Anglian Water Services, CPRE, Weston Homes and Natural England support this objective. Anglian Water Services points out that increased wastewater discharges into the environment may affect phasing of development.
- ✓ English Heritage generally supports this objective but feels the wording is unclear and suggests it is changed to 'To protect and enhance the natural and historic environment of the district.'
- ✓ Support but remove spurious apostrophe from the text.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Dunmow Town Design Statement Group suggests the following amendments "To protect and enhance the specific local strengths and characteristics of the various parts of the Districts' natural environment including its biodiversity and the historic environment through positive improvement working in partnership with landowners and other stakeholders and through applying developer contributions"
- ✗ The Core Strategy should discuss how the Elsenham option accords with this objective
- LA21 suggest a special mention should be made of the need to protect water resources insert "and water resources" after "biodiversity"

Policy DC9 – Protecting the Historic Environment

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Natural England generally supports this policy but suggests that open space protection should be the subject of a separate policy.
- ✗ Essex CC Spatial Planning feel this policy could be improved by adding bullet points such as:
 - Developments that would adversely affect nationally important heritage assets will not be permitted
 - Where development is permitted it should protect and enhance the area's 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

Summary of Representations

- × Natural England generally support the policy but consider there should be further policy guidance on nature conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and suggest the inclusion of objectives in the Essex Biodiversity Action Plan. They also suggest wording for inclusion in the policy
'To optimise conditions for wildlife, achieve a net gain in biodiversity, implement the Essex Biodiversity Action Plan and tackle habitat fragmentation the Council will:
Ensure that new development would result in no net loss of biodiversity value of any of the following priority habitats:
Ancient /species rich hedgerows and green lanes, ancient woodland, cereal field margins, old orchards, reedbeds and urban areas. Reduce the fragmentation of, improve or extend existing Priority Habitats. Protect and strengthen populations of priority or other protected species. Enhance the biodiversity value of wildlife corridors. Ensure that development designs in wildlife and any unavoidable impacts are appropriately mitigated for.
- × English Heritage object to policy DC10 stating that it is disappointing and should be expanded to reflect the importance of the districts heritage, they suggest referring to the conservation area appraisals.
- × 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.
- × 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

Paragraph 4.21 (5.21 in hard copy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Tesco supports the sustainable expansion of retail within existing centres and supports the findings of the District Retail Study.
- × Waitrose are concerned that additional retail development is being directed in the first instance to locations outside the defined town centres to accommodate additional floorspace. The LDF should also define primary shopping area for Saffron Walden
- × Felsted PC object to this paragraph as edge of town retail development is incompatible with the council's policy of nurturing thriving market town centres.
- × Retail development must be focused within town centres and not at the town margins. Development in the form of large retail sites at the edge of the town would still detract from the character of the town.
- × Out of town retail warehouses will not benefit the economic viability of the town centres.

- ✗ Development at Henham or Elsenham will encourage travel to Bishops Stortford and Cambridge. Development adjacent to the new A120 obviously a preferable alternative.
- ✗ CPRE objects to the suggestion that further out of town retailing should be provided at Saffron Walden or Dunmow. Constraints on retail expansion as a result of their historic character should be accepted.
- ✗ Does not agree with the stated policies of the RSS that define a hierarchy of retail development and adding to the edge of small market towns does not fit this at all. The charm of such towns is that they do provide local retail opportunities for locally produced and small scale goods.
- ✗ Friends of the Earth consider that the retail study made it clear that, in their view, better town management was needed to encourage more retailing business into the centres of market towns. It did not recommend out of town development as a deterrent to visiting larger centres. Providing retail space outside the town centre in our view will inevitably harm town centres and encourage the use of the car. Suggested deleting para and replacing with "The Council will promote further retail development in the town centres of the market towns of Saffron Walden, Dunmow, Stansted and other larger settlements. Edge of town and out of town developments will not be approved unless the need is established and there will be no adverse effects on the health of the existing town centre".
- ✗ Opposed to introduction of more retail floorspace on the edge of town or expansion of edge of town supermarkets. Strategy should concentrate on the vitality and viability of market town centres.
- ✗ Dunmow Trader - Welcome new business within the town but retail parks outside small market towns would put even more pressure on the small traders.
- ✗ Dunmow Trader – Object to out of town retailing - it seems very simplistic to offer more retail space at the edge of town, so that the people stay and shop in Uttlesford. Shopping trends have changed with most homes on broadband and online availability of most products. In fact the major retailers that will most benefit from the out of town development have also had the most growth in this type of retailing year on year. For the people who prefer to come and touch and feel and see the products we need policies which do not drive them away out of these historic town centres.
- ✗ LA21 - The paragraph does not accurately represent the retail study which accepts that shoppers will continue to travel to larger retail centres like Cambridge where there is greater retail choice. Delete all but the first sentence and substitute " the council will promote further retail development within the town centre boundaries of Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow, Stansted and the larger village centres to maintain active retail commercial and service provision within the centres. Such centres should not, however attempt to subvert the regional hierarchy of retail centres as spelt out in the RSS"
- Essex CC Spatial Planning state that there needs to be passenger transport access between the existing centre and the new sites.
- ASP on behalf of clients suggest that the document should include a specific sub section which identifies the future role, functioning and character of the Key Service Centres. The objective should be to support sustainable housing development.

Objective 11 – Function of the Market Towns

Summary of Representations

- ✓ English Heritage and Taylor Wimpey Developments, Weston Homes and Tesco support this objective. English Heritage suggest it could be strengthened by referring to the need to integrate new development with the established grain and character of the area.

- ✓ Objective must be to ensure that long term viability of the towns both as places to live and centres of the hinterland.
- ✓ This objective contradicts the preamble and therefore I agree with it as long as it is not modified to promote large-scale non-centre-of-town retail development.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group, Dunmow Town Design Statement Group and Dunmow Town Council seek the amendment of Objective 11 to read: "Require high quality new development and secure improvements to the public realm that respects, preserves and enhances the historic nature of the town centres of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow and supports their function, vitality and viability as important local retail service and community centres within the District."
- ✗ Newport PC and others question how a single development at Elsenham would support the market towns.
- ✗ Location of the new settlement will lead to additional cross District road traffic and congestion on already inadequate roads.
- ✗ Options 3 and 4 fail to provide sufficient affordable homes in key market towns to ensure the viability of key services and community.

Paragraph 4.22 (5.22 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Tesco supports the councils preferred approach of allowing some new development on the edge of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow town centres, including the expansion of existing edge of town supermarkets subject to establishment of need.
- ✗ West Essex PCT request that for clarity reference is made within the supporting text to community facilities such as primary health care as a function and use to be encouraged in the market towns at Para 5.22. This would help to explain what may be meant by "other development" i.e. appropriate non retail uses within Policy DC11 itself.
- ✗ Object to the strategy of allowing edge of town retail floorspace. What is needed are active town management teams to investigate the potential for attracting more retail businesses into market town centres.
- ✗ Out of town supermarkets have already had a detrimental effect on our local towns.
- ✗ UDC should be looking to maintain (and diversify) those businesses already operating within the town centres, rather than adding out of town shopping centres.
- ✗ This new approach contradicts the objective. The stated policy is unobjectionable the preamble is very objectionable.
- ✗ Object to more edge of town retail the need is for the centre of the town to thrive.
- ✗ Object that Core Strategy could allow retail and supermarket development outside town limits.
- ✗ Friends of the Earth suggest new wording. Delete existing para. Substitute "The historic town centres of Saffron Walden & Great Dunmow provide an attractive setting for retail and service opportunities. There are problems with traffic congestion in the narrow streets and additional capacity will need active management. . The Council will encourage and support steps to increase shopping choices within the town centres. Edge of town expansion will not be permitted unless need can be clearly demonstrated and such development can be shown not to be detrimental to the health of the town centre.
- ✗ Great Dunmow Town Council would contest any proposals to allow out-of-town retail developments where these would have a detrimental impact on the economic viability of

the town centre. The viability of the town centre as a retail environment must in no way be diminished. It requires positive support.

- ✗ Dunmow Trader - Small towns like Dunmow thrive on independent retailers but I fear the council have lost sight if they think large DIY stores outside every town is necessary.
- ✗ Dunmow Trader – I strongly object to the stance outlined in the Core Strategy
- ✗ More shops on the edge of Great Dunmow is a bad idea. The need for more shops was made in comments on the Eastern Sector application.
- ✗ LA21 does not consider that the paragraph accurately represent the retail study which accepts that shoppers will continue to travel to larger retail centres like Cambridge where there is greater retail choice. Delete all after the first sentence

Policy DC11 – Function of the Market Towns

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Highway Agency supports this policy, however, they stress the need for policies to be consistent with PPS6 and state that the impact on the trunk road network from out of town expansion should be considered. The supporting text will need to take account of Transport Assessments in line with circular 02/2007. Demand management measures include travel plans and parking management. The policy should identify that developers will be expected to mitigate residual impact upon the network.
- ✓ 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.
- ✓ Some retailers including Sainsbury's and Tesco support the Council's position that new development will be encouraged to enhance the role of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow as retail and service centres.
- ✗ Waitrose consider that policy DC11 should be clarified so that it refers to new development which maintains and enhances the role of the defined Town Centres. The Core Strategy should make clear the distinction between edge of town supermarkets and edge of centre locations as defined in PPS6. The potential for existing town centre foodstores to increase their retail floorspace should be investigated in the first instance.
- ✗ Two Dunmow retailers are concerned about the potential impact of out of town shopping on the local businesses and stress the important role that smaller independent retailers play in the market towns.
- ✗ English Heritage and Newport PC object to this policy. Newport PC feels that DC11 is too generic and question how this will be achieved. English Heritage wishes to add 'Development must be of an appropriate scale and character and support town centre vitality and mixed use.' at the end of the policy.
- ✗ EERA consider that the policy does not provide a clear retail hierarchy and more detail is required in this area.
- ✗ 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.
- ✗ Tesco consider that the policy should be expanded to promote retail, commercial and other development in Stansted Mountfitchet, Thaxted and in the other key service centres. Policy should be expanded to include local centre and village shops or a new policy included which recognises the role of such shops and services to meeting resident's day to day needs.
- ✗ Opposed to the introduction of more retail floorspace on the edge of town or expansion of edge of town supermarkets. Strategy should concentrate of promoting the vitality and viability of the market town centres.

Policy DC12 – Character of the Market Towns

Summary of Representations

- ✓ 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
- ✗ Both Newport PC and English Heritage object to this policy. Newport PC feels that it is too generic and questions how it will be achieved. English Heritage wish to change the policy wording to 'The historic character and quality of the market towns will be maintained and enhanced, including their layout, urban grain, views and built form. New development must be design led and based on thorough appraisal of historic interest to ensure successful integration with townscape and landscape, and to promote a sense of place in new neighbourhoods.'
- ✗ Policy is not sufficiently specific.
- ✗ Policy should state commitment to achieving sustainable communities
- ✗ Great Dunmow Town Council, Great Dunmow Town Strategy Group and the Great Dunmow Town Design Statement group seek additional text setting out how development should meet specific design and other criteria.

Resources and Renewable Energy

Paragraph 4.24 (5.24 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Great Dunmow Town Council object - a new policy is needed on noise and air pollution.
- ✓ CPREssex support this section of the strategy
- ✓ British Wind Energy Association is very encouraged by the Council's recognition of the important "contribution that greater energy efficiency, use of renewable energy and recycling in new developments can make to meeting national and regional objectives relating to climate change" and we strongly support the Council's assertion that "all

development should reduce its environmental impact. BWEA recommend including the para 1.4 and 1.5 taken from the "Context" section of the Council's Adopted Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy SPD within the introduction to the Core Strategy Section on Resources and Renewable Energy.

Objective 12 – Use of Natural Resources

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Anglian Water Services, ECC Spatial Planning CEMEX, Weston Homes and others support this objective. Essex CC however, wish to see further information regarding monitoring.
- ✓ Replace by slight modifications to take account of other scarce or energy-hungry materials and to remove the ambiguity and redundancy in the policy. 'To reduce the use of resources, including water, energy and building materials, to the minimum in the construction, operation and eventual disposal of developments.'
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Great Dunmow Town Council suggest amendment to objective 2 to read; The use of resources, including water, is reduced to the lowest practical minimum in the construction, operation and eventual disposal of existing and new developments
- ✗ LA21 suggest the objective should be reworded. Insert "and building materials" after "water". Delete "lowest practical" which is redundant

Objective 13 – Reducing Emissions

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Supported by CEMEX and Weston Homes
- ✓ Essential – the district should address how windfarms can be deployed to enhance the landscape and support sustainable growth.
- ✓ Replace 'encouraging' by 'requiring', 'low' by 'zero' and adding 'and the use of energy efficient measures' at the end.
- ✓ Support but objective should be amended to read "To minimise greenhouse gas emissions by making renewable energy and low carbon technologies compulsory"
- ✗ Cambridgeshire County Council consider this objective should be revised to include reference to air pollutants as air quality is only referred to in objectives 17 and 18
- ✗ LA21 suggest delete "encouraging" insert "enforcing" This strengthens the commitment.
- Friends of the Earth suggest amendment - Insert "and enforcing energy conservation and " between "encouraging" and "the supply".

Paragraph 4.25 (5.25 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Support but the restriction of using wind and solar power for listed buildings needs to be removed.
- ✓ Remove the weakening 'try and' and 'more' before 'efficient use' and insert 'to the highest standards' after 'renewable energy' in the last sentence

Policy DC13 – Use of Natural Resources

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Natural England, British Wind Energy Association and ECC Spatial Planning all support this policy. ECC wish to replace 'encourage' with 'require'.
- ✓ 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 specific, positive and set targets.
- ✗ Policy should include new bullet points stating that :-
 - development uses building materials that are sustainable.
 - development should maximise the use of previously developed land.
- ✗ 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"

Paragraph 4.26 (5.26 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ La21 suggest the following wording changes: Delete "experimental figures" insert "estimates" in sentence 1. Similarly in sentence 3. Also in sentence 3 delete "reduce" insert "minimise". Delete last sentence. Replace with "The difficulty of the district council in addressing the energy efficiency of existing buildings many of which are listed required that all new build must be of the highest possible standard of energy efficiency in order for CO2 reduction targets to be achieved.
- ✗ Experimental surely should be 'estimated' or similar. Suggest adding a further sentence: 'The proposed new housing provides an opportunity to make these measures viable.' Perhaps this should replace part of the last sentence that otherwise doesn't make sense, especially the 'greenfield sites' part.
- Friends of the Earth consider that the last sentence does not make sense, all new housing should be carbon neutral whether on Greenfield sites or not. One reason for the high energy use is the high number of listed buildings where it is difficult to introduce effective energy conservation. This should be explained. The last sentence should be deleted and replaced with "This emphasises the importance of high standards for all new housing".

- Delete the last sentence it adds nothing and could be used as justification for premature development of Greenfield sites.

Paragraph 4.27 (5.27 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ This is very laudable
- ✗ ASP on behalf of clients consider it is unreasonable that the Council should wish to bring forward a development control policy which seeks to require development contributions for every tonne of CO2 resulting from new development, to be used to subsidise energy saving measures for existing homes and this reference should be removed.
- ✗ Chater homes consider that while the principle of this approach is commendable it is questionable whether sufficient information exists on household emissions in the district to properly justify this position.
- ✗ An objector considers whether 10% is enough.
- British Wind Energy Association consider it imperative that an ambitious, prescriptive on site microgeneration policy is included in the DC DPD with incremental increases in the target percentage between now and 2016
- The sooner this is expressed in definite rather than aspirational tones the better.

Policy DC14 – Renewable Energy

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Natural England supports renewable energy, 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
- ✗ Newport PC feels that the policy is too generic and questions how it will be achieved.
- ✗ 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 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

Objective 14 – Reducing Flood Risk

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Supported by Weston Homes

Paragraph 4.29 (5.29 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ The Environment Agency objects stating that it is a contradictory statement as it states development can be accommodated on low risk land yet some development may result in flooding. They point out that no areas should be at risk of flooding as the SFRA shows that development required can be provided on low risk land. They also feel that the paragraph is unclear in the words 'flood risk elsewhere' and assumes it is referring to surface water run-off and suggests new paragraph wording. 'Development in certain locations may result in flood risk elsewhere as a result of increased volumes of surface water run-off and the Council will work with the Environment Agency in requiring sustainable local flood mitigation measures to be provided as part of the development.'
- British Waters should be consulted on any water management issues that may impact on the River Stort Navigation.

Policy DC15 – Reducing Flood Risk

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Policy supported by Anglian Water Services, Natural England and others but recommend that it should mention Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs). Natural England suggests the policy should include 'Development will be required to incorporate SUDs to manage surface water drainage.'
- ✗ The policy is objected to by the Environment Agency:

- 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.
- Suggest that in the Core Strategy or DC DPD problem areas identified in the SFRA should ensure that the drainage scheme will not increase flood risk or should reduce the burden to existing systems.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- ✗ 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.

Stansted Airport

Paragraph 4.30 (5.30 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Suggest to insert in the first sentence 'however there has been virtually no growth in 2007 and passenger throughput is capped at 25 mppa.'
- ✗ A developer objects and suggests an additional objective 'The Council will seek to maximise the potential economic and social benefits of the airport for the local community and the wider sub region.'
- Representations protesting the prominence given to the airport in the strategic thinking behind the options, especially as it is against the Council's policies.

Paragraph 4.31 (5.31 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ There was a representation of support for this paragraph expressing the need to keep a cap on airport use by non business users.

- ✗ Go-East objects on the grounds that there is no articulation of what the Airport White Paper means for Uttlesford. While the Council is opposed to the expansion there is no evidence put forward to substantiate this or any other option.
- ✗ 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.
- ✗ The 2003 white paper is now out of date and precedes current awareness of the environmental damage done by aviation.

Paragraph 4.32 (5.32 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Representation in support, however, they wish to see the paragraph reworded: "The Council remains opposed to this government policy because of its concerns about the contribution of air transport carbon gas emissions and radiative forcing effects globally to climate change, and the local environmental effects, which are substantial *for such a diverse rural area*. It recognises that this Core Strategy needs to be informed by government air transport, *environmental and other climate change policy and these policies are in conflict with each other*
- ✓ Whilst EEDA supports this paragraph they wish to see that appropriate aviation infrastructure is planned with the white paper and that any proposals for infrastructure maximise economic and social benefit while minimising impacts on the environment.
- ✗ The Council must be aware that it is fundamentally inappropriate for an LDF to be advanced on the basis of stated opposition to national policy. The appropriate policy approach is one that assumes the bringing forward of a second runway and for the Council to provide that it is brought forward in a way that seeks to control and mitigate adverse impacts and to maximise local benefits.

- ✗ Replace last sentence with 'the Council remains unconvinced that the growth of the airport would bring net economic benefits.'
- The Council should make a case to the government that its final proposals should not be submitted until the outcome of Stansted Airport G2 inquiry.
- Friends of the Earth wish to omit reference to need to inform Core Strategy and repeat that development proposals put forward by the operator will be considered the usual way.

Paragraph 4.34 (5.34 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- UDC should state more strongly the harmful local effects of the airport and incorporate a policy rejecting a second runway. Questions what the G2 planning application implications would be.

Paragraph 4.35 (5.35 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- UDC should state more strongly the harmful local effects of the airport and incorporate a policy rejecting a second runway. Questions what the G2 planning application implications be?

Paragraph 4.36 (5.36 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Local transport pollution and congestion issues are vastly compounded by airport expansion.
- ✗ Suggesting this section should include an objective about the historic environment similar to objectives 17 and 18 noting that the Council will seek to minimise the impact of further airport development on the historic environment.
- ✗ At present the Core Strategy does not fully acknowledge the uncertainty surrounding the proposed development of the airport.

Objective 15 – Stansted Airport

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Do not encourage housing growth such as Option 4 that would inevitably be dependent on road infrastructure needed for a second airport runway and so demonstrate to the outside world that the council is pre-empting decisions not yet made
- ✓ CPRE support objective – development contingent on levels of airport development should only go ahead when required.
- ✓ Objective is supported by CEMEX

- ✗ The draft policies are focussed on limiting all future development within the existing airport boundary – objective is unachievable as this approach does not plan for all possible eventualities including for example a second runway.
- ✗ Go-East are concerned that there is no articulation of what the options are or what the preferred option might be for Stansted. They expect to see a preferred option based on evidence and a SA as well as other options that have been considered. They also express how important it is that Stansted is not treated in isolation.
- ✗ Stansted Airport Limited object – the appropriate policy approach, consistent with national and regional policy is one that assumes the bringing forward of a second runway and for the Council to provide that in a way that seeks to control and mitigate adverse impacts and maximise local benefits. Objective should be reworded to recognise that development of a second runway is supported by national policy.
- ✗ Great Dunmow Town Council suggest the objective should read: The Core Strategy as a whole will need to be sufficiently robust to accommodate the uncertainty surrounding the level of airport development by 2021, because of the commercial and economic regulation considerations and potential difficulties in achieving the Government's proposed external climate change costs test and demonstrating that the benefits outweigh the significant local environmental costs.
- ✗ Land Securities object – the preferred option at Elsenham is predicated on infrastructure associated with Stansted expansion the draft Core Strategy contains a contradiction between the preferred option for housing growth and objective 15
- ✗ Suggest amended wording to “The Core Strategy as a whole will need to be sufficiently robust to accommodate the uncertainty surrounding the level of airport development by 2021, whether the current movement and passenger caps remain in place, or the government permits full use of the existing runway or imposes a second runway and passenger throughput increases to about 68 million passengers a year.”
- Newport PC and others question what measures will be used to make this objective robust.

Objective 16 – Access to the Airport

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Objective is supported by Great Canfield Parish Council and CEMEX who also consider that the Council should seek to maximise the public transport links between key settlements and the airport
- ✓ Weston Homes support the objective but suggest change to first sentence to read “the council will seek to maximise public transport use for journeys made by passengers and workers to and from the airport”
- ✓ Stansted Airport Limited say BAA has no objection to Objective 16 although it would be sensible to make clear that the Council supports the maximum practical use of public transport.
- ✓ Essex Wildlife Trust support the objective but are concerned that the provision of new car parks should be minimised as the airport expands in order to send out a clear message to users that private car usage will be discouraged.
- ✗ Maximum number of journeys should mean all journeys.
- ✗ Objective cannot be met through further development at Elsenham or Henham
- ✗ Pious but ineffectual statement. The statement needs to be beefed up so as to explain how the Council is going to implement this.
- ✗ Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Great Dunmow Town Council suggest amended wording - The proportion of journeys to and from the airport by air passengers by public transport will be expected to increase from its current level by a significant degree

through management and infrastructure investment in parallel with any growth in passenger numbers. The proportion of workers and airport customers travelling by public transport walking or cycling will be expected to reach 80% by 2010 or in advance of any significance further increase in activity. Further increases in throughput will be expected to demonstrate how and when the investment necessary to support these levels of sustainable access will be delivered and by whom. Appropriate surface access infrastructure and service capacity is provided to meet airport related demand without impacting on capacity to meet the demands of other network users.

- Newport PC questions what measures will be used to make objective robust – these are visionary and vague.

Objective 17 – Air Noise, Ground Noise and Air Quality

Summary of Representations

- ✓ English Heritage, Galliard Homes and Weston Homes support this objective. Weston Homes consider that the objective should refer to minimising the impact on the environment (see comments on objective 18 below).
- ✓ Great Canfield Parish Council support the objective but are concerned that there are no matching policies.
- ✓ CPRE support objective but are doubtful of it's achievement
- ✓ Essex Wildlife Trust support the objective but are concerned that in relation to NOx levels the proposed expansion under G1 is already exceeding the 30 micrograms limit contour on one corner of Hatfield Forest.
- ✗ ECC Spatial Planning point out that it is unclear if this objective has been translated into a policy. Also wishes to have reference to education and recognising the findings of the RANCH study.
- ✗ Development at Elsenham, so close to the airport will subject even more people to the very pollution the council is concerned about.
- ✗ Add at the end: "It will require any proposed development to contain detailed proposals for reducing noise levels both at the airport and within the surrounding area, and for improvements in air quality. "
- ✗ Great Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Great Dunmow Town Council suggest amending objective to read: In the event of further increase in throughput the Council will require the operation to meet the highest practically achievable standards of air noise, ground noise and air quality in order to avoid further and where possible to reduce the impact on the health and amenity of local communities, the historic environment and the tranquillity of the District."
- Newport PC and others question what measures will be used to make this objective robust.
- This statement must be made much more robust and Core Strategy needs to state how this will be achieved.

Objective 18 – Hatfield Forest

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Natural England and others fully support objective 18.
- ✓ Great Canfield Parish Council support the objective but are concerned that there are no matching policies and feel it is not clear how the objective can be achieved.
- ✓ CRPEssex support the objective but doubt if it can be achieved.
- ✓ Great Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Great Dunmow Town Council suggest the objective should be amended to read: "The Council will seek to minimise the impact of poor air quality on local biodiversity and local communities, and will act to ensure that there is no further deterioration in the air quality in Hatfield Forest National Nature Reserve and Sites of Special Scientific Interest and to improve air quality in appropriate residential areas"
- ✗ Newport PC and others feel that Hatfield Forest is not the only green space that must be protected, there should be protection for all green spaces and measures that require new ones in large developments.
- ✗ English Heritage feel that maintaining the value of Hatfield Forest should be included in the objective.
- ✗ Weston Homes question the need for this objective. The protection of local biodiversity could be integrated into objective 17.

Objective 19 – Impact on Communities

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Great Canfield Parish Council supports the objective – every effort is needed to avoid the development of a conurbation around the airport.
- ✓ Galliard Homes support this objective
- ✓ Weston Homes support the general thrust of this objective but would add "and enhance" after "the Council will seek to maintain"
- ✓ The council needs to set out what it will do to achieve this objective
- ✗ After "cohesion" add "and "quality of life". At the end add "This includes those affected by air traffic movements within a 20 mile radius of the airport"
- ✗ Stansted Airport Limited consider that the text and the objective is inappropriate and should be removed.
- Options 2,3 and 4 directly contravene this objective

Paragraph 4.37 (5.37 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ West Essex PCT request that the text refers to the need for community facilities to be built into the social infrastructure of airport development.

Paragraph 4.37 (5.37 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ An agent states that airport related employment should not be limited to land within the airport perimeter, they mention Start Hill and adjoining land as a suitable area for employment development. They request that the text is amended to refer to the need for community facilities to be built into infrastructure related to airport development.

Policy DC16 – Land within the Airport

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Natural England shares the Council's concerns over carbon gas emissions and its impact on climate change, but wishes to see the policy revised to more fully reflect objectives 15-19.
- ✗ EEDA states that the objectives and policies DC16 and 17 underplay the airports potential role for the wider region and the positive effects its growth could have.
- ✗ 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

Summary of Representations

- ✓ English Heritage Support this policy, however, they feel it may be appropriate to seek stronger controls over ancillary buildings as they have the potential to undermine the objective of this policy.
- ✗ Natural England shares the Council's concerns over carbon gas emissions and its impact on climate change, but wishes to see the policy revised to more fully reflect objectives 15-19.

- ✗ EEDA states that the objectives and policies DC16 and 17 underplay the airports potential role for the wider region and the positive effects its growth could have.

Paragraph 4.38 (5.38 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Transport infrastructure must be enhanced.
- ✗ It is not possible to travel by train from Elsenham directly to the airport
- ✗ The existing local plan policy T3 should be incorporated as policy DC19

Policy DC18 - Transport

Summary of Representations

- ✓ 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
- ✗ Newport PC objects to this policy stating that this is a county issue and the document does not set out the requirements on developers to benefit the occupiers in terms of transport.
- ✗ 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.
- ✗ Great Dunmow TC feels that this needs to be far more specific identifying schemes linking to passenger growth thresholds and with a co2 limit.
- The proposed road changes that would result from the G2 expansion of Stansted Airport are effectively isolating Elsenham. UDC have accepted flawed research done by developers without checking the validity of their data or conclusions

Theme 4- Living in Communities

Paragraph 4.39 (5.39 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ There is a representation in full support of this paragraph
- ✗ Amend second sentence to read 'The challenge is to make sure that this quality of life is delivered and sustained.' Amend title 'Living in Sustainable Communities'.

Objective 20 – Health and Well Being

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Sport England welcome the specific reference to sport in this objective and that sport will be part of the provision of community facilities as part of Policy LC1
- ✓ Weston Homes support the objective
- ✓ Essex CC Spatial Planning generally support this policy but state that in terms of green space mental well being should be reflected and suggest the following change "Opportunities to encourage activities such as walking and cycling and access to the countryside should be taken as they can contribute greatly to people's health and well being."
- ✓ LA21 suggest the second "attractive" should be "accessible" or similar. Insert "transport" after "health facilities".
- ✓ Twigden Homes support this objective and consider that focusing growth on Saffron Walden would be the most cost effective and sustainable way of achieving this.
- ✓ Bellwinch Homes support the objective and feel that focusing growth on Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden would be the most cost effective and sustainable means of achieving this.
- ✓ Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd support the objective and feel that focusing growth on Great Dunmow would be the most cost effective and sustainable means of achieving this.
- ✗ Natural England feel there should be greater emphasis on outdoor recreation and suggests the following changes 'opportunities to encourage activities such as walking and cycling and access to the countryside should be taken as they can contribute greatly to peoples health and well being.'
- ✗ Newport PC feels that the Council has no decision making role on health matters and requires a specific requirement to fund our leisure centres, foot and cycle paths within developments to support healthy living.
- ✗ Great Dunmow Town Strategy Group and Great Dunmow Town Council suggest rewording objective to read: "To support the health and well being of Uttlesford residents by making sure that enough health facilities and other community facilities e.g. for sport are provided to meet current needs and the additional requirements arising from any new development so that levels of physical activity increase in the whole community and that the incidence related ill health conditions are reduced and life expectancy improved"
- ✗ Great Dunmow Town Strategy Group, Great Dunmow Town Design Statement Group and Great Dunmow Town Council consider that a new policy is required on food access as follows: "A strategy will be prepared to increase the supply and accessibility of good quality fresh and healthy food supplies within the District. This will address producer systems, markets and distribution. Interim proposals to enhance local food production and supply will be supported subject to sustainability criteria and policies in this plan.

Developers seeking large scale convenience retail outlets will be expected to contribute to the means of strengthening the local food supply system.”

- ✗ Bridgefoot/Walden Road Gospel Trust welcome the objective but is should acknowledge the close linkages between the wider community provision including places of worship with health and well being and delivery of social inclusion and cohesion.
- Neither objective 20 nor policy LC1 refers to the dedicated facilities for young people. Safe attractive places to live have safe attractive places to play.
- Objective should be reworded to read: The Council will endeavour to support the well being of Uttlesford residents by delivering safe, attractive, healthy places to live and ensuring community facilities are provided to meet the needs of all residents.

Paragraph 4.40 (5.40 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ West Essex PCT generally support this paragraph however for clarity they request the text makes reference to the need for developer contributions to be made towards health and community facilities as part of relevant new developments.
- ✗ Essex CC Spatial Planning object stating that the document needs to reflect the whole community well being agenda.

Policy LC1 – Health and Community Facilities

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Support England East supports this policy, however they wish to see a specific policy relating to the protection of existing open spaces and sport and recreation facilities.
- ✓ Great Canfield PC require the policy to say that the provision of these should be timed so that existing services are not degraded beyond a specific limit.
- ✓ This is a strong, simple and clear policy that is a model for the delivery of all the other objectives in the Core Strategy.
- ✓ Support from a developer promoting their site stating that it would provide all the facilities needed
- ✓ A developer is in support, however suggests the addition of the phase ‘where need is demonstrated as a result of such development.’
- ✓ West Essex PCT supports this policy, however they wish to see reference to the need of developer contributions towards 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. They state that where the necessary infrastructure cannot be guaranteed through the above mechanisms permission may be refused or granted so as to phase development accordingly

- ✗ 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 LC1 does not refer to the need for dedicated facilities for young people, particularly the 13 to 19 year age group.

Paragraph 4.41 (5.41 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Amend paragraph 'Existing and new residents *shall* be protected....'
- ✗ It is not clear how this will be achieved when development will involve large numbers of heavy vehicles using roads which are unsuitable for purpose.
- ✗ In view of the health effects of phone masts policy T4 in the local plan should be included as a sub Para of LC2 or as a new policy.

Policy LC2 – Health Impacts

Summary of Representations

- ✓ In support, however change 'account into' to 'into account'
- ✓ There is support for this policy from a developer
- ✗ 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

Paragraph 4.42 (5.42 in hardcopy)

- ✓ Amend paragraph to read 'All development *shall* meet' There also needs to be consideration of transport and communication services in this rural area.

Policy LC3 - Accessibility

Summary of Representations

- ✓ West Essex 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

Paragraph 5.1 (6.1 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Development should be focused on existing centres
- ✓ Two representations in support from developers promoting land. One stating that the preferred growth option of reliance on Elsenham is not considered to accord with these principles. The other one stating that it should be recognised that housing provision should include a variety of housing types and tenures to meet local housing need including housing for the elderly.
- ✓ A few representations are in support, however, they stress that a new settlement should be avoided. One representation states that spreading the increase in homes across the district based on the 2001 census would result in a much better level of planning control.
- ✗ Options and objectives are in conflict with each other and with national and regional policy and strategies
- ✗ Lack of evidence specifically mentions SHMA, housing trajectory and the fact that no monitoring mechanism is out forward, for these reasons the preferred option is not justified.
- ✗ There are muddled references to sustainability
- ✗ The spatial strategy should reflect and implement policy guidance in PPS3 and the EoE Plan. These should be reflected in the wording of this paragraph. A new settlement goes against the EoE Plan.
- ✗ The current consultation does not present the options for growth in an appropriate context to allow an informed public response.
- Go-East feel this section only really deals with housing options and does not articulate how this achieves the district vision or adequately links the options to employment/transport or retail strategies. They also state that it is not clear why certain options have been rejected.
- There should be some discussion of environment and infrastructure capacity

Paragraph 5.2 (6.2 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Interesting to note that the last of these is free standing which is the preferred option.
- ✓ one representation in support, however, feels the Council should abandon option 4

Paragraph 5.3 (6.3 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ One representation of support, however, they feel these principles are admirable but have been ignored in option 4
- ✗ A number of representations state that this paragraph emphasises that the strategy should take into account the need to provide housing in key service centres and other settlements in order to enhance and maintain their sustainability, option 4 fails to take this into account. A developer questions why Hatfield Heath is not being considered for further development and feels that it should be included as a key service centre.
- If housing is to be provided in the rural areas then the only viable options are 2 and 3.

Paragraph 5.5 (6.5 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ EEDA fully supports this paragraph stating that the clarification of the roles of the market towns is welcomed. The safeguarding of employment sites and the identification of Saffron Walden as a focus for offices, research and development and light industry (B1) and Great Dunmow for industry and warehousing is also helpful in delivering on the aspirations for the Cambridge and Stansted/Harlow sub regions in the RES
- ✓ A number of representations in support stating that this will achieve sustainable expansion.
- ✗ Edge of town centre expansion would be harmful to town centre shopping facilities and is contrary to RSS policy. They would be hard to access without a car.
- ✗ There needs to be a rigorous sequential assessment for edge of town retail development. Suggested rewording of policy – delete ‘and by allowing appropriate shops on the edge of town or expansion of edge of town supermarkets’
- ✗ Two towns cannot both be the largest, replace first sentence with ‘Saffron Walden is the largest settlement in the district.’
- ✗ Developers consider the definition of market towns and villages is not based on through analysis. Stansted Mountfitchet is now defined as a village whereas in the Local Plan it is defined as an urban area. It should at least be a key service centre. A settlement hierarchy should be based on criteria including access to employment, education, and access to other settlements. Only limited growth should be expected through expansion of villages.
- ✗ Elsenham and Great Chesterford are identified in the Local Plan as key rural settlement, now they are described as key service centres. Given this represents a change from the Local Plan this document fails to provide the necessary explanation for the change.
- ✗ Employment land must take account of accessibility. Any further allocation on the eastern side of Saffron Walden would exacerbate the difficulties caused by traffic. Suggests changes to the paragraph delete ‘by allowing appropriate shops on the edge of town or expansion of edge of town supermarkets. After ‘class B1 use add ‘in accessible locations.’
- ✗ Saffron Walden is only one of the historical settlements and to protect this town against others is discriminatory.
- Saffron Walden suffers from congestion. Any bypass must recognise and preserve the historic centre of the town and the quality of access to the town e.g. Windmill Hill.
- A developer is concerned that additional retail is being directed outside of the defined

town centres. Additional floorspace should be focused in existing centres. This contradicts the aim and objectives of PPS6. the description 'edge of town supermarkets' should not be confused with edge of centre locations, this distinction is not made clear and should accord with Annex A table 2 of PPS6. They feel that a primary shopping area should be defined in Saffron Walden.

Paragraph 5.6 (6.6 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Option 4 does not meet any of these objectives
- ✓ Agents support the identification as Elsenham as a key service centre. One specifically mentioning how development at Stansted Road could provide green space and affordable housing.
- ✓ An agent supports the inclusion of Thaxted as a key service centre.
- ✓ One representation in support, however, they express the need for villages to retain their identity and not be engulfed by new development.

- ✗ A number of representations objecting to this paragraph stating that options 2, 3 and 4 join the villages of Elsenham and Henham together and the historic character of the area will be destroyed therefore these options are contrary to this paragraph.
- ✗ Consideration should be given to the preparation of a settlement hierarchy document based on national and regional policies on sustainable development for consultation and agreement in order to inform the growth options for the District.
- ✗ A steady and controlled release of properties in the countryside is necessary to support the local rural economy. Supplying housing of all types in sustainable villages and towns meets the government's objectives and gives people the choice of where to live.
- ✗ Elsenham and Great Chesterford are described as key service centres. This approach represents a change from the Local Plan and there is no clear explanation why.
- ✗ A developer wishes to see Clavering in the list of key services centres

- Option 4 will not protect these villages
- other villages have village shops whose viability would be supported by some growth. Each village should be assessed for need and potential capacity. Stansted Mountfitchet has not been mentioned for having a rail station.
- Options 2, 3 and 4 are inconsistent with this statement as they do not preserve the countryside.
- Option 4 will place pressure on villages, such as Great/Little Chesterford and Littlebury corridor. This area has 'relatively high sensitivity to change' as recognised in the Landscape Character Assessment. These villages lie in the valley bottom, without using the valley sides there is the risk of ribbon development on the B1383.
- Essex CC draws attention to the Council's land at The Mead Thaxted, which has capacity for 50 – 60 houses and would represent a low impact on the existing settlement. This would provide a proportion of affordable housing and would support the existing local services.

Paragraph 5.7 (6.7 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Only allow limited development in and around rural villages on poorly used or poor quality land to ensure that our villages remain vibrant communities.
- ✗ Rural protection is not served by 470 additional homes in Stansted as in option 1
- If this statement is to be followed through, a thorough and impartial assessment of each of the settlements and villages in the countryside must be undertaken to ensure that land that could be sensibly used for development, without damaging the countryside, is properly identified.
- Options 2, 3 and 4 are inconsistent with this statement as they do not protect the countryside.

Paragraph 5.8 (6.8 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ There is support for the preservation of the green belt
- ✓ There is support from a developer, however, they feel that this should not preclude minor revisions to local Green Belt boundaries in local context where it can be demonstrated such areas no longer accord with the original purpose.
- ✗ A developer promoting a site in Hatfield Heath states that the need for affordable housing in this village justifies an expansion to the green belt.

Paragraph 5.9 (6.9 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ There is support for the preservation of the CPZ
- ✓ A developer is in support, however, they feel this should not preclude minor revisions to boundaries in a local context where it can be demonstrated that such areas will not contribute towards coalescence in settlement and the airport.
- ✗ A developer objects stating that land at Start Hill along the B1256 should be excluded from the CPZ.
- ✗ Government guidance gives limited weight to local landscape policies of this nature. Remove reference to the CPZ, or if it is to be retained the supporting text should explicitly state that the internal and external boundaries of this will be the subject of review in respect of both airport growth and land that has been established as contributing little to the objectives of the policy.
- Finding adequate land for option 2 would involve encroaching on the Countryside Protection Zone at land south of Stansted Road Elsenham.

Paragraph 5.10 (6.10 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ EEDA fully supports this paragraph
- ✓ There are a number of representations in support of this paragraph
- ✗ The Council is wrong to say it recognises the growth of Stansted Airport when its policy is to oppose growth. Change wording to '...is opposed to the growth of Stansted Airport beyond the present approved limits.'
- ✗ One representation objecting questions what 'The District Council recognises the growth of Stansted Airport.' mean?
- ✗ A developer objects and wishes to amend this paragraph after the second sentence to read 'Stansted Airport is recognised as an international gateway, a major employment centre and a key driver of the sub- regional economy. Development at the airport will maximise the economic and social benefits of the airport for local communities and the wider sub-region.'
- Light pollution controls should be added to the airport's environmental impact assessment.
- The phrase 'The Council recognises the growth of Stansted Airport' could be seen as support for the expansion. Suggest rewording 'The Council has had to deal with the growth of Stansted Airport to its present permitted size.'

Growth Options

Paragraph 5.11 (6.11 hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Little Hallingbury PC fully support this paragraph
- ✗ The themes of the Uttlesford Community Strategy would be better promoted by distributed development rather than at a single location.
- ✗ Representations objecting to the options, specifically option 4 stating that the quality of life will be affected by infrastructure that cannot cope with the demands made upon it.
- ✗ A new settlement is best placed with good motorway links, possibly along the A120 or Stump Cross on the M11.
- ✗ Option 2 far more acceptable.
- ✗ Why has proper thought not been given to locating these developments close to adequate road infrastructure?
- ✗ A new settlement at Elsenham was not mentioned in previous consultations. Gt Chesterford, Newport and Stansted have very small allocations.
- ✗ Great Chesterford suggested as an area for new development.
- ✗ This option means a problem in the provision of affordable housing in other areas of the District. Growth should be spread in a range of settlements to ensure that social and economic benefits are experienced across the District. Thaxted is specifically mentioned as a key service centre which should be considered for growth.
- ✗ None of the options are acceptable; a variant of option 2 would be the best preferred option.
- ✗ The limitation to four choices without explanation as to why other possibilities have been rejected needs to be justified and explored. Specific reference is made to a major development in Great Chesterford and/or Little Dunmow and to combining settlements with other districts.

- × Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden do not have rail station therefore if residents chose to travel by train there would be an increase in road usage to Bishops Stortford.
- × Building an extra 4000 homes plus is unsustainable in regards to water supply, energy use, construction materials and land use, climate change and waste. A way must be found to counter developer's aversion to less profitable affordable housing, the incentive for this would be greater if housing developments were smaller.
- × Housing should only be provided for local people.
- × Quality agricultural land should not be built on and will be an important assessment to the economy and leisure facilities in the future.
- × There is no need for more low cost housing in Stansted as it has seen large development recently.
- × The green belt needs to be preserved, therefore no more development at Stansted.
- × Inadequate evidence was made available to the public. The LDF process has been defective in its implementation.
- × Option 3 should read 'significant development at Henham.' Option 4 'new settlement to the south west of Henham'.
- × Debden PC object as they feel Uttlesford will be overdeveloped, they do not believe there is a requirement for this number of homes, have concerns about the environmental and social impact and wish to preserve the rural landscape of the district.
- × Quendon and Rickling Newport and Stansted state that not enough detailed information is given. Stansted also believe the consultation process has been flawed and state that they want to balanced development between the south and north.
- × Thames Water Property Services state that more detailed information is needed for them to make a detailed response. They point out that it is easier for them to deliver infrastructure for a small number of large sites. They stress the importance of phasing development to allow prior completion of necessary infrastructure.
- × Broxted PC objects to the four proposed options they explain their preferred approach is to see any bulk development centered around existing towns and some development in all the villages with social housing for local people.
- × Newport PC object as there may be other locations for a single development with better logistics in place, smaller groups of housing may support smaller community growth and development must have infrastructure and employment opportunities.

- Any development should be aimed at an area with existing infrastructure which can be expanded.
- Stansted Mountfitchet and Quendon and Rickling PC state that until they see detailed information regarding services and infrastructure they cannot reach a conclusion. Quendon and Rickling PC stress the lack of infrastructure to support development on this scale.
- In conclusion the Council must ensure any new housing proposals (be it a new settlement at Elsenham or elsewhere, or an alternative housing strategy) are compatible with the growth of the airport which is supported in the ATWP and which is of national importance.
- Friends of the Earth state that option 4 was not included in the original consultation. They feel that the leaflet sent out to the public does not make it clear that this was consultation on the Core Strategy and not just on the preferred options needed to meet government housing targets. They are concerned that people without access to the internet had to visit the Council Offices or the Library. Changes in local policies should have been highlighted at this stage. In relation to option 4 they express concern that its inclusion in the SA came after the decision. They suggest a radical review of option 2 which would reduce the number of housing in Saffron Walden and Dunmow, remove those allocated to Takeley, and consider a number of villages to have small developments. They also point out that the quality of map was poor.

- The empty housing stock should be used. Mentions the fact that the District has an aging population. Expresses the fact that there is a need for agricultural land to grow crops which we won't be able to do if it is covered in housing.
- A developer is concerned about the deliverability of the new settlement in the time period and feels that growth in the key service centres should be encouraged. They promote their site stating that it will provide additional infrastructure. They feel that the Council needs to allocate more than sufficient sites.
- A developer promoting a site feels that the A120 corridor represents an opportunity for growth at a scale that respects the character of the individual settlements. However, they state that the A120 should not be the focus of growth for all the Districts housing.
- Uttlesford Council should continue to fight the government's housing figures. Suggestion to amend the strategy 'recognize Government housing targets and endeavour to provide where Uttlesford district character is preserved.' They state that any further housing should be restricted to the main settlements.
- Newport should have a housing programme which would revitalise the village. It has the advantage of a rail link and is in close proximity to the airport.
- New housing needs to be positioned where it is easiest to provide new infrastructure. They stress the need to take commuting patterns into account and development should be in areas with good road access. State their objection to large scale development in small settlements and in the A120 corridor.
- A landowner states that it would be a pity to dismiss the opportunity of having housing development in the villages. Questions whether any studies have identified the critical mass of a village which would a) draw pupils solely from within its own boundaries and b) support an imaginative public transport system possibly staffed by part time drivers (student age and retirees) to give access to stations and local towns.
- Proposal of an option 5 that would contain a project to encourage the planning and seeding of housing in peripheral frontier districts of the core of Uttlesford, which would be undertaken with Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire.
- Option 4 will prevent the character of many small villages being destroyed.
- 10-15 houses in each village would solve the problem of young people moving out.
- All facilities and housing should be in one location where people can cycle and walk to everything they need.
- A landowner promoting their site stating that Great Easton is a location which should be considered for development as it is well served with a primary school and a pub. They also point out that there are sites with former agricultural buildings on which are now unused and should therefore be considered for housing development.
- There must be adequate car parking at train stations. They believe the new settlement should be located on the land east of the railway line, or an alternative option would be to place much of the housing in Dunmow as it is an established town with good road access.
- Option 4 would be preferable as most of the houses will be built on one site which has good access to major motorways and trunk roads and where facilities and amenities can be concentrated in that area for the use of the residents. If they were to be spread extra amenities would be unaffordable and far too spread.
- The village of Stansted will not be able to cope with the knock on effects of option 4.
- The maps are not clear, they do not show sites for employment use or where new infrastructure, such as roads will go. Option 4 map only shows housing in a few settlements suggesting that none will be distributed amongst villages.
- Has the option of sitting any homes around Bishop's Stortford or Harlow been considered? These larger settlements would not be adversely affected in the same way as Saffron Walden or the villages, and have infrastructures far more able to cope with the additional population.
- Support the Council's preferred option
- No more housing in Saffron Walden as it already has seen enough new development.

- Wendens Ambo should be considered for housing development as it has a train line and is within a mile of the County High School. The village is also suitable for infilling.
- If we need to expand our airports then London's airports would be best.
- The M11 corridor has good transport links with main line rail links whilst not jeopardising existing communities.
- Thames Water Property Services state that It is generally easier to deliver infrastructure for a small number of largely clearly defined sites than for a large number of smaller sites. More time and detailed information is needed before a detailed response can be given.
- One representation questions why the EoE Plan states that Uttlesford needs to provide 8,000 new dwellings by 2021 yet this document states 9,666 new dwellings by 2024.
- Why is there not more development proposed in the north of the District?
- A proposal that 3000 home be spread amongst all communities by relaxing dome development constraints. 5 new houses in every village would be looking after the local community, especially if they were affordable homes.
- If housing is needed for the armed forces what about a joint development?
- Wishes to see a general review of the plan based on majority options of residents.
- A number of representations stating that options 1 and 2 were their preferred options

Paragraph 5.12 (6.12 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ There is support for the Elsenham development
- ✗ Henham and Elsenham PC objects due to the process being flawed and the lack of information.
- ✗ A number of representations objecting to option 4 stating that it is the worst choice due to lack of infrastructure, roads, lack pf planning detail, joining Elsenham and Henham together which is contrary to the district vision.
- ✗ Option 4 not supported by a robust and credible evidence base.
- ✗ The SA followed, rather than informed the decision. The selection of a single location is inflexible and could hamper delivery.
- ✗ Assessment for growth options and the Policy Choices and Options for Growth document were omitted from the evidence base.
- ✗ There is a lack of knowledge and understanding from the planners and the members.
- ✗ Lack of maps and diagrams to make an informed decision.
- ✗ A number of representations objecting, suggesting alternative locations for a new settlement including Great Chesterford, Little Chesterford and questions are asked as to whether other locations have been considered. Creating a new settlement is likely to offer another nucleus for housing growth, making that of urban sprawl worse. Distribution of the housing across existing communities will have less adverse impact on the District character and will give young families the chance to keep villages and towns sustainable.
- ✗ Option 4 was not part of this consultation period and it did not follow proper procedure and is no documentation to support this decision.
- ✗ A Transport Impact Assessments and Environmental Impact Assessments are needed before a balanced decision can be made.
- Other more concentrated settlement solutions need to be explored.

Growth Option 1
Development to be split between Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and Stansted
Mountfitchet

Paragraph 5.14 (6.14 in hard copy)

Summary of Representations

The representations from the statutory consultees are summarised below:

- ✓ Hadstock, Ugley, Henham, Elsenham and Clavering PC fully support this option, with Clavering stating that the villages could take a small proportion if necessary.
- ✗ Saffron Walden TC objects as they believe Saffron Walden does not have the infrastructure to support such growth.
- ✗ Great Easton and Tilty PC object stating that it would affect the current infrastructure in a detrimental fashion.
- ✗ Stansted Mountfitchet PC objects due to the strain on infrastructure that is already at breaking point including rail, road and health as well as the difficulties with integrating the Rochford development.
- ✗ Newport PC feels that it is ill thought out
- Essex CC Spatial Planning point out that in addition to the lack of viable secondary school expansion options consideration would need to be given to additional school transport costs.
- Birchanger PC points out that Audley End station has advantages over Elsenham station such as parking.
- Takeley PC states that this option best reflects national and regional policies. They are concerned that Saffron Walden has limited development options and Dunmow and Stansted are assimilating development already but express the need to fully utilise opportunities as they exist.

Other representations in favour of option 1 made the following points:

- ✓ 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 of 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.

Other representations objecting to option 1 made the following points:

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

Paragraph 5.15 (6.15 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ There are a number of representations in support, including one from an agent, of this paragraph as the locations are sustainable and are capable of offering access to services and facilities
- × The district's main centres are the market towns of Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden plus Stansted Airport, but not Stansted Mountfitchet, which has limited retail capacity.

Paragraph 5.16 (6.16 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ One representation is in support, however, they point out that due to commuting trends Elsenham and Henham could turn into dormitory towns.
- ✓ There are a number of representations, including some from developers, in support of this paragraph stating that development in the towns will allow better access to employment and transport/road links.
- ✗ Newport PC point out that housing anywhere will create commuting and there is more rail capacity north to Cambridge than south to London.
- ✗ There is already substantial new housing development in Great Dunmow. Very few residents will work in Dunmow so it would make little difference to the road problems.
- ✗ Give greater consideration to the potential for growth at Takeley in the light of the MGB constraints in Stansted Mountfitchet.
- ✗ There is more rail capacity north to Cambridge than south to London

Paragraph 5.17 (6.17 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ This will avoid ghettos of affordable housing
- ✓ A number of representations in support, including from agents, stating that the main settlements are where the affordable housing is needed.
- ✓ Affordable homes should be sited where car ownership is essential
- ✓ This option gives a greater spread of affordable housing than option 4
- ✗ It is essential that sensible development be encouraged in outlying settlements to ensure that the character of these villages is preserved and enhanced.
- ✗ No option that excludes the provision of housing in rural villages can be good for those rural communities.
- ✗ most affordable housing will need to be in the larger settlements
- Newport PC state that most affordable housing need will be in the largest communities
- All affordable housing should be constructed to housing corporation minimum Eco and other standards
- I would have some sympathy for this proposal if it could be guaranteed that an increased supply of affordable and 'starter' homes might be provided

Paragraph 5.18 (6.18 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ A number of representations in supports stating that these locations already have infrastructure which could be improved, built upon, unlike option 4.

Paragraph 5.19 (6.19 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ A number of representations in support stating that this approach makes more sense and development in villages would have a greater impact on the communities and countryside.
- ✓ Two representations in support, however, they feel that some relaxation could be made to proposals to allow small clusters of developments in the villages and the countryside to allow for natural growth.
- ✓ In support, however is concerned that the Council will still consider a new settlement in Great Dunmow

- ✗ Newport PC object as they feel it would devalue communities where new development might support existing facilities.
- ✗ It is essential that sensible development be encouraged in outlying settlements to ensure that the character of these villages is preserved and enhanced.
- ✗ No option that excludes the provision of housing in rural villages can be good for those rural communities.
- ✗ The Historic Settlement Character Assessment prejudices the Site Allocation Document by stating further growth around Saffron Walden would have a detrimental effect on its character. Points out that Wendens Ambo and Great Chesterford are well served by public transport and Littlebury has potential for small growth.
- ✗ Would devalue communities where new development might support existing facilities.

- Option 1 would minimise the impact on Stansted Mountfitchet compared to the other options.
- An agent feels that significant expansions would be difficult to integrate due to the local distinctiveness and sense of place as described in the Historic Settlement Character Assessment.

Paragraph 5.20 (6.20 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ A number of representations in support stating that employers would most likely locate to the main settlement. It would be a sustainable option as people would be able to travel to work by sustainable modes.

- ✗ Newport PC question how this will ensure access to employment other than by car as the centres do not have rail.
- ✗ A better balance between growing the main settlements of Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden and growing some of the villages is needed. A hierarchy approach should be examined more closely.
- ✗ There is no sustainable transport plan
- ✗ Questions how development in the main centres ensures there is more opportunity to access employment by car when the two main towns have no rail station.

- The document states 'it gives more opportunity for people to get to work by foot, cycle or public transport.' How does the building of 470 extra houses in Stansted meet this objective?

Paragraph 5.21 (6.21 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ This whole paragraph seems premature in that it is too specific to be useful to strategy considerations, however it does illustrate that infrastructure capable of development only exists in or near existing major settlements.
- ✓ This will all need to be done wherever the new houses go but economies of scale will operate in the larger settlements.
- ✓ Regarding schools there is a need to consider children coming in from outside the catchment zone.
- ✓ Both Saffron Walden and Stansted Mountfitchet have play space and sports facilities that can be expanded/enhanced.

- ✗ Newport PC object stating the comments are inadequate
- ✗ Objection to the statement that Stansted has potential to expand. It has already got 648 new dwellings being built.
- ✗ Objects as they infrastructure is inadequate.
- ✗ A developer objects stating that there are sites not currently allocated for employment use which would be ideal for housing development which would allow existing employment sites to remain in employment use avoiding the need to allocate additional employment land.

- West Essex PCT requests that the text under infrastructure subheadings reflects the need for developer contribution towards health care facilities.
- Birchanger PC question why Newport Grammar School has not been mentioned and mention the positives of infrastructure already being in place and providing affordable housing where there is great demand in the towns.
- Development in Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow would require major infrastructure changes in towns very difficult to adapt.
- The Stansted Mountfitchet school could be expanded by the acquisition of adjacent land
- The issue of secondary schools in Uttlesford needs to be considered in more detail. It might be far better to build a new secondary school in the north of the district rather than the south
- Helena Romana School could be expanded if the agricultural land between the school and north of Dunmow bypass was acquired.

Table 5.1 (6.1 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ The smaller villages are growing by small scale developments through the normal planning processes at rates already consistent with these figures
- ✓ Future housing developments in the villages should increase to 130.
- ✓ Significant housing in Saffron Walden would be contrary to the Air Quality Management area requirements.
- ✓ Oakwood Park may have an extra 162 dwellings if the Enodis appeal succeeds.
- ✓ The figures show how much Saffron Walden has been bypassed in recent years by housing growth

- ✗ No evidence to show how the information in this table has been sourced. Saffron Walden is more sustainable than Great Dunmow, the table is therefore wrong to allocate a larger number of houses in Great Dunmow.
- ✗ Delete all reference to Components of Supply in all tables, precise dwelling capacities for each settlement will be determined through Site Specific DPD consultations
- ✗ A developer feels that Newport should be included to provide 400 units to reflect the assessment of capacity under option 2
- ✗ Concentration of new communities submerging or being in tension against existing population.
- Cambridgeshire CC feel that the relative sustainability of the Preferred Option 4 is unclear as it is not consistent with the housing target identified in policy DC1.

Growth Option 2

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

Paragraph 5.22 (6.22 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

The representations from the statutory consultees are summarised below:

- ✓ Birchanger, Hempsted, Quendon and Rickling and Felsted PC generally support option 2, with Hempsted PC expressing the need for at least one additional secondary school, upgrade of the water and sewage systems and healthcare provision, and Quendon and Rickling expressing the need to see more detailed information before they can fully endorse an option, however, they feel option 2 or 3 would be best with additional infrastructure. Birchanger PC support option 2 due to the good transport links, close to airport jobs and affordable housing being spread throughout the district.
- ✓ Thaxted PC supports a modified option 2 with smaller levels of development in all towns and villages.
- ✗ Stansted Mountfitchet, Great Easton and Tilty, Saffron Walden TC and Hatfield Heath PC object as they believe existing infrastructure will be overwhelmed with Saffron Walden TC specifically mentioning the infrastructure in their town. Hatfield Heath PC also believe that additional infrastructure is unlikely to be provided. Stansted Mountfitchet are especially concerned with the number of proposed houses in Elsenham as it would put a strain on the towns infrastructure.
- ✗ Ashdon PC object stating that distributing 4200 homes in existing villages and settlements is not an option due to the damage it would cause to the rural district.
- ✗ Little Chesterford PC object to the building of 80 new houses in Great Chesterford due to the local school and the County High having little room to expand and due to its location attracting commuters.
- ✗ Newport PC object stating it does not evidence clear thinking.
- ✗ Elsenham PC object due to the significant impact it would have on the village.
- ✗ Takeley PC objects stating that the villages are less sustainable with poor access to infrastructure. They also point out that Takeley has a large development already and the new runway alignment will run through the centre of Takeley.
- Essex CC Spatial Planning state that option 2 is their preferred option specifically the previous option 2b with further growth at Priors Green where the County Council has a land holding. They also point out that in addition to the lack of viable secondary school

expansion options consideration would need to be given to additional school transport costs.

Other representations supporting option 2 made the following comments:

- ✓ 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 existing towns and villages that have identifiable centres and recognised communities
- ✓ Spreads the impact of the housing more fairly, particularly in relation to local services and infrastructure.
- ✓ In relation to Great Dunmow one supporter felt that it would benefit Great Dunmow with another supermarket and extra jobs and businesses for the Dunmow Area.
- ✓ New development at Saffron Walden it was suggested would make new infrastructure improvements more viable.
- ✓ Supports local businesses across the district and reduces the need for people to travel.
- ✓ Allows new inhabitants to live closer to facilities and jobs
- ✓ Spreads traffic generation
- ✓ Identifies settlements with good access to the road network
- ✓ Gives increased recognition to the role of the larger villages which benefit from a decent range of facilities and services including shops, schools and public transport accessibility including railway links.
- ✓ Provides for more sympathetic growth than 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.
- ✓ Spreads the affordable housing throughout the district and provides affordable housing to meet needs in a variety of towns and villages.
- ✓ Reduces the risks associated with reliance on single sites
- ✓ Many villages could sustain a small housing development
- ✓ Spreads housing across a wider range of settlements which could reduce the total amount of green field land required within the district.
- ✓ Option 2 was also supported by developers and landowners promoting sites in the towns and villages identified in option 2. A full list of residential sites being promoted is included as Appendix 2. Towns and villages suggested include Thaxted, Elsenham, Newport, Takeley, Quendon and Rickling. Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden.

Some support was conditional with people making the point that the scale of development should be small and in keeping with the area.

Representations objecting to Option 2 made the following comments:

- ✗ Option 2 is a piecemeal solution in which no one element is large enough to justify new infrastructure solutions. Each of the villages would be pushed to and beyond its capability to integrate new residents while not able to add to schools, roads, retail facilities.
- ✗ Option 2 threatens Alsa Wood east of the M11. Housing close to the M11 would be subject to noise and chemical pollution.
- ✗ Hatfield Heath should be included as a key service centre

- ✘ All four options have implications for Stansted, Do not support any of these options because the infrastructure of the village would be severely affected by each of them. It would be impossible for Chapel Hill and Grove Hill to cope with the extra traffic that these developments would bring to the village.
- ✘ Persimmon Special Projects suggest an approach combining elements of Options 1 and 2 would more closely reflect the policy framework in the EEP and be more robust than Option 4.
- ✘ Essex County Councillor - Spreading the load compromises the rural character of the District, and further threatens the countryside, as developers may see this as a green light to push for more outside the towns and villages. Infrastructure, facilities such as schools, and highways will come under pressure. Employment is concentrated in the towns and cities, and this proposal will contribute further to commuting pressures already experienced in the area.
- ✘ Concerned about impact of options 2-4 on the road network of Ugley. Do not believe that the development at Elsenham is sustainable.
- ✘ Countryside Properties supports a balanced strategy but objects to the proposed distribution of housing and considers development should be dispersed along the A120 particularly between Bishops Stortford and Great Dunmow and should include land at Dunmow Park, Great Dunmow
- ✘ Many of the smaller proposed settlements for growth are not sustainable communities at the moment and adding more houses could not be seen as sustainable. The options for small additions to the larger towns in the district are too small to justify commensurate matched provision of services and would only serve to add to the limitations of those existing towns.
- ✘ Chater Homes says this is a piecemeal solution which would have an adverse impact on a number of settlement and suggesting instead a large scale new development at Chelmer Mead
- ✘ Fairfield Partnership object to option2 because it would fail to represent the most appropriate strategy in all the circumstances. Growth proposed would have a significant impact on the scale of historic settlements. Significant pressure on shops and services particularly secondary school provision. Implications of further growth at Takeley are significant. Dispersal fails to maximise the potential investment into new infrastructure.
- ✘ Friends of the Earth – allocating some houses to other larger villages relieves pressure on the three larger towns but numbers for Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow are still too high to be assimilated into a sustainable whole town and the traffic problems would still be insuperable. Object to further housing in Takeley – too close to the airport. Doubtful that Elsenham could accommodate as many as 750 new homes. There is a case for reviewing this option to assess whether other villages could with minor infrastructure and public service improvements absorb more houses.
- ✘ Object to large number of houses proposed for Takeley – already had large development and too close to Stansted Airport.
- ✘ Strutt and Parker on behalf of clients concerned that smaller villages may be overlooked to the detriment of the rural economy. Suitable, well planned and integrated developments will support local services without placing undue pressure on transport services. A larger allocation should be given to the villages e.g Barnston, Arkesden, Felsted, High Easter, Leaden Roding, Quendon, Henham and Takeley
- ✘ Strutt and Parker on behalf of other clients support the inclusion of Takeley but consider a more “pepper potted” approach will not provide infrastructure benefits compared to an approach where development is concentrated in a fewer number of settlements and each allocation increased as a consequence.
- ✘ Object to any option involving further development that is out of character and out of proportion with the existing town of Saffron Walden.
- ✘ Options 1,2, and 3 do not provide sufficient gain to any community to offset the disadvantages and option 4 provides a community of adequate size to justify the

provision of a new secondary school and other community services and makes use of existing road and rail infrastructure.

- × Required housing development should be allocated in a manner that supports the retention of community facilities which need increases in this catchment area population in order to remain viable. They will not survive unless some organic growth including affordable housing is permitted in smaller communities which presently maintain a range of facilities. More detailed analysis is needed on this hierarchy approach so that the wider community benefits from the housing allocation can be maximised. There is clearly a greater need for housing in “other villages” than the 130 proposed in Option 2.
- × Many of the objectors to the Elsenham new town proposal in Option 4 also raised similar concerns in relation to the smaller number of new homes proposed in Option 2 i.e.
 - Location chosen not capable of accepting even the smallest number of houses. 750 would double the size of the village and more than twice the size of a previous proposal which was rejected because of the inadequacy of the area to accommodate it.
 - Do not believe that any of the options involving development in Elsenham will result in the attraction of significantly more employment opportunities to the village and commuting will be increased.
 - Would not make affordable homes available more widely in the District. Road system is inadequate.
 - Rail system is inadequate. Impact of level crossing on traffic movements.
 - Development would merge Henham and Elsenham into one large village.
 - Impact on quality of life.
 - Existing services will not be able to cope.
 - Impact on schooling.
 - Impact on special landscape.
 - Increase in Crime.
 - Option 2 is inconsistent with policies DC5, DC6 and DC7.
 - Water demand is a major issue.
 - Impact on Wildlife.
 - Concern about Sewers, Flooding, Electricity, Police and Fire.
 - Elsenham News will be unable to function.
- × Residents of Little Dunmow – current sites have numerous problems. New infrastructure has not been completed strain on existing infrastructure. Resident of Saffron Walden concerned about traffic problems. Alter current infrastructure and communities of the present villages.

Paragraph 5.23 (6.23 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Housing number and detailed locations should be reviewed after further detailed examinations of evidence.
- × Adding 750 to a 1000 home settlement will be traumatic – it is too many
- × There are insufficient open spaces for these numbers.
- × The Council states that one of the factors that influenced the decision on this Option was to include a development that had little impact on the character of the place. Choosing Option 2 contradicts that, as 750 houses most certainly will have a huge impact upon the character of these villages.
- × Taylor Wimpey consider that the suggested distribution of development between settlements as expressed at Table 5.2 does not reflect the capacity of locations. Stansted Mountfitchet has greater capacity than Elsenham 30 homes as opposed to 750.

Paragraph 5.24 (6.24 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ This is a sound philosophy
- ✗ Newport PC and others point out that there is no mention that putting development in the key centres would potentially support the facilities they have and question why there is no mention of Hatfield Heath.
- ✗ Too many in Elsenham
- ✗ Encourages travel to work and shop.

Paragraph 5.25 (6.25 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Option 2 would permit employment and housing to be developed locally and adjacent to the airport.
- ✓ Fairhall Properties consider that Option2 will achieve the objective to deliver employment and services in a sustainable manner.
- ✓ Option 2 is supported by Swords on behalf of clients with landholdings near the airport because there is recognition of the need for employment land near Stansted Airport and the M11 motorway. One of the sites is in Stansted which is not mentioned specifically in this paragraph.
- ✗ Newport PC and others state that housing anywhere will end up in commuting and there is more rail capacity north to Cambridge than south to London.
- ✗ Question where all these new jobs are coming from.
- ✗ Great Dunmow and Takeley are both significantly nearer to access the airport than Elsenham
- ✗ Inadequate roads, especially poor HGV access.
- ✗ No requirement to locate airport related housing at Elsenham and Takeley and planning to do so is in direct contradiction of policy E8 in the East of England Plan
- Where will new jobs be located at Great Dunmow. Most new high tech employers would be looking to Chesterford and Cambridge to attract employees.
- Commuting to Cambridge would be mitigated if the Saffron Walden Chesterfords area adapted itself to be more closely involved in Cambridge-like high value employment. Chesterford Park is the catalyst for such innovation.
- How will the building of extra housing in Great Dunmow Saffron Walden, Priors Green and Elsenham meet the objective of increasing the opportunity to work locally.

Paragraph 5.26 (6.26 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Newport PC is in support as the affordable housing would be spread across the district.

- ✓ The supply of affordable housing needed in the main communities is an essential benefit that is ignored by the supporters of option 4.
- ✓ Fairhall Properties consider that the disadvantages of Option 4 in delivering affordable housing through the District's communities have been given insufficient weight. Option 2 delivers a more balanced provision of affordable housing.
- ✓ Whilst this option allows for minor growth of smaller villages which is an improvement on option 1 the supporting statements would suggest that these will all be "affordable" is this realistic.
- ✓ Support organic and proportionate growth of existing communities over a hierarchy of established settlements but consider that some development in the smaller villages is always necessary to meet local needs and sustain the vitality of the community e.g. Quendon and Rickling.
- ✗ It is essential that sensible development be encouraged in all outlying settlements to make sure that the character of these villages is preserved and enhanced.
- ✗ What is being presented as minor growth is being grossly misrepresented
- ✗ New settlement at Elsenham would concentrated all the affordable housing in one place this would be unfair on the rest of the district. Families would be moved from support of family and friends. Young families would be concentrated in the area who may have employment and other issues.
- ✗ Affordable housing should be spread around the district rather than centred on a few options.
- Option 2 would be the best option for affordable housing if the allocation at Elsenham was reduced to provide a very small amount of affordable housing only.

Paragraph 5.27 (6.27 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Existing infrastructure will collapse
- ✗ Infrastructure is inadequate and the proposals will not produce the scale of funding required to deliver a viable outcome.

Paragraph 5.28 (6.28 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Significant development in Elsenham would have a major adverse impact on the historic character of Stansted Mountfitchet and the Conservation Area.
- ✗ The impact of 750 on the 1000 home settlement of Elsenham will be far greater than the same number on a much larger settlement.
- ✗ Impact on special landscape of the area and wildlife around Elsenham.
- ✗ The statement which says there will be less impact on the sense of place and distinctiveness of the main settlements with option 2 is completely false. Elsenham is surrounded by countryside and open spaces. There will be a huge impact as this Option nearly doubles the amount of existing dwellings in the village.
- Newport PC and others feels that the statement regarding Elsenham and Takeley is not useful as putting houses anywhere would have this affect.

Paragraph 5.29 (6.29 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Felsted PC fully supports this paragraph.
- ✓ Fairhall Properties feel that provision of local public transport is more likely to be delivered when based on an existing main bus corridor. The incremental provision which is developed in tandem with the rate of development is more achievable when based on the existing towns and villages in option 2.
- ✓ Agree with this para but it justifies option 1 and does not justify any degree of damage to the lesser settlements such as Elsenham

- ✗ Rail Infrastructure cannot absorb additional housing at Elsenham service is already at capacity. Inadequate roads will make an improved bus service impossible to operate successfully. Routes to school are dangerous for walking.

- Newport PC and others question how this will ensure more opportunity to access employment and services other than by car.

Paragraph 5.30 (6.30 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ This is a fair start to evaluating the needs but more work needs to be done in a re-evaluation of the detail of Option 2.
- ✓ Fairhall Properties say there is no evidence that option 2 could not deliver mixed communities that would be part of an established town or village. Option 2 would provide schooling incrementally.
- ✓ Would like to see a rail link to Great Dunmow as part of the Core Strategy to reduce the need for car travel.

- ✗ Newport PC and others feel that there is opportunity at all local schools for development and there should be mention of sports facilities across every town and village. They also state that spreading development would support existing shops in the future and all options require water and sewage work.
- ✗ Great Canfield Parish Council would prefer development to be concentrated. Spreading development across the major towns and villages will require much more infrastructure.
- ✗ If the site of the proposed development at Elsenham is the same as Options 3 and 4 then reference to Elsenham should be Henham throughout.
- ✗ Infrastructure required in and around Elsenham is not deliverable economically.
- ✗ Object to option 2 because roads leading into Elsenham and Stansted Mountfitchet cannot cope with any more traffic. No services for young people. No sixth form provision. This proposal will double the size of the village and more amenities will be needed. Concerned about sewage and surface water disposal.
- ✗ No assessments appear to have been carried out by the Council to demonstrate that the existing road network can, in fact, accommodate the increased traffic, generated by the 750 new homes,
- ✗ All this diversity of small scale development is very poor economics. Better to get the economies of scale by making proportionally more money available to larger projects so that this then becomes a justification for option 1 and not option 2.

- West Essex Primary Care Trust point out that developer contributions would be needed to deliver health care facilities, the larger the growth area the greater the need. They want the text amended to reflect this.

Table 6.2 – Option 2: Components of Supply

Summary of Representations

Most of the comments on the table are general objections to option 2 on grounds which have been reported in the comments above.

- ✓ JTS Partnership support the allocation at Thaxted but suggest that a call for sites should be undertaken to allocate sites which are suitable and available for development to support the figures in the table.
- ✓ Enodis support Option 2 but suggest an amended distribution for the table which identifies 120 additional homes at Oakwood Park.

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.

Paragraph 5.31 (6.31 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

The representations from the Statutory Consultees are summarised below:

- ✗ Saffron Walden TC, Great Easton and Tilty, Birchanger, Stansted Mountfitchet and Hatfield Heath PC are all concerned that the existing infrastructure will be overwhelmed. Saffron Walden TC and Stansted PC specifically feel that their towns do not have the infrastructure to support such growth, with Stansted PC stating that Elsenham is not the right location for such growth. Stansted PC also question if their secondary school would be relocated as this would put more pressure on public transport and therefore road infrastructure, and if it were what would happen to the land adjacent to Rochfords nursery site and question the impact the move of the school would have on the leisure centre. Birchanger PC also note that the development in Elsenham would cause a coalescence with Henham and thus is against the vision. A parade of shops would be needed and the train station and car parking facilities are inadequate. The development would cause a devastating impact on the environment, over development of land and loss of rural character. Possibility of social problems due to the siting of affordable homes in one place.
- ✗ Quendon and Rickling PC state that until detailed information is provided about services and infrastructure they can not endorse any option. However, they feel that option 2 and 3 are best as they preserve the rural character of the district but want to see affordable housing for local people.
- ✗ Newport PC feel that ignoring Hatfield Heath as a key centre could undermine its location and facilities. They also state that all development must have appropriate amenity space and sports provision.
- ✗ Elsenham PC object as they feel option 3 will develop in time to a settlement at least the size of that proposed in option 4.

- ✘ Great Canfield Parish Council consider that spreading development across the major towns and the larger villages will require much more infrastructure and development should be concentrated.
- Essex CC Spatial Planning state that in addition to the lack of viable secondary school expansion options consideration would need to be given to the additional school transport.
- Takeley PC mention the start of a new settlement to be delayed until 2016 thus allowing delivery of a new access route to the A120 or M11.

The reasons people have given for supporting option 3 are similar to those given by those supporting option 2 i.e.

- ✓ Surely it is better to moderately enlarge the existing residential areas of the district, supporting and improving facilities for all the existing communities rather than in one condensed area.
- ✓ Supports local businesses and extends better employment prospects because the main centres are capable of offering employment and services.
- ✓ Expansion of existing villages will keep them viable. Public transport can be maintained between villages.
- ✓ Spreading development to Key Service Centres that have the necessary infrastructure, will allow development pressures to be absorbed more evenly throughout the District, and therefore place less strain on existing services.
- ✓ Spreads the total number across a range of settlements which could reduce the total amount of Greenfield land required within the district.
- ✓ Avoids too much pressure being placed on roads and services in any particular location.
- ✓ Option3 is also supported by landowners or their agents promoting land in the settlements identified in this option including Elsenham, Newport, Great Dunmow, Thaxted. A list of sites being promoted is attached as Appendix 2.
- ✓ Mindful to support option 3 with the proviso that the number of homes to be built within Dunmow is reduced to 80 and the number of new builds in Great Chesterford is increased to 1,000
- ✓ ASP on behalf of clients support the reduced quantum of housing in Elsenham as set out in option 3. This is not to dismiss the aim of delivering a new settlement which can be further extended in the next plan period as part of a longer term growth strategy that would allow the phased construction of the settlement and the infrastructure required. In the short term this would allow greater opportunity for deliverable supply as envisaged in DC2 but with greater emphasis on the key service centres.
- ✓ Sworders on behalf of clients suggest that the establishment of a new settlement could be attractive from the point of view of housing delivery but recommend that the Core Strategy should not stipulate that development is limited to the land to the north east of Elsenham but permit other sites adjacent to the village to come forward.
- ✓ Sworders on behalf of clients suggest that Options 2 and 3 better meet the requirements of PPS3 and the RSS but Clavering should be included as a Key Service Centre and Hatfield Heath as a Key Service Centre should be included in the list for a specific housing allocation.
- ✓ Wickford Developments give limited support to options 2 and 3 because the dispersal of development amongst other villages would encourage unsustainable trends as the new residents would inevitably need to travel predominantly by car to access a range of services and facilities in the towns.

Other objections to option 3 reiterate many of the objections to Options 1,2 and 4

- ✘ None of the options are acceptable – this area is not suitable for this level of housing development and the Government policy is fundamentally flawed

- × Totally change the face of three historic settlements and their surrounding villages and put an intolerable strain on existing infrastructure including roads, drainage, schools and hospitals, which is already stretched by recent development.
- × Particular concern about traffic problems in Saffron Walden and Stansted Mountfitchet
The three main settlements have narrow streets which will not cope with dramatic traffic increases.
- × Residents of Little Dunmow have objected to the Chater Homes proposal called Chelmer Mead between Great Dunmow and Little Dunmow. Current sites have numerous problems. Promised infrastructure has not been completed.
- × The options for small additions to the larger towns in the District are too small to justify commensurate matched provision of services, and would only serve to add to the limitations of those existing towns.
- × Whilst I deplore the loss of countryside, I am persuaded that in consideration of the principal issues of transport, sustainability of development, employment, educational and recreational needs, as well as the provision of other essential infrastructure referred to in the consultation document, the most favourable option is for a new settlement comprising the maximum number of dwellings. Object to options 1,2 and 3.
- × The required housing development should be allocated in a manner that supports the retention of community facilities – schools, village shops, pubs, halls and churches in all settlements within the district.
- × Many people 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
 - Contrary to advice in East of England Plan
 - Detrimental impact on existing services and infrastructure
 - Concerns about need for new infrastructure, what, how and when it would be provided
 - Lack of local employment will only encourage commuting
 - Detrimental impact on the character of Elsenham and Henham
 - Impact on Stansted Mountfitchet
 - Impact on sensitive landscape and wildlife
 - Inadequacy of existing public transport e.g. trains operating at capacity
 - Opportunities to improve public transport are limited. Narrow lanes limit viable provision of new bus services which would be more likely to be delivered if based on existing bus routes and incremental growth around existing towns.
 - Inadequacy of road access. E.g North Hall Road is entirely unsuitable as the main route north from the proposed development.
 - New shopping developments would detract from existing facilities in Elsenham and Henham. A few shops as proposed wouldn't support the local need.
 - Impact on existing schools and concern about new provision including secondary school and early years provision. Concern about the possible closure of the Stansted Mountfitchet College. Additional traffic will make routes to school on foot and by bicycle dangerous.
 - Existing services e.g. Electricity are poor and would not cope
 - Concerns about sewage, pollution, surface water disposal and flooding
 - Adequacy of the water supply
 - Does not deliver affordable housing throughout the district.
 - Merging of Elsenham and Henham contrary to PPS12 and the Council's policies
 - Impact on Bishops Stortford
 - No facilities for young people
 - Increase in crime and anti social behaviour.

- Railway crossing cannot cope with any additional traffic
 - Impact on road network in Ugley
 - Loss of productive agricultural land
 - Loss of footpaths
 - Elsenham News will be unable to function with such a large increase in houses in Elsenham
- × Location chosen at Elsenham is just not capable of accepting even the smallest of these options which would effectively double the size of the village and is more than twice the size of the previous proposal which was rejected because of the inadequacy of the area to accommodate it.
- × Developers objecting to Growth Options 3 include:
- Countryside Properties objecting to the proposed housing numbers at Elsenham. Development should be dispersed along the A120 corridor particularly between Bishops Stortford and Great Dunmow and should include land at Dunmow Park, Great Dunmow
 - Fairhall Properties – lack of flexibility and reliance on one location. A new settlement is not supported by the RSS
 - Chater Homes – delivers too few new homes in any one location to support substantial new facilities or infrastructure. Even 1,440 at Elsenham.
 - Taylor Wimpey are concerned that only 30 units are shown for Stansted Mountfitchet, whilst 1440 are shown for Elsenham. The two stated criteria upon which the Council base its assessment are the capacity of locations likely to deliver the housing and how much development can be delivered with least impact on the character of the settlement.
 - Fairfield Partnership support option3 because it recognises the potential for a new settlement at Elsenham as a central component in meeting the growth needs of the District however the option fails to identify the full potential that exists at Elsenham.
 - Strutt and Parker on behalf of clients consider that whilst the importance of sustainable development in terms of transport and access to local amenities is accepted, there is concern that smaller villages within the district may be overlooked e.g. Arkesden, Leaden Roding, Takeley
- Capacity at Helena Romanes school in Great Dunmow could be greatly increased if the agricultural land between the school and the bypass was acquired for educational purposes.

Paragraph 5.32 (6.32 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Elsenham does not qualify as a key centre. E.g isolated by poor roads.
- × Strutt and Parker on behalf of clients are concerned that smaller villages such as Barnston, Felsted, High Easter Quendon and Henham and Takeley may be overlooked to the detriment of the rural economy. A larger allocation should be made in the villages,
- × Sworders request that Hatfield Heath should be included as a Key Service Centre.

Paragraph 5.33 (6.33 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Additional infrastructure is unlikely to be provided and the existing will be overwhelmed.
- × Land exists but without viable road and rail access nobody will want to live there (Elsenham)

Paragraph 5.34 (6.34 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × This is misleading because while option 3 specifies a starting figure it does not indicate a likely long term outcome. To work according to the stated objectives the development has to become a town comparable to those it is intended to supplement.
- × If the Council is thinking ahead then it is crucial that the right kind of development is being planned for in the next plan period.

Paragraph 5.35 (6.35 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Great Dunmow has much more convenient access to the Airport and the M11 than Henham or Elsenham.
- × Surely contrary to Council policy and would encourage airport related employers to look beyond the airport boundaries to set up businesses to tap into the possible growth in potential employees.
- × Employers will not locate to areas they cannot access with HGVs. Hall Road is currently the only viable HGV route.
- × Fairhall Properties consider the railway station at Elsenham is more likely to encourage out commuting and discourage the establishment of local employment. There is insufficient evidence for option 3 to deliver sustainable local employment and reducing the need to travel.
- × Swords on behalf of clients suggest that employment opportunities should be recognised in Stansted Mountfitchet and Takeley and appropriate allocations made.

Paragraph 5.36 (6.36 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Whilst this option allows for minor growth of smaller villages which is an improvement on Option 1 the accompanying statements would suggest that these will all be “affordable”. Is this realistic?
- × A commuter dorm is not a sensible location for large scale affordable housing developments.
- × New settlement at Elsenham would concentrated all the affordable housing in one place this would be unfair on the rest of the district. Families would be moved from support of family and friends. Young families would be concentrated in the area who may have employment and other issues
- × Affordable housing will not be delivered in other areas of the district where it is needed.

Paragraph 5.37 (6.37 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × No spare capacity in the existing infrastructure
- What are the infrastructure improvements that are “viable” under option 3 that would not be possible under the other options?

Paragraph 5.38 (6.38 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × It is agreed there would be a major impact on the area south west of Henham which is landscape which has moderate to high sensitivity to change. It is not agreed that there would be no impact on the village of Henham itself.
- × Options that involve significant development in Elsenham will harm the historic character of Stansted Mountfitchet as well as the sense of place and distinctiveness of Elsenham and Henham.
- × Option 3 is in direct contradiction of Policy ENV6 in the RSS
- × The landscape is valued for local walking, beauty and wildlife.

Paragraph 5.39 (6.39 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Benefit of a railway station makes Elsenham a logical centre for further development but there are problems with the road links.
- × Rail service is already at capacity. Development will produce a commuter settlement. Parking at the station is already a problem which affects the surrounding roads.
- × Fairhall Properties consider the provision of local public transport is more likely to be delivered when based on an existing main bus corridor. Also, the incremental provision, which is developed in tandem with the rate of development, is more achievable when based on the existing towns and villages in Option 2.

Paragraph 5.40 (6.40 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Would like to see the rail link extended to Great Dunmow to reduce the need for travelling by car.
- × Essex CC Spatial Planning express the need to adjust the text to reflect the need for developer contribution for the provision health care facilities. Stating that the larger the development the greater the need.
- × West Essex PCT advise that the provision of new health care facilities and contributions towards their delivery through developer obligations would need to be provided on all growth options within the relevant settlements and due to a lag and shortfall in PCT funding, reliance on developer contributions will be necessary to ensure that shortfalls in

necessary provision are avoided. Essentially, the larger the development proposal or growth area/new settlement, the greater the need will be for infrastructure funding to be secured through developer contributions and therefore, it is requested that the relevant text under the 'infrastructure' subheading(s) is amended to reflect this position

- ✗ Spreading the extra housing across many towns and villages is not sustainable in terms of transport to employment, education, shopping and recreation.
- ✗ Replace references to Elsenham by Henham throughout.
- ✗ This is only part of the things that will be needed to make this option work and many of the things already on the list, if deliverable at all, will not be available until many years after the homes building is well under way. During that interim period existing communities will suffer lasting damage.
- ✗ No mention of services and facilities for young people.
- ✗ A community needs more than houses, a shop, a doctor a school and a play area to thrive. This document gives no indication of an understanding of these needs!
- ✗ Water supply constraints of a development on the watershed are contrary to Policy DC13
- ✗ There is no evidence to justify the claim that new primary schools or a new secondary school will be needed/viable.
- ✗ Any development in Newport must be supported by specific details of infrastructure improvements and the affordable housing level should be at least 60%. There should be a blend of house types and sizes and environmentally sound.

Table 6.3 – Option 3: Components of Supply

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Support Option 3 but number of homes in Dunmow should be reduced to 80 and number of homes in Great Chesterford increased to 1000.
- ✓ Support the development allocation at Thaxted but a call for sites consultation should be undertaken to identify sites which are suitable and available for development.
- ✗ Taylor Wimpey object to the distribution. Future development at Stansted should be increased from 30 to 470 units and future housing development at Elsenham should be redistributed in line with a proper assessment of the capacity of the settlement hierarchy to accommodate development.

Option 4 – Preferred Option Development of a new settlement to the north east of Elsenham with limited development in the towns and villages

Paragraph 5.41 (6.41 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

The representations from the Statutory Consultees are summarised below:

- ✓ Saffron Walden TC, Great Easton and Tilty, Chesterford, Little Dunmow, Great Hallingbury, Ashdon, Stebbing, Hatfield Broad Oak, Barnston and Little Canfield PC support option 4. Little Canfield PC express the need for consideration to be given to adequate water supplied and road access and Hatfield Broad Oak stress the need for infrastructure to be in place prior or as development takes place.
- ✓ Natural England supports this option as it is the most sustainable of the options examined. However, they are concerned to see that the detrimental impact on the landscape, character and biodiversity is avoided where possible and an objective of the

development should be to enrich the areas natural beauty. They stress the need for a detailed landscape appraisal to be undertaken and appropriate design solutions developed. They suggest reading The Countryside in and Around Towns document to ensure a functional relationship between the settlement and surrounding countryside. They also stress the need for greenspace provision and advice using the Natural England's Urban Greenspace Standards.

- ✓ Highways Agency generally support this option, however, they have concerns regarding the impact on junction 8 of the M11 and state that the following text must take account of Transport Assessments to assess the impact on the road network. They also state that the policy should be accompanied by a travel plan that encourages sustainable travel modes and partnership working is set up with the HA for monitoring and enforcing purposes.
- ✓ English Heritage generally support option 4, however, they stress the importance of Henham and Elsenham remaining separated with significant green area between them. They also state that urban design must be given high priority where historic landscape character information informs design. They assume an archaeological assessment has been carried out and state the importance of getting County's advice on this. They question whether there will be further consultation on the specifics of the 1200 dwellings.
- ✓ Takeley PC support option 4, however they question if 3000 homes would make it sustainable and stresses the need for access and road improvements.

- ✗ Thaxted PC are concerned that it would have a catastrophic effect to Thaxted due to insufficient road and rail infrastructure, and the eco-town would increase the numbers to 5000.
- ✗ Quendon and Rickling PC object as they are concerned about the pressure on local infrastructure in the Elsenham and Henham area. They also have concerns regarding safety due to additional traffic for children walking to school.
- ✗ Ugly PC object stating the consultation process was flawed and the proposals have not addressed local road and infrastructure issues. There will be burden on existing infrastructure and it would decimate the rural nature of the area.
- ✗ Arkesden PC would prefer a single settlement but feel the location of Elsenham is not right, they would rather see the settlement in the south of the District.
- ✗ Felsted PC strongly object to this option as they are concerned the council has ignored the advice of the Regional Panel and its own Assessment of Growth Options document which this option scored low in. They feel it is not large enough to support new schools, there are no conditions concerning employment provision thus likely to be a commuter town and no firm provision for additional infrastructure in terms of road, rail and public transport. They also stress that funding for infrastructure through developer contributions is inflexible and delays the provision.
- ✗ Broxton PC feel that the chosen location is inappropriate as it does nothing to increase the opportunity to work locally, the locating of affordable housing in one location could be detrimental, it would have an unacceptable visual impact on the area, the rail station is already operating at near capacity and increased traffic at level crossing would impact traffic flows.
- ✗ Widdington PC question how the vision and policy framework will be served by a single settlement in Elsenham.
- ✗ Birchanger object stating that it would be a coalescence of two villages, there is poor road links which will exacerbate existing problems. Shops would be needed, there is inadequate retail and station parking and it would have a devastating impact on the environment and social nature of the village. It is also considered that the high proportion of affordable housing outside existing centres may create social issues and over development of land.
- ✗ Stansted PC specifically feel that their towns do not have the infrastructure to support such growth, with Stansted PC stating that Elsenham is not the right location for such growth. Stansted PC also question if their secondary school would be located as this

could put more pressure on public transport and therefore road infrastructure, and if it were what would happen to the land adjacent to Rochfords nursery site and question the impact the move of the school would have on the leisure centre

- ✗ Henham and Elsenham PCs- coalescence of two villages which is contrary to district vision, the availability to create a new school, the availability of the rail station, inability to deliver affordable housing to areas of need, the evidence base is not complete, lack of impact assessment on Elsenham and Henham and the loss of countryside, lack of consistency with district, regional and government policy and guidance and lack of adequate road access.
- ✗ Newport PC feel that the information is not specific enough
- ✗ Essex CC show concerns over a number of issues. At this stage they feel there is insufficient evidence published to establish which the preferred option is. They state that the SA is inadequate in its current form, the assessment of larger settlements being unsuitable for expansion in comparative terms with a new settlement is not transparent. They emphasis the need to for a comparative assessment to be undertaken of alternative locations which should include details of the proposals delivery, timing issues of the locations considered and scale and extent of infrastructure to be provided. they also state that it is unclear how the new settlement relates to post 2021 growth. They also express the view that the implications of this option has not been adequately considered with BAAs proposed airport expansion. And conclude that available research suggests that a settlement of this size is not sustainable.
- EEDA suggest to take account of the emerging work on development of eco-towns in the region
- Go East notes that there is no clear information as to how the preferred option was arrived at. The figure of 1000 for future development elsewhere should include details of broad locations and quantum locations might be able to accommodate so as to assess how they perform in sustainability terms and implications. A reminder is given that the strategy and policies need to be founded on a robust evidence base.

Other Representations in favour of option 4 made the following points.

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

Other Representations objecting to option 4 made the following points.

- × 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.
- × 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.
- × 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*.
- × 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.
- × Creation of a single settlement would locate all affordable housing in one place which would not be of benefit to the rest of Uttlesford
- × 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.
- × 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.
- × 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
- × If there are new shops in the proposed development then they would detract from existing facilities in Elsenham and Henham
- × 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.
- × 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.
- × Fails 4th 6th 7th 8th 9th tests of soundness

Paragraph 5.42 (6.42 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Swan Housing Association supports the preferred as it will have to potential to become a successful sustainable community if the proposed infrastructure recommendations are incorporated into the wider plan.
- × Henham and Elsenham PC objects stating that the claim of option 4 better delivering services and infrastructure in a sustainable manor is unsupported by evidence, option 1 would better deliver this.
- × Newport PC feels that specific details are needed on how this is sustainable.
- × To justify Option 4 on the basis of Option 3 supports the conclusion that this core strategy production has become deficient and lacks evidence to support the current outcomes
- × No evidence that development will incorporate new infrastructure, which means that this development will put a lot of strain on the existing over stretched infrastructure.
- × A landowner is concerned that the preferred option will mean that smaller villages within the district such as Felsted may be overlooked, to the detriment of the rural economy.
- × In accordance with PPS3, preference should therefore be to enhance the existing infrastructure in the established large towns in the District including Great Dunmow rather than establish a new settlement.
- × Does not take advantage of previous investments in services and infrastructure. Fails to create employment and encourages personal expenditure to go outside UDC area losing benefit of development for UDC ratepayers.
- × The "necessary infrastructure" is not defined.
- Should the preferred option of a new settlement be pursued, the scale of development which will be sought at other settlements should be clearly set out.

Paragraph 5.43 (6.43 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ The benefits of a developing a new settlement are recognised however consideration should be given to that new settlement being located in an area where it will cause the absolute minimum damage to or undermine areas of natural beauty, historically important locations, wildlife habitats and areas of tranquillity
- ✗ Henham, Elsenham and Newport PC object due to the lack of information on how employment opportunities will be created. Henham PC also states that the claim option 4 would better deliver employment opportunities in a sustainable manner are unsupported by evidence. They point out that the POC claimed the rail station would encourage out commuting.
- ✗ There is no evidence that the jobs required to sustain such a large settlement will exist. Most existing local job opportunities are for lower paid posts at Stansted Airport or are in airport related retail units. Most of those vacancies are filled by migrant workers living in isolated multi occupancy accommodation.
- ✗ This area already has very low unemployment and many of the unskilled workers at Stansted Airport already commute from outside Uttlesford.
- ✗ Additional employment opportunities are not appropriate as the local roads are not suitable for commercial traffic. Suitable HGV access is needed.
- ✗ The statement that the community will generate employment is not supported by evidence. Other similar sized communities have failed to generate local employment
- ✗ There is no lack of work at the present but if the countryside is destroyed and the roads made even more difficult certainly less people will come to the area so that local businesses suffer. If local businesses suffer, so will employment. Providing cheap housing is likely to isolate people who will certainly have to travel a considerable distance to employment. Local industry does not seem an option and the expansion of Stansted Airport does not seem significant.
- ✗ A landowner considers that additional employment land can be accommodated elsewhere in the district, including at Great Dunmow.
- ✗ The provision of employment land should not be at the expense of prejudicing the use of other land at Start Hill along the B1256 for airport related employment purposes.
- ✗ A landowner objects as this option does not take into account the need for employment land in, or near, other settlements.
- Development of the outstanding houses could be located in the villages to the north of the District and contribute to the Cambridge Sub-Region.

Paragraph 5.44 (6.44 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ This rightly says that Option 4 would not meet the affordable housing needs of other settlements.
- ✗ Henham and Elsenham PC object stating that the disadvantage of option 4 in delivering affordable housing throughout the district is given insufficient weight.
- ✗ By creating 1200 Affordable homes (40%) in one place this policy runs the risk of serious social problems.
- ✗ This option takes no account of those people who wish or need to live in other parts of the district.

- ✗ Concentration of affordable homes at Elsenham would place a large and very young population 40 mins away from the nearest accident and emergency hospital this would seem inconsistent with UDC policy on health and wellbeing.
- ✗ A developer considers that the location of a new settlement will not meet the spatial need for affordable housing which in the main will arise in the two principal towns in the district.
- ✗ By spreading the affordable housing across more locations in the District, each developed by different developers; it is probable that a greater percentage of affordable housing can be provided, as compared to that delivered by a single site development.
- Newport PC supports this paragraph, however, wants the requirements set down in detail.

Paragraph 5.45 (6.45 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Anglian Water Services supports a new settlement however stresses the importance of working with them on adoption of the CS to identify a site for a new wastewater treatment works
- ✓ To develop a new village with its own identity is better than destroying 3 other villages and allows appropriate planning of roads and schools.
- ✓ A developer promoting an alternative new settlement supports the proposal of a new settlement (per se) as it can significantly reduce the pressure on existing settlement infrastructure, many of which already have considerable development.
- ✗ Newport PC objects on the grounds of poor infrastructure.
- ✗ No mention is made about the burden that a new, large, yet highly mobile population would create for Bishop's Stortford and Harlow hospitals.
- ✗ No evidence that congestion can be mitigated.
- ✗ It is not clear that all necessary infrastructure could be provided early in the development of a new settlement, which may result in unsustainable travel patterns.

Paragraph 5.46 (6.46 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Henham and Elsenham PC object stating that the effect on the village character of Henham and the landscape between Henham and Elsenham has been insufficiently assessed.
- ✗ The character of Stansted Mountfitchet would also be affected by the Preferred Option.
- ✗ A development of some 3,000 dwellings will obviously have a significant impact on the sense of place and distinctiveness of Elsenham and of Henham. Given this assessment, the conclusions drawn are spurious and do not constitute a robust or credible explanation for the Preferred Option.
- ✗ The relatively more recent development, around the historic village core does not provide the protection stated and landscaping is not possible in the compact location.
- Newport PC questions how 'moderate to high sensitivity to change' is defined, as building on green fields is a significant change.

Paragraph 5.47 (6.47 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Newport PC support this paragraph but stresses the need for provision to enhance the railway service.
- ✗ Henham and Elsenham PC feel that the train station is likely to create a commuter settlement and state that provision of local transport is more likely to be delivered on an existing bus corridor. They claim that this paragraph is unsupported by evidence.
- ✗ There is no evidence that the existing road network leading to Elsenham / Henham or the existing railway line in Elsenham could form an adequate basis for a "public transport orientated development". Alternative sites are likely to be more appropriate to achieve this objective and should be considered further.
- ✗ A development orientated around a public transport network would be fine were it possible for such a network to feasibly link up with national networks which without massive expenditure it will not.
- ✗ Improvements to rail and bus service are unlikely. The provision of cycle paths, footpaths and bus stops within the development is not much of an incentive to encourage travelling without a car. This could be achieved in existing settlements.
- ✗ Further evidence is required to demonstrate that a high frequency bus service could be funded from the outset. If such a service is not in place from the outset it is likely to be difficult to encourage a modal switch at a later date.
- ✗ The provision of a frequent bus service to larger settlements is not considered to represent a sustainable strategy when it has been demonstrated that the larger settlements in the District have capacity to accommodate additional housing which will omit the need for these journeys.
- Developing close to an existing railway station with access to existing employment opportunities seems sound, although on its own it does not justify the development being called sustainable. However, the rail service is already at capacity. Therefore without guaranteed capacity growth, travel is likely to be dominated by road. This is contrary to the East of England plan which seeks less dependence on car use.

Paragraph 5.48 (6.48 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Henham and Elsenham PC state that there is no evidence supporting the claimed advantage of option 4 delivering renewable energy and low carbon technologies. They point out that the POC concluded option 4 as less supportive.
- ✗ Concentrating the focus for renewable energy on a new, large settlement will mean that focus on existing communities will be neglected. The largest consumption of non-renewable energy takes place in existing communities so these have most to offer to reduce carbon emissions.
- ✗ Whilst in principle a large scale new development will benefit from economies of scale in incorporating renewable and low carbon technologies, initial costs may be high as some settlement-wide infrastructure is likely to be required at the outset, but housing delivery is likely to be phased.
- ✗ There is no evidence to support the claimed advantage of option 4 in delivering renewable energy and low carbon technologies, other urban extensions would be equally capable.

- ✘ White Young Green's Initial Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Options (January 2007) states that 'development of a new settlement will require a higher output of energy, natural resources and raw materials'.
- Newport PC want to see more detail as it is weak at present.

Paragraph 5.49 (6.49 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Be aggressive with sustainable development and energy efficiency technologies - set the developers tough targets. Concerned about how to make the new settlement truly a mixed community - not just young families.
- ✓ Support subject to infrastructure being put in place first.
- ✘ Henham and Elsenham PC object to this paragraph raising the issue of flooding around the railway line, stating that there would need to be significant new connections to the power grid and questioning where the new pylons would be located and the route they would take. They also question the deliverability of a secondary school stating that not enough assessment has been done on this, and are concerned that a new 'village centre' would detract from the existing facilities in the villages. They have concerns with road access and feel that there is no evidence to prove adequate access can be achieved.
- ✘ West Essex Primary Care Trust request the text be amended to make it clear that developer contributions would be needed to deliver health care facilities, the larger the growth area the greater the need. They also stress that existing facilities would need to be significantly expanded and phased in tandem with the growth.
- These facilities must be available within the settlement at the outset, and not be left to be achieved on some random basis in the course of time. And they must be fully funded from the start.
- There is a mention of increasing bus routes to the south ie Stansted, Stortford, but not to the North to Saffron Walden and beyond.
- BAA state that the surface access effects of the proposed new settlement need to be fully assessed and evaluated so as to ensure the surface access requirements of the Airport development can be satisfactorily accommodated and consistent with the wider transport strategy for the area.
- Whatever the scale of the housing development, the Council should be ensuring that these technologies are being fully incorporated into all new housing designs

Paragraph 5.50 (6.50 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✘ Henham and Elsenham PC point out that planning officers acknowledged option 4 posed a risk to the future commercial viability of Saffron Walden and Dunmow and state that Uttlesford is at risk of not having a viable commercial centre.
- ✘ Environment Agency request evidence in relation to water capacity, waste water and sewage treatment works, including a water cycle strategy, stating that discussions with water suppliers is not sufficient evidence.
- ✘ For this reason the development should be spread where there are existing schools and infrastructure to support them -it is much easier to expand existing facilities than to create new ones from scratch.

- ✗ Before deciding on the housing allocation, more information is needed on the educational requirements for the district as a whole, to show which area of the district most needs a new school, to avoid having schools that are either overcrowded or undersubscribed.
- ✗ Several landowners do not agree that further development at the larger settlements and the Key Service Centres would fail to provide for associated infrastructure requirements. Existing services and facilities in these settlements could be expanded to meet the additional requirements imposed by development, in a manner that would also result in an overall improvement on a District wide basis.
- ✗ A developer suggests that there is no evidence to demonstrate that existing schools in Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and the other villages cannot be expanded to accommodate pupils arising from further development, or that existing, well established health care and community facilities cannot be expanded or that sport and play space cannot be provided as part of urban extensions.
- ✗ Further development at Saffron Walden and the other major settlements should be considered – the opportunities to enhance education facilities and mitigate environmental issues should be embraced

Table 5.4 (6.4 in hardcopy) – Option 4 Components of Supply

- Widdington PC questions the rationale for increasing the development in villages from 130 to 250, yet decreasing the number of houses in Newport, they request a review of this figures and ask UDC to liaise with Newport PC.
- ✓ Support future development in villages but would like to see further consultation and more detail on where the 250 houses are intended.
- ✗ The shortfall of 200 houses is objected to by a number of representors.
- ✗ The Dunmow society object to developments in and around Dunmow being considerably more than that of the other large towns. Can we presume that a much fairer distribution will be made of the remaining 750 plus 200 unallocated quota?
- ✗ Cambridgeshire County Council state that the Key Diagram in the Submission Draft should indicate the scale and distribution of development within Uttlesford District.
- ✗ A number of landowners state that there is a degree of confusion between the elements of supply set out in policy DC2 and the Components of Supply set out in the table.
- ✗ A number of landowners object that the provision of only 250 dwellings to the villages is insufficient to satisfy the requirements of policy SS4 of the East of England Plan and national policy supporting mixed communities in rural areas.
- Berden PC observe that this option is 200 houses short of the target and ask can the Council be more specific about 750 houses in Larger Towns?
- Cambridgeshire County Council observe that the relative sustainability of the Preferred Option 4 is unclear as it is not consistent with the housing target identified in policy DC1.
- Widdington Parish Council accept that in addition to the present commitment for 120 new dwellings in villages, a small number of additional dwellings could be placed in villages. WPC does not understand the rationale for increasing that additional number from 130 (in Options 2 and 3) to 250 in Option 4 and requests a review of the final figure of 370 village dwellings in Option 4.
The parish council notes that Option 4 withdraws the proposal for 200 additional houses for Newport contained in Options 2 and 3 (and so reduces the total from 9666 to 9466). WPC requests UDC to reconsider that withdrawal and to consult with Newport Parish Council to identify whether, and if so what number of, new dwellings might enhance the viability of that village's services.

- A developer points out the reduction of 200 dwellings and supports the inclusion of the 200 units into the 'villages' allocation as it will assist in further safeguarding the historic setting of the larger towns, will ensure that a recognisable housing 'cap' is maintained on the new settlement, and will benefit the rural sustainability of some of the key service centres and larger villages in the district.

Petition

In addition to the letters and e-mails reported above the Council also received a petition signed by over 500 young people requesting the District Council to drop options 3 and 4 for a major new housing estate between Elsenham and Henham and asking the district council to protect their countryside, health and quality of life.

Sustainability Appraisal

Paragraph 5.51 (6.51 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Natural England support the SA, however they note that there are no policy options to choose from and so no SA assessment can be made.
- ✗ Newport PC feel that the proposals are vague and not all the potential impacts and harmful effects have been considered.
- ✗ The Sustainability Appraisal is weak and suffers from a serious weakness in that aspects of the options and policy framework are not accurately or adequately addressed. These include the possible impact of edge of town retailing on the viability and vitality of the centre.
- ✗ Gt Dunmow Town Council consider that the Sustainability Appraisal on the Options and the Plan is not fit for purpose and should be fundamentally reviewed preferably by an independent party. It most certainly cannot be used as a basis for choosing options or coming to a judgement as to the adequacy of the Core Strategy.
 - The officer assessment of the growth options used the objectives as set out in the CS itself which are similar but by no means the same as the SA objectives.
 - It is difficult for the community to know which SA undertaken at different stages in the core strategy, to give weight to.
 - The consultants have applied what can justifiably be called conventional wisdom but there are no attempts at a quantifiable assessment in any issue; there are a significant number of assessments which can be challenged as being untrue or contradictory.
 - Several assessments are by the consultants own admission contingent on information that is currently unknown.
 - The process by which the overall outcome of the appraisal is arrived at is not made clear. It is thus claimed that option 4 is 'the most sustainable option' whereas based on current evidence it is simply not possible to reach that conclusion
 - It is difficult to see how the way in which the options assessed in July and subsequently presented as 3 options to Committee on 4th September became the 4 options and how option 4 introduced at the meeting became the preferred option could be represented as the transparent and objective, evidence-based approach required by the guidance

- × There is very little difference in the assessment of the options against the 24 objectives and therefore there is insufficient evidence in terms of the Council's SA to conclude that option 4 represents the most sustainable strategy for growth.
 - × The Sustainability Appraisal should be revisited to consider other potential locations for a new settlement in the district
 - × It is suggested that the SA process to-date has not met the relevant legislative requirements or reflected government guidance, thus making the draft Core Strategy unsound
 - × Concerned that the Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options Document is not a thorough, objective assessment but seeks to provide justification for the decision of the Environment Committee on 4 September 2007
 - × Further work needs to be undertaken to elucidate the overall impact of the different options. The sustainability appraisal is an inadequate vehicle in its current form and more work is needed to substantiate its conclusions.
- Go-East is surprised by the lack of references to the SA in the document especially in the context of the options. They feel it is not clear that the findings in the SA support the preferred option. A clear audit trail between the SA and the spatial strategy is needed for the final DPD. They suggest preparing a non-technical summary of the DPD preparation process drawing out the linkages between the SA process and the Council's decisions on the submitted spatial strategy and core policies, including reasons why certain options were chosen over others to be included in the soundness self assessment document, or similar.
 - Local Agenda 21 recommend that the three basic approaches of 1. New eco-settlement 2. Expansion of existing principal settlements and 3. Dispersal among a larger number of settlements should be evaluated on the basis of which is likely to deliver the most sustainable solution with the lowest carbon footprint and which is likely to accommodate further growth pressures in the future should they arise. We regard to the preferred approach of developing an eco-settlement the possible sites for this should be evaluated, compared and the most sustainable site chosen. If no sites in Uttlesford or straddling district boundaries with a partner authority can be found which satisfactorily address all the criteria then the next most sustainable solution is chosen in a sequential approach.
 - Other locations for a new settlement are being proposed and the suggested Great Chesterford location, the close proximity to a railway station, the M11 motorway interchange/junction, and the better access links to District towns and Stansted Airport, would present it, as possibly, a more superior choice for a new settlement than the currently chosen Elsenham/Henham location

Paragraph 5.54 (6.45 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Sustainability appraisal wasn't done until after option 4 was chosen. I thought that a sustainability appraisal was intended to set out the implications before decisions are made.
- × It would appear that the evidence base quoted in the Core Strategy Consultation has been chosen to direct members of the public towards material that seemingly supports the choice of preferred option when omitting the advice, guidance and conclusion of the planning officers

Paragraph 5.56 (6.56 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- Newport PC questions how this vague assessment specifies options 1-3 having negative impacts on the region compared to a single development? They feel the policies should set out specific requirements for the developers.

Paragraph 5.57 (6.57 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ I agree; the alternative Options will be materially detrimental for the towns and villages concerned.
- ✓ A development company agrees that a single new settlement is the most sustainable option for providing Uttlesford's housing needs, providing it is in an appropriately low impact location.
- ✗ This statement is premature in the extreme and should not be made at this stage
- ✗ The results show that the sustainability implications of each of the options are very similar with no one option being far more sustainable than the other options.
- ✗ CPRESsex is not convinced that the sustainability appraisal has properly evaluated the 4 options in terms of their differing impacts on the landscape, the landscape setting of settlements or on the historic character of settlements.
- ✗ There is no evidence to justify why Option 4 (or its close equivalent) has suddenly been transformed from being equal in sustainability terms with the other options to becoming the most favoured option in sustainability terms.
- ✗ It is unsound to proceed with Option 4 on the basis that it is the most sustainable solution, when there has been no "like for like " comparison with proposals for a single settlement in other locations, where the road access, for example, is likely to be considerably better than it is for Elsenham.
- ✗ We take issue with the conclusion that growth option 4 is the most sustainable solution with particular reference to Objective 4 Historic Buildings; Objective 12 – Rural Transport; Objective 14 – Crime; Objective 17 – Improving Sports and Cultural Facilities; and Objective 21 – Educational outcomes. We consider that options 2 or 3 would better meet these and other objectives.

Paragraph 5.58 (6.58 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ The sustainability report fails to mention the distance of option 4 from an accident and emergency hospital; and the inadequacy of the local roads. No other locations were considered for a new settlement. This would tend to indicate a poor process of evaluation.
- ✗ Further evidence is required to demonstrate that the necessary community infrastructure and other facilities can be delivered at the outset of a new settlement. If not, there may be unacceptable social impacts.
- ✗ If further peripheral expansion of the existing larger settlements is deemed to be unsustainable, the evidence to support this conclusion in comparative assessment terms compared with a new settlement is not transparent.
- ✗ Agree that a ~single development could lead to greater controls but the development does not make specific observations and requirements of developers so there is in effect no control

Paragraph 5.59 (6.59 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × The historic importance of Henham & Elsenham have been overlooked
- × it is not true that building developments on the edge of our towns and villages would detract from the historic if sensible planning and good design are used
- Newport PC feel that development on the edge of towns would not detract from the historic environment.

Paragraph 5.60 (6.60 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × Newport PC states there are poor existing services in Elsenham with exception of the railway.
- × Do not agree that in practice residents would walk to railway station or catch bus to airport or Bishops Stortford and that in fact they would drive.
- × The rail service is already overstretched and crowded and would not be able to cope with more passengers.

Paragraph 5.61 (6.61 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × There is no evidence to demonstrate that the long-term economies of scale are sufficient to cover initial costs to incorporate renewables and low carbon technologies.
- Newport PC feels that specific details are needed to explain how this can be achieved.

Paragraph 5.62 (6.62 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ True, by spreading rather than centralising the impact is minimalised.
- Newport PC point out that by spreading rather than centralising, the impact is mineralised.

Paragraph 5.63 (6.63 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- × This is not a valid statement as no other locations for 3000 homes were considered.

- ✗ The sustainability appraisal published in November 2007 and supporting Option 4 post-dates the decision to add a fourth option and to select it as the Council's Preferred Option, which was taken on 4th September 2007.
- ✗ Newport PC feels that this statement is not proven by the document.

Dismissed Options

Paragraph 5.64 (6.64 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✗ Villages should have a proportionate share of the housing development which is proposed in this round.
- How does the proposed annual rate of development compare against the current incremental growth that the Council support in approving small developments on an annual basis. Could development be controlled across the district within these numbers?

Paragraph 5.65 (6.65 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Widdington PC fully supports the council dismissing this option.
- ✓ Representations supporting the dismissal of this option suggest that this would help to protect the character of the smaller villages
- ✗ Representations objecting to the dismissal of this option suggested 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.
- ✗ Newport PC objects stating that it is unproven.
- ✗ Object to the dismissal of this option and support a hierarchy approach to development with dispersal of houses around the settlements in the District. However, more work needs to be undertaken to ascertain the capacity of each settlement to accommodate more housing.

Paragraph 5.66 (6.66 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Barnston and Stansted Mountfitchet PC fully supports the councils decision to dismiss this option.
- ✓ 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
- ✓ 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.
- × Quendon and Rickling PC object and suggest full consideration should be given for development at Chelmer Mead which is supported by a good rail link and road network.
- × Newport PC objects stating it is unproven and inaccurate.
- × People objecting to the dismissal of the A120 option consider the following points to be the positive advantages.
 - 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
- × 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
- Whist agree that distributing development in settlements along the A120 corridor or the West Anglia rail corridor would have a detrimental effect on the historic character of the district and the settlements in those corridors; a well designed urban extension to Great Dunmow, close to the A120 could help support the local economy and enable the provisions of additional infrastructure.

Paragraph 5.67 (6.67 in hardcopy)

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
- These are valid reasons to reject allocations of all development to a single/town; but this applies equally to options 3 and 4.

Paragraph 5.68 (6.68 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

- ✓ Little Dunmow PC supports the Council's decision to dismiss this option, mentioning how unsuitable the Chelmer Mead proposal is due to lack of infrastructure

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 Associates 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:-

- × Widdington, Great Easton and Tilty, Hatfield Heath and Arkesden suggest looking at different locations, Hatfield Heat PC to the east, Arkesden to the south of the district, both suggesting working with Braintree DC. Great Easton and Tilty PC suggest Great Chesterford. Widdington PC feel that the rail corridor, Cambridge sub region or north of Saffron Walden should be considered.
- × Broxted PC believe that a proper and professional survey should be undertaken to decide where a single settlement should be located, and feel that the council is wrong to dismiss such a development along the A120 and West Anglian rail corridor.

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.
- Newport PC feel that the arguments used are flawed and any development must be designed around infrastructure, which Elsenham is lacking.

Paragraph 5.69 (6.69 in hardcopy)

Summary of Representations

The council needs to get the strategy right in the first place so that monitoring can track successful outcomes and not undesirable ones, such as those that would arise were Option 4 to prevail.

- ✗ Newport PC feels that there needs to be specific policies in place for monitoring to be effective.
- ✗ EERA consider that Policies to address the implementation and monitoring requirements should be included to achieve consistency with the Further Proposed Changes to the RSS
- ✗ HBF object to the complete failure to mention implementation and monitoring, particularly with regard to housing delivery.
- ✗ No indication is given as to phasing of development and the manner in which the Council will seek to deliver its Preferred Option if carried forward. There will be an inevitable lead in time in terms of infrastructure and coordination's and therefore a sufficient supply of permissions for development in the towns and villages will be needed so as not to unnecessarily constrain supply.
- ✗ Core Strategy must also address the issues of implementation, delivery and monitoring target before Submission stage. These omissions will lead to the Core Strategy being found to be unsound
- ✗ In absence of a monitoring framework the presently 'Preferred Option' of a new settlement at Elsenham appears to have been derived without any regard to the implications for delivery of physical, social or community infrastructure, not to mention the houses and employment requirements.

Appendix 1 – Locations Promoted for Employment Development

| 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 / Takeley ? | Land East of Thremhall Priory | 6.11ha | Employment |
| 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 | 2.06ha | Employment |

| | Street | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|---------|---|
| 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 |

Appendix 2 – Locations 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 Chesterford | Great Chesterford | | No specific site but scale greater 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 |

| Parish | Site | Size of Site | Uses |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | 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 | Residential |
| 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 | | |

| Parish | Site | Size of Site | Uses |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|---|
| 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/ 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 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 |

| Parish | Site | Size of Site | Uses |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | 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 | |
| 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 |

| Parish | Site | Size of Site | Uses |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | | 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 Stebbing | | 3,000 new homes. Facilitate larger eco town of 5,000 at least 40% affordable |
| 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 | 23ha | |

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