

9. TRANSPORT AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

General

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 5

Representor: Dale, Saffron Walden Friends of the Earth **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Split chapter 9 into two separate chapters.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Chapter on transport and telecommunications should be separated into two chapters. There is no connection between them

Comments:

This chapter deals with aspects of communication

Recommendation

No change

Paragraph 9.1

9.1 The polices in this section have the following objectives:

- **To facilitate the improvement of the transport and telecommunications network.**
- **To protect the character of the countryside from inappropriate transport and telecommunications development.**

Representations of Objection

Ref.No: 210 Rep.No: 6

Representor: Wadey, British Horse Society **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Recommended Addition to 9.1 "to support and aid the provision of non-motorised modes of transport"

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The society regrets that the whole of the transport aspects of Chapter 9 are related to motorised transport. The society seeks policies supporting the retention and development of the (mainly) non-motorised network (footpaths, bridleways, byways)

Ref.No: 191 Rep.No: 7

Representor: Warren, East of England Tourist Board **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Policies should be developed for transport provision other than for cars drawing on the Essex LTP. Although the LTP is referred to in Para 9.2 it would be useful to be more explicit.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: It is surprising that the objectives do not look at more strategic goals such as easing the movement of people or goods within the District or improving alternatives to the car - indeed no reference is made to walking, cycling or public transport provision.

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 41

Representor: , Proto Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Littman and Robeson

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the second objective to read to accommodate transport and telecommunications development to meet economic growth and social needs whilst minimising harm to the character of the countryside.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The second objective fails to have regard to the balance between transport as a driver of social and economic growth and managing its environmental consequences

Comments:

Structure Plan polices and Local Transport Plan provides guidance on this issue but it is recognised that the Plan lacks text on encouraging modes of transport other than the car

Recommendation

Make appropriate changes to text in Chapter 9

POLICY T1 – TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS

Deposit Policy

The following transport schemes are proposed:

- **The new A120 Stansted to Braintree**
- **M11 – Airport slips at Junction 8 Birchanger Roundabout**
- **Great Dunmow North West Perimeter Road**

Land shown on the proposals map is safeguarded for the construction of these schemes.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Representations of Support

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 19

Representor: White, Saffron Walden Town Council **Agent (if applicable):**

The Council has no objections to these proposals (T1 to T4)

T1

Ref.No: 153 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Walsh, Thaxted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

The Great Dunmow north west perimeter road should be completed no later than the completion of the new A120 notwithstanding how many houses have been built on the woodlands site. This is to reduce rat running through Thaxted and Broxton by vehicles heading for the airport, Harlow and the M11.

Representations of Objection

Ref.No: 142 Rep.No: 10

Representor: , Wickford Development Co Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Melville Dunbar Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the line of the north west relief road on the Great Dunmow Inset Map.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The safeguarded line of the north west relief road does not accord with the route approved under application Ref No UTT/0084/01

Comments:

Agree

Ref.No: 186 Rep.No: 2

Representor: , Siemens Pension Fund **Agent (if applicable):** Colliers CRE

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy T1 be amended to reflect the down-grading of the existing A120

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Comments:

This is not relevant to this policy.

Ref.No: 222 Rep.No: 8

Representor: Young, Go-East **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We question the need for policy T1 which refers to road improvements which are for the Highways Agency or Essex County Council not the District Council

Comments:

This point is accepted but the policy is considered useful for the time being.

Recommendation

No change to policy.

Amend line of northwest relief road to reflect permission.

POLICY T2 – ROADSIDE SERVICES AND THE NEW A120

Deposit Policy

Roadside services on the new A120 alignment will not be permitted unless there is an over-riding need on the part of road users.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Representations of Objection

Ref.No: 10 Rep.No: 16

Representor: Turner, National Trust **Agent (if applicable):** Community and Regional Planning Services

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Support Policy T2 but the words "unless there is an overriding need on the part of the road users" is woolly. We suggest either omitting these qualifying words or at least tightening up the conditions which would apply.

Ref.No: 105 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Clarke, **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: After para 9.3 to acknowledge that there is a need for roadside services on the new A120. After policy T2 either to state " Planning permission will be granted for a roadside service area on the route of the new A120" or to identify the objectors land at Highwood Farm as part of a site for a roadside service area.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Site west of Dunmow is suitable for use as roadside services. The Council should re-consider the need for services. If a site were approved now by the Council it may be preferable to one being imposed by the Sec of State at appeal later. There is a compelling argument for further roadside services to be built on the eastbound alignment of the new A120 between Birchanger and Braintree.

Ref.No: 124 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Trembath, **Agent (if applicable):** Davies Arnold Cooper

Amendment(s) Sought: Allocate land for new roadside services.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land to the south of the A120, west of Strood Hall should be allocated for the provision of roadside services. There is demonstrable need due to the lack of facilities on this stretch of the A120. Change in character of the local area as a result of the highway improvements and provision of a new junction eg introduction of lighting and overall effect of increased traffic flows.. Adequate space with the potential to provide for the full range of services. Satisfactory means of access is achievable.

Ref.No: 165 Rep.No: 6

Representor: , Riverbrook Estates Limited **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy T2 to read "A site is identified specifically for the roadside service area as shown on the Great Dunmow Inset Map at the Great

Dunmow south junction of the A130 and new A120 roads. Further services on the new A120 alignment will not be permitted unless there is an overriding need on the part of road users.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: A detailed needs assessment is to follow. This demonstrates that there is an over-riding need for a service area to provide for road users on the new A120 and this need will be exacerbated by the opening of the M11/A120 slip roads which will divert 50% of the A120 flow away from Birchanger Green and 100% of the flow from existing petrol filling stations and restaurants on the old A120 unless a new site is allocated in the plan.

Ref.No: 186 Rep.No: 7

Representor: , Siemens Pension Fund **Agent (if applicable):** Colliers CRE

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy T2 (Roadside services and the new A120) be amended to identify the potential for roadside services on the new A120 in association with the proposed rest area.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Ref.No: 213 Rep.No: 25

Representor: Herrman, CPREssex **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: We suggest that if it is to be retained the policy should be reduced to read simply "roadside services on the new A120 alignment will not be permitted". If the Council does believe that a case may be made out for such services, we would prefer to see a positive policy giving the location where it would be permitted with appropriate safeguarding conditions.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: CPREssex strongly objects to this policy and considers that it will be totally unworkable

Comments:

It is considered that the 15 miles between the service areas at the Birchanger Interchange and Braintree is not so out of accord with national advice as to create a need to allocate a site. The policy is flexible enough to allow development subject to evidence of need.

Recommendation

No Change

POLICY T3 – CAR PARKING ASSOCIATED WITH STANSTED AIRPORT

Deposit Policy

Proposals for car parking associated with any use at Stansted Airport will be refused beyond the Airport boundaries, as defined in the Stansted Airport Inset Map.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Representations fo Support

Ref.No: 10 Rep.No: 17

Representor: Turner, National Trust **Agent (if applicable):** Community and Regional Planning Services
The National Trust strongly supports Policy T3

Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 9

Representor: Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**
Whilst STAL seeks to provide sufficient public transport facilities for passengers and staff any residual element using cars require the provision of car parking spaces. STAL supports the policy requirement for such provision within the airport boundary in order to prevent ad hoc and sporadic development of sites in the vicinity of the airport to the detriment of other policy aims.

Representations of Objection

Ref.No: 36 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Rickford, **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Paragraph 9.4 and policy T3 should be deleted. The Council seeks to abdicate its proper responsibility for considering applications for car parking to the "multi agency airport forum" which it does not control and which is not answerable/responsible to local electorate.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy is an absolute fetter on the Council's discretion which is unlawful. Policy would negate section 54 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act as material considerations have no change to prevail. The policy effectively grants BAA a monopoly contrary to UK and EU policy (Treaty of Rome).

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 42

Representor: , Proto Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Littman and Robeson

Amendment(s) Sought: Redraft policy to read "proposals for car parking directly related to a use at Stansted Airport will be permitted within the airport boundaries as defined in the Stansted Airport Inset Map.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The text should refer to "directly related to a use" rather than "associated with any use". The policy can then be written in a positive style relating to activity within the airport. To the extent that proposals might occur elsewhere, these would need to be assessed against other relevant policies and considerations.

Ref.No: 222 Rep.No: 8

Representor: Young, Go-East **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy T3 refers to car parking associated with Stansted Airport but we suggest that the policy covering parking for development elsewhere with a cross reference to the standards in Appendix 1 and PPG13 would be better located here rather than in Chapter 3 (GEN 9).

Comments:

The Council wish to avoid airport related uses beyond the airport boundary and therefore it is considered important to have this specific policy. In the light of a recent appeal decision which confirmed that it was appropriate for such a policy to apply to settlements as well as open countryside it is proposed to amend the supporting text accordingly.

Recommendation

No change to policy.

Amend supporting text to refer to the character of the countryside, settlements and residential amenities not being damaged by car parking compounds.

POLICY T4- TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Deposit Policy

Telecommunications equipment will be permitted outside settlement boundaries if the following criteria are all met:

- a) **There are no practical alternatives such as mast sharing;**
- b) **There is a technical requirement for the equipment that outweighs its visual impact;**
- c) **The equipment is located so as to reduce its impact as far as possible.**

Development will not be permitted within a built up area if it would harm the amenities or character of the area.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Representations of Support

Ref.No: 200 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Banks, Railtrack Property **Agent (if applicable):**

Railtrack welcome and support the above policy particularly the Councils support for mast sharing.

Representations of Objection

Ref.No: 19 Rep.No: 3

Representor: , British Telecom **Agent (if applicable):** RPS Chapman Warren

Amendment(s) Sought: Reword policy T4 to have regard to technical and operational considerations as set out in PPG8

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy should have regard to PPG8 in relation to technical and operational considerations. This should relate to telecommunications development both within the built up area and outside settlement boundaries

Ref.No: 70 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , One 2 One Personal Communications Ltd **Agent (if applicable):**
James Barr Consultants

Amendment(s) Sought: Phrase "outside settlement boundaries" in the first line of the policy should be omitted and no distinction made between masts located either within or without built up areas. The policy should be straightforward and list criteria relative to national planning policy guidance concerning all proposed telecommunications apparatus. Suggest that a distinction is made between mast sharing and site sharing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The diverse nature of telecommunications development dictates a more flexible approach to assessment of applications, based on the presumption in favour of development subject to assessment of material considerations, Government Guidance and technological requirements. There will be occasions where masts and other telecommunications development will be required in a built up area and technical or operational constraints may dictate that this is the best option. Instances where site sharing as opposed to mast sharing may be appropriate. Locating tower masts close together and therefore minimising the height the structure needs to be is sometimes a more suitable option than locating on an existing mast which often required to be upgraded and the height increased to accommodate additional equipment. For clarity the policy should make a distinction between these two options.

Ref.No: 80 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Wipperman, **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: New policy proposed as set out in representation.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy inadequate in protecting residential and visual amenity and is based upon an incorrect premise that telecommunications equipment should be permitted outside settlement boundaries when it should be drafted to consider whether it is appropriate sites having regard to sensitive locations and issues of acknowledged importance. Operator need and sequential assessment should then follow after such as assessment. Furthermore the Council has not dealt with generic applications and notifications properly.

Ref.No: 108 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Virtue, Crown Castle UK Ltd **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Include on the proposals map all large telecommunications installations and areas suitable for accommodating such installations. Amend policy T4. Telecommunications equipment will be permitted subject to the following criteria. A) mast sharing and siteming have been thoroughly investigated and have proven to be unacceptable from either environmental or technical perspectives. b) There is a justified technical requirement for the proposal. C) The proposal is of a suitable design and location that it minimises any potential detrimental visual impact. Development within areas designated for their historic or environmental importance will be permitted providing the applicant has demonstrated that the proposal has been minimised so as to reduce perceived visual effects.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy T4 fails to provide an appropriate or adequate local planning policy framework to satisfactorily accommodate future developments for telecommunications. The policy as worded fails to acknowledge the importance of telecommunications to the local and national economy and makes no provision for its growth as one would for other forms of infrastructure. The policy is negative and does not identify locations where major telecommunications installations could take place. T4 is particularly lacking in guiding larger requirements such as for control sites that need many dishes, towards existing sites.

Ref.No: 210 Rep.No: 9

Representor: Wadey, British Horse Society **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: add to the end "permission will not be given where the only means of access to the site is by "footpath or bridleway" The Society would be pleased to discuss the precise wording with the Council in order that it fits in with the rest of the policy suitably

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The society notes that in some parts of the region, telecommunications companies have sited masts such that they can only be reached by using motor vehicles on public rights of way. The society considers that this is inappropriate use of footpaths and bridleways and so seeks the following addition to Policy T4

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 48

Representor: Dale, Saffron Walden Friends of the Earth **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Transfer telecommunications policy to new chapter. Consequential amendments. Amend policy T4 (b) There is a technical requirement for the equipment. c) the design of the equipment minimises its visual impact. (d) the equipment is located so as to reduce its impact as far as possible. (e) it will not be sited adjacent to houses or schools

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Comments:

The policy needs to balance the need to facilitate growth in telecommunication systems and the need to protect urban and rural areas, however it is recognised that the policy need not distinguish between the rural and urban areas and a revised policy is proposed.

Recommendation

Amended Policy to read

Telecommunications equipment will be permitted if the following criteria are all met

- a) There are no practical alternatives such as mast sharing;*
- b) There is a technical requirement for the equipment that outweighs its visual impact;*
- c) The equipment is located so as to reduce it's impact as far as possible on the character of the area; and*
- d) There would be no material harm to residential amenities.*

New Policy - General Aviation

Ref.No: 8 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Bloomfield, General Aviation Awareness Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: A safeguarding policy should be included A general GA related policy should be included. See suggested wording for two policies included in the letter.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The number of GA aircraft represents a growing proportion of the total aircraft on the UK register. GA tends to be viewed as primarily being a leisure based activity, but 70% of flights have some business or safety connotation including pipeline worktraffic surveys etc. It also provides an opportunity for people to train as pilots etc. PPG13 advises LA's to consider the needs of small airports and airfields. This advice endorses the inclusion of an appropriate development plan policy. The Local Plans should include a policy which acknowledges the need for safeguarding of airspace around operational aerodromes. The CAA publish airspace standards which establish "obstacle limitation surfaces" around an aerodrome in the interests of air safety. Circular2/92 recommends that aerodrome operators take steps to protect their locations from the effects of possible adverse development by establishing an agreed consultation procedure with the LA. The inclusion of safeguarded zones is encouraged by the CAA

Comments:

Structure Plan Policy BIW9 Airport Development provides the appropriate guidance.

Recommendation

No change

New Text – Rail freight and Integrated Transport

Ref.No: 200 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Banks, Railtrack Property **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: The Council will need to devise policies which will reflect and promote the implementation of both the Government's and the SRA's aspirations for railfreight and intergrated transport.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Railtrack object to the fact there are no specific policies on railfreight. This is surprising since Uttlesford covers sites of strategic importance to railfreight. Both the Government and the Strategic Rail Authority have actively promoted the increased use of railfreight and the safeguarding of appropriate sites for such use. This is contained in "A New Deal for Transport". As the Council is aware there are sidings at Great Chesterford, Stansted and Elsenham. There are a number of opportunities for railfreight use in the District through the supply of aviation fuel in times of danger or maintenance of the underground pipe system. Opportunities for express parcels and post trains to and from the airport terminal. Both the above examples may involve enlargement of the railway's current land boundaries and the possible doubling or enlarging of the current tunnel to the airport.

New Policy - Cycling

Ref.No: 210 Rep.No: 7

Representor: Wadey, British Horse Society **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Additional Policies T5 and T6 suggested along with lower case text - see representation.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: To further non-motorised transport, the society believes that some mention of cycling is necessary.

New Policy Protection of Equestrian Routes

Ref.No: 210 Rep.No: 8

Representor: Wadey, British Horse Society **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Recommended addition to chapter - Uttlesford has a significant horse riding population and a fragmented bridleway network. New developments can encroach on the minor roads used by riders. In consideration of a sustainable and integrated transport system the Council will seek to retain minor roads and verges of busier roads for use by riders or will require alternative facilities to be provided. New Policy T7 - Protection of Equestrian Routes. The needs of horseriders will be taken into account whenever development would affect routes used by riders or where the creation of new paths along strategic routes would jeopardised. Suitable replacement paths will be required when routes used by riders will no longer be suitable for continued use, as a result of other changes to the road network or new development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The needs of horseriders are often forgotten in local transport consideration. The Society recommends the addition of a policy making it clear to developers that equestrian need must be taken into account where they will be affected.

New Policies

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 6

Representor: Dale, Saffron Walden Friends of the Earth **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: New Para's 9.1 and 9.5 New policies T6 - Pedestrian and cycle accessibility, T7 Car Parking, T8 Major Developments and Bus Links See Rep for detailed wording.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Additional policies are required to strengthen the requirement to develop a more sustainable transport system and reduce dependence on the private car.

New Policies

Ref.No: 222 Rep.No: 8

Representor: Young, Go-East **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: There is a disappointing absence of policies on transport matters. There are no policies relating to traffic reduction, cycling, walking, public transport and freight and no indication of how the transport strategy set out in the Essex and Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan is to be implemented in the district. In addition there is no reference to the Essex Local Transport Plan which should complement the Local Plan.

New Policy

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Parker, Essex County Council, Learning Services **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: There is no general policy about any new development having a bearing upon safe routes to schools. As you will know both central government and the LEA is promoting that children should be encouraged to walk/cycle to school to minimise the number of car journeys each day and to reduce congestion outside schools.

Comments:

Due to the limited powers that the Council has in actually implementing many transport schemes and the fact that such policies are more appropriately in the Structure Plan, Local Transport Plan and Uttlesford Transport Strategy, it is considered inappropriate to have specific policies in the Local Plan. However it is proposed that there is additional supporting text to expand on transport matters – traffic reduction, cycling, walking, public transport, freight and implementation of the the Local Transport Plan.

Recommendation

Additional supporting text on transport matters.

New Policies

Ref.No: 230 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Swindlehurst, Local Agenda 21 Built Environment Working Group

Agent (if applicable):

Amendment(s) Sought: Need plans for traffic management which can be implemented as and when land use options arise.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Chapter 9 lacking in transport policies. Traffic considerations need to be given greater consideration in relation to housing. There is no provision to link the Printpack development to Shire Hill and provide an alternative route to Thaxted Road, relieving the intense pressure at the Radwinter Rd/ Thaxted Rd junction.

Comments:

The Policy GEN1 Access provides the framework for considering the transport implications of development proposed in planning applications. These implications have also been taken into account in reviewing the allocations in the deposit plan. No link between Radwinter Road and Shire Hill is proposed in the Essex Local Transport Plan or the District Strategy as it would have limited benefit. A study of the eastern side of Saffron Walden taking into account the development allocations has suggested the potentially most effective transportation measures.

Recommendation

No new policy
