

**PART TWO
SELECTED AREAS**

SELECTED AREAS – GENERAL

Paras 10.1-19.3

Ref.No: 213 Rep.No: 26

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Within each section of the Selected Areas entries we consider it would be helpful to include cross references to relevant policies in the general and topic chapters

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The title page (p.41) for selected areas leads the reader to expect the text for each area to refer to all the relevant policies in the general and topic sections of the plan. We found it confusing that some were not mentioned.

Comments: *In considering any proposals for development in the District all the relevant general and topic policies will be taken into account. It is not considered necessary to include reference to this in relation to each of the selected areas. A footnote will be included on each page of the plan referring the reader back to the general policies.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 67 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Reinstate text for the individual village insets

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: I am extremely disappointed that the text supporting the village insets has been dropped, in the majority of cases. The previous plan's text insets often gave the reasoning behind where Conservation Area or Development Limits were drawn. In our own village this was used by objectors to development to support their case. Protection of our village is very much weakened by the omission of this supporting text, when it is specifically written for each village.

Ref.No: 226 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Mead, North West Essex & East Herts Preservation Assoc **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: It would be particularly helpful to Parish Councils and their residents if all inset maps could again be accompanied by a narrative showing the application of the policies to the respective areas.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Inset text omitted.

Comments: *Government advice is that local plans should be concise and focus on areas of change. The re-introduction of the descriptive insets for all the villages where no significant changes is proposed would add considerably to the length of the document. It is proposed to prepare Conservation Area Statements as supplementary planning guidance. Village design statements could also be prepared*

as supplementary planning guidance to secure greater community involvement in the planning process.

Recommendation: No change

ARKESDEN

Site: Land South of Stocks Mead, Wicken Road, Arkesden

Ref.No: 21 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Extend boundary settlement line to include land south of Stocks Mead, Wicken Road.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Adj Protected Lane

Comments: *This site is not adjacent to the settlement boundary as drawn in the deposit plan. To include this site would mean a significant extension of the settlement boundary including the adjacent property of Stocks Mead which has a large curtilage increasing development potential along a Protected Lane.*

Recommendation: No Change

Site: Land r/o Tallis Cottage, Orchard House, Hampit Road Arkesden

Ref.No: 22 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Settlement Boundary to be redrawn along field hedge, behind Tallis Cottage to Orchard House.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Settlement boundary to rear of Tallis Cottage to Orchard house does not follow original garden boundary and excludes buildings previously part of Tallis Cottage. There is room for a 2 bed dwelling within settlement boundary but by adjusting the boundary the house and garage could be better sited.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The suggested boundary follows a field hedge. This would be a logical and defensible extension to the Settlement Boundary.*

Recommendation: Amend settlement boundary as suggested.

Site: Land at Hill Farm, Arkesden

Ref.No: 195 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Payne, Agent (if applicable): Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend H1, Part (c) to take account of smaller settlements such as Arkesden which do have an opportunity to provide limited housing growth in a more sustainable manner. Allocate land at Hill Farm for housing

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land adjoining Hill Farm would be a suitable location for future housing growth within the settlement of Arkesden. At the present time the village envelope does not take into account Hill Farm but it is our opinion that land in the future should be earmarked to provide additional housing for Arkesden. The allocation would contribute to the range of new housing required in the district in a location which could assist in supporting the rural community as a whole. While Arkesden does not directly provide a good range of local services including schools, public houses and community facilities it is located within reach of a good quality principal bus route and therefore would provide an alternative to sporadic development in the open countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The allocation of this site would result in built development in the open countryside, contrary to Government advice and the housing strategy set out in this plan. The site is 0.6ha and could accommodate 18-30 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Sufficient land is allocated in policy H1 to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

ASHDON

Site: Clays Acre, Church Hill, Ashdon

Ref.No: 27 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Bowles, Agent (if applicable):

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary to include that part of Clays Acre which was previously within the Development Limits or alternatively include the whole of the curtilage within the settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The adopted plan includes part of Clays Acre in the development. We can see no logical reason for changing this. We cannot understand why the whole of Clays Acre is not included in the limit.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Partly included within VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The VDL in the adopted District Plan included the large listed property Clays and the adjacent Gardeners Cottage (subsequently replaced by the property now known as Clays Acre) but did not follow a logical boundary on the ground. The*

new settlement boundary follows the line of the boundary between Clays and The Beeches, to the north. To include Clays Acres the listed property at Clays would also need to be included. Both these properties are large houses set in their own grounds. For the settlement boundary to follow logical and defensible boundaries on the ground there would be considerable potential for infilling along this approach to the village which would be detrimental to its character.

Recommendation: No change

BARNSTON

Site: Land adj to Broadgroves, High Easter Road, Barnston

Ref.No: 37 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Include site within settlement boundary and identify as being suitable for residential development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Settlement Boundary is illogical in its exclusion of an area of land at the junction of High Easter Road and Chelmsford Road. The site is well contained and separated from open countryside by hedges and trees, it adjoins Broadgroves and converted barns. Site does not visually form part of open countryside. Proposal would represent a logical, sustainable and modest rounding off. Development would contribute to overall housing need including affordable housing, it would help maintain village services and facilities. No scope for infilling within proposed boundary.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The allocation of this site would result in built development in the open countryside, contrary to Government advice and the housing strategy set out in this plan. The site is 0.5 ha and could accommodate 15-25 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Sufficient land is allocated in H1 to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: No Change

Site: Land to the South East of Barnston

Ref.No: 194 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Hamilton, **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Land to the south east of Barnston should be included within the Settlement Boundary

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land of 4.76 acres to the south east of Barnston is currently outside the settlement boundary which is tightly drawn. We consider there is an opportunity to provide limited housing growth in this sustainable location. Barnston has a limited range of local facilities and there is some

employment. Barnston is also on an extremely well used and well served public transport corridor. This is more sustainable than the proposed sites set out in part (c) of Policy H1 which looks to the re-use of existing buildings and previously developed land outside urban areas, This would amount to sporadic housing in rural parts of the district without good access to public transport or public highway networks able to provide an alternative to the private car.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site at 1.9 hectares is relatively large and development here would result in a significant extension of built development into the open countryside. At the government's density range of 30-50 dwellings to the hectare the site could accommodate up to 95 dwellings. Sufficient land is allocated in Policy H1 to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

BERDEN

Site: Land to the north of the Village around White House Farm

Ref.No: 54 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend settlement boundary to include the properties around White House Farm etc.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary is drawn too tightly.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Any proposal which would result in a more consolidated form of development in this location would be unacceptable since it would adversely affect the rural characteristics of this part of the village. The scale of development would be inappropriate in this village with few facilities. For these reasons it would be inappropriate to include the site within the settlement boundary.*

Recommendation: *No change*

BIRCHANGER

Site: Land between 331 and 351, Birchanger Lane, Birchanger

Ref.No: 56 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Clayden, **Agent (if applicable):** David Shaw Town Planning Consultant

Amendment(s) Sought: Request the inclusion within the settlement boundary, and exclusion from the Green Belt, of the northern part of the site between 331 and 351 Birchanger Lane

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Village is tightly constrained and there is little room for organic growth or for affordable housing. Objection is made that the village and green belt boundary should be altered to allow for either a small number of plots to be developed, for affordable housing or a mixture of the two. By developing only part of the field will avoid a continuous built up frontage while at the same time allowing a small amount of growth to take place. Development will have limited impact upon views into or out of the village. General location is visually already contained within the village.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *Government advice as set out in PPG2 is that the metropolitan green belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances where there is an overriding need for the development. The housing strategy set out in policy H1 makes adequate provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirements. There is no need for any additional land. The current boundary is considered to be logical and defensible as required by PPG2. Any proposal for affordable housing can be considered in relation to Policy H10 where in Green Belt the need will have to represent special circumstances to justify an exception to policy S6.*

Recommendation: *No change*

BROXTED

Site: Bell Meadow, Church End, Broxted

Ref.No: 154 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Clark, Broxted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: That a settlement boundary should be drawn at Broxted to allow one dwelling to facilitate provision of recreational facilities.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: At Church End, Broxted there is a four acre field known as Bell Meadow. It is presently being used as a small holding. The Parish Council has been approached with a plan to build one dwelling on the field with some or all of the remaining land being given to the village as recreational space. There is no public recreational space in Broxted and this is something the Parish Council is

trying to rectify. The general view of members is that they would support an application for one dwelling on this field.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Within 57 Leq noise contour

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Within 57 Leq noise contour

Comments: *Any proposal for playing fields/recreational space would be considered in relation to policy LC4 and could be permitted outside the settlement boundary. A settlement boundary to facilitate a single dwelling would be inappropriate.*

Recommendation: *No change*

CHESTERFORD PARK RESEARCH STATION

CHESTERFORD PARK LOCAL POLICY1

Deposit Policy

A Development Zone of 15.59 hectares is identified on the inset map. Facilities for research and development will be permitted within the zone if all the following criteria apply:

- a) They are compatible with its rural parkland setting;**
- b) The proposals include a comprehensive landscaping scheme to help assimilate development into the park setting;**
- c) The Mansion, The Garden House and Emanuel Cottage are conserved;**
- d) A comprehensive traffic impact assessment of the full development potential demonstrates that the movement likely to be generated can be properly accommodated on the surrounding transport network and that measures are proposed to ensure that as high a proportion of journeys as is reasonably feasible in the context of the site will be by modes other than the private car;**
- e) The transport needs of the development can be accommodated whilst maintaining or improving road safety and the surrounding environmental conditions for the local community without the need for engineering measures that would detract from the countryside character of the area.**

Developers will be required to prepare a comprehensive master plan for the site to indicate how specific proposals, which may be implemented on a phased basis, relate to an overall design concept for the site. It will also indicate the full development potential of the site as constrained by the development zone boundary. The master plan will be subject to public consultation. Development will need to be implemented in accordance with such a master plan approved by the Council.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 147 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Cookson, Great Chesterford Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: None-the policy is supported

We support the additional controls included within this Local Plan proposal in particular criteria d) requiring a comprehensive traffic impact assessment for the development potential.

Ref.No: 72 Rep.No: 3

Representor: , Norwich Union Life and Pensions **Agent (if applicable):** CGMS Limited

Amendment(s) Sought: Wording of criterion (e) should read "the transport needs of the development can be accommodated whilst maintaining or improving road safety and the surrounding environmental conditions for the local community with a minimum of impact on the countryside"

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: It is considered that this would clarify the policy approach and ensure that an appropriate balance is struck in assessing the merits of any transport proposals

Comments: *Agree*

Recommendation: *Amend criterion (e) as suggested.*

Ref.No: 92 Rep.No: 12

Representor: Securities, Audley End Estates **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Permitted uses at Chesterford Park should be widened to incorporate all uses falling within Use Class B1, B2, and B8.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Chesterford Park Research Station is considered to be an ideal site for research and development due to its significant natural screening, security and highly accessible location close to the M11 connecting to Cambridge, London and the national motorway network. For the above reasons it is also submitted that the site would be ideal for all light industrial general industrial and storage and distribution uses. Intensification of development of the site would also contribute towards maximising employment opportunities.

Comments: *The character of the site with its parkland setting is particularly well suited to Research and Development type uses. There are limited opportunities elsewhere within the District to provide this type of facility and broadening the range of uses on the site would limit the potential of this site. In addition, general industrial use could increase the amount of heavy traffic visiting the site which would be inappropriate in this rural location.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 204 Rep.No: 11

Representor: Burchell, Essex County Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Add to criteria b) "and improving public access for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists through the park; Amend criteria e) to readimproving road safety for motorised and non-motorised users (horse riders, cyclists and pedestrians) and the surrounding

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Currently there are no public paths across the estate - this has already been raised as an issue in the context of the relevant planning application relating to vehicular access.

Comments: *The sensitive nature of work being undertaken has meant that in the past the site has been kept secure and public access limited. While the aim of the representation is supported this is a private site, there are no existing footpaths and it would be unreasonable to insist on these additions. Any opportunities to provide greater public access can be explored further with the developers in response to an application.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 49 & 50

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Add to the end of para 10.1 "although good public transport links will need to be established" Add criterion (d) - Developers will be required to contribute to any public transport required to/from work.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Not given

Comments: *Criteria (d) of Local Policy 1 makes reference to the need to ensure that as high a proportion of journeys as is reasonably feasible will be by modes of transport other than the private car. In addition Structure Policy T3 requires applicants for all major commercial developments to produce a "travel to work" plan setting out a package of measures to minimise the negative impact on the environment of travel to and from the workplace.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 23

Representor: Fletcher, English Heritage **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Criteria c) should refer to protection of context or settings.

Comments: *Agree*

Recommendation: *Amend criteria (c) to read "The Mansion, the Garden House and Emmanuel Cottage and their settings are conserved"*

Chesterford Park Inset Map

Ref.No: 3 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Christian, Brian Christian Building Surveyor **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend policy boundary to exclude undeveloped areas of land.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The development limit is too wide ranging including large tracts of green and arable land unnecessarily earmarked for development. The development limit should be in two tightly drawn sectors omitting open parcels of land.

Ref.No: 72 Rep.No: 4

Representor: , Norwich Union Life and Pensions **Agent (if applicable):** CGMS Limited

Amendment(s) Sought: Realignment of the boundary to the existing fence line would be appropriate to the north west and north east of Emmanuel Cottage (see map).

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The development boundary shown on the inset map is proposed to be amended from the existing Local Plan to reflect the location of some later development and to reduce the extent of the land within the development boundary. The proposed new alignment also excludes land which has historically been part of the operational part of the park and which is separated from cultivated agricultural land by existing fence line. The new boundary would create an irregular boundary line and an irregular development zone. Consider that the parkland setting can be best maintained and enhanced by ensuring that the necessary car parking is generally located to the rear of buildings in landscaped groves. Amending this line would enable more land adjacent to the internal access road to remain open. Land to the north east of Emmanuel Cottage should also be included within the settlement boundary. The suggested changes would not materially alter the amount of development and would improve the setting.

Comments: *The policy area boundary as drawn reflects the committed land allocation and allows for a reasonable degree of growth within the parkland setting. It is not considered appropriate to reduce the policy area as requested. The additional area could be included within the policy area without causing any adverse impact and would give further flexibility for the internal layout in the southern part of the site..*

Recommendation: *Amend the policy area to include land to the north east and north west of Emmanuel Cottage*

CLAVERING

Site: Land at Stortford Road, Clavering

Ref.No: 42 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: None – the settlement boundary is supported.
Support the amendment of the old village development to include the land between the village shop and the last residential property along Stortford Road.

Site: Land Adjacent to Rossie, Colehill Lane, Clavering

Ref.No: 26 Rep.No: 1
Representor: Doherty, **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Land adjacent to Rossie, OS Field 4000 should be included within the settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land adj to Rossie should be included within the settlement boundary for housing. Clavering as a village has facilities to support additional development. Site should be included for the following reasons: It is a brownfield site immediately adjoining established residential areas. Significant planning gains can be made with the provision of public amenity space. No other significant provision has been made within the village for residential development. The site falls within all of the general planning policies with the sole exception that it is outside the arbitrarily drawn settlement boundaries.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV
Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Development in this location would have a detrimental impact on the attractive rural character of this northern edge of the village. The allocation of this site would result in built development in the open countryside, contrary to Government advice and the housing strategy set out in this plan. The site is 0.9 ha and could accommodate 27-45 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Sufficient land is allocated in H1 to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

CLAVERING (HILL GREEN)

Site: Land adj to Hilberry, Hill Green, Clavering

Ref.No: 176 Rep.No: 1
Representor: Hitchcock, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.48 ha) on the south eastern edge of Hill Green, offers potential for infill development and as such it should be included within the settlement boundary for small scale infill development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary of Clavering does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This is not an infill plot – genuine infill plots beyond settlement boundaries will be considered in relation to Policy S7. This representation seeks the inclusion of the site specifically to allow development. The site has no logical boundary and development in this location would be an inappropriate extension into open countryside. The site is 0.48 ha and could accommodate 14-24 dwellings at the Government’s density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Policy H1 makes adequate provision for new housing to meet the Structure Plan Requirement. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: No change

Site: Land adjacent to Hill Green Farm, Hill Green, Clavering

Ref.No: 176 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Hitchcock, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.29 ha) at Hill Green Farm, is a redundant farmyard and as such offers potential for its reuse for residential development and as such it should be included within the settlement boundary for small scale development. The site offers the potential for housing mix and open space,

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary of Clavering does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This is not an infill plot – proposals for genuine infill plots beyond the settlement boundary will be considered in relation to policy S7. Conversion of rural buildings may be acceptable beyond settlement boundaries subject to criteria but the main building on this site is large and modern and its conversion for residential would be contrary to Policy H5. If the site outlined which measures 0.4 ha was included in the settlement boundary this could result in a development of 12-20 new dwellings at the Government’s density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Policy H1 makes sufficient provision for new housing to meet the Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: No change

DEBDEN

Site: Land at Ashvale House, Rook End, Debden

Ref.No: 44 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary to include land at Rook End.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary should be extended to include the top end of Rook End Lane. The reason for this is, over the last 10 years various barns have been converted into dwellings and farm buildings into homes, making this area an integral part of the community.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond settlement boundary

Comments: *The southern end of the village is characterised by sporadic development. The extension of the settlement boundary to include this site could result in additional development which would be detrimental to this character.*

Recommendation: No change

DUDDENHOE END

Ref.No: 30 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Camerson, Agent (if applicable):

Amendment(s) Sought: Define a settlement Boundary for Duddenhoe End.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Plan makes no reference either by text or plans to Duddenhoe End

Comments: *The Development Limit in the Adopted Plan was drawn around a small part of the settlement within which development opportunities have now been realised. It was therefore considered appropriate to remove the settlement boundary. Proposals for development will be considered in relation to policy S7 and other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: No change

ELMDON

Site: Land to the North East of Whitehall Cottages, Heydon Lane, Elmdon

Ref.No: 53 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Bond, Agent (if applicable):

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary to include the site.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to the village plan for Elmdon since it precludes development on land to the east of Whitehall Cottages.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The site is some way from the existing settlement boundary. A remote settlement boundary around this site would be inappropriate and a large extension would be necessary to include it. An extension to the settlement boundary in this location would be inappropriate since the site forms part of the open landscape rather than the built up area of the village.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land off Hollow Road, Elmdon

Ref.No: 61 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: We would like the settlement boundary that runs along the bottom of the gardens in Hollow Road to continue NNW and embrace our property and its associated grounds marked on the plan.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land is excluded from the settlement boundary

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Protected Lane/Special Verge

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Protected Lane

Comments: *All the existing development in this location is on the southern side of the road which forms a logical boundary to the settlement boundary in this location. The proposal would result in an isolated extension into the Countryside to the north of the road with no logical boundary.*

Recommendation: *No change*

ELSENHAM VILLAGE INSET

ELSENHAM LOCAL POLICY 1

Deposit Policy

Land at Golds Nursery Business Park and Old Mead Road is identified on the Proposals Map Inset as a key employment area.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 109 **Rep.No:** 1 & 2

Representor: Willis Gambier Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** AS Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Elsenham Local Policy 1 should be amended by adding the following text: "Sympathetic consideration will be given to proposals to expand the employment site at Old Mead Road within the development area shown on the inset map, subject to the provision of suitable landscaping and screening to minimise the effect of development on the adjoining countryside" Amend policy area

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The allocation of land at Old Mead Road for employment purposes is supported in principal. The extent of the policy could be widened from simple protection of the existing area to encouragement for additional floorspace. The site is shown inaccurately on the Inset Map and should be amended to reflect planning permissions. Elsenham is located in a strategically convenient position in the District. It has good road and rail access and it quite rightly referred to as a key rural settlement. The identification of Old Mead Road as a key employment area should therefore allow for expansion of employment on the site, and this should be referred to in the policy. The ability to service the site in a sustainable way is greatly enhanced by the proximity of the railway station as a means of transporting workers to the site who are not resident in the village.

Comments: *Agree that the policy area should reflect the planning permission granted in August 1999 for an extension to the existing warehouse (ref UTT/0554/99/FUL). Any further extension of this site would be inappropriate in this rural area.*

Recommendation: *Amend the Local Policy 1 area to reflect the permitted extension. Also the notation colour shown on the map needs to be changed to show safeguarded employment land*

Site: Essex Auto Sprays, The Gables, Stansted Road, Elsenham

Ref.No: 5 **Rep.No:** 1 & 2

Representor: Mortimer, Essex Autosprays **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Include site within Settlement Boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: In view of the long established industrial and commercial uses which have and continue to exist on this site (TL5326) it's character is alien to a rural area and its visual contribution to the same is of no merit. If the site were included within the settlement boundary it would be ideally suited for a limited number of affordable housing units. This would satisfy a local need and at the same time improve the appearance of the site and its surrounding by removing the industrial uses and the vehicle haulage depot.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Any proposal for affordable housing beyond the settlement boundary would be considered in relation to policy H10.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land west of Station Road, Elsenham

Ref.No: 143 **Rep.No:** 3 & 5

Representor: Kennedy, David Wilson Estates **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Identify land west of Elsenham for residential development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land west of Elsenham is an appropriate location for development. Site is contained by existing development, woodland, M11 and Stansted Road. It is accessible to village services. Concern over lack of flexibility in housing figures, over emphasis of capacity of previously developed land and the belief that supply is insufficient to meet the housing requirement in the plan period.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The boundary of the village is well defined along this western edge. The proposal represents a major extension of the village into the open countryside, out of scale and character with the village and its rural surroundings. The site is approximately 11 ha and could accommodate 330-550 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30–50 dwellings per hectare. Development of this scale would be contrary to housing strategy set out in policy H1 which provides sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. No additional land is required*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: The Orchard, to the south of Alsa Gardens, Elsenham

Ref.No: 29 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , Fairhall Properties **Agent (if applicable):** Cunnane Town Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary of Elsenham to include the Orchard.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The curtilage of The Orchard, Station Road, Elsenham should be included within the defined settlement boundary of Elsenham. The site constitutes previously developed land. Redevelopment would reduce the pressure for the release of greenfield sites. The site forms part of the settlement of Elsenham. It is well defined and relates more to the village to the north east and west than the area of open countryside to the south. The settlement boundary has been arbitrarily drawn from a map without proper consideration on the ground of the relationship between the surrounding development and the orchard site's building and features.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site of approx 2. ha could accommodate 60-100 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Development on this scale would be contrary to the housing strategy set out in Policy H1 which provides for sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Development on this site would involve an unnecessary and undesirable extension of the built form in a location that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adjacent to Woodview, Elsenham

Ref.No: 178 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Hedges, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.04 ha) between Woodview and the railway line should be included within the village boundary for infill development and excluded from the MGB [note:site not in MGB but is in CPZ]

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary of Elsenham does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, within CPZ

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond settlement boundary, within CPZ

Comments: *Any proposal for an infill development on the site would be considered in relation to policy S7 and S8. There is no need to extend the settlement boundary to include this site.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the north of Elsenham

Ref.No: 16 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Stock, The Fairfield Partnership **Agent (if applicable):** Januarys Chartered Surveyors

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend settlement boundary to incorporate site for residential development together with associated public open space, structural landscaping and other community facilities.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land bounded by the northern edge of Elsenham, the M11 and the rail line is excluded from the Settlement Boundary. Land coming forward for development in the urban areas is considered optimistic. In order to achieve targets expansion of suitable villages is requested. Elsenham satisfies the requirements for settlement expansion set out in the Adopted Structure Plan and represents an ideal location for further housing growth. Although identified as a key rural settlement no allocation is proposed.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Partly within Poor Air Quality zone

Comments: *No map was included but 13 ha of land to the northern edge of the village east of the M11 and west of the railway line represents a major extension of the village into the open countryside, out of scale and character with the village and its rural surroundings. The site could accommodate 390-650 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Part of the site along the motorway falls within the poor air quality zone and residential development in this area would be contrary to Policy ENV12. Development on this scale would be*

contrary to the housing strategy set out in Policy H1 which provides sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Additional land is not required

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land between Mill Close and Old Mill Farm, Elsenham

Ref.No: 115 **Rep.No:** 2 & 3

Representor: , Prowting Projects and Gleeson Homes **Agent (if applicable):** Boyer Planning Limited

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land between Mill Close and Old Mill Farm House within the Settlement Boundary and include reference to the site in Para 11.1

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to the settlement boundary for Elsenham in conjunction with our proposal for the allocation at Stansted Road for housing. Land at Stansted Road Elsenham is proposed for housing and associated development. The site has a capacity of approx 150 dwellings and is suitable for a phased release. This proposal is consistent with the recognition of Elsenham as one of the District's larger villages defined as a key rural settlement in the Local Plan. It is appropriate for housing development on the scale proposed having regard to the range of local facilities which it contains, including local employment and rail and bus based public transport

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, CPZ

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond settlement boundary, CPZ

Comments: *The site is within the Countryside Protection Zone. Development in this location would lead to coalescence between the main part of the village and the small isolated group of houses to the west. It is suggested that the site could accommodate some 150 dwellings. This scale of development would be contrary to the housing strategy set out in Policy H1 which allocates sufficient land to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

FELSTED

Site: Chelmsford Road, Felsted

Ref.No: 74 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , Gordon Crawford Farms **Agent (if applicable):** PJ Rayner and Co

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary and include allocation of the site for housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The small extension of the Felsted settlement boundary and allocation of housing on the site proposed on the Felsted inset map will provide a few private dwellings of medium density on an existing village street location to give people the option and choice of residing in a new non-

estate dwelling. The development abuts the existing settlement boundary and is set in a built residential street scene both sides. The development can be carried out without any significant affect on the area and would not be detrimental to the landscape or intrude into open countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The site is 0.4 ha and could accommodate 12-20 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Development here would encroach into the gap between the village and development at Causeway End. Policy H1 makes sufficient provision for housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirements. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: No Change

Site: Land at the Vicarage, Station Road and Tidings, Mill Road, Felsted

Ref.No: 152 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Clark, Felsted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend settlement boundary to exclude (i) land at the vicarage garden and (ii) the garden of Tidings from the settlement boundary

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Parish Council supports the local plan but considers minor changes to the outline are needed to safeguard against future development claims in the vicarage garden and the garden of Tidings in Mill Road

(i) Land at the Vicarage Garden, Station Road, Felsted

Notation in Adopted Plan: Within VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Within Settlement Boundary

(ii) Garden of Tidings, Mill Road, Felsted

Notation in Adopted Plan: Within VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Within Settlement Boundary

Comments: *In preparing the Deposit Plan Settlement boundaries have been drawn where possible to reflect boundaries on the ground. In relation to both these sites it is considered that the boundaries are logical. Any development proposal in these areas will be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan and inappropriate development will be refused.*

Recommendation: No change

Site: Land adjacent to Montague House, Mill Road, Felsted

Ref.No: 193 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Balson, **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Land adjacent to Montague House, Mill Road, Felsted should be included within the settlement boundary and allocated within H1.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Facilities are available in the village and the site is served by public transport. This is a more appropriate location for housing growth than sporadic development in the open countryside which would amount from Policy H1(c) through the conversion of rural buildings and previously used land which will not generally be located on the edge of existing settlements. Following on from the re-use of previously developed land and buildings we support peripheral development as the next best alternative, in locations that allow sustainable growth.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site is approximately 0.14ha. At the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha this site could accommodate 4-7 dwellings. An extension of the settlement boundary in this location would be detrimental to the rural character of this approach to the village. .*

Recommendation: *No Change*

FELSTED (CAUSEWAY END)

Site: Land at Beazleys, Chelmsford Road, Felsted

Ref.No: 152 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Clark, Felsted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Land at Beazleys, Chelmsford Road should be excluded from the settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Parish Council supports the local plan but considers the boundary line should be the garden of Beazleys in Chelmsford Road to exclude the lane, used as a field entrance to avoid future development claims.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Within the VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Within settlement boundary

Comments: *Agree that the more logical boundary would be the boundary of the garden at Beazleys.*

Recommendation: *Amend the settlement boundary as requested.*

FELSTED (WATCH HOUSE GREEN)

Site: Land to the North East of Watch House Green

Ref.No: 87 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Payne, **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Extend settlement boundary of Watch House Green to include Watch House Farm, Cromwells, The Watch House and the Watch House Farm industrial estate as shown dashed on the attached inset map.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: It is considered illogical to continue to exclude the Watch House Industrial Estate and three residential properties from the hamlet of Watch House Green. Since the existing uses and development are lawful, it is a matter of fact that this land is a developed part of the settlement - there is no benefit in excluding it. There are potential benefits to arise from including the land within the settlement boundary by virtue of provision of new housing, employment, recreational facilities, or community facilities. The realisation of one or more of the potential benefits would assist in achieving the prime objectives of the Local Plan.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond the settlement boundary

Comments: *The land to the north and east of Watch House Green is rural in nature. The inclusion of the land within the settlement boundary could result in an unacceptable consolidation of built development in the countryside. Any proposals for re-use/redevelopment of existing buildings can be considered in the context of other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

FELSTED (GRANSMORE GREEN)

Settlement Boundary

Ref.No: 111 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Alexander, **Agent (if applicable):** John Daldry Partnership

Amendment(s) Sought: Define a settlement boundary for Gransmore Green.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Gransmore Green, Felsted is a settlement with naturally defined boundaries. Within the settlement there is an established pattern of developed land, outside of which is open rolling countryside. New development has been permitted within the settlement.

Comments: *There are a number of locations in the District where there are a number of outlying settlements around greens. The character of development in these locations tends to be loose and sporadic where new development would not be appropriate and in accordance with the strategy set out in Section 2 of the plan no settlement boundaries are defined.*

Recommendation: *No change*

GREAT CHESTERFORD

Ref No: 147 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Rolfe, Great Chesterford Parish Council **Agent (if applicable)**

Amendment(s) Sought: None – representation of support

The Parish Council cannot object to any further infill but highlights the amount of infill experienced over the last 10 years and believes there are very few remaining sites. In particular we would object to any change of use for the “green” sites e.g. Coronation Green and the school playing fields to the rear of Carmen Street

Ref.No: 147 Rep.No: 5

Representor: Rolfe, Great Chesterford Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the line to exclude land at Ash Green.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Parish Council favour the line of the settlement boundary shown in the previous plan. We object to any changes. Ash Green London Road - the green area within this development is now included inside the line. It is an important open space and should remain outside the line.

Comments: *This is an important open space within the settlement boundary, and this is how it should be notated in the plan.*

Recommendation: *Identify site as protected open space of environmental value*

GREAT CHESTERFORD LOCAL POLICY 1 – SAFEGUARDING OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT AREA

No representations

GREAT CHESTERFORD LOCAL POLICY 2 – LONDON ROAD EMPLOYMENT SITE

Deposit Policy

A 0.89 hectare site identified on the proposals map inset is proposed as an employment site for uses falling within class B1. Development will be permitted if it is compatible with adjoining existing residential development.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 3 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Christian, Brian Christian Building Surveyor **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Retain for existing business expansion or retain as housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Area has no need for further employment. Retain for existing business expansion or retain as housing. Village has housing need, further employment will fuel more need.

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 43

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Whilst this is a small site (0.89ha) it is one of the four set out at policy E1 - Distribution of employment land. Further employment development seems inappropriate here with existing residential development on three sides and the policy itself seeking development only within Class B1 and it being compatible with the adjoining residential development.

Comments: *Although the site to the south is residential access to the employment site to the rear runs through the representation site and this is not ideal with residential use on the site . Local employment opportunities are required in accordance with Government advice and the strategy set out in the Structure Plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site; Land at the Railway Sidings, Great Chesterford

Ref.No: 3 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Brian Christian Building Surveyor **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Extend Great Chesterford settlement boundary to include former railway sidings.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Development limit should be moved westwards to embrace former railway siding which are useless for any other purpose than development by industry.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The difference in levels between the railway sidings and the adjacent business uses is a practical constraint of development in this location.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land north of Poplar Lodge, Newmarket Road, Great Chesterford

Ref.No: 3 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Brian Christian Building Surveyor **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Extend Settlement Boundary at Great Chesterford along west side of Newmarket Road to include worked out gravel pit.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village development limit should be extended northwards to embrace the worked out gravel pit for housing. It has no other use nor potential

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Development would be inappropriate since it would result in ribbon development which would be detrimental to the loose knit, semi rural nature of this approach to the village.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the South of Four Acres and the Elms, Great Chesterford

Ref.No: 62 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Robinson, **Agent (if applicable):** Bidwells

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary to include land north of the High Street and South of the Elms and allocate for housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Site at Great Chesterford should be allocated for housing. Great Chesterford is identified as a Key Rural Settlement. The site forms part of the area of 20th Century development to the north east of the Conservation Area. Great Chesterford village and parish have an abundance of jobs both within the village and nearby at the Chesterford Park research station, reinforced by the large research facility at Hinxtton nearby. The village has a school and other local services and facilities which, in part underpin its designation as a key village. Uniquely in the key villages no housing allocations are made. The land in question has housing on three sides and a road on the fourth. It forms part of the built up area of the village with little affinity to the Countryside around it. A housing allocation here would logically round off the built form of the village, would help to support local services, help to address the imbalance of jobs in the parish and provide much needed housing in this key village.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Partly within the Conservation Area

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond the Settlement Boundary, Partly within the Conservation Area

Comments: *This site is approx 4 ha and could accommodate 120-200 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Policy H1 makes adequate provision for new housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. This proposal could not be justified on the basis of housing need.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the rear of Foxborough

Ref.No: 63 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend settlement boundary to include land to the rear of Foxborough

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land to the rear of Foxborough should be included within the settlement boundary. The new line should follow the hedgeline and the boundary of the Conservation Area. Due to plan scales and line thicknesses it is not easy to define the area exactly and the existing hedgeline would provide more clarity and better agree with our understanding of the development area.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Conservation Area

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Conservation Area

Comments: *The suggested boundary would be more logical following an existing hedge line for part of its length and coinciding with the Conservation Area boundary.*

Recommendation: *Amend the settlement boundary as requested.*

GREAT DUNMOW

Great Dunmow Inset Map

Ref.No: 57 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Reintroduce a landscape protection designation for the Chelmer Valley and introduce some text into the Dunmow statement to the effect that the Chelmer Valley will be protected from development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land in the Chelmer Valley should be protected from development. Policy H10 allows for development of affordable housing on exceptions sites. The area of special landscape value designation in the adopted plan gave additional protection and this should be reinstated. The text from the adopted plan which talked about the protection of the valley should also be reinstated.

Ref.No: 41 Rep.No: 3

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Chelmer Valley from Braintree Road to Church End be added to Protected Open Space for Informal Recreation

Comments: *Only important spaces which are within the settlement boundary are designated as protected open space since outside the settlement boundary there will be strict control on new development in accordance with Policy S7. The high*

environmental quality of the Chelmer Valley would be taken into account in considering any proposals for affordable housing on any “exception” site within this area.

Recommendation: *No change*

Retailing and Commerce in the Town Centre

POLICY GD1 – SHOPPING CENTRE

Deposit Policy

The shopping centre is defined on the proposals map inset. Change of use of existing shops, restaurants, public houses and hot food take-aways to residential uses will not be permitted, unless both the following criteria are met:

- a) **The existing use is surplus to current and foreseen future requirements; and**
- b) **The property has been widely advertised for at least six months on terms reflecting its use.**

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 51

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the timescale in criterion (b) from 6 to 12 months

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified

Comments: *Six months is considered to be a reasonable timescale.*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY GD2 – LAND TO THE REAR OF 37-75 HIGH STREET

Deposit Policy

A 0.62 hectare site to the rear of 37 to 75 High Street is proposed for a mixed use development, subject to the development including improved access to White Street and the public car park.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 24

Representor: Fletcher, English Heritage **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: We consider that the policy should include criteria relating to the need to: safeguard the settings of the listed buildings fronting the high street, respect the grain of the historic plots and be of the highest quality design appropriate

to its context. The site should also be assessed for its archaeological interest in accordance with PPG16.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This is an extremely sensitive site. A number of modern developments in the town are conspicuous for their poor quality - for instance the buildings on the prominent corner site at the Chelmsford Road roundabout. In other cases listed buildings have been insensitively hemmed in by modern development. The achievement of a high quality scheme must be a priority on this site.

Comments: *Additional text could be included in paragraph 13.3.*

Recommendation: *Amend paragraph 13.3 to read*

13.1. Policy RS1 will apply to the shopping centre. A site has been identified on the proposals map inset at the southern end of the High Street on the east side where there is an area of mixed uses. This 0.62 hectare site has potential for a mixed-use scheme with new homes, community and commercial uses. Development *should be of the highest quality design and will need to safeguard the setting of the listed buildings fronting the High Street, respect the grain of the historic plots and should be generally restricted to two storeys. An archaeological assessment may be required. Development should also provide for improved access to White Street and the town's main car park. This will enable the High Street/White Street junction to be closed to vehicular traffic adjacent to the Boars Head Public House. This could significantly assist the revitalization of Great Dunmow town centre.*

POLICY GD3 – WHITE STREET CAR PARK EXTENSION

No representations

Residential Development

Para 13.5.3

Ref.No: 25 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Hicks, Agent (if applicable):

Amendment(s) Sought: Restricted or no parking on Flitch Lane (this road is only wide enough for 2 cars to pass)

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Although the development has been completed, as a local resident it has caused a great deal of on street parking in Flitch Lane. I understood that all houses in Harris Green had off street parking, however almost all residents along Flitch Lane park in front of their houses. This is particularly dangerous in front of Normansfield as it forces a driver on to the wrong side of the road. It could also obstruct emergency vehicles accessing Normansfield.

Comments: *This is not a matter that be addressed through the Local Plan. The highway department of Essex County Council have been made aware of the concerns.*

Recommendation; *No change*

POLICY GD4 – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN GREAT DUNMOW'S BUILT UP AREA.

Deposit Policy

The following sites, identified on the proposals map, are proposed for residential development.

Site	Site area (ha)	Minimum capacity
Off Godfrey Way	0.37	11
Off Riverside	0.8	21
Flitch Lane	0.99	44
ECC depot Haslers Lane	0.34	17
South of Springfields	0.71	23

These will be supplemented by other sites, which will generally be small in scale and are not specifically identified on the proposals map inset.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 24 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Re: ECC Depot, Haslers Lane. To ensure development respects adjoining conservation area the proposed housing should be in a style and materials in keeping with adjoining development, existing properties should not be overlooked by multi storey flats or housing built too close to boundary. The Mature Horse Chestnut trees on edge of the land should be protected. Vehicle congestion on New Street should not be increased and parking allocation retained.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Proposal is lacking in detail so that new development might spoil the bordering conservation area.

Comments: *Development of this site should be in accordance with the General Policies which cover design, access and good neighbourliness issues. If the Horse Chestnut Tree is considered worthy of protection it can be made the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 149 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Wilson, Great Dunmow Town Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land off Riverside is contrary to policy GEN3 and is totally unsuitable for development.

Ref.No: 33 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Grayson, (Officer of the Council) **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Omit part of the final sentence in para 13.5.2 which refers to the site not having planning permission. Amend the final sentence in para 13.5.2 to reduce the capacity of the site to a maximum of 5 dwellings.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The site off Riverside continues to enjoy planning permission for the erection of the remaining 5 of the 13 dwellings approved because a start was made with the construction of the road. The erection of 8 dwellings would conflict with policy GEN2 (a) because it would respect the form and layout of surrounding buildings, in particular the density would be much higher and the garden sizes smaller than properties to the north and south. 8 dwellings would conflict with policy GEN4 because it would result in overlooking and an overbearing effect on neighbouring properties. Also conflict with GEN3 because it would mean one property in the southwestern corner of the site which has flooded twice during the last 13 months. The Government never intended advice in PPG3 to apply to small plots of land within established low density areas. There is no shortage of land in Dunmow and no need to cram 8 dwellings onto this site.

Comments: *Planning permission has been granted for development on this site. The potential flood risk is capable of resolution by the construction of a bund and this is being investigated by the Environment Agency. The capacity of the site for 8 dwellings is in accordance with advice in PPG3.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 116 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Smith, Essex County Council - Property Services **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Inclusion of the Essex County Council owned land east of Tesco Superstore Great Dunmow within policy GD4 as a proposed site for residential development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Essex County Council own a 1.97 ha vacant site to the east of the Tesco Superstore and immediately to the south of the GD5 housing proposal. The site was originally acquired to house a new magistrates court and police station but both proposals have now been abandoned. The site lies within the settlement boundary of Great Dunmow where Policy S1 confirms a presumption in favour of development. With the development of Woodlands Park the site will be bordered on two sides by housing development and could make a valuable contribution to Uttlesford meeting its structure plan housing requirement if adopted in the Plan as a Policy GD4 housing proposal.

Comments: *This relatively large vacant site within the settlement boundary is not currently allocated in the Deposit Plan. Land is already allocated in the town for a significant amount of new housing and additional housing land is not required to meet the Structure Plan requirements. This site would be suitable for employment uses, primarily falling within Class B1. This allocation of this site would comply with advice in PPG4 and Structure Plan policy BIW2 to ensure that there is sufficient land available which is readily capable of development and well served by infrastructure.*

Business, industrial and warehousing development should be concentrated primarily in the large urban areas where people live and in locations well served by travel modes other than the private car. This site meets these requirements.

Recommendation: *Include site as an employment site primarily for B1 uses. Consequential amendments to Policy E1, lower case text and Great Dunmow Inset Map*

Add additional text and policy to Great Dunmow Inset as follows

New paragraph after 3.11 Land 0.90 hectares in extent is allocated for employment uses on the old Newton Works site adjacent to Tesco's. The site will be appropriate for uses mainly falling within Class B1. The remainder of the site (1.94 hectares) is safeguarded for a new school site. The means of access for pedestrian and vehicular traffic will be determined by a traffic impact assessment. Landscaping will be required as a buffer between the school and the employment site and to protect the amenity of surrounding residential uses. In the event that the school site does not come forward the entire site is proposed for employment uses.

New Policy - The Former Newton Works

Land at the former Newton Works is proposed for employment uses which will be primarily within class B1. The balance of the site 1.94 hectares is safeguarded for a primary school. Developers will be required to prepare a master plan to indicate how adjoining non-employment uses will be protected and how the site will be landscaped. Development will need to be implemented in accordance with such a master plan approved by the Council. A traffic impact assessment will be required. In the event that land is not required for a school that part of the site that does not have planning permission for housing is proposed for additional Class B1 employment uses.

Ref.No: 118 Rep.No: 10

Representor: , Bryant Projects **Agent (if applicable):** DLP Consultants Ltd

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Welcome the addition of sites identified under Policy GD4 as an appropriate balance between making the best use of available urban land without compromising the strong established character of the town through slavish identification of sites which would over intensify urban use or which are unlikely to be genuinely available to contribute to development needs in the Plan Period. We question why land off Riverside and south of Springfields have not been implemented to date or are not subject to planning consent. We consider that where there is no apparent reason for precluding the implementation of such sites, these sites should be subject to monitoring and management to address the event that they do not come forward for development during the plan period.

Comments: *Agree that the sites will be the subject of monitoring*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 9

Representor: , Bryant Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Vincent and Gorbing

Amendment(s) Sought: The capacities of the sites set out in the table should be adjusted to omit completions and existing dwellings on the sites.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: To avoid double counting the completions that have already been omitted from the housing requirement for 4620 dwellings in Policy H1.

Comments: *The Table in Policy GD4 should include only the outstanding dwellings as at April 2000 - base date for all the housing information. Any completions before that date will have been deducted from the total 5,600. Therefore there should be no double counting of completions..*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 149 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Wilson, Great Dunmow Town Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Alternative wording is suggested "these will be supplemented by other sites which will be small in scale and within the main settlement boundaries."

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The statement "these will be supplemented by other sites which will generally be small in scale and are not specifically identified on the proposals map" is weak and a licence for developers to build wherever they like. There is no point in identifying specific sites and areas where development may be permitted if you then add the above "rider". This needs to be more concise.

Comments: *Agree*

Recommendation: *Amend sentence at the end of Policy GD4 to read "these will be supplemented by other sites within the settlement boundary which will generally be small in scale and are not specifically identified on the proposals map inset" This change will also need to be made to Policies SM2 and SW2.*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 3

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Assuming that the five sites do not include any social /affordable housing units we would need to seek a developer contribution for the following additional school places. Land off Godfrey Way - 3 primary and 3 secondary pupils. Land off Riverside 5 primary and 4 secondary. Fritch Lane - 11 primary and 9 secondary, ECC Depot, Haslers Lane, - 4 primary and 3 secondary. South of Springfields 6 primary and 5 secondary.

Comments: *Noted – Policy GEN6 requires that development makes provision for school capacity. Further discussions will need to take place with developers and Essex County Council, learning services at the application stage.*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY GD5 – WOODLANDS PARK

Deposit Policy

Land at Woodlands Park, as defined on the Inset Map, is proposed for comprehensive residential development for 1,175 dwellings and associated facilities.

The following criteria must be met:

- a) It provides for a mixed and balanced community;**
- b) It provides for a primary school, community facilities and open space;**
- c) It provides specifically for the construction of a north-west relief road;**
- d) It provides for substantial landscaping within the development boundaries to complement the layout and arrangement of buildings and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide off site landscaping.**
- e) It is designed to mitigate adverse effects upon existing residential and community interests and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide or contribute towards wider and longer term planning benefits reasonably associated with the alleviation of any such impact.**

The provision of these and other relevant planning benefits will be regulated by legal agreement on the grant of associated planning permissions.

Developers will be required to prepare a master plan to indicate how specific proposals, which may be implemented on a phased basis, relate to an overall design concept for the site. The master plan will be subject to public consultation. Development will need to be implemented in accordance with such a master plan approved by the Council.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 142 Rep.No: 8

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Para 13.6. Should be enlarged to make reference to the comprehensive development at Woodlands Park. Reference should be made in 13.7 to the approved master plan for Sectors 1 and 2. Details should be given of the capacity and number of dwellings completed in each of these sectors. Policy GD5 should be amended to reflect the fact that development is in progress at Woodlands Park and has reached a different stage in each sector and the fact that a master plan

has been produced and approved for Sectors 1 and 2 (see rep for details of stages which should be included in the policy)

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The policy and supporting text should reflect the stage reached with the development. In Sector 1 about 100 dwellings have been occupied in Sector 2 approx 200 dwellings have been occupied. Policy GD5 fails to reflect that development is in progress at Woodlands Park and has reached a different stage in each Sector. The policy also refers to a requirement to prepare a master plan. This requirement should only apply to sector 3 of Woodlands Park and sectors 3(i) and 4 if found to be required

Comments: *It is considered appropriate that the entire development should be in accordance with an approved Master Plan. References to progress in each of the sectors would quickly become out of date and the information is available elsewhere.*

Recommendation *No change*

Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 10

Representor: , Bryant Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Vincent and Gorbing

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This allocation is essentially the same allocation as that identified in the current adopted plan for 625 dwellings for post 8 mppa Stansted Airport related housing. The policy should be amended to relate the 625 dwelling element of the site to airport related growth. This would leave the site with a capacity of 550 additional dwellings for non-airport related houses for this plan period. Notwithstanding these comments we have doubts as to whether the suggested number of dwellings can be provided within the plan period.

Comments: *It is inappropriate to refer to housing as “airport related” – there is no specific need for housing in relation to employment growth at the airport.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 149 Rep.No: 5

Representor: Wilson, Great Dunmow Town Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Re-write para e)

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Para e) is unclear and required to be re-written. Why has the number of houses on Woodlands Park been reduced, particularly as it is contrary to Government guidance which states that housing needs should be met by increasing density on sites. It should be increased. Every effort should be made to find a suitable solution to allow the early completion of the north west by pass.

Comments: *The number has not been reduced. The adopted District Plan made provision for 1275 dwellings on this site. The Deposit Plan policy makes reference to*

1175 dwellings but at the base date of April 2000 about 200 dwellings had already been completed

Recommendation: *Include additional lower case in paragraph 13.6.*

Planning permission existed in April 2000 for 671 dwellings to be built at Woodlands Park on the western edge of the town. The approved master plan shows additional residential development in that part of the site accessed off Emblems. This will provide about 105 dwellings. This is in addition to the 200 dwellings that had already been built.

Ref.No: 201 Rep.No: 7

Representor: Countryside Properties PLC **Agent (if applicable):** Strategic Land and Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Housing allocation at Woodlands Park, Great Dunmow, be reduced to around 600 dwellings in the present plan period, to reflect outstanding planning permissions only

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The rate of progress on this site has been extremely slow within only around 300 houses having been built in well over 10 years. The north western relief road has never been built and there is no realistic prospect of advancing the timing of this road through the local plan process. Other planning and community benefits which were envisaged have also not been realised. The developers of the site have made it clear that they do not wish to intergrate affordable housing into the scheme. It has also apparently proved impossible to agree an overall master plan for the whole development. This very disapointing track record gives no grounds for optimism that the continued allocation of land for housing at Woodlands Park will produce the required number of houses within the plan period. No further land should be allocated for development in the period of the present draft plan beyond these existing permissions.

Comments: *The site is required at this level of development to meet the housing requirement as set out in Policy H1*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 213 Rep.No: 27

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

Amendment(s) Sought: We suggest that the criterion be enlarged to read: c) it provides specifically for the construction of a north-west relief road to be completed before the dwellings in the north west phase of the development are built.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Whilst strongly supporting the principle involved CPREssex objects to the wording of this criterion considering that is not strong enough to ensure the construction of the relief road before the dwellings are completed.

Comments: *Construction of the bypass is linked to the phasing of the development and controlled by a legal agreement attached to the planning permission. It is not considered to be necessary to refer to detailed terms of this in the policy.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 25

Representor: Fletcher, English Heritage **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: The development should include a buffer of woodland on this boundary to safeguard the setting of the listed Newton Hall. Any pressure for development to the north of the proposed allocation should be resisted. The plan should also indicate that growth to the west of the new road will be resisted due to the high quality of the landscape.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Note that the plan seeks to extend this allocation and that detailed planning permission has not yet been granted for the whole site. The large scale of this development is extremely hard to assimilate in the context of a small historic town. The housing completed thus far is of poor quality design incorporating UPVC windows and small detached dwellings arranged in street patterns common to housebuilder developments. We would strongly urge that the design requirements for this development are reassessed and that more appropriate development reflecting local distinctiveness local materials and traditional layout is required. The local plan policy should refer to higher quality design being a key requirement. The allocation also impinges on the setting of Newton Hall to the north.

Comments: *Details of design and any requirements for screening can be taken into account in considering reserve matters applications.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 4

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: There is already in existence a S106 agreement for a site for a new primary school on this development. However, discussions have recently taken place with Wickford Development with a view to the new primary school being located on the Newton Works Site which is owned by ECC plus adjoining land fronting on to Woodlands Park Drive which Wickford Development will release to ECC. Provided that Wickford Development pays ECC the value for the Newton Works sites and associated costs with an access from the A120 then with the agreement of UDC the present S106 can be relinquished.

Comments: *Part of the Newton Works site is proposed for employment uses. The remainder of the site is allocated for the school site.*

Recommendation: *Include reference to school site in policy for the former Newton Works site*

Employment

Para 13.10 - 13.12

Ref.No: 149 Rep.No: 7

Representor: Wilson, Great Dunmow Town Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Plans should be formulated now to provide future industrial development perhaps including land to the south of Smiths Farm. The possibility of using the Ongar Road Trading Estate for housing development should be explored with the industrial units being transferred to another site on the periphery of the town with better access.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Industrial employment must be encouraged and increased to try and maintain a manufacturing base in the town and provide work for the local population and school leavers in particular. Efforts should be made to persuade a major manufacturer to come to the town, particularly with the better communications to be afforded by the new A120.

Comments: *Additional employment sites are being suggested at Hoblongs and on the former Newton Works site but the site at Ongar Road also contributes to the supply of employment land and should be retained.*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY GD6 – GREAT DUNMOW BUSINESS PARK

Deposit Policy

A 9.61 hectare site to west of Chelmsford Road is proposed for a business park of employment uses, which will be primarily within class B1. Development will provide specifically for substantial peripheral landscaping and open space adjoining housing on Ongar Road and Clapton Hall Lane.

Developers will be required to prepare a master plan to indicate how specific proposals, which may be implemented on a phased basis, relate to an overall design concept for the site. The master plan will be subject to public consultation. Development will need to be implemented in accordance with such a master plan approved by the Council. Implementation of the Master Plan proposals will be regulated by legal agreement in association with the grant of planning permissions.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 118 Rep.No: 11

Representor: , Bryant Projects **Agent (if applicable):** DLP Consultants Ltd

Amendment(s) Sought: None – the Policy is supported
With reference to our support for Policy E1 we support Policy GD6 and the allocation of land for employment to the west of Chelmsford Road

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 44

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This site has already been referred to in the context of objections to Policy E1 - Distribution of Employment Land. It fails to provide land of an adequate quality.

Comments: *This site is allocated as a business park in accordance with advice in PPG4 and Structure Plan policy BIW2 to ensure there is sufficient land available which is readily capable of development and well served by infrastructure. Business, industrial and warehousing development should be concentrated primarily in the urban areas where people live and in locations well served by travel modes other than the private car. This site meets these requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 40 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Hockley, **Agent (if applicable):** Alan Wipperman and Co

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy E1 to be amended to include land required for employment use for relocation of HGV depots and for recycling and amenity centre and defined on the inset map if required in the plan period with appropriate environmental requirements and obligations. Policy GD6 to be amended and settlement boundary to be amended.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The plan identifies the ECC depot off Haslers Lane as suitable for residential development but no site is identified for its relocation. Clients have objected to planning application proposing heavy goods vehicle depot and civic amenity and recycling centre on land rear of Brook Cottage. The Plan does not give proper consideration to the relocation of these facilities nor make the appropriate policies and allocations.

Ref.No: 189 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Exors of D Cock **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land south of Great Dunmow, adjoining Hoblongs Ind Estate, within settlement boundary and identify as being suitable for employment purposes.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Additional land needs to be allocated for Great Dunmow to take into account growing needs of A120/M11 corridor as well as the airport. Site has good access to new A120 as well as providing a strong visual identity as you enter the town from the new A120. It would not create additional traffic movements in Dunmow town centre or surrounding villages.

Comments: Land to the south of the Hoblongs industrial estate has been identified as a suitable site by the County Council for a new civic amenity site to serve the south of the District and a depot to replace the existing depot in the town centre. The County Council has made an application and it is considered that the plan should be amended to accommodate these uses on this out of centre site.

Recommendation: Include new policy relating to the provision of a civic amenity site and depot. Consequential amendments to the lower case text and the Great Dunmow Inset Map.

Add new paragraph after policy GD6

Civic Amenity Site and Depot

A site to the south of the Hoblongs industrial estate has been identified as a suitable site for a new civic amenity site to serve the south of the District and a depot to replace the existing Council depot in the town centre. Landscaping will be essential adjacent to the neighbours. Further screening will also be required adjacent to the A120 bypass.

Add new policy

Civic Amenity Site and Depot

A 1.83 hectare site to the south of the Hoblongs industrial estate is proposed for a civic amenity site and depot. Proposals should include landscaping adjacent to the neighbouring properties and the A120 bypass.

POLICY GD7 – SAFEGUARDING OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT AREAS

Deposit Policy

The following existing employment areas are identified on the proposals map as key employment sites:

Existing employment area	Area (ha)
Chelmsford Road Industrial Estate	4.23
Flitch Industrial Estate	2.10
Hoblongs Industrial Estate	2.60
Oak Industrial Estate	2.10
Ongar Road Industrial Estate	1.52

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 41 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Beedle, Agent (if applicable):

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Is the Ongar Road site also approved for residential development in the existing plan?

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 45

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete reference to the Ongar Road Estate

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Of the key employment sites within Great Dunmow it is perhaps surprising that the Ongar Road Estate is safeguarded bearing in mind it is totally surrounded by residential property

Comments: *The site is included within the residential notation in the adopted District Plan but it is currently in use for employment. It is proposed that the site be retained for employment use. Advice in the Structure Plan is that existing sites should be retained since they possess the necessary infrastructure and services and their retention within urban areas reduces the need to find greenfield sites.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at Tiggers, Ongar Road, Great Dunmow

Ref.No: 2 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: That the Town Development Limit be moved to the new A120, being the natural barrier to any creeping building in the area indicated on the enclosed map

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: That the demarcation line stops on the north of Ongar Road, ignoring the property on the south side.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond TDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site forms part of the strategic green wedge between the edge of the town and the route of the new A120, It would be inappropriate to identify an isolated settlement boundary to facilitate development on this site.*

Recommendation: *No Change*

Site: Land at the junction of St Edmunds Lane and the Broadway

Ref.No: 41 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Should not Bardfield house site on junction of St Edmunds lane/ the Broadway be included within Settlement Boundary as an approved site for 11 dwellings

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified

Comments: *This site was previously included within the Development Limits reflecting a planning permission 12 dwellings. However the permission has now lapsed and in view of the rural nature and the provision of sufficient housing land elsewhere to meet the Structure Plan requirements it is considered appropriate to exclude the site from the settlement boundary.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Dunmow Park, Braintree Road, Great Dunmow

Ref.No: 202 **Rep.No:** 6

Representor: Duncan, Countryside Strategic Projects **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Dunmow Park should be allocated for residential development or as a reserve site. It can then be used if the windfall targets are not met. The land to the north and east of the proposed new residential area should be allocated for use as a riverside park

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to the way in which the Council has addressed the distribution of the District's Structure Plan housing requirement through its overall strategy. Land at Dunmow Park is considered to be suitable for residential development. It is submitted that the site is more appropriate than sector 3 of Woodlands Park for residential development on sustainability grounds and the plan should be amended to identify this land for residential development. The Local Plan will set out the Council's policies up to 2011. However we are concerned that certain issues need to be considered over a longer timescale. The new Structure Plan will roll forward the housing provisions for Uttlesford to 2016 and there is a very real risk that the Local Plan will be out of date soon after it is adopted.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond TDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The site is approx 8.7ha and could accommodate 260-430 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Dunmow Park which lies in the countryside to the south of Braintree Road is a particularly attractive area of open parkland which forms part of the Chelmer valley. Development in this location would be detrimental to the environmental quality of this area which is an important element in the rural setting of the town. Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient housing to meet Structure Plan requirements. No additional land is required*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adjacent to 71 The Causeway, Great Dunmow

Ref.No: 50 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: McBride, **Agent (if applicable):** Geoffrey Lane

Amendment(s) Sought: Include no 71 the Causeway and buildings to the north within the Great Dunmow settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: To the south of 71 The Causeway lies a substantial housing estate beyond which is established residential development. The area of open land on the southern boundary is allocated for development in the emerging plan and it is understood that this land has planning permission. The objection site is closely encompassed by residential development on all sides. As such it has no direct connection with the open countryside and should not be designated as such. The two listed houses, the converted stable block and the new house to its north equally comprise an urban area. Although the objector does not own them, they should be included within the settlement boundary for the same reasons as the objection site. The site and land to the north is within a Conservation Area. Policies for this and listed buildings provide adequate protection for the built environment of the locality without having to include it within the open countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond TDL, ASLV, Partly within Conservation Area

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Partly within Conservation Area

Comments: *This northern approach to the town is characterised by sporadic development with gardens and other spaces. The objection site also shares this character and it is appropriate that it remains beyond the Settlement Boundary.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at Brick Kiln Farm, St Edmunds Lane, Great Dunmow

Ref.No: 142 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Settlement boundary is redrawn to include Land at Brick Kiln farm, St Edmunds Lane, Gt Dunmow.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Settlement Boundary at Church End excludes an area of 0.9ha located to south of St Edmunds Lane. Land comprised former farm yard, stables and 3 dwellings. Site is closely related to existing services, it would redevelop derelict and unattractive farmbuildings, it is a logical extension to the settlement boundary, it would create a better urban edge without reducing open space. Land can be developed without significant adverse visual affects on landscape. Current boundary is illogical .

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond TDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The current boundary follows the well defined boundaries around the Church End settlement. The site is visually prominent and development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the Chelmer Valley. The site is 0.9 ha and could accommodate 27-45 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Policy H1 makes adequate provision for housing to meet the requirements of the Structure Plan. No additional land is required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land off Ongar Road, Great Dunmow

Ref.No: 118 Rep.No: 4 & 14

Representor: , Bryant Projects **Agent (if applicable):** DLP Consultants Ltd

Amendment(s) Sought: Alter the definition of the settlement boundary for Great Dunmow to include within it land at Ongar Road and Clapton Hall Lane. Add this 3.98 ha site with a capacity of 120 dwellings to the Table within Policy GD4.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Support the principle of S1 and the wording and intentions underlying the policy. In respect of land at Ongar Road, Great Dunmow we object to Policy S1 insofar as it excludes the land from the settlement envelope. The site comprises an open field bounded to the north by Ongar Road and to the east and south by Clapton Hall Lane. In the alternative the land should be identified as an Area of special restraint capable of being brought forward for development in the event that the monitoring of the Plan indicates an expected shortfall of supply. The site is 1000m south of the town centre. Ongar Road is a public transport route and there are provisions for bus stops convenient to the site. All of the site lies within 300m of a bus stop. In addition to Town Centre Facilities and access to extensive and varied areas of existing and committed employment there are also other local facilities within easy walking distance, including a public house.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond TDL, Partly within ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site is an area of elevated agricultural land overlooking Hoblongs Brook. Residential development of this site would extend Great Dunmow into the open countryside and prejudice the maintenance of a green wedge between the town and the new A120. The objection talks about 120 dwellings but at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha it is possible that this site could accommodate up to 200 dwellings. Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient housing land to meet the requirements of the Structure Plan – no additional land is required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site : Land south and west of Great Dunmow

Ref.No: 186 Rep.No: 3

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

Amendment(s) Sought: The boundary for Great Dunmow should be extended to include the representation site at Folly Farm. The boundary should follow the line of the proposed A120.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The site represents a unique opportunity to make a significant contribution to meeting the projected housing land requirements and likely employment growth for the area in the most sustainable manner. Urban extensions are the most suitable option after "brownfield land" for new housing, providing the site is developed in a sustainable manner

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond TDL, Partly ASLV, Part of site is important woodland

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, County Wildlife Site, Part of site is important woodland

Comments: *This is a large site (98ha) and the objectors suggest that it could accommodate some 1,000-1,200 dwellings, along with employment land and other commercial uses together with community and recreational facilities. Residential development on this site at the scale suggested would significantly extend development of the town into the open countryside and prejudice the maintenance of a green wedge between the town and the new A120. The housing strategy set out in policy H1 makes adequate provision for sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirements. There is no need for additional provision to be made.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the south of the A120 and adj to the Flich Industrial Estate

Ref.No: 82 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Landowners **Agent (if applicable):** Whirlidge and Nott

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land within the settlement boundary for residential or other development

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land to the west of the Flich Industrial Estate should be zoned for housing. Site is about 1.75 hectares adjacent to a main road within significant road frontage. The site is presently under utilised. Its location provides an opportunity to allocate residential development close to the existing town centre. This site would be within walking distance of the High Street. It is also close to main roads which would provide easy links to Stansted Airport where there are employment opportunities.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond TDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The road forms a logical and defensible boundary to the TDL. The objection states the advantage of a road frontage but there is no access to the A120 at this point. This site of 1.75 ha could accommodate 50-90 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Policy H1 makes adequate provision for housing to meet the structure plan requirements. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at Woodlands Park

Ref.No: 142 **Rep.No:** 7

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary - it should be drawn further to the north to provide additional land in compensation for the shortfall. Omit reference to master plan for Sectors 1 and 2 in last sentence.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary in relation to sector 3 does not relate to features on the ground. Incorporate access to Sector 3 from the proposed north west by pass approved by the Council under planning permission ref.no 0084/01. The area of Sector 3 has been measured from a topographical survey of the site and allowing provision for a landscape margin to the north west relief road, the retention of landscape buffer/strips to separate Sectors 2 and 3 and land sterilised because of drainage. It is calculated that the net amount of land available for development is over 11 ha. At an overall average density of 30 dph this will accommodate up to 350 dwellings a deficiency of 50 units. Therefore the settlement boundary should be drawn further to the north to provide additional land in compensation for the shortfall.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Within the VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Within Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The settlement boundary should be amended. The access point was approved when the by pass was granted consent and this access point provides a logical boundary for the settlement boundary. The additional land compensates for land previously included within the housing area but now to be maintained as a landscape area.*

Recommendation: *Amend the settlement boundary*

Ref.No: 142 Rep.No: 9

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

Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary should be redrawn

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary shown on the Great Dunow Inset Map is incorrect in relation to the edge of the open space in Sector 1. It should follow the development line on the approved Master Plan for Sectors 1 and 2.

Comments: *Agree*

Recommendation: *Amend the settlement boundary as requested.*

Site: Land north of Ongar Road, Great Dunmow

Ref.No: 94 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , Saxon Developments Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** David Lock Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary for Great Dunmow at Ongar Road should be realigned to run along the north eastern edge of the poor air quality zone along the new A120. The land within this new settlement boundary should be

allocated for residential development as an urban extension to Great Dunmow through an addition to Policy H1(b) and the addition of a further GD policy adapting policy GD5 to the particular circumstances. Depending on the extent of the deficit against the District's Structure Plan housing requirement arising from objections to policies S2, H1, SW2 and SM4/BIR1 the re-alignment of the settlement boundary could also enclose land within the new A120 to the south of Ongar Road. In that event this additional area should be brought within the terms of policies H1 and the further GD policy cited above.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The exclusion from the settlement boundary of land at Ongar Road that will be enclosed by the new A120 is inappropriate. As a consequence of our objections to policies S2, H1 SW2 and SM4/BIR1 this area's allocation for housing will be necessary for the District's Structure Plan housing requirement to be met. The areas close proximity to a range of key existing and proposed employment areas and ready accessibility to the town centre ensures that car-borne travel from development here would be minimised. The new A120 provides a defensible boundary to such development as would a southwesterly extension of the tongue of Olives Wood that forms part of the area's north-western boundary wherein trees lost to development could be replaced through conditions

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond TDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Residential development in this location would prejudice the maintenance of a green wedge between the edge of the town and the new A120. This site of approx 4ha could accommodate 120-200 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. The housing strategy set out in Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirements. There is no need for any additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

GREAT EASTON

Site; Land at Petersfield, The Endway, Great Easton

Ref.No: 39 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Include site within settlement boundary and identify as being suitable for residential development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Site adjacent to Petersfield is excluded from settlement boundary.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *It would be inappropriate to identify an isolated settlement boundary around this single plot. Any proposals for development on the site would be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

GREAT HALLINGBURY

Site: Land north of Bedlars Green

Ref.No: 170 **Rep.No:** 3

Representor: Streeter, Member **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.15 ha) north of Bedlars green, should be included within the village boundary for infill development between existing residential development. The settlement boundary should include the area of the 1995 local plan and extend to the edge of the existing residential development to include infill sites. This area would not extend into the CPZ.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary of Great Hallingbury (Bedlars Green) does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement. The development limits of Great Hallingbury (Bedlars Green) appear to have been restricted in the draft local plan from the current 1995 local plan.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Partly within VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond settlement boundary

Comments: *The settlement boundary has been drawn further back than the previous Development Limit because it was felt that infilling along this approach to the village would be inappropriate. Also the site is within the 57Leq, where noise sensitive development would normally be refused, in accordance with Policy ENV9*

Recommendation: *No change*

GREAT SAMPFORD

Site: Land at Moor End, Great Sampford

Ref.No: 103 **Rep.No:** 1 & 2

Representor: Curtis, **Agent (if applicable):** John Martin & Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Define a Settlement Boundary for Moor End, Great Sampford

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Settlement Boundary excludes Moor End at Great Sampford. The Plan defines boundaries for smaller collections of dwellings elsewhere and which are more remote from the main settlement. Moor End is a compact area of development within the wider landscape. If a boundary were defined, other policies exist to afford protection from inappropriate development but at the same time allow for small scale development to occur on appropriate sites. Policy H2 should set out a clear definition of the type of infill development which would be allowed.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV
Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *No settlement boundary is defined for Moor End because it's character is of well spaced out development with large properties, many of them listed, set within large gardens. Infilling in the Hamlet of Moor End would be detrimental to its character and for this reason it would be inappropriate to define a settlement boundary.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adjacent to Snowdrop Cottage, Great Sampford

Ref.No: 173 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Radbourne, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: An area of land (0.45 ha) on the east of the village, opposite Sadlestone Hatch, should be included within the village boundary for small scale development. The site offers the potential for housing mix and open space.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Great Sampford Village Boundary does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV
Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site is not considered to be an infill plot. Any proposals for genuine infill development will be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan. The site is approx 0.5 ha. This could accommodate 15-25 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. This level of development would be inappropriate in this rural location and contrary to the housing strategy set out in Policy H1.*

Recommendation: *No change*

HADSTOCK

Hadstock Conservation Area

Ref.No: 67 **Rep.No:** 2

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Amendment to the Conservation Area boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The area to the west of Bardsfield was the subject of a planning application for a new house. Although it was refused perhaps an enlargement of the area would discourage future applications. My suggested new

line omits the two dwellings in Sargent's Lane as there is presumably a reason why they were omitted in the first place.

Comments: *The existing Conservation Area boundary was defined in 1975. It would be inappropriate to introduce changes to the Conservation Area to prevent development. The area in question is outside the settlement boundary where there will be strict control over new building in accordance with policy S7.*

Recommendation: *No change*

HATFIELD BROAD OAK

Hatfield Broad Oak Inset Map

Ref.No: 96 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Crook, **Agent (if applicable):** Mark Liell and Sons LLP

Amendment(s) Sought: Removal of the entire ENV designation currently placed on Great Chalks, Bury House and the rear private land, situated within the village of Hatfield Broad Oak

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The property comprises 2 privately owned substandard old detached residences together with formal gardens a large meadow and an orchard which is significant in size and located within the built up envelope. The land to the rear of Great Chalks and Bury House is in a single private ownership and not accessible to the general public. It is surrounded by rear gardens on all four sides. Part of the area is subject to an area TPO. An arborocologists report has been prepared which identifies a large number of poor quality and diseased trees in addition to good quality specimens. A joint review of the trees should be carried out with a view to agreeing on selected tree protection, this should be sufficient to protect the quality trees. Existing vegetation around the perimeter of the land in question provides ample screening to protect the individual visual amenity of the neighbouring private residential properties.

Comments: *Areas of open space make a valuable contribution to the character of a number of villages in the District and development of them would be detrimental to this character. Sometimes it is possible to protect them from inappropriate development by excluding them from the settlement boundary but where the sites are within the built up area the most appropriate way is to designate them as a protected open space. Even though there is no public access to this land it is still important for its environmental value.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land South of Cannons Lane

Ref.No: 179 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Broad, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (2.2 ha) south of Cannons Lane should be included within the village boundary for small scale development. The site offers the potential for housing mix and open space.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary of Hatfield Broad Oak does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The edge of the settlement is well defined by the rear boundaries of the gardens along Cannons Lane. This site area is 2.2 ha and could accommodate 60–100 dwellings if the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare were to be applied. This scale of development represents major encroachment into the Countryside. The strategy set out in H1 makes provision for sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. No additional land is required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

HATFIELD HEATH

Site: Land south of Chelmsford Road, including Mandel and Katalba, Hatfield Heath

Ref.No: 112 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Maryon, Eeles, Benzin & Warrel, **Agent (if applicable):** John Daldry Partnership

Amendment(s) Sought: MGM Boundary should be redrawn to exclude the properties of Mandel and Katalba and the land to the west. (Note amendments to settlement boundary will be consequential)

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Proposed amendment to boundary will not cause merging of Bishop's Stortford and Stansted and current boundary does not follow recognisable features on the ground. Majority of site is already residential curtilage and is not a 'greenfield site'. Development or redevelopment as a site for a few new homes on the edge of a small village (with good services) would be consistent with sequential approach set out in Councils 'Your community, Your Voice, Use it!'. With the need for a logical MGB boundary and the obligation to choose already developed land the boundary should be redrawn to exclude the properties of Mandel and Katalba and the land to the west.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *Development here, would encroach into open countryside and established Green Belt. The total extent of the objection site is 2.3 ha which could result in a development of 78-115 new dwellings if the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha were to be applied. This would be contrary to the housing strategy set out in Policy H1 which makes provision for sufficient housing to meet the structure plan requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at Stortford Road

Ref.No: 172 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Roberts, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (1.2 ha) on the south west side of Stortford Road, should be included within the village boundary as small scale infill and excluded from the MGB.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The boundary of Hatfield Heath does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *This is a long narrow site running along the north western approach to the village. Advice in PPG2 states that Green Belt should enjoy a strong degree of permanence and that it's boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Sufficient land has been allocated to meet the Structure Plan requirement and there is no need for additional land. This is not a genuine infill plot, it is not a small gap within a small group of houses or a minor extension to a group. This type of development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land south of Blaisdon Lodge, and Land north west of Blaisdon Lodge south of the B183, Hatfield Heath

Ref.No: 179 **Rep.No:** 3 - Land south of Blaisdon Lodge

Ref.No: 179 **Rep.No:** 2 – Land north west of Blaisdon Lodge

Representor: Broad, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.9 ha) south of the B183, south of Blaisdon Lodge, should be included within the village boundary as small scale infill and excluded from the MGB.

The area of land (0.19 ha) south of B183 adjacent Laurels should be included within the village boundary and excluded from the MGB.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary of Hatfield Heath does not take into account small redevelopment plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *Both these sites are within established Metropolitan Green Belt. Advice in PPG2 is that Green Belt should enjoy a strong degree of permanence and that its boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Sufficient land has been allocated to meet the Structure Plan requirement and there is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at St George's Cottages, Ardley End, Hatfield Heath

Ref.No: 171 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Scantlebury, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.15) ha at St Georges Cottages, Ardley End, should be included within the village boundary as infill development and excluded from the MGB.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The boundary of Hatfield Heath does not take into account small backland infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *Although this is a relatively small site Government advice is that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. There is no exceptional need which would justify and amendment to the boundary in this case.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land north of Sawbridgeworth Road, Hatfield Heath

Ref.No: 172 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Robarts, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (4.2 ha), north of Sawbridgeworth Road, should be included within the village boundary as small scale development and excluded from the MGB. The site offers the potential for housing mix and open space.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Boundary of Hatfield Heath does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *This is a relatively large site in open countryside which is established Metropolitan Green Belt. At the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha this site could accommodate up to 210 dwellings. This clearly does not constitute infill development. There is no justification in terms of housing need to amend the Green Belt boundary in this location.*

Recommendation: *No change*

HEMPSTEAD

Site: Land south of Longcroft, west of High Street, Hempstead

Ref.No: 199 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Haylock, **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy H1 – (c) should be amended to take account of smaller settlements such as Hempstead which do have an opportunity to provide limited housing growth. Include land adj to Longcrofts within the settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Re-use of existing buildings and previously developed land outside the urban areas is not a sustainable way of dealing with housing allocations. There are more suitable locations for development rather than sporadic development throughout the rural area. Land adjacent to Longcroft is a suitable location for future housing growth within the settlement of Hempstead and would amount to village infill. This allocation would contribute to the range of new housing required in the District in a location which could assist in supporting the rural community as a whole.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Development on this site would be a major extension of built development into the countryside beyond the settlement boundary. The site is 1.6 ha and could accommodate 48 to 80 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Policy H1 allocates sufficient land to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the North West of Harvey Way, Hempstead

Ref.No: 199 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Haylock, **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land to the north of Harvey Way within the Settlement boundary and allocate for housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Do not consider that the re-use of existing buildings and previously developed land on a sporadic basis will be the best way to bring forward housing development as part of the local plan to 2011. Therefore suggest the additional growth in locations such as Hempstead which can sustain

additional housing as part of the villages vitality and viability. The site to the north of Harvey Way is an appropriate location for additional housing. It is highly appropriate to allocate land such as this in settlements including Hempstead as they have the ability to provide basic facilities. The site is served by public transport. It is a more appropriate location for housing growth rather than sporadic development in the open countryside through conversion.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Development on this site would be a major extension of built development into the countryside beyond the settlement boundary. The site is 0.8ha and could accommodate 24 to 40 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Policy H1 allocates sufficient land to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

HENHAM

Site: Land west of Lodge Cottage, Chickney Road, Henham

Ref.No: 75 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Smith and Smith, **Agent (if applicable):** PJ Rayner and Co

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary to include land at Chickney Road Henham and to include site as allocation for housing

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The extension of the settlement boundary will provide a housing scheme of medium density development to allow private housing to be available in the village to help meet the needs of the area for the next 10 years. The development adjoins the settlement boundary and the substantial built up part of the residential approach to Henham. The development can be carried out without any major detrimental affect on the surrounding landscape and countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The current settlement boundary is drawn along the rear boundaries of the last group of houses in Chickney Road. To extend the boundary further would result in further development along this approach to the village and out into the countryside. The inclusion of this 0.6ha site could result in 20-33 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare and would result in an extension of the built form to the detriment of the rural character of this approach to the village. Sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement is made in policy H1 – additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Old Mead Road, Elsenham

Ref.No: 128 Rep.No: 1

Representor: McDonald, **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: That some consideration should be given to the outskirts of village sites such as this site in Old Mead Lane. It is surrounded by residential property. A small settlement on the southern outskirts of Henham village which could easily accommodate a number of houses without having any serious impact on the local environment.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Some consideration should be given to providing further housing on land at Old Mead Lane. The site has frontage to Old Mead Lane which could provide safe access for a small number of quality residential units lying in close proximity to Elsenham Station and the facilities of both Henham and Elsenham

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comment: *This site is in a rural location where residential development would be contrary to the housing strategy set out in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land south and east of Vernon's Close, Henham

Ref.No: 141 Rep.No: 3 & 6

Representor: Penn, Persimmon Homes (Essex) Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** RPS Chapman Warren

Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary for Henham should be amended to identify land off Vernon's Close as a housing site. Equally, the Inset Map should be amended to identify land for recreational use at the southern boundary of the Primary school, such land being made available in conjunction with the proposed housing development off Vernon's Close.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Inset Map identifies land off Vernon's Close as beyond settlement boundary. Boundary should be amended to include site as a housing allocation. An area of land to the south of the Primary School will be made available for the significant enhancement of playing field facilities. Part of the proposed housing area is presently leased to ECC and used as part of the school curtilage. The lease expires August 2009. Appropriate recreation facilities will be gifted to school in perpetuity should land at the southern boundary of the school be laid out for playing field use in conjunction with a housing development off Vernons Close. The recreational land will be larger than the site presently leased.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL,

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Playing fields are an appropriate use of land beyond the settlement boundaries and extensions to existing facilities will be permitted in accordance with policy LC3. The settlement boundary is well defined in this location by the rear boundaries of the properties in Vernon Close. Residential development in this location would be detrimental to the character of the rural area beyond the settlement boundary. The site is approx 1 ha and could accommodate 30-50 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Policy H1 makes sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. No additional land is required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land south of Gernel, Woodend Green, Henham

Ref.No: 174 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Mascaux, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: This areas of land (0.13 ha) between Gernel and Badgers Cottage, Woodend Green, should be included within the village boundary for infill development between existing residential development. The development limit should include the area shown in the 1995 Local Plan and be extended to include this proposed site as infill.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Village boundary does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement. The development limits of Henham appear to have been severely restricted in the Draft Local Plan. This site was originally on the edge of the development limit and the edge of the conservation area.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site is remote from the settlement boundary as defined in the Deposit Plan. It would be inappropriate to include the site within its own settlement boundary to facilitate development alternatively a large extension would be required which would result in consolidation of the sporadic development at Woodend Green to the detriment of the character of this part of the settlement. Any proposals for infill development on this site could be considered in relation to policy S7 and other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land between Hall Close and Carters Lane, Henham

Ref.No: 196 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , Diocese of Chelmsford **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Land between Hall Close and Carters Lane should be included within the settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: It is considered that the extension to existing urban areas such as Henham is preferable to new sporadic development taking place on land within the open countryside. This leads to less sustainable development and increases the need for private motorcar usage. There have been some changes to the Henham settlement boundary, reducing the housing development within the settlement and providing separate village envelopes to the north and south of the village. This is not appropriate, especially in the light of H1 - c) which states that there is an opportunity for infill in some of the villages. Access from Hall Road would be a suitable alternative into the site. The proposal of 575 dwgs for the re-use of redundant farm buildings and rural sites is too high. It would be far more sustainable to allow small scale housing growth in one or more suitable smaller settlements which can encourage the re-use of existing facilities and links to good public transport corridors e.g. Henham.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site of approximately 3.8 ha could accommodate 114-190 new dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Sufficient land is allocated in Policy H1 to meet structure plan requirements and additional land is not required. Development on this site represents a major intrusion into the open countryside.*

Recommendation: *No change*

HIGH EASTER

Site: Land at High Easterbury, High Easter

Ref.No: 192 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Luckin **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: The site should be included within the settlement boundary and designated in Part (c) of housing policy H1.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land at High Easterbury lies beyond the boundary of the village of High Easter. There are no scheduled monuments or listed structures on the site. The site is defined as garden land/orchard and is adjoined by existing residential properties. The site is currently underused. Government guidance in PPG3 continually emphasises the need to maximise the use of under used land and we would suggest that this is a suitable location for further expansion in the village. High Easter does not directly provide a high range of local services but it is located within easy reach of a principal bus route which offers a local service serving the larger settlements in the District. The site would contribute to the range of new housing required in the District in a location which would assist in supporting the rural community as a whole. Development would respect the character of the village enhancing the gradual transition within well spaced out properties relating to the open countryside adjoining.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site is 0.05ha and could accommodate 1 or 2 dwellings. Development in this location would be inappropriate because it would extend the built up area of the village along this approach.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Chapel Field House, North of the Street, High Easter

Ref.No: 90 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Drown, **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Extension of the defined settlement boundary to include land at Chapel Field House and allocate for housing development

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The principle of defining settlement boundaries within a village is supported but reviews to these boundaries should be considered at each local plan to enable new sites to be brought forward for development. Land adjoining Chapel Field House, High Easter to the side and the rear is suitable for residential development. The site should be seen as an opportunity to provide a small group of housing units in the heart of the village close to village facilities. A sensible, logical and defensible amendment to the development limits would be to follow the rear boundary line of the substantial hedge to the north of the sites which follows the alignment of the neighbouring properties rear boundaries including the Berkely Homes development. The proposed change to the settlement boundary will incorporate the entire grounds and outbuildings of Chapel Field House and facilitate the opportunity for residential development on previously developed land.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, mostly within CA

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond settlement boundary, mostly within CA

Comments: *This site is 0.8 ha and could accommodate 24-40 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. This scale of development in this attractive rural location on the edge of the village would be entirely inappropriate. Adequate land has been identified elsewhere to meet the Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

HIGH RODING

Site: Land at the Mushroom Farm, High Roding

Ref.No: 137 Rep.No: 6

Representor: Coxeter, **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend High Roding Inset Map to include land at the old Mushroom Farm, High Roding

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The boundary shown on the inset map reflects the arbitrary boundary drawn following the previous local plan inspector's recommendations. Since that time circumstances and policy regarding development have altered. This objectors site is plainly substantially previously developed on an intensive basis due to its former use. The most intensively developed part of the site is excluded from the village limit. The site should be used more effectively and efficiently as an amendment to the previously endorsed principle of redevelopment.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Land adjacent to this site was included within the Development Limits in the Adopted Plan in recognition of the nature of the site and its potential to provide a limited amount of new housing. A site specific policy limited the amount of new housing to 4 dwellings. The current representation seeks the inclusion of the remainder of the redundant buildings within the settlement boundary with the land between the extension and the settlement boundary shown for tree planting with the retention of the pond. The policy context has changed since the previous District Plan was adopted. It would be inappropriate in the light of current Government advice to limit development on the site to four dwellings and this is reflected by the deletion of the policy. With the suggested extension the total area of the site would be 1.10 ha. And could accommodate 33-55 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. This level of development would be inappropriate in Leaden Roding which has few facilities. Also the access to the site would be unsuitable to serve this level of development.*

Recommendation: *No change*

LANGLEY UPPER GREEN

Settlement Boundaries

Ref.No: 140 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Define a Settlement Boundary for Langley Upper Green.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Encouraged that Policy S7 applies to Langley Upper Green but have to be alert to applications for back land development. By defining a Settlement Boundary for the settlement this would prohibit 'backfill', keeping vistas open and ensuring housing will not spread, ad hoc, on to designated agricultural or garden land.

Comments: *The fact that there is no settlement boundary for Langley Upper Green means that there will be strict control on any new development in accordance with Policy S7. This will include proposals for backland and infill development*

Recommendation: *No change*

LEADEN RODING

Site: (i) Land to the North and East of Leaden Roding, (ii) Land to the south of Leaden Roding

Ref.No: 85 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , **Agent (if applicable):** Whirlledge and Nott

Amendment(s) Sought: Consider that this land should be designated as suitable for housing development

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Two sites totalling 67 acres lie north and south of the village with significant road frontage. Although part of the land is currently zoned Green Belt, its location provides an opportunity to allocate residential development close to existing houses within reasonable access to Chelmsford, Harlow, Bishop's Stortford with retail and amenity facilities and employment opportunities, including Stansted Airport; and therefore meets sustainability objectives.

Notation in Adopted Plan: (i) Beyond VDL (ii) Beyond VDL, MGB
Notation in Deposit Plan: (i) Beyond SB (ii) Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *Both these large sites would mean extensive encroachment into the open countryside. The combined sites of 27 hectares could result in new development 800-1350 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Leaden Roding does have some limited facilities but development on this scale in this small village would be totally contrary to Government advice and the housing strategy set out in the Deposit Plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the South West of Leaden Roding

Ref.No: 83 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , Landowners **Agent (if applicable):** Whirledge and Nott

Amendment(s) Sought: Land west of the crossroads should be included in Settlement Boundary and taken out of Metropolitan Green Belt

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Site extends to about 8 acres. The site would provide an opportunity to infill between properties. The site is adjacent to a main road with significant road frontage and has the benefit of good access to communication and services. Development of the site would assist in the continuation and sustainability of existing community services such as the primary school, shop and village hall. There are also a number of employment sites locally. The land is classified as Grade 3 and does not lie in an area at risk of erosion or flooding. Although the land is zoned as Green Belt its location provides an opportunity to allocate residential development close to existing houses within reasonable access to Chelmsford, Harlow, Bishops Stortford with retail and amenity facilities and employment opportunities.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *As the sites above - this site would also mean extensive encroachment into the countryside. Development on this site could result in 240-400 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Development of this scale in the small village would be totally contrary to Government advice, Green Belt Policy and the housing strategy set out in the Deposit Plan. Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement – no additional land is required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

LINDELL

Site: Land to the west of The Slades, Lindsell

Ref.No: 145 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Priors Hall Limited **Agent (if applicable):** PJ Rayner and Co

Amendment(s) Sought: We proposed the reinstatement of the development limits/settlement boundary for Lindsell in the District Plan and to be extended to include land to the west of the Slades to allow for minor additional housing provision.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: There will be no further infilling in villages which previously had Development Limits but which do not have them in the Deposit Plan, due to the wording of the restrictive policy S7 H2 and the loss of Policy H6. No development will be allowed now in these villages without notation and we recommend that the development limits be left as the adopted plan or preferably altered and extended as described below to allow these village settlements to thrive. Planning should be about providing people with evolving housing choice in the communities and settlements in which they live. The site is low grade agricultural land which is prone to hold surface water and is unviable to tend. The site could accommodate 2 small dwellings, is infilling between and opposite existing housing and is part of the built street scene. Hedge and tree planting along the west boundary would further ensure that the site proposed would intergrate into the village scene without detrimental effect on the countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Lindsell is characterised by sporadic development. The Development Limit in the Adopted Plan was drawn around a small part of the settlement within which development opportunities have now been realised. It was therefore considered appropriate to remove the settlement boundary. Proposals for development will be considered in relation to policy S7 and other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

LITTLE DUNMOW

Settlement Boundary

Ref.No: 151 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Thomas, Little Dunmow Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Little Dunmow should be included on the list of settlements at H2 for which a settlement boundary is defined and that the settlement boundary be identical to the previous village development limit.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Little Dunmow has been omitted from the list of settlements for which a settlement boundary is defined, thus removing a visible limit on where infilling with new houses would be permitted. Any infilling proposals would be considered within the context of policy S7. The Parish Council believes that withdrawing the settlement boundary from Little Dunmow removes positive protection from the village. Even if that is not the case it is certainly how it would be perceived by village residents. Policy S7 seems commendable but control seems much less certain than within settlement boundaries.

Comments: *The Village Development Limit for Little Dunmow was removed because there was not considered to be any further opportunities for infill development within the limit. The absence of a settlement boundary means that all development proposals will be considered in relation to Policy S7 where there will be strict control on new building.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adjoining the Ivy House

Ref.No: 187 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Metson, **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Include the site within the settlement boundary and identify site for housing development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land adjoining Ivy House is beyond Settlement Boundary. Cannot support part (c) of the policy which will lead to sporadic development in the open countryside. Use of redundant farm buildings will not create sustainable patterns of development. It is considered that additions to smaller settlements such as Little Dunmow would provide a sustainable opportunity growth albeit on a small scale. Proposal would provide a small scale housing development suitable to Little Dunmow. It would provide a range of housing required and assist in supporting the rural community.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This is an area of agricultural land forming part of a larger field. There is no defensible boundary to the proposed site which extends into the village making an important contribution to the rural character of Little Dunmow. The site is 0.8 ha and could accommodate 24 to 40 dwellings at the Government's density range of between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare. Development on this scale in this village with few facilities would be contrary to the housing strategy set out in*

Policy H1 which makes sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement – no additional housing land is required.

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land opposite the Flitch of Bacon, The Street, Little Dunmow

Ref.No: 151 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Thomas, Little Dunmow Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: That the conservation area be extended to include the triangle of land opposite the Flitch of Bacon public house.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The current conservation area does not include the triangle of land opposite the Flitch of Bacon Public House. Since the village by pass was built this area together with the pond has become visually important open space within the village.

Ref.No: 113 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Evens, Persimmon Strategic Land **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend settlement boundary to include land opposite Flitch of Bacon PH and identify for residential development and open space and removal of countryside notation from land within that settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to under provision of land to meet approved Structure Plan requirements. Even assuming implementation of all proposals there is a shortfall against housing requirement. However, likely that at least some of the allocations may not come forward or be fully implemented. Pending better explanation of component H1(a), object to assumed contribution from this source and absence of reserve housing land. Consider land at Little Dunmow should be identified to assist in making good shortfall. Development could bring environmental benefits to settlement and opportunity for affordable housing to meet local needs.

Ref.No: 91 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Ridley, TD Ridley and Sons Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Reinstate the defined settlement boundary of Little Dunmow and increase the settlement boundary to include land adjacent to the Flitch of Bacon Public House and allocate the site for residential development

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: There does not appear to be any justification for the removal of Little Dunmow's settlement boundary. The boundary of the settlement is long established and there are no reasons for it to be removed. Other settlements in the plan which are the same size as Little Dunmow have retained their development boundaries. In addition the boundary should be extended to include the land adjacent to the Flitch of Bacon Public House. This would act to consolidate the settlement and provide an opportunity for residential development in the centre of the village. The site should be seen as an opportunity to provide a small

group of housing units in the heart of the village. In accordance with Government advice the release of this site would ensure that land is available within existing villages to enable local requirements to be met. A sensible, logical and defensible amendment to the development limits would be to follow the boundary line shown on the attached plan.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Open spaces are important elements in the character of this small Conservation Area village and this open space enhances the appearance of the village. This site of 0.77ha could accommodate 23-39 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Sufficient housing land is allocated in Policy H1 to meet the Structure Plan requirements. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adjacent to Priory Place, Little Dunmow

Ref.No: 187 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Metson, **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land adjacent to Priory Place within Settlement Boundary and allocate for housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Consider that there are more suitable locations for development rather than sporadic development throughout the rural parts of the district reusing existing farm buildings which are not linked to sustainable public transport corridors or access to employment and community facilities. Policy H1(c) should be amended to take account of smaller settlements such as Little Dunmow which do have an opportunity to provide limited housing growth but in a more sustainable manner. Land adjoining Priory Place would be a suitable location for future housing. It would provide a range of housing required and assist in supporting the rural community.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This is an important open space on the edge of the conservation area which makes an important contribution to the character of the village. This site is 0.5ha and could accommodate 15 to 25 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Policy H1 makes sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the north east of St Mary's Church, Little Dunmow

Ref.No: 197 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Metson, **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Concerned that the LPA have removed the settlement boundary and suggest that it should be re-instated. Consider allocating the site for housing development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Suggest additional growth in locations such as the settlement of Little Dunmow which can sustain additional housing as part of the villages make up. Land in the centre of Little Dunmow abutting Brook Street is an appropriate location for additional housing which can relate to the Conservation Area and potential open space adjoining. It is appropriate to allocate land such as this in settlements including Little Dunmow as they have the ability to assist basic facilities within the village. The site is served by public transport therefore reducing reliance on the private motor car. This is a more appropriate location for housing growth rather than sporadic development in the open countryside which would amount from policy H1(c) through the conversion of rural buildings and previously used land which will not generally be located on the edge of existing settlements.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, CA

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, CA

Comments: *This is an important open space within the conservation area which makes an important contribution to the character of the village. This site is 0.85ha and could accommodate 25 to 42 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Policy H1 makes sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

LITTLE EASTON (DUCK ST)

Site: Land adjacent to The Stag, Public House, Duck Street, Little Easton

Ref.No: 88 **Rep.No:** 1 & 2

Representor: Ridley, TD Ridley and Sons Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Extend the settlement boundary to include land adjacent to The 'Stag' Public House.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Settlement boundary should be amended to include land adjacent to The Stag Public House. Inclusion of the site would act to consolidate the village & in accordance with Government advice the release of this site would help to ensure that sufficient land is available within existing village to enable local requirements to be met. The visual character and appearance of the village would not be prejudiced by appropriate housing, of sympathetic and vernacular design in accordance with the Essex Design Guide. A modest scale development would provide visual interest and a mix and variety of housing to meet local needs and requirements. Site relates well to existing pattern of development;

there are adequate local facilities to accommodate additional housing; and there are no overriding planning infrastructure constraints.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This proposal represents a major extension into an area of attractive open countryside beyond the village. This site is 3.5 ha and could accommodate 105 to 175 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. This scale of development in this rural village with limited facilities would be totally contrary to Government advice and the housing strategy set out in this plan. Policy H1 makes sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adjacent to The Old Stag, Duck Street, Little Easton

Ref.No: 132 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , Trustees of the James Shand Will Trust **Agent (if applicable):**
Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement limits to include land at the Old Stag

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land at the Old Stag, Little Easton should be included within the settlement boundary since there are houses on the opposite side of the road and further to the east. There are no other opportunities to provide housing within Little Easton/Duck Street and further opportunities should be provided. This site could provide further housing within the settlement boundary. In general no thought has been given to future expansion of Little Easton - an entirely artificial situation since the village has grown over the last few hundred years on a very gradual basis and this should be allowed to continue within reason. This particular site and indeed land to the north east could easily provide for the future needs of the village

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The same considerations as above also apply to this smaller site of 0.4ha. The approach to the village between the stables and the Old Stag is open and rural in character and development would be detrimental to this.*

Recommendation: *No change*

LITTLE HALLINGBURY

Site: Land north of Wrights Green, Little Hallingbury

Ref.No: 167 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Padfield, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.9 ha) north of Wrights Green , Little Hallingbury (rear of Monks Acres and Pipers) should be included within the village boundary as small scale infill and excluded from the MGB.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The boundary of Little Hallingbury does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *This is not a genuine infill plot. Government advice is that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land East of Wrights Green, Little Hallingbury

Ref.No: 170 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Streeter, Member **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.51 ha) east of Wrights Green, adjacent the M11, should be included within the village boundary as infill development and excluded from the MGB

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The boundary of little Hallingbury does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB, Poor Air Quality Zone

Comments: *The site is within the poor air quality zone where, in accordance with ENV12 residential development would be inappropriate. Development would be contrary to Government advice on development in Green Belt as set out in PPG2*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the South West of Wrights Green

Ref.No: 170 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Streeter, Member **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (3.75 ha) south of Wrights Green, should be included within the village boundary as small scale development and excluded from the MGB. The site offers the potential for a housing mix and open space.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Boundary of Little Hallingbury does not take into account small infill plots available in the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This is not a genuine infill plot. Government advice is that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. This large site could accommodate 112-187 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land south of Green Corners, George Green, Little Hallingbury

Ref.No: 167 **Rep.No:** 3

Representor: Padfield, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: Area of land (1.0 Ha) east of George Green should be included within the village boundary as small scale infill and excluded from the MGB. This area of land is a natural infill between developments as shown on the proposals plans.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The boundary of Little Hallingbury does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *This is not a genuine infill plot. Government advice is that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement. There is no need for additional land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land between Wychwood and Kings Crest, on the A160, Little Hallingbury

Ref.No: 167 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Padfield, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: Area of Land (0.8 ha) on the A160 between Wychwod and Kings Crest, which is an area of scrub should be included within the village boundary as infill and excluded from the MGB. This area of land is a natural infill between developments as shown on the proposal plans.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The boundary of Little Hallingbury does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement and the MGB

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB

Comments: *This site is an important gap between the two parts of the village. Development in this location would be inappropriate.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Mapping Error - Land adjacent to Cartref, Dell Lane, Little Hallingbury

Where possible in drawing up the settlement boundaries they have been linked to features on the ground. Officers are recommending a change to the settlement boundary in this location. The line is currently drawn to the north of the track adjacent to Cartref – there is no logical reason why this should be so. It would be more appropriate if the line were to follow the garden boundary of Cartref and an amendment to this effect is proposed.

MANUDEN

Inset Map Heading

Ref.No: 213 Rep.No: 28

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Correct the map heading from Maunden to Manuden

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The heading for the Map of Manuden has been mis-spelt

Comments: *Agree*

Recommendation: *Amend as requested*

NEWPORT

Site: The Carnation Nurseries, Cambridge Road, Newport

Ref.No: 68 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Jennings, New Chelmsford Estates Ltd **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary on the north eastern boundary of Newport to include the nurseries

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to the settlement boundary line being drawn without due regard to adjacent land which has previously been developed. The nurseries are outdated and partially redundant.

Ref.No: 79 Rep.No: 1 & 2

Representor: Vidal & Fraguera, **Agent (if applicable):** Roger Lynn Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the Settlement boundary to include the site.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Site to the rear of Carnation Nurseries is excluded from the Settlement Boundary. Northern half frontage already developed for housing and southern half currently being built up with housing. This leaves land to the rear which is currently glasshouses. Site is ideal for residential being a brownfield site. The settlement boundary would not have to be extended along the road frontage. There are adequate shopping, schooling, amenity and transport facilities in Newport to cope with development.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site falls entirely within the floodplain residential development in this location would be contrary to policy GEN3. Development in this location is not essential as sufficient land is allocated elsewhere in the plan to meet the structure plan requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adjoining the Potteries, Newport

Ref.No: 133 Rep.No: 1

Representor: McNaughton, **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land at the Potteries within the Settlement Boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Our clients objects to the proposals in the draft plan since the development of the area of Newport has not been allowed to expand to provide more housing. While some of the areas have been subject to flooding in the past there is no reason why the ground levels should not be raised in that area to ensure that houses were not affected. The area is never likely to be used for agricultural purposes as it is not large enough. There is a possible access from Station Road and there is also a possibility of access from London Road, well within the 30 mph limit. To the north east the railway line provides a natural boundary.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site falls entirely within the floodplain residential development in this location would be contrary to policy GEN3. Development in this location is not essential as sufficient land is allocated elsewhere in the plan to meet the structure plan requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land west of School Lane, Newport

Ref.No: 177 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Hill, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (2.5 ha) between Wicken Road and Wicken Water, should be included within the village boundary for small scale development. The site offers the potential for housing mix and open space.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary of Newport does not take into account small plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site represents a major extension of the village into open countryside. . The site is 2.5 ha and could accommodate 75-125 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. There is no need for Additional land for housing since Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient land to meet the Structure Plan requirements*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Wydhams Croft, Whiteditch Lane, Newport

Ref.No: 134 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Hammali, **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land at Wydhams Croft, Whiteditch Lane, within the Settlement Boundary

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The main objection is the lack of further residential building opportunities within Newport village which has numerous facilities including a mainline station, but there appears no future expansion of the village. Lack of controlled expansion is somewhat artificial as most villages have been allowed to expand slowly for the last 600 years. The site owned by clients extending to approx 7.5 acres has been spoilt considerably by the new sports pavilion and floodlighting which has changed the environment from a rural situation into something of a more urban character. It is believed that the site could easily be developed with an improvement to Whiteditch Lane for the residents to the north west particularly if properties adjoining and including the council depot were to be developed at the same time. To one side of the site there is an existing glass house

operation and it is believed this site could contribute a further residential sector to the village.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site represents a major extension into open countryside beyond the settlement boundary. The site is 3 ha and could accommodate 90 - 150 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. There is no need for Additional land for housing since Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient land to meet the Structure Plan requirements*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land West of Braeside, London Road, Newport

Ref.No: 127 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , Exors of Barnard Deceased **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Land adjacent to Braeside, London Road should be included within the settlement boundary

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Notation in Adopted Plan:

The village settlement boundary should be moved in a westerly direction to the west of the property known as Braeside and along the rear gardens of properties fronting London Road. The area concerned could easily accommodate one dwelling sharing the access onto London Road currently used by three existing dwellings.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The settlement boundary drawn in the deposit plan follows a logical boundary on the ground. In order to include this site the boundary would need to extend to include all the curtilage of Braeside. This could then set a precedent for including all the rear gardens along London Road which would be inappropriate.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Bury Water Nursery, Bury Water Lane, Newport

Ref.No: 125 **Rep.No:** 3

Representor: Lipinski, Cala Homes (South) Ltd **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: policy H1 should be amended to include smaller allocated sites in other larger settlements such as Newport and in particular the Burywater Nursery.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: H1 Does not take into account the potential contribution that development at Burywater Nursery would make to the district housing requirement. Burywater Nursey is a site of approx 2.2 ha and it can

accommodate some 60 dwellings. The site is available for development and can provide the dwellings within the plan period. CALA homes objects to the over reliance on the large releases as identified in H1 as it does not take into account the possibility that these sites will not be completed within the Plan Period. The development of large sites requires long lead in times. No provision has been made to take account of any shortfall in the housing provision during the plan period. A residential development at the nursery would not harm the character of the village or the countryside as it would still be contained within the existing linear pattern of development within the village. Nor will it harm the amenities of neighbours.

Ref.No: 116 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Smith, Essex County Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Re-alignment of the settlement boundary to include the depot and neighbouring properties similarly excluded within the settlement of Newport

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The above depot in Essex Council ownership is let to the County's highways maintenance contractors and comprises a 0.46ha yard with a number of industrial storage buildings situated on the northern fringe of Newport. The depot is situated within a primarily residential areas with residential properties adjoining the depot boundaries with the exception of the southwestern boundary which adjoins the open countryside. The settlement boundary line is shown on the inset map as running along the southside of Bury Water Land and therefore excludes properties developed fronting the north side of Bury Water Lane which is considered anomalous as these properties and their immediate curtilages are a contiguous part of the developed area of Newport. Arbitrary exclusion of the depot and neighbouring properties from the settlement boundary may prejudice future operation of the site which is properly part of the urban area but will be restricted by planning policies designed to protect the countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The Carla Homes site is 2ha The county council depot site is approx 0.5 ha but the exact site area was not shown. Together they could accommodate 75 - 125 dwellings at the Governments density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. There is no need to allocate additional land for housing since Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient land to meet the Structure Plan requirements*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land west of London Road and South of Frambury Lane, Newport

Ref.No: 120 Rep.No: 8

Representor: , Laing Strategic Land Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Sellwood Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend Settlement Boundary at Newport to include land adjacent to London Road

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village limits of Newport should be extended to incorporate land to the east of Newport County Primary School shown on Plan RMS1. This land should also be allocated for housing.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Development of this site would result in the loss of a large area of countryside on the edge of the village. The site is prominent from the motorway. . The site is 5.3ha and could accommodate 159-265 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. There is no need to provide additional land for housing since Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient land to meet the Structure Plan requirements*

Recommendation: No change

OAKWOOD PARK (FELSTED & LITTLE DUNMOW)

Paras 14.1, 14.2

Ref.No: 205 Rep.No: 5

Representor: , Enodis Property Developments **Agent (if applicable):** GL Hearn Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend final sentence para 14.1 to 'The approved Masterplan defines sites with a total net area of 20 ha for 650 dwellings taking into account the character of the site its setting and the need for a 350m cordon sanitaire from the Felsted sewage treatmentworks'. Replace Para 14.2 with 'This plan provides the number of dwellings to be increased from 650 to 820. The revised Masterplan should respect the principles established in approved Masterplan.' Amend '650' to '820' in Local Policy 1.Reinstate Inset as per adopted District Plan 1995. If allocation remains at 650 amend para 14.1 and Inset Map as described above, no change to 14.2., Delete and replace Local Policy 1 as set out in full in representation.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The plan fails to take into account the ability to improve the Felsted Sewage Treatment works, thereby significantly reducing the need for a cordon sanitaire in comparison with the current adopted Local Plan. This significant change should be reflected in the revisions to the Local Plan

Comments: The factors relevant to this proposal are being fully explored at a local inquiry, which is still in progress. The Council's objections are as set out in its evidence to the inquiry

Recommendations: No change

OAKWOOD PARK LOCAL POLICY 1

Deposit Policy

The Oakwood Park site, formerly the Felsted Sugar Beet Works, defined on the Inset Map, is proposed for comprehensive residential and associated development of 650 dwellings.

The following criteria must be met:

- a) The development provides for a mixed and balanced community;**
- b) It provides for a local centre incorporating community facilities, suitable shopping, and a primary school, satisfactory open space and sport and recreation facilities.**
- c) It provides for substantial landscaping both within and beyond the development boundaries to complement the layout and arrangement of buildings and to create a broad landscaped swathe beside the River Chelmer and Stebbing Brook.**
- d) The development is designed to mitigate adverse effects upon existing residential and community interests and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide or contribute towards wider and longer term planning benefits reasonably associated with the alleviation of any such impact.**

Development will need to be implemented in accordance with the Master Plan approved by the Council. Implementation of the Master Plan proposals will be regulated by legal agreement in association with the grant of planning permissions.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 201 Rep.No: 8

Representor: , Countryside Properties PLC **Agent (if applicable):** Strategic Land and Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: None the policy is supported

Although Oakwood Park is in an isolated position in the open countryside it includes an element of previously developed land and this was considered by the Local Plan Inspector in 1994 to justify development on this scale. A larger development proposed by the developers of the site, was rejected because of its greater impact on the character of the countryside, the nearby rural settlements and the road network. We support the retention of the original site boundaries and the capacity figure of 650 dwellings on this site.

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 46

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete Policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Representations to Policy H1 - Housing Development - have suggested that the site should be a commitment rather than an allocation

Comments: *The development is phased and not all phases have full planning permission. The policy is therefore still necessary to guide development.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 11

Representor: Bryant Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Vincent and Gorbing

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This allocation is essentially the same allocation as that identified in the current adopted local plan for 650 dwellings for post 8mppa Stansted Airport related housing. The policy should be amended to relate the site to airport related growth. Notwithstanding these comments we have doubts as to whether the suggested number of dwellings can be provided within the plan period.

Comments: *In the adopted plan development on this site was controlled in relation to growth of passenger throughput at the airport. This control is now considered to be artificial. All of the new housing to be provided is to meet the housing requirements set out in the Structure Plan which makes no distinction between “airport related” and other housing requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 207 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Wilkinson, Uttlesford Primary Care Trust (PCT) **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Reference in the 'criteria to be met' to the potential for a health facility to be developed as part of the overall housing development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: No reference is made in the list of 'criteria to be met' to the potential provision of a health facility as part of the new housing development. This is despite correspondence, meetings and discussions between the District Council's Planning Department, the PCT and local GP's which have determined that the option to develop a health facility as part of the housing developments should be kept open.

Comments: *Health facilities are not specifically mentioned but criteria b) includes reference to community facilities which would allow the option for health facilities to be provided.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 5

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified – for information.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: A site for a new primary school has already been agreed under a S106 Agreement for 650 dwellings. However, after lengthy discussions with Enodis the landowner we have now agreed an alternative location

for the new primary school at the southern end of the development. If the application to increase the density to 825 units is approved, Enodis have agreed to give ECC the extra land that would be required to meet the increased size of the school plus a financial contribution of £200,000 under a revised S106 Agreement

Comments: *Policy requires primary school provision to be made – its size/location etc can be determined through ongoing discussions on the planning application*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 205 Rep.No: 2

Representor: , Enodis Property Developments **Agent (if applicable):** GL Hearn Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: The Oakwood Park Settlement boundary should be reinstated as per the adopted Uttlesford District Local Plan 1995.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary set for Oakwood Park artificially limits the development capacity of the site. As a consequence the Local Plan fails to make best use of previously developed land in accordance with national policy guidance.

Comments: *No settlement boundary for Oakwood Park is shown on the Inset Map but it is referred to in Policy S2 and this should be addressed. The factors relevant to this proposal are being fully explored at a local inquiry, which is still in progress. The Council's objections are as set out in its evidence to the inquiry*

Recommendation: *Show settlement boundary on inset map.*

QUENDON & RICKLING

Site: Land between Street Farm and The Norden, Cambridge Road, Quendon

Ref.No: 190 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , Pegasi Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Identify site between Street Farm and The Norden for housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to part H1(c) which will lead to sporadic development in the open countryside. Additions to smaller settlements such as Quendon & Rickling would provide a sustainable opportunity for housing growth albeit on a small scale. The site between Street Farm and The Norden would amount to village infill. Site is within existing street scene and therefore would have no wider impact on the open countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Access within Conservation Area

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Access within the Conservation Area

Comments: *Any proposal for infill development on this site could be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan – there is no need to identify a specific settlement boundary to facilitate development on this small site.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adj to Mill Cottages, Cambridge Road, Quendon

Ref.No: 104 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Small, **Agent (if applicable):** Portland Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land adjacent to Mill Cottages, within the revised village limits or allocating it for housing development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Site adj to Mill Cottages is considered suitable to housing development. One is not aware of it being open. It's development would not result in all open spaces being lost to development because such sites would contribute to the character and appearance of the village and conservation area. Development of the site would be appropriate in the context of the more concentrated pattern of development in the northern part of the village. Good design of any houses would be essential. There is a lack of previously developed sites within Quendon. The site is well situated within the village. Development would provide much needed smaller housing at the lower end of the market and would contribute towards sustaining the village community. There are no known physical constraints to the development of the site. Development would satisfy the criteria in PPG3.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Within Conservation Area

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Within Conservation Areas

Comments: *Any proposal for infill development on this site could be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan – there is no need to identify a specific settlement boundary to facilitate development on this site. Gaps between and around the buildings in Quendon are important to the character of the village. Development in this location would be detrimental to this character.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land between the Church and the Rectory, Quendon

Ref.No: 196 **Rep.No:** 3

Representor: , Diocese of Chelmsford **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Take this site into account in preparing the second deposit plan looking at the key issues of infill, sustainability and development which can help to sustain existing village facilities.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to policy H1- C) - we cannot support a policy that will result in sporadic development in the open countryside. We wholly support the re-use of urban land for peripheral development to form new urban

extensions, however 575 dwellings in the open countryside by the means of using redundant farm buildings will not create sustainable patterns of development. Additions to smaller settlements such as Quendon and Rickling would provide a sustainable opportunity for housing growth, albeit on a small scale. Planned small scale housing development in locations such as Quendon and Rickling can provide for the much needed improvement to existing facilities including public house, shops basic employment and schools. Land between the Church and the Rectory provides a development opportunity within the settlement of Quendon which would be a suitable location for future housing growth. There would be no wider impact on the open countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Within Conservation Area
Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Within Conservation Areas

Comments: *This an important gap which contributes to the character of the village. Development in this location would be contrary to the housing strategy identified in the plan. No additional land is required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at Foxley House, Rickling

Ref.No: 35 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Include site within settlement boundaries and identify as being suitable for housing development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Settlement boundary exludes the area between the development to the east of the B1383 (which includes the bowling green and club house) Vantor Lodge, the School and the last remaining public house, Red Star Garage and Foxley House. The village has good facilities (school, public transport, drainage) yet because village envelope has not been extended in the past the shop has closed, post office facilites are limited and no new services have opened. No low cost housing in village and there is a shortage of middle range housing. Support the proposal to require 40% of any significant development to be low cost housing.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV
Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The exact area to be included is not defined. Land is allocated elsewhere for sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

RADWINTER

Site: Land the the east of East View Close, Radwinter

Ref.No: 18 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Parker, **Agent (if applicable):** Bidwells

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land to the east of East View Close within the settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to the settlement boundary for Radwinter. Site of 1.216 ha off Eastview Close should be included and allocated for housing to meet local needs. The allocation would be accessed from Eastview Close. The site is not subject to specific landscape protection policies and is outside the Conservation Area. The proposal is within easy walking distance to the primary school, village hall and post office. Proposed allocation may assist the Parish Council in meeting its local needs. The opportunity arises to provide an element of public open space adjoining the brook enabling access via an improved public footpath along the southern edge of the site.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary,

Comments: *Development in this location would encroach into the open countryside. The eastern part of the site is within the floodplain and development here would be contrary to policy GEN3. There is no need for residential development in this location since adequate provision has been made elsewhere for sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirements.*

Recommendation: No change

SAFFRON WALDEN

Para 15.2

Ref.No: 60 Rep.No: 4

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

Amendment(s) Sought: None – the paragraph is supported

As indicated in 15.2 Saffron Walden traffic in general needs a drastic new look. The heavy lorries that navigate from the High Street into George Street are unsafe and entirely unacceptable, frequently mounting the pavement and shaking buildings.

Ref.No: 15 Rep.No: 5

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Insert at the end "Measures to encourage walking and to develop pedestrian networks would ease the traffic congestion".

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Absence of attention in the Plan to the role of walking in the proposed policies. Journeys on foot relieve traffic congestion; increase social contacts, breaking down segregation & make towns more attractive to live in & have significant health benefits. Walking important to household without cars and include the poorest and most disadvantages sections of society.

Comments: *Agree that encouraging walking can help reduce the amount of car journeys and has health benefits. Additional text could be added to the end of paragraph 15.2*

Ref.No: 64 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: UDC should appoint a senior officer as the single point of responsibility for the urgent implementation of a strategic transport plan for Saffron Walden and Uttlesford working closely with ECC and other relevant organisations.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Any new residential or employment developments in Saffron Walden currently increase the amount of traffic passing through the town centre. A comprehensive transport strategy is needed. This does not appear in the Uttlesford Transport Strategy.

Ref.No: 65 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Riding, Castle Street Resident's Association **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Castle Street residents association has prepared a Transport Strategy for SW with short, medium and long term measures . A comprehensive transport plan should be developed for SW. Recommends that UDC appoints a senior officer as the single point of responsibility for the urgent implementation of a strategic transport plan for SW & Utt working closely with the CC and other organisations. Failing this quality of life in SW will worsen each year because of unresolved traffic problems.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: “Further traffic management measures are envisaged” is not specific enough and makes no mention of a comprehensive transport strategy for Saffron Walden.

Comments: *These are not local plan issues*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 22

Representor: Fletcher, English Heritage **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Saffron Walden has significant traffic problems which are highlighted in para 15.2. The local plan should address these more fully since this is the only document which considers land use and transport together.

Comments: *It is more appropriate that proposals for detailed transport schemes and to be dealt with through the Local Transport Plan and the Transport Strategy and reference to both of these is made in paragraph 15.2.*

Recommendation *No change*

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 52

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete "without delays" in 2nd sentence. Add "causing delay to vehicles and a poor environment for pedestrians and occupants of buildings close to the roads affected" after "during the day"

Comments: An amendment could be made to paragraph 15.2 to make it clear that other outcomes other than delays to motorists can arise.

Recommendation

Amend Para 15.2 as indicated

Traffic in Saffron Walden is a significant problem with its historic street pattern, restricted carriageway widths and junction geometry. *At various times during the day the existing road system is unable to cope with the number of trips being made. This can result in delays, disturbance to the occupants of buildings close to the affected roads and a reduction in the quality of the environment for pedestrians.* Further traffic management measures are envisaged during the plan period, to be identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan and Uttlesford Transport Strategy. *These will include facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport.*

POLICY SW1 – SHOPPING CENTRE

Deposit Policy

The shopping centre is defined on the proposals map inset. Change of use of existing shops, restaurants, public houses and hot food take aways to residential uses will not be permitted, unless both the following criteria are met:

- a) **The existing use is surplus to current and foreseen future requirements; and**
- b) **The property has been widely advertised for at least six months on terms reflecting its use.**

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 138 Rep.No: 3

Representor: , St John's College **Agent (if applicable):** Carter Jonas

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend policy to include reference to residential uses which could be for residential above shops, or possibly by the removal of backland retail

units which are not viable within the secondary location, without the need to advertise the retail unit for 6 months

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy is unduly prescriptive and does not allow flexibility for residential uses to come forward. In keeping with the area, the policy should permit some residential uses to complement the existing retail, but not in prime frontages. Residential development could contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre. There are potential sites available for residential development which struggle as retail units. A policy preventing changes of use could be counter productive. The need to advertise any retail uses for 6 month is not justified. If indeed the shopping centre is the most important in the district then some small losses ought to be possible without affecting the overall vitality and viability.

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 20

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

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Town Council supports this policy although they would not wish to see it used to restrict change of use on first floor rooms to residential as this is considered vital to ensure a presence in the town centre at night time.

Comments: *Agree that residential uses can contribute to the vitality of the town centre. PPG3 gives support to mixed use including residential but priority should be given to employment generating uses such as shopping at ground floor level. A significant amount of retail frontage within the High Street has been lost to non retail uses and further losses will be resisted. It is considered that six months is appropriate length of time for the market to be tested in respect of trying to ensure that retail uses are maintained. The use of upper floors for residential use would be in accordance with the Structure Plan and this will normally be allowed, subject to other policies in the plan. Amend policy SW1 and lower case in paragraph 15.4 text to make it clear that residential at first floor level would be acceptable*

Recommendation:

Amend second sentence of Policy SW 1 to read "Change of use of the ground floor of existing shops, restaurants, public houses and hot food take aways to residential uses will not be permitted

Add sentence to the end of Para 15.4 "In order to maintain the vitality of the centre, conversion of upper floors to residential use will be supported"

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 53

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete 15.6 and replace with "Residential development sites in the town are:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified

Comments: *Agree that paragraph 15.6 could be worded more clearly.*

Recommended: *Amend paragraph 15.6 to read*

“There are a number of sites within the built up area of the town that have potential for redevelopment as housing”

Para 15.6.3 – Land East of Thaxted Road

Ref.No: 15 Rep.No: 6

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Prefix last sentence with the word "some", add "Convenient access for cyclists, pedestrians and people with impaired mobility will be needed.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Absence of attention in the Plan to the role of walking in the proposed policies. Journeys on foot relieve traffic congestion; increase social contacts, breaking down segregation & make towns more attractive to live in & have significant health benefits. Walking important to household without cars and include the poorest and most disadvantaged sections of society.

Ref.No: 221 Rep.No: 7

Representor: Porter, Friends of the Earth **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Account must be taken of "traffic congestion " and 3.4 access and included in all development applications.

Comments: *The need for access to be provided for cyclists, pedestrians and people with impaired mobility should apply to all proposals for residential development and not just this specific site. Policy GEN1 will apply to all such proposals. Changes to GEN1 are proposed*

Recommendation: *No Change*

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 3

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete the policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The site is unsuitable for housing development of any significant size because of traffic problems. It is partly owned by the District Council and this area should either be retained for allotments or used for development of a smaller number of affordable homes. The site should be kept for employment uses perhaps high tech or sunrise industries unless the land is needed for 100% affordable housing or recreational use in which case employment land provision should be expanded elsewhere in the town.

Comments: *This site is required for the contribution it makes to the residential land supply to meet Structure Plan requirements and to address affordable housing needs. Use of the site for employment uses could give rise to greater amounts of heavy traffic and would be inappropriate on this site.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Para 15.6.4 – Sites in West Road and Tudor Works Debden Road

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 4

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete para

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Opposed to the loss of employment land in this part of the town. Encouraging these firms to move to another site will either lose good employment opportunities for local people or will increase the distances that the employees living near home have to travel to work.

Comments: *The loss of employment land has to be balanced against the benefits to local residents of removing this “non-conforming” employment use from this residential area, and the contribution the site can make to housing supply*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 55

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Add new para 15.6.7 - Further residential locations are dependent on the outcome of a transport assessment for the whole town

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Comments: *In accordance with Policy GEN1 all development will be assessed to make sure that it satisfies criteria (a) which requires that the main road network must be capable of carrying the traffic generated by the development safely.*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY SW2 – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN SAFFRON WALDEN’S BUILT UP AREA

Deposit Policy

The following sites, identified on the proposals map, are proposed for residential development.

Site	Site area	Minimum capacity
Raynham’s, High Street	0.26	12
Braybrooke Gardens and	1.07	34

Jordan Close, Station Street		
Harris Yard, Thaxted Road	0.22ha	14
Land east of Thaxted Road	1.9 ha	67
West Road	0.48 ha	17
Tudor Works, Debden Road	0.46 ha	14
Land at Printpack site, Radwinter Road	1.25 ha	80
Land at Bell College	1.4 ha	23

These will be supplemented by other sites, which will be generally small in scale and are not specifically identified on the Proposals Map.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Consequential Amendment

In line with the change proposed to Policy GD4 the last sentence in this policy should also be amended to read “these will be supplemented by other sites within the settlement boundary which will generally be small in scale and are not specifically identified on the proposals map inset”

Tudor Works Debden Road

Ref.No: 46 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: None – the policy is supported

Quality executive type homes will enhance the locality and reduce chaotic traffic congestion in Debden Road, since there will be no delivery lorries. It will also eliminate employees parking cars outside residents properties and on the pavement.

Bell College

Ref.No: 17 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , The British and Foreign School Society **Agent (if applicable):**
Bidwells

Amendment(s) Sought: The housing allocation SW2 should be extended to cover the PF notation and the buildings of the Bell College and the notation changed to SW2/PF. Table relating to SW2 should be amended to 5.1 hectares and 134 dwellings Consequential amendments to H1 - existing allocations are effectively demoted in the search sequence when compared to the proposed allocation.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: BFSS supports the principle of the housing allocation in respect to land at Bell College, but objection is made to the extent of the land currently identified. This should be extended to cover a site of 5.1 hectares with a minimum capacity of 134 dwellings. PPG3 advises sites to be allocated for housing in Local Plans should follow a search sequence which gives priority to the reuse of previously developed land and buildings then urban extensions then new development around roads and good public transport corridors. Land adjoining Peaslands Road falls within the urban area and its potential for redevelopment should take priority over built extensions to the urban areas in the District.

Comments: *Government advice as set out in PPG17 and PPG3 is that playing fields should normally be protected and that developing more housing within urban areas should not mean building on urban green space. Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient land to meet the Structure Plan requirements. Additional housing land is not needed*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 52 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Remove the designation of residential land from the playing fields at the Bell College, Saffron Walden

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to the change of the designation of land at Bell College from protected open space to land for residential development. Do not accept that the designation should be changed to reflect the planning permission. Should the development not commence the land should revert to its former designation as protected open space and any future planning application be decided on its merits and subject to any appeal process. Council should defend this land against any future development and use every opportunity to preserve it as open space. There is strong local opposition to further development within the town without any corresponding increase in local infrastructure. No provision has been made for additional schools that will become essential due to the current oversubscribing of all the schools within the town. There is no environmental gain to the development of this land. It is not a brownfield site. It should be protected as a green space within the town boundary.

Ref.No: 58 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete the housing land notation.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to the proposed change in the designation of land at Bell College from protected open space to land for residential development. While planning permission has been granted this is only for a limited period. It does not imply that any future housing development should automatically be allowed. I think that if permission expires without work being commenced the land should revert to its former designation as protected open space. Open space and sports facilities are short, traffic congestion is a serious problem to which there is no solution and school capacity is virtually full. To invite housing development to the site would be unwise.

Comments: *The current allocation reflects a planning permission granted on appeal. The site makes a contribution to the housing supply required to meet the Structure Plan requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Land East of Thaxted Road

Ref.No: 92 Rep.No: 13

Representor: Securities, Audley End Estates **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Remove land east of Thaxted Road from Policy SW2. Reconsider land available within Saffron Walden urban area through a new urban capacity study. Add land at Ashdon Road to the table as the site already falls within the settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land east of Thaxted Road includes a number of existing and established employment uses with multiple land ownership and tenure. These uses contribute towards a wide mixture of uses within the urban environment providing the opportunity for people to live and work close to one another. The likelihood of this site being brought forward for residential development must therefore be questioned. Furthermore in the event that this land is developed for residential it will be necessary to find alternative suitable accommodation for the displaced employment uses.

Ref.No: 94 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Saxon Developments Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** David Lock Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Land east of Thaxted Road, West Road and Tudor Works. Debden Road sites should be deleted from policy SW2 as should their corresponding notations from the Saffron Walden Inset Map. The dwellings proposed for these three sites should be accommodated in an urban extension to Great Dunmow at Ongar Road.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Three sites are inappropriately proposed for residential development under the terms of this policy. Land east of Thaxted Road, West Road, and Tudor Works, Debden Road. All three sites include existing employment uses and provide job opportunities within walking distance of existing residential communities. Relocating these uses to the employment site at Thaxted Road would remove these benefits. Such a relocation would represent a net loss in sustainability terms. Additionally it is by no means evident that the allotments forming part of the land east of Thaxted Road can be readily replaced on a site convenient to this part of the town. The deliverability of this proposal is therefore questionable while none of the sites appear to have planning permission for residential use thereby casting further doubt on the deliverability of these three proposals.

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 54

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete land east of Thaxted Road, West Road and Tudor Works, Debden Road, from Table.

Comments: *Land east of Thaxted Road is required to meet the housing land requirements set out in the Structure Plan, and is an appropriate housing site. An access constraint on development is being addressed actively.*

West Road and Tudor Works sites are perhaps less certain. They could be considered as windfall sites if they came forward.

Recommendation: *Delete West Road and Tudor Works sites*

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 21

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Town Council is concerned to note the suggestion that access to the 1.9 ha site to the East of Thaxted Road could be secured through the adjoining Harris' Yard site" The Council believes a Master Plan for the development of this site should be produced and in particular should show how the developers could overcome the access problems. Whilst noting that minimum capacities are shown nonetheless the Town Council are concerned at the suggested capacity for the Thaxted Road site. An application covering approx 1/3 of the site is currently being considered for 70 units. The Town Council believe a more realistic figure should be shown.

Comments: *A design brief has been prepared for the Harris Yard site. The capacity of the Thaxted Road site is in accordance with Government advice as set out in PPG3.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Other Suggested Sites

Ref.No: 81 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , Saffron Walden Laundry **Agent (if applicable):** Bidwells

Amendment(s) Sought: Include the laundry site within SW2 as a site identified for residential development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The site which could be regarded as a non-conforming site, is physically and in locational terms, entirely appropriate for residential use on redevelopment. The listed building on the site frontage could be converted back to a house with the rest being redeveloped for housing. The laundry is currently engaged in active negotiations to relocate to an industrial site within Saffron Walden. The site is similar in many ways to other sites listed in SW2.

Comments: The site is on the edge of the town centre and could be removed from the town centre designation to allow for a residential scheme to be considered as a windfall site.

Recommendation: *Amendment to town centre designation on the Saffron Walden Inset Map.*

Ref.No: 138 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , St John's College **Agent (if applicable):** Carter Jonas

Amendment(s) Sought: Identify land between King Street and Church Street for residential /and retail development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Request that land between King Street and Church Street is allocated for residential development. The land at present consists of a variety of uses predominantly single storey retail. It would be possible to accommodate a small residential development of about 20+ units within the area possibly with some retail uses.

Comments: *It would be contrary to the current policy of retaining retail uses within the town centre to allocate this large block of land within the town centre for residential development. Any proposal for a mixed use scheme could be considered in relation to policy SW1 and other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 209 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Three Valleys Water Plc **Agent (if applicable):** Freeth Melhuish

Amendment(s) Sought: Add the site to the table in policy SW2 - site area 0.25 minimum capacity 12. New para 15.6.7 This site comprises pumping station and depot use. In taking account of the Pumping Station's continued operation, the remaining depot use would be suitable for redevelopment to provide between 12-15 houses/flats at a density of 50 dph.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Non identification of part of the water company depot site, Debden Road as a housing allocation. A site of 0.25 ha should be allocated for housing to provide between 12 and 15 units. This allocation would require amendment to the Proposal map. The site is currently used for depot and maintenance but is being run down and likely to become surplus to requirements in the short term. In accordance with Government Planning Policy Guidance and the emerging plan policy the Council should give positive consideration to the identification of "previously developed sites" within the urban areas in preference to the redevelopment of greenfield land on the urban fringe.

Comments: *There is no need to specifically identify this small site. Any scheme for housing on this site could be considered as a windfall site and in relation to other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 6

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We do not intend to ask for any developer contributions for additional primary school places for any of these small sites in Saffron Walden as there is sufficient school provision in permanent accommodation to take the children from these new developments, However we will need developer contributions for additional secondary school places as follows. Raynhams - 2, Braybrooke Gardens - 7, Harris Yard -3, Land east of Thaxted Road - 13, West Road - 3, Tudor Works - 3, Printpak - 16, Bell College - 5

Comments: *For information – these requirements should form the basis for negotiations with developers at the planning application stage in accordance with Policy GEN6.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Para 15.8

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 56

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

Amendment(s) Sought: A statement about the need to protect local employment should be made in this para.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified

Comments: *This paragraph will be deleted as a consequential amendment if the proposal to reallocate the business park is approved.*

Paragraph 15.9

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 57 0

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete "heavy" in last sentence and replace with "extensive forest scale trees and landscaping"

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified

Comments: *This paragraph will be deleted as a consequential amendment if the proposal to reallocate the business park is approved. Substantial landscaping will still be required in relation to any development on the Ashdon Road site.*

Recommendation: *New text in relation to development on the Ashdon Road site"*

POLICY SW3 – SAFFRON WALDEN BUSINESS PARK

Deposit Policy

A 5.4 hectare site south of Ashdon Road is proposed for a business park of employment uses, which will be primarily within class B1. A traffic impact assessment will be required. This will need to consider the road haulage implications.

Developers will be required to prepare a master plan to indicate how:

- a) Specific proposals, which may be implemented on a phased basis, relate to an overall design concept for the site;**
- b) Adjoining non-employment uses will be protected;**
- c) The site will be landscaped.**

The master plan will be subject to public consultation. Development will need to be implemented in accordance with such a master plan approved by the Council. Implementation of the Master Plan proposals will be regulated by legal agreement in association with the grant of planning permissions.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 1 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: The policy should be deleted. A new policy should identify the meadow grassland as a County Wildlife Site.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The site is served by narrow and congested roads and most commercial traffic will also have to navigate the congested town centre. The draft policy acknowledges the issue but tries to defer proper consideration to a later 'traffic impact assessment'. This is an admission that the problem has not been quantified and that no solution is feasible. This is not a suitable location for a commercial area. There is no need for land to be allocated for commercial or industrial development. Part of the site to the rear of ambulance station/hospital is an area of semi natural unimproved grassland which is rare in Saffron Walden & Uttlesford. Bee orchids, which are uncommon in Uttlesford are found on site. The field should be protected from development and managed for benefit of biodiversity.

Ref.No: 60 Rep.No: 3

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: I have major reservations about the proposed business park to the south of Ashdon Road. The traffic on Ashdon Road and Radwinter Road is already horrendous and it would clearly be undesirable to provide access anywhere near Saffron Walden hospital for which a future does seem to be envisaged.

Ref.No: 148 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Green, Ashdon Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Ashdon Parish Council notes the intention to develop the above 5.4 hectares between the Ashdon and Radwinter Roads as a

business park and trusts that a full traffic impact assessment will be carried out prior to any permissions being granted: furthermore that no extra traffic will be routed or allowed to be routed through the village of Ashdon.

Ref.No: 221 Rep.No: 9

Representor: Porter, Friends of the Earth **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: In Saffron Walden for instance in proposed Business Development south of Ashdon Road a traffic impact assessment will be required. There are serious road haulage implications through the town centre of very large trucks through the narrow medieval streets.

Ref.No: 92 Rep.No: 14

Representor: Old Road Securities, Audley End Estates **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Re-allocate land at Ashdon Road for an element of light industrial uses, some live-work units, public open space, market and affordable housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land at Ashdon Road has been marketed during the plan period but the only interest has been for uses than would require small elements of this site. It is not practical or feasible to provide the necessary infrastructure and develop the site for individual small occupiers and there is no market demand for employment development due to the potential detrimental traffic and environmental impacts that would effect neighbouring non-employment uses. There are more appropriate sites within Uttlesford for the development of a "business park" and specifically a high quality B1 development. These include Chesterford Park and land to the north east of Wendens Ambo. A comprehensive urban capacity study would have identified this site as an existing employment site that could be reallocated for residential. It is submitted that this site would provide an ideal opportunity for a mixed use development.

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 47

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: None of the sites identified meet the criteria for securing economic and employment growth. They will fail to meet the Structure Plan requirement because of their qualitative limitations

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 22

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Town Council does not believe that this site is either feasible or practical for use as a business park. The site has been included in the present plan and has shown no sign of being developed. The Town Council believes this site is on the wrong side of town and that access for industrial

vehicles is difficult and undesirable. The Town Council believes that with the proposals for Chesterford Park the site should be reallocated in such a way to ensure that the replacement designation would allow for a substantial amount of public open space.

Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 26

Representor: Fletcher, English Heritage **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Given the extremely difficult traffic problems in Saffron Walden we consider further thought is needed as to how these are to be addressed before allocations of this nature are made.

Comments: : *The traffic impact and lack of commercial interest in development this site is recognised and it therefore proposed to retain 0.6 hectares for employment uses primarily falling within Class B1. It is proposed that the remainder of the site should be safeguarded and brought forward if required to meet any identified shortfall in the housing supply in accordance with policy H#. In relation to the presence of Bee Orchids on this site a nature conservation survey would be required in accordance with GEN7*

Recommendation: *New text and policies to be included. Consequential amendments to Saffron Walden Inset Map*

Land south of Ashdon Road

A site of 4.8 hectares is safeguarded as a site for housing should monitoring of residential land supply identify a likely shortfall. Supplementary planning guidance will be prepared in respect of phasing and development of the site.

New Policy SW#

A 4.8 hectare site to the south of Ashdon Road is allocated as a reserve housing site and will only be developed in accordance with Policy H#

Land Adjoining the Saffron Business Centre

The site of 0.6 hectares, is proposed as a site for further development to accommodate businesses falling into Class B1, light industrial, offices or research and development facilities.

New Policy SW#

A 0.6 hectare site identified on the proposals map inset is proposed as an employment site for uses falling within Class B1. Development will be permitted if it includes appropriate measures for landscape and amenity protection

POLICY SW4 - THAXTED ROAD EMPLOYMENT SITE

Deposit Policy

A 3.76 hectare site at Thaxted Road is proposed for employment uses. Development will be permitted if it includes appropriate measures for landscape and amenity protection

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 48

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: None of the sites identified meet the criteria for securing economic and employment growth. They will fail to meet the Structure Plan requirement because of their qualitative limitations.

Comments: *In accordance with Government Guidance and the Structure Plan this site is identified because it is available for development capable of being served by public transport and accessible. It is also close to a major centre of population.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 23

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Add the following wording to the end of the policy "including existing public rights of way"

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Whilst supporting this proposal the Council are keen to protect a well used and attractive public right of way. They suggest an addition to the policy

Comments: *Agree*

Recommendation *Add suggested wording to the end of the policy*

POLICY SW5 – SAFEGUARDING OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT AREAS

Deposit Policy

The following existing employment areas are identified on the proposals map as key employment areas.

Existing employment area	Area (ha)
Ashdon Road Commercial Centre	12.83
Printpack factory Radwinter Road	2.00
Shire Hill Industrial Estate	11.25
SIA factory Radwinter Road	3.00
Thaxted Road	2.10

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 59 Rep.No: 1**Representor:** Storah, **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: None the policy is supported
 Given Saffron Walden's relatively poor public transport links with surrounding centres of employment it is important to retain existing potential employment opportunities. Hence the Ashdon Road Commercial centre should along with others in SW5 be protected for employment generating uses provided due regard is given to neighbouring residential areas.

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 24**Representor:** White, Saffron Walden Town Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: None – the policy is supported
 The Town Council fully supports this proposal

No: 129 Rep.No: 1**Representor:** , SIA Abrasives Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: The SIA site should be zoned for residential use. It is within the town boundary, close to amenities.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Site has been incorrectly zoned. It is zoned for its current use rather than what is most suitable to the site and its location. Intensification of the industrial use would cause both environmental and traffic issues for the surrounding area. Radwinter Road is inappropriate for industrial uses due to the residential neighbourhoods of the converted hospital, Fairview's development and the subject road. The road capacity is not sufficient for HGV's of any description serving the subject site due to the restricted road width, the on street parking and the pedestrian and car flow to both the residential areas and the Tesco Superstore. The site is unsuitable for industrial use due to be historic nature of the buildings and the lack of underlying industrial demand. As an industrial site it would be uneconomic and unsuitable for redevelopment. There is a lack of suitable employees.

Ref.No: 162 Rep.No: 1**Representor:** , **Agent (if applicable):** Carter Jonas

Amendment(s) Sought: SIA factory should be excluded from SW5 and included for residential development in policy SW2

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: SIA Factory on Radwinter Road is more suitable for residential development

Comments: *This site is included within the SW5 policy in accordance with advice in PPG4 and Structure Plan policy BIW2 to ensure there is sufficient employment land available. Advice is that business, industrial and warehousing development should be concentrated primarily in the large urban areas where people live and in locations well served by travel modes other than the private car. This site meets these*

requirements. Sufficient housing land is allocated to meet the structure plan requirements- no further allocation is required.

Recommendation: *No change*

New Policy - Arts Centre

Ref.No: 60 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Make some reference in the plan to the need for an arts/cultural facility in Saffron Walden

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Section 7 in the plan - Leisure and Cultural Provision contains nothing about cultural provision. There is a clearly expressed view in Saffron Walden that the town badly needs an Arts Centre and a group has been formed to promote the idea The first step could be some recognition in the plan that there is a need with suggestions on land/building allocation. Surely UDC as a planning authority can recognise that good multi cultural provision can have huge direct and indirect economic benefits for a town.

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 25

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

Amendment(s) Sought: The District Council should identify a suitable site in Saffron Walden for an Arts Centre and suggest the following policy"provision is made for x hectares of land at y specifically for the provision of an all purpose Arts Centre for the Uttlesford District"

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The recent loss of the Arts Centre in the Town Centre has meant that the District has no Arts Centre at all. The town council notes that the recent feasibility study undertaken by the District Council identified Saffron Walden as the most suitable location for an arts centre.

Comments: *The allocation of a site and a specific policy without a commitment to build could remove flexibility and be counter productive. If a suitable site were to come forward this would be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan. Any suitable site beyond the settlement boundaries would be considered in relation to policy LC2 which allows for such facilities providing certain criteria are met.*

Recommendation: *No change*

New policy - car parking

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 27

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Add new policy " Provision is made for x hectares of land at y specifically for the provision of public car parking.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The town council believes that Saffron Walden has two major problems in respect of transport; congestion and car parking. As a medieval town with narrow streets and listed buildings there is a limit to what can be done in terms of highway engineering. Nonetheless the Town Council believes that as part of the Uttlesford Transport Strategy, Uttlesford District Council should invite consultants to arrange a traffic study for Saffron Walden. The town Council recognises the need for additional car parking. However for the same reasons as above identifying new and viable car park sites is very difficult. The Town Council believes this requires imaginative and creative thinking to adopt new practices and would ask that the district council carry out this exercise and identify and zone new sites for car parking. Because of the importance that the car must play in a rural area the Town Council therefore consider additional car parking must be provided.

Comments: *It would be inappropriate to include a site within the plan unless there was some realistic possibility that it would become available for use as a car park within the plan period. If a site did come forward it could be considered in relation to other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommended: *No change*

Site: Thaxted Road, Saffron Walden

Ref.No: 78 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Mitchell, Kier Land Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** GMA Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary to include (i) land south of Rystone Way; (ii) north east of the civic amenity site; and (iii) south of the Leisure Centre and Winstansley Road, and identify the site for residential/employment development

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: There will be a requirement for housing and employment development to take place at the periphery of Saffron Walden. Land for employment at Thaxted Road has already been identified. There is limited scope to utilise brownfield land within the town. Question the reliability of the Housing Capacity Study and the assumed level of housing that will be delivered. Urban extensions are the next most suitable option of new housing and employment growth. Sites in Thaxted road are capable of providing a sustainable urban extension with a mixture of uses and transport options. This will help to ensure that a planned urban extension is delivered as and when the need arises.

Notation in Adopted Plan: (i) Beyond VDL, ASLV, (ii) Beyond VDL, ASLV
(iii) Partly within SW7 allocation for Employment

Notation in Deposit Plan: (i) Beyond Settlement Boundary, ASLV,
(ii) Beyond Settlement Boundary, ASLV
(iii) Partly within SW5 allocation for Employment

Comments: *Development of these large sites represents major encroachment into the countryside beyond the built up area of the town. The site areas are (i) 8ha (ii) 3ha and (iii) 7ha and each site could accommodate a substantial number of new*

dwellings. Policy H1 allocates sufficient land within the District to meet the Structure Plan requirement no additional land is required

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land West of Little Walden Road, Saffron Walden

Ref.No: 92 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Old Road Securities, Audley End Estates **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary of Saffron Walden (as identified) on the attached plan) to provide for mixed uses including a new arts centre, additional town centre car parking, recreational open space of a town/country park, public open space, sheltered housing/affordable housing, a chiropractice and a reserve area for new housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: There is a pressing and identifiable need within Saffron Walden for a variety of community facilities including a new arts centre, additionally town centre car parking, recreational open space, sheltered housing, a chiropractice. There is an ideal site at Audley End Road which could be utilised to assist deliverance of all these community facilities. The site is close to the town centre and surrounded on all sides by existing footpaths. The site is served by suitable vehicular access from Catons Lane. The site would provide an ideal "reserve" site for residential development in the event that other allocated sites are not brought forward, windfall sites do not emerge as anticipated or if housing requirements are discovered

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Open land uses such as car parking and recreational space could be considered in this location without a change to the settlement boundary. Proposals for affordable housing can be considered beyond the settlement boundary. Policy LC2 allows for needs for community facilities to be met beyond settlement boundaries subject to criteria*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at Herberts Farm, Saffron Walden

Ref.No: 48 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Kitcherside, Frogmore Investments Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** David Lane Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend settlement boundary to include land at Herberts Farm and designate site on proposals map for housing and public open space.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land at Herberts Farm is promoted for housing and public open space as an extension to Saffron Walden to which it is well related, thus representing a sustainable location for such development

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The site is an area of flat agricultural land situated on the ridge of the bowl which physically constrains the development of Saffron Walden. The site is prominent from the south and is not constrained by defensible boundaries. The site is just beyond the built up edge of Saffron Walden and would therefore lead to pressure to develop the remaining fields. This large area of 17 ha could accommodate 510-850 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. The inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary would be contrary to the housing strategy set out in the Deposit Plan which provides for sufficient housing to meet the structure plan requirements. The site is inappropriate on the grounds that development would intrude into open countryside, lead to the loss of agricultural land and poor connections with the highway network.*

Recommendation: *No change*

New Policy - Swards End

Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 26

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

Amendment(s) Sought: New policy SWTC5 - Swards End Playing Fields - Provisions is made for x hectares of land at y specifically for the provision of public playing fields.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: As with Saffron Walden itself there is inadequate playing field space in Swards End. Local sports clubs have to play outside of the village and there is a demand for play facilities for younger children

Comments: *It is not considered necessary to allocate a site. If a suitable site were to come forward this would be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan. Any suitable site beyond the settlement boundaries would be considered in relation to policy LC4 which allows for such facilities.*

Recommendation: *No change*

STANSTED AIRPORT AND ENVIRONS INSET

General

Ref.No: 228 Rep.No: 10

Representor: Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: There can be no commitment to further development at Stansted Airport unless - A proper independent assessment of the environmental impact is made; The economic cost of air transport is assessed and likely future demand calculated; A review of air space is undertaken to ensure safety; other options are seriously reviewed in considering the long term airport policy. A public inquiry must be convened.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The reasons surrounding aviation policy and the specific concerns relating to more than doubling the size of Stansted Airport make it inappropriate for the latter to be decided through a planning application. The Parish Council consider that 35 mppa plus cargo cannot be accommodated whilst retaining the rural character of the surrounding area. As such, the minimum requirement is for all of these issues and concerns to be analysed and examined at a public inquiry.

Comments:

The structure plan contains a policy for the consideration of proposal for new development at any existing operational airport including Stansted, which is consistent with regional planning policy and national airports policy.

Ref.No: 226 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Mead, North West Essex & East Herts Preservation Assoc **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: The Local Plan should contain a copy of the area map specifically showing the 57dB(A) Leq contour, the flight paths and their swathes and the positions of the noise monitors at either end of the Stansted runway. It would be helpful to have an explanation as to why the Safeguarded Areas to the north and east of the airport do not reappear in Deposit Plan.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Mapping details omitted

Comments:

There is a wealth of data on the operation and effects of Stansted Airport, which is available as background information. To keep the plan concise it only contains that which is necessary for planning purposes.

Ref.No: 229 Rep.No: 3

Representor: MacBride, Chelmsford Borough Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Plan should recognise this situation, or have contingencies in place to address the infrastructure and other development requirements should this expansion be accepted.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: It is considered unhelpful that the Local Plan, which covers the period up to 2011, fails to provide any realistic guidance on the expansion needs of the airport beyond 15 mppa, not only in the context of the submitted planning application, but also in recognition of the fact that much of this expansion is expected to occur during the Plan period. This could place further unplanned development pressures on Chelmsford.

Comments:

Structure Plan policies and BIW9 in particular provide a framework for considering the current planning application for development to enable 25 mppa.

Para 16.2 & 16.3

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 49

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Recast following urgent review of likely future needs and the travel, economic and social consequences of accommodating less related or associated activities within the airport boundary

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policies AIR1 to AIR5 set out a range of activities for which each of the five sites is "principally reserved for " This paragraph makes it clear that those uses/activities are not intended to be definitive or exclusive. There could be an attempt to make the relevant policies more definitive and thus clearly and easily understood. It is noted that there is the reference to an hotel within policy AIR1 scope for considerable flexibility as to the uses within the policy AIR2 area. Offices for a very wide variety of support functions within the AIR3 area and that the northern ancillary area can be used for similar support functions as in policy AIR3. If the reviews of airport policy suggest that Stansted should accommodate additional traffic and the current application is permitted then the extent to which the airport site can accommodate associated or indirect activity is questionable. Many of the associated activities may be more appropriately accommodated off airport.

Comments:

The local plan policies are consistent with the Structure Plan Policy BIW7.

Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 10

Representor: Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: None – the policies AIR1 to AIR6 are supported AIR1 - AIR6 are noted as being identical to those in the adopted District Plan 1995 and these have formed the basis of the airport's development planning with the Council. These policies are supported and the development proposals currently before the Council are in compliance with these policies within the draft Plan.

POLICY AIR1 – DEVELOPMENT IN THE TERMINAL SUPPORT AREA

Deposit Policy

Land adjoining the terminal, as shown on the Inset Map, is principally reserved for landside road and rail infrastructure and a telecommunications building, airside roads, the apron, passenger vehicle station rapid transport system and other airside operational uses; terminal support offices; an hotel and associated parking; a bus and coach station and short term and staff car parks.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 50

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete "principally" in line 2 and "an hotel and associated parking" in Line 5

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The policy should be clear and concise in terms of the uses to be accommodated and exclude those activities that are not closely related to the airport. (see also reasoning to representations to paragraphs 16.2 and 16.3)

Comments: *It is not possible to be definitive. The intention and objectives of the policy are clear.*

Recommendation:
No change

Ref.No: 146 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Copping, Member **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Insert in policy AIR 1 at the end of the first para " to support up to an not beyond 15 mppa" Add a policy as "AIR 8" stating that no further runway development will be permitted beyond the existing operational runway and the authorised stand-by runway

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy AIR 1 does not state the Council's policy on expansion at the airport - which is limited to 15 mppa. Furthermore Chapter 16 of the Plan does not refer to any potential changes in the area of and around the operational runways and taxi ways and neither does the inset map.

Comments: *Structure Plan policies and BIW9 in particular provide a framework for considering the current planning application for development to enable 25 mppa and other relevant proposals..*

Recommendation:
No change

POLICY AIR2 - CARGO HANDLING /AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE

Deposit Policy

The area shown on the Inset Map as the cargo handling/aircraft maintenance area is principally reserved for the repair, overhaul, maintenance and refurbishment of aircraft, and facilities associated with the transfer of freight between road vehicles and aircraft or between aircraft.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 51

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete " principally" in line 2. Delete associated with in lines 3 and 4 and replace with FOR

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The policy should be clear and concise in terms of the uses to be accommodated and exclude those activities that are not closely related to the airport (see also reasoning to representations to paras 16.2 and 16.3)

Comments: *It is not possible to be definitive. The intention and objectives of the policy are clear.*

Recommendation:
No change

POLICY AIR3 – DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTHERN ANCILLARY ZONE

Deposit Policy

The area of land identified on the Inset Map as the southern ancillary area will be principally reserved for activities directly related to, or associated with the Airport, such as car hire, parking, maintenance and valeting operations; flight catering units; offices for various support functions, freight forwarders and agents; support functions for aircraft maintenance which can be carried out remote from an aircraft being serviced; airline training centres; airline computer centres and equipment storage facilities for airlines. Development will take place in phases based on a broad design brief agreed with the Council

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 52

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete "principally" in Line 2. Delete from "offices in the line 4 to "centres" in line 8

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This policy should be clear and concise in terms of the uses to be accommodated and exclude those activities that are not closely related to the airport

Comments: *It is not possible to be definitive. The intention and objectives of the policy are clear.*

Recommendation:
No Change

Ref.No: 165 Rep.No: 4

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Add before the final sentence "development involving the provision of a Motorway or roadside Service Area will not be permitted within Policy Area AIR 3

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Fully support this policy but would suggest the additional sentence

Comments: *No sound justification for policy addition*

Recommendation:

No change

POLICY AIR4 – DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHERN ANCILLARY AREA

Deposit Policy

The area of land identified on the Inset Map as the northern ancillary area will be principally reserved for activities directly related to, or associated with, the Airport, such as business aviation facilities, hangarage, aviation fuel storage depots and all those activities listed in Policy AIR3.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 53

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete "ancillary" in the title to the policy. Delete principally in line 2. Amend list of activities acceptable arising from policy AIR3

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This policy should be clear and concise in terms of the uses to be accommodated and exclude those activities that are not closely related to the airport.

Comments: *It is not possible to be definitive. The intention and objectives of the policy are clear.*

Recommendation:

No change

AIR5 – THE LONG TERM CAR PARK

Deposit Policy

The area shown on the Inset Map for long-term parking is reserved for the parking of aircraft passengers' cars.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 226 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Mead, North West Essex & East Herts Preservation Assoc **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Reference in policy to the need for underground car parking facilities at the airport.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Need to avoid the adverse visual impact of large scale external car parking areas or any multi storey buildings which may be proposed.

Comments: *Such a degree of prescription is not justified.*

Recommendation:

No Change

POLICY AIR6 – STRATEGIC LANDSCAPE AREAS

Deposit Policy

Development will not be permitted within those areas identified as strategic landscape areas on the Inset Map.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

AIR6

Ref.No: 165 Rep.No: 5

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy AIR6 to read " Development, particularly Motorway or Roadside Service Area or related development will not be permitted within those areas identified as strategic landscape areas on the Inset Map"

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We fully support this policy but would suggest additional wording

Comments: *The term development covers all types of development. It is not considered necessary to identify specific forms of development.*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY AIR7 – PUBLIC SAFETY ZONES

Deposit Policy

Uses resulting in an increase in the number of people residing, working or congregating will not be permitted within the Public Safety Zones identified on the inset map.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 11

Representor: Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend to reflect the advice from the Government Aviation Policy Division

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Draft policy may not reflect emerging Government Guidance. General objective that there should be no significant increase in the number of people living, working or congregating in PSZ's remains unchanged. To achieve this there is a general presumption against new or replacement development or changes of use within the PSZ unless allowable as permitted development. It is understood that consideration is being given to certain types of new development which might be permissible because of the low density of people working or congregating as a result of that development.

Comments: *It is acknowledged that up to date policy guidance is still awaited from the Government. This can either be fed into later stages of the local plan process, or it will carry greater weight than the local plan if it is issued after the plan is adopted.*

Recommendation: *No Change*

Ref.No: 10 Rep.No: 19

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We object to the omission from Chapter 16 of any policy controlling aircraft movements or passenger throughput at Stansted Airport or levels of noise emissions from it. Such policies are essential against which to judge any further applications for development or for variations to existing planning conditions at the Airport.

Comments: *Structure plan policy BIW9 and other local plan policies ENV10 and ENV12 provide an appropriate framework for considering current and future planning applications and the environmental effects of development.*

Recommendation: *No Change*

Stansted Airport Inset Map

Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 13

Representor: Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Remove notations from the Inset Map

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Notation has been applied to Pidgeon Wood and Green Street Spring Wood which are habitats lost to development permitted by UTT/1320/98/DFO. Pritchetts Wood is within the airside operational area of the airport. None of the sites were previously identified in the 1995 Plan

Comments: *Accept that the notation should not cover Pidgeon Wood and Green Street Spring Wood. Pritchetts Wood's location airside is not relevant however.*

Recommendation: *Remove wildlife site notation from Pidgeon Wood and Green Street Spring Wood*

Ref.No: 95 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Chartwell Land PLC **Agent (if applicable):** Town Planning Consultants

Amendment(s) Sought: Extend the Stansted Airport Boundary to the south of the A120 to allow development needs associated with Stansted Airport.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Stansted Airport Boundary should be extended to the south of the A120 at least up to the line of the railway to allow development needs associated with Stansted Airport. The area available for development within the boundary is insufficient for the economic activity associated with the growth of the airport. There is a need for further development land associated with the airport. The current limitation also means that there is no alternative land available for airport related development other than that controlled by BAA who therefore have a virtual monopoly of airport related development which is unfair practise. It is more sustainable to have economic activity generated by the airport as close to it as possible. The airport uses already impact upon the environment surrounding the airport. It is more appropriate to protect countryside farther away and to use land around the airport for development.

Comments: *This would be inconsistent with the concept of the Countryside Protection Zone and Structure Plan policy BIW7*

Stansted Inset Thremhall Priory Site

Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 12

Representor: Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Specify policy applicable to identified site

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy indication of site notated as airport related not provided

Comments: *The site is subject to planning permission and therefore a policy is considered unnecessary.*

Site: White Cottage Start Hill

Ref.No: 169 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Thwaites, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The property known as White Cottage including the area of land (0.1 ha) at Old Cottage, White Cottage and land to east, should be included within the village boundary allowing infill development which would be in keeping with the character of the settlement. The boundary of the CPZ should also be amended accordingly so as to exclude this area.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Start Hill settlement boundary does not fully account for the residential settlement line by excluding the property known as White Cottage. In doing so it excludes small infill plots available which are already in residential use and would provide a small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement. This land is noted as being CPZ whilst the land immediately to the north, east and west is not protected.

Comments: *The inclusion of this site would result in the development of land which is not despoiled or derelict.*

Recommendation : *No change*

STANSTED MOUNTFITCHET

General

Ref.No: 228 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: 1) No change or addition to industrial sites is proposed other than to consider a reordering and possibly some extension of Parsonage Farm estate in its existing location, and the possible development of the old quarry north of the village. 2) The growth of non-industrial commercial activities should be supported, provided that new locations are able to meet parking requirements on site. 3) Shops cannot be forced to open or remain open, but the Council would request that planning policies seek to encourage the maintenance or enhancement or the opportunities for retailers to flourish if their service is desired.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Comments: *Parish Council comments will be taken into account in considering any applications received in relation to these issues*

Recommendation: *No change*

Para 17.3

Ref.No: 228 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: The only possible exception to this policy which should be considered is where there is an overwhelming public gain to compensate for development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: No additional housing development should be permitted. Assuming the development of Rochfords, then no additional development should be permitted outside the development limit. There should be no further breach of the Green Belt. There should be no infilling, especially in the area of woodfields and Stoney common.

Comments: *Comments are noted*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 228 Rep.No: 6 & 7

Representor: Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: The plan needs to incorporate growth to handle increased demand.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: An expanding population requires an increase in facilities. The local doctors' practice is operating from premises which are too small and active consideration is being given to finding a site on which a new centre, possibly incorporating the baby clinic may be developed. Four sites are under consideration - the lower street car park; Crafton Green (subject to relocation of Parish Council Offices), land on High Lane beyond the new Catholic Church, and the Rochfords development. The latter two sites are not favoured by the Parish Council given their location on the edge of the village.

Expansion in Stansted Mountfitchet, the surrounding area and the potential growth of Stansted Airport point to sustained pressure on already inadequate hospital facilities.

Comments: *The above comments are noted. The health authority was consulted on the Deposit Plan and will continue to be involved in discussions on relevant applications.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 225 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The plan ignores or at best gives inadequate emphasis to the serious shortage of public open space in many settlements particularly Stansted Mountfitchet. There is the possibility of securing about 216 acres of the former Repton Parkland at Stansted Park subject to planning consent for limited enabling development to provide compensation to the existing agricultural tenant, a trust to finance the restoration and long term future maintenance of the parkland in perpetuity and compensation for the loss of rental income. It is recognised that this matter could best be considered in the context of the review of the local district plan rather than as an exception to policy following a planning application.

Ref.No: 228 Rep.No: 8

Representor: Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Any proposal which might bring Stansted Park into public ownership, with adequate funding for restoration and maintenance should be considered. This may be a development which could be an exception to policy in relation to MGB and Settlement Boundary. Playing fields for organised sport needs to be identified. A number of possible sites have been identified by the Parish Council, but consideration should be given to land adjacent to The Mountfitchet High School and the new Sports and Leisure facilities, with the latter providing changing rooms.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Open space has been and remains in serious short supply.

Comments: *Additional land for housing is not required in Stansted and it would be inappropriate to allocate land for housing in order to finance proposals for the restoration and maintenance of the parkland at Stansted Park. Proposals for the provision of playing fields will be approved on suitable sites in accordance with policy LC4.*

Recommendation: *No Change*

Ref.No: 228 Rep.No: 9

Representor: Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: A new road through Brook View and the Rochfords development would ease pressures and allow the unsatisfactory road through Old Bell Close to be eliminated. The road improvements identified in connection with the Roachfords development should proceed.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The disastrous situation in the Stoney common/West Rd area, as a result of unwise and unfettered development, should be alleviated if at all possible.

Comments: *This has been explored and found to be inappropriate.*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY SM1 – VILLAGE CENTRES

No representations

POLICY SM2 – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN STANSTED MOUNTFITCHET'S BUILT UP AREA

Deposit Policy

The following sites, identified on the proposals map, are proposed for residential development.

Site	Site area (ha)	Minimum capacity
Land south of Old Bell Close	0.6	15
10 – 20 Silver Street and land to the rear	0.22	13
St Teresa’s Church	0.45	17

These will be supplemented by other sites, which will be generally small in scale and are not specifically identified on the Proposals Map.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Consequential Amendment

In line with the change proposed to Policy GD4 the last sentence in this policy should also be amended to read “these will be supplemented by other sites within the settlement boundary which will generally be small in scale and are not specifically identified on the proposals map inset”

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 7

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Assuming that the three sites do not include any social/affordable units we would need to seek a developer contribution for the following additional school places. Land south of Old Bell Close - 4 primary and 3 secondary. 10-20 Silver Street 3 primary and 3 secondary. St Theresas Church - 4 primary and 3 secondary.

Comments: *Noted – to be discussed with developers in considering any application on these sites*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY SM3 – SITE ON CORNER OF LOWER STREET AND CHURCH ROAD

Deposit Policy

This 0.2 hectare site identified on the Proposals Map is proposed for a mixed use development with a small residential element.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 8

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Reserve the right to come to you on any possible developer contribution for education provision once the number of dwellings is known.

Comments: *Noted*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY SM4/BIR1 – ROCHFORD NURSERIES

Deposit Policy

Land at Rochford Nurseries defined on the Inset Map, is proposed for comprehensive residential and associated development for 600 dwellings.

The following criteria must be met:

- a) **It provides for a mixed and balanced community;**
- b) **It provides for a primary school, a primary health care centre, community facilities, suitable shopping and satisfactory open space and arrangements for sport and recreation;**
- c) **It provides for substantial landscaping within the development boundaries to complement the layout and arrangement of buildings and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide off site landscaping.**
- d) **It is designed to mitigate adverse effects upon existing residential and community interests and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide or contribute towards wider and longer term planning benefits reasonably associated with the alleviation of any such impact.**

The provision of these and other relevant planning benefits will be regulated by legal agreement on the grant of associated planning permissions.

Development will need to be implemented in accordance with such a master plan approved by the Council. This indicates how specific proposals, which may be implemented on a phased basis, will relate to an overall design concept for the site.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 16 Rep.No: 5

Representor: Stock, The Fairfield Partnership **Agent (if applicable):** Januarys Chartered Surveyors

Amendment(s) Sought: More appropriate locations for residential development be considered as an alternative to the whole, or part of this site.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This is an inappropriate site - there are more suitable locations to be found elsewhere in the District. The size of the site is excessive given its surrounding and characteristics and may result in a detrimental impact on the setting and landscape of the surrounding area. In addition it is understood that there are potential difficulties regarding delivery of development on the site, despite the approved Master Plan and current application for outline planning permission on the site.

Ref.No: 92 Rep.No: 15

Representor: Securities, Audley End Estates **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Land at Rochford Nurseries should be allocated for up to 400 dwellings. The greenfield land take should be reduced by increasing density to the requirements of PPG3. In the event that the site is retained for up to 600 dwellings the sensitivity of the site and the significance of predicted impacts should be tested and addressed through an environmental impact assessment

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Whilst Rochford Nurseries could accommodate 400 dwellings it is submitted that 600 would be unacceptable in transport and environmental terms. 600 dwellings would have an adverse impact upon the surrounding road network. There are significant traffic issues that need to be carefully considered in relation to the junction of Stansted Road and Foresthall Road. Development of this site would result in a need for significant contributions for off site highway measures. Intensive development would result in detrimental impacts to the safeguarded natural heritage surrounding including Stansted Park and the Mount. It is submitted that planning applications for development of this sensitive site should be accompanied by an environmental impact assessment. In any event provision of 400 dwellings should be at PPG3 densities reducing the greenfield land take in accordance with Government Policy. There are more appropriate sites within Saffron Walden for residential use.

Ref.No: 94 Rep.No: 5

Representor: , Saxon Developments Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** David Lock Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: The references to 600 dwellings in Policy SM4/BIR1 and paragraph 17.4 should be amended to 400 dwellings and consequential amendments made to this policy and its supporting text.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The increase in the number of dwellings proposed on this site from 400 to 600 is inappropriate. This increase is neither explained or justified in the context of the existence of an approved master plan for 400 dwellings.

Ref.No: 102 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , Laing Homes **Agent (if applicable):** Carpenter Planning Consultants

Amendment(s) Sought: Alternative provision for residential development should be made for Stansted (no alternative site suggested)

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Rochford Nursery site failed to come forward for development within the last plan period despite its allocation for residential use. We consider it unlikely that it is capable of delivering the 600 dwellings identified within this plan period. Alternative provision should be sought.

Ref.No: 118 Rep.No: 12

Representor: , Bryant Projects **Agent (if applicable):** DLP Consultants Ltd

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Question whether this site is likely to be fully implemented within the Plan period. The needs to obtain a satisfactory planning consent including a suitable S106 agreement, carry out necessary infrastructure works and commence implementation makes it possible that first completions may not arise until the end of 2003. This assumes that the Council are in a position to determine the applications during 2002, are minded to grant consent in advance of the conclusion of the local plan review and that the site is not subject to any Direction issued by the Secretary of State. Taking into account that major developments rarely come fully on stream from the start we consider that some caution is warranted in over reliance on the implementation of 600 dwellings on this scheme.

Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 12

Representor: , Bryant Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Vincent and Gorbings

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This allocation is essentially the same allocation as that identified in the current adopted local plan for 400 dwellings for post 8mppa Stansted Airport related growth. The policy should be amended to relate the site to airport related growth. Notwithstanding these comments we have doubts as to whether the suggested number of dwellings can be provided within the plan period.

Ref.No: 201 Rep.No: 9

Representor: , Countryside Properties PLC **Agent (if applicable):** Strategic Land and Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Reduce site capacity to 400 dwellings, as in the adopted local plan, amend policy to require an environmental statement

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Rochford Nurseries site was allocated in the 1995 plan for 400 dwellings following the recommendation of the Inspector who had evidence before him of potential impacts. It has not been demonstrated that a greater number of dwellings can be satisfactorily accommodated, either in terms of traffic and other infrastructure or in terms of an environmental impact assessment. In addition the site is split between two separate major ownerships and it has not been demonstrated that an integrated master plan for the whole development can be achieved. Object to the proposed increase from 400 to 600 dwellings on this site. The policy ought to also require the submission of a full environmental statement consistent with the approach taken by the Council in the case of the proposed development at Priors Green Takeley.

Ref.No: 203 Rep.No: 2

Representor: , Croudace Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Charles Planning Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend policy to refer to a site capacity of about 710 dwellings.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Rochford Nurseries site should be identified as having a capacity of about 710 dwellings in order to more properly reflect the advice at Paragraphs 57 and 58 of PPG3:Housing March 2000.

Ref.No: 217 Rep.No: 6

Representor: , Pelham Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Barton Willmore Planning Partnership

Amendment(s) Sought: Change 600 to 720 dwellings. Delete (b) and replace with "it provides on or off site for a primary school, a primary health care centre, community facilities, suitable shopping and satisfactory open space and arrangements for sport and recreation"Delete c) and replace with " It provides good layout, design and landscaping in accordance with PPG3 - Better Places to Live" Guidance"

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Although we support the policy in principle the wording of the policy is misleading. We object to the number of dwellings listed for the development 600 dwellings is too low. In addition we object to the wording of (b) as it does not specify the locationof the planning benefits of the site. We also object to c) as it does not make reference to or comply with PPG3. The number of dwellings listed as 600 does not comply with PPG3, underestimating the densities appropriate for the site. Section (b) does not specify the location of planning benefits of the site and implies that all planning benefits would be located on site. This would not be satisfactory as not all the benefits listed may be accommodated on site. Section c) does not make reference to PPG3 or PPG3 - Better places to live guidance and therefore will not take into account design as stated in PPG3. Landscaping should be an integral part of new development and opportunities should be taken the retention of trees etc

Comments: *This site is a long standing commitment. 600 dwellings on the site is appropriate in terms of Government Guidance and the housing strategy to meet the Structure Plan requirements. Transport effects justify constraining the site capacity to 600 dwellings, which still achieves a net housing density of 30 dwellings per hectare.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 58

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Add new criteria (e) - It conforms to the Transport Policies of the Plan

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Comments: *This suggested additional criteria is considered to be unnecessary. This issue is covered by other policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 27

Representor: Fletcher, English Heritage **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: The policy should seek high standards of design in the new development. The scale of this allocation makes this particularly important.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Comments: *Issues of design quality are covered in other policies*

Recommendation *No change*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 9

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We have agreed with Pelham Homes that they will provide a free school site for a new primary school with the option of ECC acquiring additional land at market value if the new school was to serve a wider area. We are still in discussion with both Pelham Homes and Croudace Homes about meeting the construction cost of this new primary school provision. If the amount of dwellings increased from 600 to 770 we have agreed with Pelham Homes that the site area they will provide on the development would be sufficient for a 240 place primary school.

Comments: *Noted*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 228 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: A primary school must be constructed with adequate playing fields on the Rochfords site. This must be undertaken early and not late in the development

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Comments: *Developers have agreed that a site for a new primary school will be provided within the development at an appropriate stage.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Stansted Central/ Industrial Site – High Lane

Ref.No: 225 Rep.No: 2

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: I consider that as the site is isolated in a predominantly residential areas the site might be better designated for redevelopment for domestic housing. Hopefully future light industrial and commercial businesses could be encouraged to develop on the Parsonage Farm Industrial Estate in Forest Hall Road, particularly with the imminent development of housing on the former Rochford Nursery site.

Comments: *The site at High Lane, which is currently in employment use is not allocated as a protected employment site. The site provides limited local employment and additional residential land is not required to be allocated. If the site did become available then any proposal for it's re-use would be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

POLICY SM5 – PARSONAGE FARM

Deposit Policy

Within the Policy Area redevelopment of existing buildings for Class B1 purposes, primarily in small individual units, will be permitted, if all the following criteria are met.

- a) **Schemes for replacement buildings form part of an agreed overall plan for the phased improvement of the whole site, which may include arrangements for the regulation of existing haulage and car breaking uses.**
- b) **The design of new buildings suits the rural character and appearance of the locality, and associated activities and car parking are concealed from principal public viewpoints.**

Permission may also be granted for a lesser proportion of Class B2 uses. No increased floorspace will be permitted in any phase until all existing buildings in that phase have been replaced.

Permission will not be granted for new haulage or car breaking uses.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 123 Rep.No: 1 & 2

Representor: WRC Morton and Co Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Davies Arnold Cooper

Amendment(s) Sought: Policies SM5, SM6 and references in the lower case text are supported. Support the principal of the policy area but consider that the southern policy area should be realigned to form an enlarged site area.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Support the reference to Parsonage Farm contained under para 2.3 under the heading Policy S6 para 17.8, 17.9 and Policy SM5. The identification of the Policy Areas relating to Parsonage Farm on the Birchanger and Parsonage Farm Inset Map are also supported. There are special circumstances to justify the proposed realignment and enlargement of the policy area to secure, improved facilities for commercial and industrial businesses. Additional employment opportunities which would further contribute to the economic growth and development of the area. The replacement of the existing ag buildings with purpose built accommodation in a landscaped environment and substantial landscaping improvements and other environmental benefits.

Comments: *Support is noted. In relation to the request to extend the policy area further expansion would be contrary to Green Belt policy. Government advice is that green belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Adequate employment land is provided within the district. There is no justification in terms of need to extend the policy area.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 204 Rep.No: 12

Representor: Burchell, Essex County Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Add sub-section c) The safety and enjoyment of horse riders, cyclists and pedestrians using Parsonage Lane (Bridleway 27 Stansted Mountfitchet) must be fully considered as part of the redevelopment of Parsonage Farm.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The main access to Parsonage Farm coincides with an existing public bridleway (bridleway 27 Stansted Mountfitchet). It is important that the safety and enjoyment of this route by horse riders, cyclists and pedestrians is fully considered as part of any redevelopment of this site.

Comments: *This can be addressed through the Development Control process in relation to any application.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at the Stables, High Lane, Stansted Mountfitchet

Ref.No: 130 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , Foreman Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: That part of the land at the Stables, High Lane, should be included within the village development area for future residential purposes.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land at the Stables should be included within the Development Area of the village as there is development on the opposite side of the road and the area lies within walking distance of the village amenities and which could contribute further selective housing without detriment to the village.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV
Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site represents an extension into the countryside beyond the settlement boundary. The site is 0.6 ha and could accommodate 18-30 dwellings at the government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. There is sufficient housing land allocated in Policy H1 to meet the Structure Plan requirements. No additional land is required.*

Recommendation: No change

Site: Land adjacent to Croft Cottage, High Lane, Stansted Mountfitchet

Ref.No: 131 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Orpin, **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Part of the site adjoining Croft Cottage should be included within the village development area for future residential purposes.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land adjoining Croft Cottage should be included within the settlement boundary of the village as there is development on the opposite side of the road and the area is within walking distance of the village facilities and which contribute further selective housing without detriment to the village.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV
Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This site represents an extension into the countryside beyond the settlement boundary. The site is 3.3 ha and could accommodate 99-165 dwellings at the government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. There is sufficient housing land allocated in Policy H1 to meet the Structure Plan requirements. No additional land is required.*

Recommendation: No Change

Site: The Railway Sidings, Lower Street, Stansted Mountfitchet

Ref.No: 228 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary should remain unchanged apart from one amendment. The whole of the former railway sidings off Lower Street should be included within the Settlement Boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, Policy SM3 Policy Area
Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *It is considered that the settlement boundary is appropriately drawn in this location, there is no justification for including the whole extent of the railway sidings as requested*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site Land at Pines Hill, Stansted Mountfitchet

Ref.No: 126 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Dziedzic, Longley and Polley, **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Extend the settlement boundary to include this site and exclude it from the Metropolitan Green Belt.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary should be south of Ostra Brama on Pines Hill since this is a more natural boundary. The site should not be included in the Green Belt area. Land to the south has been allowed to be developed for office purposes. The projected re-routing of traffic from Stoney Common through Old Bell Close will change the character of the area. The site should be zoned for future residential purposes. A much improved access could be provided to the site through Pines Hill. Part of the site is used for engineering and this brown field portion is more suitable for residential purposes. The site is screened from Pines Hill and already contains four dwellings. The site is not suitable for agricultural or any other purpose. There appear to be no further areas suggested for residential purposes within the village other than the Rochford Nursery site.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, MGB, ASLV, Important Woodland (Part)

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, MGB, Important Woodland (Part)

Comments: *The sites lies beyond the clearly defined edge of the main village and within established Green Belt. Government advice is that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. There is no justification in terms of need since sufficient housing land is allocated to the meet the Structure Plan requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land north of Stansted Mountfitchet

Ref.No: 225 Rep.No: 3

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

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The triangle of land outside development limits following development of the new Roman Catholic church, presbytery and hall to the intersection of High Lane with the B1383 may be worthy of consideration during the present review.

Comments: *The new church and presbytery are community facilities. In the context of the plan it is appropriate that these are sited beyond the settlement boundary. However to include the whole of this site would result in an extension of the village into the countryside. This would be inappropriate.*

Recommendation: *No change*

START HILL

Ref.No: 163 Rep.No: 1 & 2

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Land at Start Hill should be included within the settlement boundary. The site should be indicated as an employment site under Policy E1 and subject to Local Policy 1

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The S3 settlement boundary does not reflect the existing boundary in the adopted UDC plan. The boundary excludes the objection site and adjacent land is also excluded from the Countryside Protection Zone. The submitted landscape and highways consultant report clearly indicate that there would be no demonstrable harm through the inclusion of this land as part of the Stansted Distribution Centre. Indeed the Landscape Consultants view is that overall there will be benefits assuming the associated planting and landscaping takes place

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, Mostly within the Public Safety Zone

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *It is accepted that the site west of the Stansted Distribution Centre is appropriate for employment purposes. It will bring a parcel of despoiled land into production use as an extension to an existing employment area*

Recommendation: *Include as employment site insert new text and local policy. Consequential amendments to Start Hill inset map and Policy E1*

New Para Start Hill

A 2.1 ha site is identified as an extension to the existing Stansted Distribution Centre. to accommodate businesses falling into Class B1 light industrial, offices or research and development facilities and Class B8 warehousing. Landscaping will be required to protect the amenity of the neighbouring residential property.

New Policy – Start Hill Local Policy 1

A 2.1 hectare site identified on the proposals map inset is proposed as an employment site for uses falling within classes B1 and B8.

STEBBING

Site: Land south of Garden Fields

Ref.No: 139 Rep.No: 5

Representor: , CWS Pension Fund Trustees Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Jones Lang Lasalle Ltd

Amendment(s) Sought: 1. Allocate the site for housing development. 2. Amend the settlement boundary of Stebbing to include the allocated site.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: In context of our objections to Policies H1 & H2 it is considered that the settlement boundary for Stebbing should be amended to allow a small scale village extension. The site lies close to the existing school and is centrally located within the village. It is separated from the Conservation Area and the listed buildings within the area by the school playing fields and existing development. It is considered that allocation of this site for housing would provide the opportunity to sustain and enhance existing facilities within the settlement, thus meeting community needs.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *The development of this site (0.9ha) would extend the built up area into attractive farmland adjoining the village. The strategic requirement for housing land is met elsewhere and further allocations are not necessary.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Stebbing Cricket Club, East of the High Street, Stebbing

Ref.No: 89 Rep.No: 1 & 2

Representor: , Keith Clements Associates **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Extension of the defined settlement boundary to include land at Stebbing Cricket Ground

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Reviews to boundaries should be considered at each local plan review to enable new sites to be brought forward. The development of the cricket ground would be an opportunity to provide a small group of housing in the heart of the village close to all main facilities. In accordance with Government advice the release of this site would help to ensure that land is available within existing villages to enable local requirements to be met. A sensible, logical and defensible amendment to the development limits would be to follow the boundary line of the cricket ground. A carefully designed scheme would preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area and meet the requirements of PPG3.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Conservation Area

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Conservation Area

Comments: *The area of countryside to the west of Stebbing which includes the cricket ground is included within the Conservation Area. The environmental quality of this area which forms an attractive rural setting for the village means it is appropriately excluded from the settlement boundary. This site is 2 ha which could accommodate 60-100 dwellings in accordance with the Governments density range*

of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Policy H1 makes sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirements. There is no need for additional housing to justify development in this attractive location.

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land rear of Town Farm, High Street, Stebbing

Ref.No: 49 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , Lodge and Sons (Builders) Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Prospect Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Redefine the settlement boundary to include land to the rear of Town Farm.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to the exclusion of land to the rear of Town Farm, High Street from the settlement boundary for Stebbing. The site is previously developed land, and benefits from a certificate of Lawfulness. The land is in active use as a builders yard. Application of restrictive countryside policies caused by exclusion of the site from the defined village envelope is frustrating the lawful use of the site. Historically all of the land, including Town Farmhouse comprised a single planning unit. It is therefore illogical to exclude the rear part of the original curtilage from the defined settlement boundary. There is a distinct change in character between all the land which comprised the original curtilage of Town Farm and the open countryside to the east. The representation sites clearly reads as part of the developed part of the village, separate from the surrounding fields.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV, Conservation Area

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Conservation Area.

Comments: *Sufficient land is allocated elsewhere in the plan to meet the Structure Plan requirements. No additional land is needed. Conversion of rural buildings may be acceptable beyond settlement boundaries subject to criteria*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at Hornsea Farm, Bran End, Stebbing

Ref.No: 181 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Hills, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.19 ha) at Hornsea Farm should be included within the village boundary for small scale infill development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide a small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Development would be inappropriate because it would led to the undesirable consolidation of sporadic development on this approach to the village.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land north of Brick Kiln Lane, Stebbing

Ref.No: 181 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Hills, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.5 ha) north of Brick Kiln Lane, should be included within the village boundary for small scale development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The village boundary does not take into account small infill plots available on the edge of the village which would provide a small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This is not an infill site. The site forms part of a large gap which separates the two areas of built development along Brick Kiln Lane. The site is rural in nature and development here would have a detrimental effect on the on the countryside. This 0.5 ha site could accommodate 15-25 dwellings at the Government's density range of 30-50 dwellings per ha. Policy H1 makes sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Area of Special Landscape Value

Ref.No: 161 **Rep.No:** 4

Representor: Brackenbury, The Stebbing Society **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Defined Area of Special Landscape Value

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Stebbing also has the benefit of being almost surrounded by an extensive area of Special Landscape Value. The Essex and Southend of Sea Replacement Structure Plan (NR4) states that these areas should be included in Local Plans. This has been ommitted from the Stebbing Inset Map and should be reinstated.

Comments: *The area of Special Landscape Value, which was defined in the adopted plan has been deleted as a notation from the entirety of this plan. The Structure Plan encourages Local Planning Authorities to carry out landscape character assessments to identify the particular character of different areas. It would be inappropriate to just include Stebbing – its has to be a comprehensive exercise to assess the character of the whole district. Policy GEN 8 requires that development will only be permitted if it protects or enhances the character of the countryside within which it is set.*

Recommendation: *No Change*

Protected Lanes

Ref.No: 161 Rep.No: 5

Representor: Brackenbury, The Stebbing Society **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Stebbing has more than one protected lane in its vicinity. Reference to them has been omitted in the Local Plan on First Deposit. The society believes that Protected Lanes should be continued to be identified and thereby protected by the Local Plan.

Comments: *Two protected lanes are shown beyond the inset area on the main proposals map beyond the inset area.*

TAKELEY VILLAGE & PRIORS GREEN (TAKELEY & LITTLE CANFIELD)

Para 18.3

Ref.No: 185 Rep.No: 8

Representor: McGowan, Hatfield Regis Grange Farm **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: Suggest inclusion in the sentence commencing " the Priors Green Site comprises ..."Established very untidy scrap recycling businesses.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Elsewhere in representations on behalf of this landowner it has been acknowledged that the land holding of this land owner has a useful and important contribution to make to the overall Priors Green Development. Para 18.3 insufficiently describes the component areas of Priors Green and should include more specific reference to their land.

Comments: *Para 18.3 could be amended to include reference to the established scrap recycling business.*

Recommendation: *Amend second sentence of paragraph 18.3 to read "The Priors Green Site comprises Takeley Nurseries, land in need of environmental improvement, including an established scrap recycling business, under utilised land where existing development has no coherent form and some adjoining farmland north of Dunmow Road.*

Para 18.4

Ref.No: 185 Rep.No: 5

Representor: McGowan, Hatfield Regis Grange Farm **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: Insert new sentence "of the sites and their setting. Some land included in the Priors Green allocation is not covered by the approved master plan. It will be expected that such land will be developed residentially in a form which is compatible with the approved master plan". The Priors Green site....."

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: In respect of Priors Green it is important that this para recognises that there is land beyond the approved masterplan but within the allocation site. The paragraph should also be amended to confirm that this additional land will be expected to come forward as part of the residential allocation

Comments: *It is proposed to increase the number of dwellings on the Priors Green site from 800 to 900 dwellings. This additional figure will allow for housing coming forward as a result of development of the pockets of land within the Policy area but excluded from the master plan.*

Recommended: *Consequential amendments to the text to reflect the increased numbers.*

Para 18.5

Ref.No: 207 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Wilkinson, Uttlesford Primary Care Trust (PCT) **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Reference to a health facility being included as part of the criteria to be met when developing these new dwellings.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: No reference is made in the list of 'criteria to be met' to the potential provision of a health facility as part of the new housing development. This is despite correspondence, meetings and discussions between the District Council's Planning Department, the PCT and local GP's to clearly indicate the need for such a facility to be included within the Master Plan (see for eg letter to J Bosworth dated 23 May 2000)

Comments: *The policy does not specifically mention a health facility but there is provision in the policy for community facilities which could include a health facility.*

Recommendation: *No change*

18.8 New Para

Ref.No: 202 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Duncan, Countryside Strategic Projects **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: The housing and employment provisions of this plan extend to 2011. The concurrent review of the Structure Plan and other strategic studies are likely to impact upon development requirements post 2011, and it is important that the Council recognises this. No decisions on future development locations need to be

made at this stage. However the Council does need to consider its potential long term development strategy and the role that key settlements are likely to play. In view of its strategic location in relation to Stansted and an area of significant employment growth its proximity to the strategic road network, the potential for significant improvements to public transport services in the future and the fact that the area is already benefitting from significant new transport and service infrastructure the Council recognises that further development at Takeley is an option that will need to be considered. The Council will therefore seek to ensure that in implementing the provision of this plan future options are not prejudiced.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Conclusion in 1.6 is that new regional guidance, structure plan review, SERAS and London to Cambridge studies etc are a matter for the review of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed at this stage. The substance of this objection is that this conclusion is inappropriate. The information will be largely available by the time this plan proceeds to inquiry and the short term incremental and largely reactive approach to future development that characterises much of the strategic planning in the County is harmful to the pursuit of a more sustainable pattern of development. Revisions should be made to ensure this Local Plan recognises the need for the Council to adopt a long term development strategy and within that context highlights the potential need for current planning policies and decisions to avoid prejudicing likely future development sites.

Comments: *No provision is made for requirements beyond the plan period. It is proposed to increase the number within the Takeley Local Policy 3 area. Land is elsewhere in the District is safeguarded to meet any identified shortfall in housing land within the plan period.*

Recommendation: *Changes to Local Policy 3*

TAKELEY LOCAL POLICY 1 – LAND WEST OF HAWTHORN CLOSE

Deposit Policy

Land west of Hawthorn Close defined on the Proposals Map Inset is proposed for a residential development of 100 dwellings. Development will follow principles set out in a Master Plan agreed with the Council.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 13

Representor: , Bryant Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Vincent and Goring

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend policy to relate the site to airport related growth.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This allocation is the same allocation as that identified in the current adopted local plan for 100 dwellings for post 8mppa Stansted Airport related housing. The policy should be amended to relate the site to airport related growth.

Comments: *There is no need now for housing provision to be related to employment growth at the airport.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 10

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified – information only

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We have already agreed under a S106 agreement for a developer contribution for primary school provision in the Takeley Area to meet the needs of this development

Comments: *Noted*

Recommendation: *No change*

TAKELEY LOCAL POLICY 2 – LAND OFF ST VALERY

Deposit Policy

A 0.83 hectare site to the south of St Valery is defined on the Inset Map is proposed for 24 dwellings.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

144 Rep.No: 14

Representor: , Bryant Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Vincent and Gorbong

Ref.No: 213 Rep.No: 29

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend map to read local policy 2

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: There is a typographical error on the Takeley Inset Map which incorrectly identifies the site as Local Policy 3 - it should be Local Policy 2

Comments: *Noted*

Recommendation: *Amend map notation*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 11

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

Amendment(s) Sought: If it is not too late we would like to seek a developer contribution in relation to a likely pupil product of 5 primary age children from this new housing.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:

Comments: *Planning permission has now been granted for this development and there is no scope for securing a developer contribution.*

Recommendation: *No change*

TAKELEY LOCAL POLICY 3 – PRIORS GREEN

Deposit Policy

The Priors Green site to the east of Takeley defined on the Inset Map is proposed for comprehensive residential and associated development of 700 dwellings.

The following criteria must be met:

- a) **It provides for a mixed and balanced community;**
- b) **It provides for a local centre incorporating community facilities and suitable shopping, a primary school and satisfactory open space and arrangements for sport and recreation.**
- c) **It provides for substantial landscaping within the development boundaries to complement the layout and arrangement of buildings and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide off site landscaping.**
- d) **It is designed to mitigate adverse effects upon existing residential and community interests and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide or contribute towards wider and longer term planning benefits reasonably associated with the alleviation of any such impact. Development will need to provide for appropriate sport and recreation facilities, and long-term traffic calming measures for Dunmow Road.**
- e) **It provides for the management of the nature conservation interests of woodland in Broadfield Road;**
- f) **The provision of these and other relevant planning benefits are coordinated with the development of the site to the east of Hawthorn Close.**

Development will need to be implemented in accordance with a master plan approved by the Council. This will indicate how specific proposals, which may be implemented on a phased basis, will relate to an overall design concept for the site.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Para 6.3

Ref.No: 185 Rep.No: 9

Representor: McGowan, Hatfield Regis Grange Farm **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The land subject of this representation is substantially previously developed land and as such is a very scarce resource in the Uttlesford District. The form and nature of the development of this land would in any circumstances suggest that there would be benefit in its redevelopment and it is probably some of the most suitable and relevant land in the whole of the Priors Green allocation area for residential development

Ref.No: 16 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Stock, The Fairfield Partnership **Agent (if applicable):** Januarys Chartered Surveyors

Amendment(s) Sought: More appropriate locations for residential development be considered as an alternative to the whole, or part of this site.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This is an inappropriate site and that there are more suitable locations to be found elsewhere in the District. The size of the site is excessive given its surrounding and characteristics and may result in a detrimental impact on the setting and landscape of the surrounding area. In addition it is understood that there are potential difficulties regarding delivery of development on the site, despite the approved Master Plan and current application for outline planning permission on the site.

Ref.No: 118 Rep.No: 13

Representor: , Bryant Projects **Agent (if applicable):** DLP Consultants Ltd

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We question whether this development is likely to be fully implemented within the period of the plan. It is possible that first completions may not arise until 2004. This assumes that the Council are in a position to entertain an application during 2002, are minded to grant consent in advance of the conclusion of the Local Plan Review and that the site is not subject to any Direction issued by the Secretary of State. This would leave seven years in which to implement the scheme, requiring an average completion rate of 100 dwellings per annum. Taking into account that major developments rarely come fully on stream from the start and that other sites in Takeley will also be in production completions will need to arise significantly in excess of this level over the greater part of the production period. Even in the recently strong housing market completions from single sites, such as Woodlands Park, Great Dunmow have rarely reached this figure.

Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 15

Representor: , Bryant Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Vincent and Goring

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the policy

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This allocation is essentially the same as that identified in the current adopted local plan for 700 dwellings for post 8mpa Stansted Airport related housing. The policy should be amended to relate the site to airport related growth. We would also point out that the land at north west Takeley is a more sustainable location for residential development than Priors Green, being

located close to Stansted Airport thereby allowing shorter journeys and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport (as the site is within walking and cycling distance of the airport and closer to existing facilities in the village). Notwithstanding these comments we have doubts as to whether the suggested number of dwellings can be provided within the plan period.

Ref.No: 185 Rep.No: 3

Representor: McGowan, Hatfield Regis Grange Farm **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend Local Policy 3 in the final paragraph to read "development will need to be implemented substantially in accordance with a master plan approved by the Council. This will indicate....."

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: For the most part the objector supports what is set out in the Takeley Little Canfield Local Policy 3. However it will be plain from other representations on behalf of these landowners that their land although within the allocation is not subject to the approved master plan. Takeley Local Policy 3, as it is written would not permit the development of these objectors land as part of the overall Priors Green allocation. That is plainly unacceptable. Very minor modifications to the policy would allow their land to make the important contribution it has to offer whilst at the same time being compatible with the aims of the local plan policy and that much of the site covered by the master plan.

Ref.No: 185 Rep.No: 1

Representor: McGowan, Hatfield Regis Grange Farm **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The inset map recognises the wide diverse area involved in this allocation including the objector's land ownership

Ref.No: 201 Rep.No: 10

Representor: , Countryside Properties PLC **Agent (if applicable):** Strategic Land and Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete 700 dwellings, replace with 750-850 dwellings: reword Criteria b) c) and d)

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Support the identification of Priors Green as a site for a comprehensive development. Support the current boundaries of the site as which are almost identical to the adopted local plan except for the exclusion of the woodland at Broadfield Road. In broad terms we support the criteria in the policy with the following reservations. The adopted plan refers to the provision of a "primary school site" and it would more appropriate if the Draft Plan were to continue to use the same terminology. Off-site landscaping can be provided on land within the control of the relevant parties. However the policy should not imply an ability to require off site provision in all circumstances. Countryside Properties is willing to seek to co-ordinate the timing and nature of the benefits arising from Priors Green and Hawthorn Close, however the sites are in separate ownerships and the policy should not assume greater co-ordination than can realistically be achieved by the developer.

Ref.No: 94 Rep.No: 2

Representor: , Saxon Developments Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** David Lock Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: The settlement boundary for Priors Green should run along the track extending eastwards from Jacks Lane with the land excluded from the new settlement boundary to the north of this track re-designated as part of the Countryside Protection Zone. Consequential amendments should be made to the Takeley/Little Canfield Local Policy 3 and the supporting text to this policy. These consequential amendments should include a significant reduction of the number of dwellings proposed at Priors Green to reflect the reduced site area suggested above.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The inclusion within the settlement boundary for Priors Green of land north of the track extending eastwards from Jacks Lane is inappropriate. This area of undeveloped farmland is of a different character to that to the south of Jacks Lane and this track where the nurseries, scattered development and under-utilised land predominate. The latter is appropriately included within the Settlement Boundary for Priors Green. The former is not. Jacks Lane and the track extending eastwards provides a defensible boundary for the Priors Green development which the existing northern and north eastern parts of the settlement boundary do not.

Comments: *This site is a longstanding commitment which makes a significant contribution to the meeting the structure plan requirement for housing in the District up to 2011. The land to the north of Jacks Lane is required to provide a high quality development with elements of public open space, landscaping etc. An application for 700 dwellings has been submitted by Countryside Properties and it is expected that if this is approved the development will be substantially completed within the plan period. Annual build rates of 100 dwellings per annum are not considered to be unreasonable. It would be inappropriate to refer to the housing as airport related since there is no link with employment growth at the airport.*

It is proposed to increase the number of dwellings within the Local Policy 3 area to 800 dwellings to take account of the potential contribution to the development of the parcels of land which are within the policy area but outside the area of the current application submitted by Countryside Properties for 700 dwellings.

Recommended: *Amendment to Takeley/Little Canfield Local Policy 3 – Priors Green and consequential amendments to the supporting text . Define settlement boundary notation on Inset map*

- 18.1. The Priors Green site to the east of Takeley, partly in Little Canfield parish, is proposed for comprehensive residential development of 800 homes and associated facilities. *“The Priors Green Site comprises Takeley Nurseries, land in need of environmental improvement, including an established scrap recycling business, under utilised land where existing development has no coherent form and some adjoining farmland north of Dunmow Road.*
- 18.2. Master Plans for this site and the land off Brewers End have been approved. Appropriate facilities and services to serve the developments need to be provided in the right place at the right time. The approved master plans define sites for about 900 dwellings, taking into account the character of the

sites and their setting. The Priors Green site includes pockets of existing housing. *There may be potential for some infill development in these locations which would make a contribution to the total number of dwellings. Development in these locations will need to respect the provisions of the approved master plan.* Jacks Lane will need to be protected by its retention within a linear open space. The woodland in Broadfield Road will need to be retained for its nature conservation interest. Structural landscaping will be required to provide a framework for development. The disposition and extent of open spaces, structural landscaping and the location of other facilities has been resolved in the master plan.

- 18.3. Access to the Priors Green site will be from Dunmow Road. There will be no vehicular access to the development from Smiths Green. Traffic calming measures will be sought along Dunmow Road in order to discourage traffic from the development passing through Takeley once the new A120 is open. These, and other appropriate measures, will take account of the desirability of promoting public transport, cycling and walking as alternatives to the private car. Links for pedestrians and cyclists will need to be considered between the development site and the existing village.

TAKELEY/ LITTLE CANFIELD LOCAL POLICY 3 – PRIORS GREEN

The Priors Green site to the east of Takeley defined on the Inset Map is proposed for comprehensive residential and associated development of 800 dwellings.

The following criteria must be met:

- a) **It provides for a mixed and balanced community;**
- b) **It provides for a local centre incorporating community facilities and suitable shopping, a primary school and satisfactory open space and arrangements for sport and recreation.**
- c) **It provides for substantial landscaping within the development boundaries to complement the layout and arrangement of buildings and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide off site landscaping.**
- d) **It is designed to mitigate adverse effects upon existing residential and community interests and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide or contribute towards wider and longer term planning benefits reasonably associated with the alleviation of any such impact.**
Development will need to provide for appropriate sport and recreation facilities, and long-term traffic calming measures for Dunmow Road.
- e) **It provides for the management of the nature conservation interests of woodland in Broadfield Road;**
- f) **The provision of these and other relevant planning benefits are coordinated with the development of the site to the east of Hawthorn Close.**

Development will need to be implemented in accordance with a master plan approved by the Council. This will indicate how specific proposals, which may be implemented on a phased basis, will relate to an overall design concept for the site.

Ref.No: 204 Rep.No: 13

Representor: Burchell, Essex County Council Agent (if applicable):

Amendment(s) Sought: In sub section d) add as follows: Improved bridleway links between Jacks Lane and the Flitch Way Country Park should be provided within the development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Reference should be made to improving links to the Flitch Way Country Park.

Comments: *The Master Plan has already been approved. Cannot require this through policy. More appropriately dealt with in ongoing discussions with the developers*

Recommendation *No change*

Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 28

Representor: Fletcher, English Heritage **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: This proposed development should be the subject of an archaeological assessment and the capacity of the site assessed in the light of the findings. The policy should include an additional qualification relating to the preservation of archaeological remains.

Comments: *Archaeology assessment is being carried out as part of the environmental appraisal process.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 12

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified – information only

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We have agreed with Countryside Properties a free school site for a new primary school on this development, although we have yet to formalise the S106 Agreement. As you will know we are not happy about the location and orientation of the new school as shown on the Master Plan but have agreed with Countryside that they will discuss further with ECC where the school could best be situated after the planning permission has been granted.

Comments: *Noted – the position of the school site within the development is a master plan issue and not one that needs to be dealt with in the local plan*

Recommendation: *No change*

TAKELEY LOCAL POLICY 4 – THE MOBILE HOME PARK

Deposit Policy

Redevelopment of the Takeley Mobile Home Park as defined on the Inset Map for conventional residential or other development proposals will not be permitted. Permission will not be granted for any additional mobile homes on the site.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 110 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Cory-Wright, **Agent (if applicable):** AS Planning

Amendment(s) Sought: Omit the last sentence of para 18.6 and the last sentence of Takeley Local Policy 4. There should be an addition to the policy to state that permission will be granted for additional park homes at the site within the undeveloped area. Because of the inherent affordability of the homes there is no need to include any restrictions on occupancy or ownership and no conflict with the Council's policy for affordable housing on exception sites, policy H10.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The circumstances in which permission for the mobile home park were granted have changed. The park is increasingly used for low cost housing and undeveloped land in the north of the site could be used for additional homes. The only reason the area remains undeveloped is that there is a ceiling on the number of homes on the site of 125 imposed by condition when the planning permission was granted the land is not required for open space. Such a proposal would fit in well with the Council's need to provide affordable housing. This is an opportunity to provide affordable market housing in a location close to the village.

Comments: *Agreed it would be unreasonable to continue to restrict the number of number of mobile homes that can be erected within the local policy 4 area. Mobile homes on this site can add to the stock of more affordable housing available within the District.*

Recommendation: *Delete "permission will not be granted for any additional mobile homes on the site" from Takeley Local Policy 4.*

Site Land at Old House Business Yard, Takeley

Ref.No: 107 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Rosper Estates Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Birketts

Amendment(s) Sought: It is requested that the site edged red on the attached plan be proposed for Class B1 office redevelopment within the plan/proposals map. The proposal should make it clear that the Grade II listed building should be retained

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The site known as Old House Business Yard represents an excellent opportunity for redevelopment for B1 purposes. The existing commercial buildings on the site (the majority of which are vacant) are a wasted resource whose scale and appearance are such that they are prominent in

and detrimental to the countryside. The sympathetic redevelopment of the site for B1 office purposes would significantly enhance the environment of the site and the character of this part of the countryside whilst at the same time providing employment opportunities in a sustainable manner. It is considered that the same general considerations apply to this site as to the Parsonage Farm site at Stansted.

Comments: *It is recognised that there is potential for environmental improvement and a more sustainable form of development in the redevelopment of this site. However it is not considered necessary to specifically allocate the site for employment use. Any proposal could be considered in relation to other policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change.*

Site: Land to the South of the A120, Priors Green, Takeley

Ref.No: 117 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , KJ Cass Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Alan Wipperman and Co

Amendment(s) Sought: None the notation is supported

The land between the A120 and the Flitch Way at Takeley south of the new residential development area has already lost its rural character and should be taken out of the area defined as CPZ.

Ref.No: 117 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: , KJ Cass Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Alan Wipperman and Co

Amendment(s) Sought:

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land to the south of the A120 within Settlement Boundary

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The new Essex Structure Plan requires new development land to be made available for housing and employment uses. The subject land area is potentially being made available for more intensive uses and so offers windfall housing opportunities. It should therefore be properly included within the Takeley development limits, as it is clearly a sustainable location with urban services. It already has an essentially urban mixed use character which will become much more pronounced as further development takes place.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, CPZ

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundaries

Comments: *Land to the north is allocated for major residential development but this site is not defined by a settlement boundary. It would be inappropriate to include this site within the policy area. Infilling proposals will be considered in relation to other policies in the plan. The Inspector at the last plan inquiry considered that even if the site to the north of the road were to be allocated (which it subsequently was) there would still be a case for preventing development spreading over the A120 because of the characteristics of this locality which is detached from the main village group by open land.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Takeley Cricket Club, North West of Takeley Four Ashes Crossroads, Takeley

Ref.No: 196 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: , Diocese of Chelmsford **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Look at the issue of Takeley and its growth potential, including the relocation of the cricket club, a sustainable location for future housing growth rather than allocating sporadic development in the open countryside.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The existing cricket ground in Takeley could be replaced by a new facility as part of the residential development planned to the east of the village. The relocation of the cricket ground would provide for development in a location which would not be impacting on open countryside adjoining the Takeley settlement as the site is well contained by existing residential development.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, CPZ

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, CPZ

Comments: *This site makes a contribution to Takeley. The extension of the settlement boundary to accommodate this site could result in a development of 30 to 50 dwellings. The housing strategy set out in Policy H1 makes provision for sufficient housing to meet the Structure Plan requirements.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land to the North West of Takeley

Ref.No: 144 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , Bryant Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Vincent and Gorbong

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy S2 should be amended to include reference to development at north west Takeley and the proposals map/inset maps amended to include the site within the settlement boundary

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land to the north west of Takeley should be identified as an "area of special reserve" for longer term development needs and the settlement boundary drawn to reflect this.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, CPZ

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond settlement boundary, CPZ

Comments: *The inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary would result in a major extension of the village into the Strategic Gap between the village and the airport. Development on this scale would be contrary to the housing strategy set out in Policy H1 which makes sufficient provision for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adjoining the White House, Takeley

Ref.No: 135 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Collins, **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land adjoining the White House, Dunmow Road, Takeley within the Settlement Boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land adjoining the White House, Dunmow Road, Takeley should be included within the development area. The site could be serviced from the development to the west on St Valery. Since the new A120 road is being constructed there is every reason to suppose that a new access may be available on the existing road frontage once this route is detrunked. In addition the area is derelict gardenland which has no other useful function and could easily provide much needed further dwellings.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond the VDL, within CPZ

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Partly within CPZ

Comments: *Sufficient land is allocated to meet the Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

TAKELEY STREET

Ref.No: 31 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Watson and Rolfe, **Agent (if applicable):** CGMS Limited

Amendment(s) Sought: Include the land at Takeley street within the Settlement Limit.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land to the south of the A120 at Takeley Street should be included within the settlement boundary. The inclusion of this relatively small area of infill development would be in accordance with the Council's strategy which seeks to direct the main housing allocations to the key settlements but allows for infill in other settlements including Takeley Street. A120 corridor is identified as a development location, Takeley Street has the same locational advantages as the sites in Takeley and Priors Green. It is ideally located to meet housing needs associated with Stansted Airport. The site should be included because the land adjoins existing development on three sides and relates more to the village than the countryside. The Fritch Way forms an effective southern boundary. Site is not subject to any planning constraints and is not in agricultural use. Its development would not result in any merging of settlements or encroachment into open countryside.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *This area of open land separates two built up areas along the A120. Development here would be inappropriate. Sufficient land for housing is allocated elsewhere to meet the Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land adj to Gransmere, Takeley Street

Ref.No: 45 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend the settlement boundary to include plot of land adjacent to Gransmere.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land to south of A120 at Takeley Street, adjacent to Gransmere should be included within the settlement boundary. Over the last 10 years various parcels of land like this have been granted planning permission. The resulting properties have greatly enhanced the overall appearance of Takeley Street. There are already residential properties either side of the land and Taylor's Farm is opposite. The meadow is overgrown and untidy and is now unsuitable for agricultural use.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, within CPZ

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, within CPZ

Comments: *This site is within the Countryside Protection Zone and residential development here would be contrary to Policy S8. Additional land for housing is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Settlement Boundary Amendment

In drawing up the settlement boundaries the aim was to reflect boundaries on the ground where possible. It has been brought to officer's attention that the rear boundary to the last property on the west of Takeley street near Taylors Farm is incorrectly drawn.

Recommendation: *Amend settlement boundary to coincide with rear boundary.*

THAXTED

Para 19.2

Ref.No: 166 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Pyatt, Woodhall Estates (UK) Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: None- the paragraph is supported

This para accurately describes the permission which has been granted as "a mixed use scheme combining employment uses and homes specifically designed for home working"

THAXTED LOCAL POLICY 1 – LOCAL CENTRE

Deposit Policy

Change of use of existing shops, restaurants, public houses and hot food take-aways to residential uses will not be permitted, unless both the following criteria are met:

- a) **The existing use is surplus to current and foreseen future requirements; and**
- b) **The property has been widely advertised for at least six months on terms reflecting its use.**

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 153 Rep.No: 3

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

Amendment(s) Sought: None – policy is supported

Agree and welcome this policy and agree the area covered as shown on the Thaxted Plan

THAXTED LOCAL POLICY 2 – LAND ADJACENT TO SAMPFORD ROAD

Deposit Policy

A 1.42 hectare site adjoining Sampford Road is proposed primarily for employment uses, with a residential element.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 153 Rep.No: 4

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy should read "a 1.42 ha site adjoining the Sampford Road is proposed for employment uses including a maximum of 18 home/work units"

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object to wording

Comments: *Consider that the proposed change is too prescriptive. A scheme which involved a lesser residential element that suggested by the Parish Council might still be acceptable.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 166 Rep.No: 3

Representor: Pyatt, Woodhall Estates (UK) Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy should read “a 1.42 hectare site adjoining Sampford Road is proposed for a mixed use scheme combining employment uses and homes specifically designed for home working”

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy wording does not accurately describe the development which has the benefit of planning permission

Note

A revision to the representation has since been submitted seeking to amend the allocation to be wholly for housing on the basis that the site has proved impossible to market in either industrial use or its current permission for over 20 years and suggesting that in line with the advice in PPG3 the site should now be released for housing.

Comments: *There is sufficient housing land allocated in the District to meet Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 29

Representor: Fletcher, English Heritage **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: We note that the land adjacent to Sampford Road already has planning permission. The policy should be expanded to refer to the land bordering the road as safeguarded from development.

Comments: *As no reason for the change is given existing policies are considered to be appropriate.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 220 Rep.No: 13

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Not specified

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Reserve the right on any possible developer contribution for education provision once I know the number of dwellings involved.

Comments: *Noted*

Recommendation: *No change*

THAXTED LOCAL POLICY 3 – SAFEGUARDING OF EMPLOYMENT AREAS

Deposit Policy

The following employment areas are identified on the proposals map as key employment areas.

<i>Employment area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>
Chemical works (existing)	0.85
Sampford Road proposals site	1.42

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ref.No: 153 Rep.No: 5

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

Amendment(s) Sought: None - the policy is supported

Ref.No: 166 Rep.No: 4

Representor: Pyatt, Woodhall Estates (UK) Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: Delete the Sampford Road site from this policy.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Sampford Road site should not be included in this category

Comments: *The Sampford Road site is proposed for a mixed use site including employment and is appropriately included in this policy.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Thaxted - New Policy

Ref.No: 153 Rep.No: 6

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

Amendment(s) Sought: A new policy to be introduced Local Policy 4 " A stringent presumption against further development in this area which would inevitably result in a significant increase in traffic through the Tanyard and Bell Lane and an increase in surface water run off to an already flood prone location will be applied. No relaxation of the Settlement Boundary will be permitted.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: A new policy 4 should be introduced

Comments: *These matters can be addressed through the development control process with reference to other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Thaxted - New Policy

Ref.No: 153 Rep.No: 7

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Introduce new policy "that open-space Conservation Areas - natural gardens at Clarence House, rear of Nos 23 and 25 Town Street and the Primary School Playing Field will be protected.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Introduce new policy to protect open space and conservation area.

Site: Land r/o 23-25 Town Street, Thaxted

Ref.No: 23 Rep.No: 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Redraw Settlement Boundary to exclude rear of Nos 23 and 25 Town Street

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Large gardens give space for the growth of tall and spreading trees, add to the townscape of the village and contribute to the variety and texture of the overall scene, they are of nature conservation value. They are a much diminished resource.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Within VDL, ASLV, Conservation Area

Notation in Deposit Plan: Within Settlement Boundary, Within Conservation Area

Comments: *A specific policy is not required. There are other policies in the plan particularly GEN3 which seek to prevent inappropriate development on important open spaces within towns and villages.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land off Wedow Road, Thaxted

Ref.No: 164 Rep.No: 9

Representor: , Bellway Homes **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

Amendment(s) Sought: Land off Wedow Road should be included within H1 . The Thaxted Inset Map should be amended to show the site allocated for housing and included within the settlement boundary.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Thaxted has been identified as a key rural settlement this is recognition that the settlement has a particular role to play within the District. We believe that a site off Wedow Road could accommodate 60-75 dwellings of which up to 50% will be affordable. Highway consultants have confirmed that the improvements required as a result of traffic generated from the new development does not prevent access being gained to the land at Wedow Road. Site approx 1.98 hectares (4.9 acres)

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond settlement boundary, small area of the site falls within the 57 Leq contour.

Comments: *Development of this large site would have an detrimental impact on the open countryside. The representation suggests that 60-75 dwellings could be accommodated. Sufficient housing land is allocated in the District to meet Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not required. A significant amount of affordable housing has already been provided to meet needs in Thaxted. Any additional proposals would be considered in relation to relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land at Bolford Street, Thaxted

Ref.No: 175 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Latham, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: The area of land (0.2ha) rear of 28 Bolford Street, should be included within the village boundary for infill development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Village Boundary does not take into account small infill backland plots available on the edge of the village which would provide small number of dwellings without affecting the character of the settlement.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, within 57 Leq contour

Comments: *Development on this site would intrude into the open countryside beyond the built up edge of the village. Sufficient housing land is allocated in the District to meet Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Land west of Guelphs Lane, Thaxted

Ref.No: 116 **Rep.No:** 2

Representor: Smith, Essex County Council - Property Services **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land adjacent to and to the west of Guelph's Lane and the mead within the Thaxted Settlement boundary and allocation of the land to meet future local housing needs

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Essex CC own a 1.72 ha that was originally acquired to provide for a replacement primary school but was identified as no longer being required for that purpose in 1993. The site has remained vacant since 1993 but the western segment is well located on the urban fringe of Thaxted and could be developed to provide for future local housing needs without significant intrusion into the open countryside. The impact of built development of the western segment of the site will have substantially less impact than the ribbon development approved for the

site adjoining Sampford Road and as such is the logical site on which to meet future housing needs whilst respecting the urban form of Thaxted and providing a defensible and sharply defined boundary between town and countryside. If development of the western segment of land were to be considered acceptable the eastern segment could be made available for public open space.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary, Within 57 Leq contour

Comments: : *Development on this site would intrude into the open countryside beyond the built up edge of the village. Sufficient land is allocated in the District to meet Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not required*

Recommendation: *No change*

WENDENS AMBO

Site: Land at Duck Street, Wendens Ambo

Ref.No: 66 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: Joslin, **Agent (if applicable):** Edward Gittings and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Land at Duck Street should be included within the settlement boundary and included as a housing site

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Land at Duck Street should be included within the settlement boundary. The site is approx 0.3 hectares. The site represents rounding off and would not extend development into the open countryside. The site is small but would accommodate 3/4 additional dwellings - a scale of development appropriate for a small village. The site has strong defensible boundaries, A limited release is justified to underpin rural services. The village is well related to the railway station. The release of the land for housing can be directly associated with the use of land to the rear for community or amenity purposes.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *Beyond the settlement boundary as drawn the character of development in the village is changes to a more sporadic form of development. This proposal would be inappropriate because it would be detrimental to this character. Additional housing land is not required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

WICKEN BONHUNT

Site: Land west of Green Acres, Wicken Bonhunt

Ref.No: 77 **Rep.No:** 1

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

Amendment(s) Sought: Extend settlement boundary to include land south of main road opposite New Cottages and west of Green Acres.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Settlement Boundary excludes land opposite New Cottages and rear of Clarks Cottage. Cottages previously stood in the current gap between Brick House and Green Acres. Site not subject to flooding. As site of previous houses it is not a 'traditional Open Space' (ENV3). Development of site would not affect qualities of Brick House. Development would be consistent with H1 "reuse of ...previously developed land outside urban areas".

Ref.No: 136 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , The Trustees of W Heard 1990 Guernsey Settlement **Agent (if applicable):** Mullucks Wells and Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Include land opposite new cottages within the settlement boundary

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The proposed local plan has once again divided Wicken Bonhunt into two separate developed areas. Historically this is incorrect. It has always been one village and part of the frontage of the site used to contain a number of cottages which were demolished in the 60's. The frontage of this site could be included within the settlement boundary for residential purposes. The site is always likely to remain derelict as it is impossible for it to be used for agricultural purposes and it has little amenity value to any adjoining properties. The site has never been flooded. There are houses on the opposite side of the road too there would be little ill effect on the village street scene. There is good visibility for access purposes. There is no opportunity for infilling or any other form of development within the village.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL, ASLV

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Site: Land at Howlands Farm, Wicken Bonhunt

Ref.No: 190 Rep.No: 2

Representor: , Pegasi Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought: Policy H1c) should be altered to identify Howlands Farm, Wicken Bonhunt as a suitable location for housing/commercial redevelopment as part of the wider housing policy for the re use of existing buildings and previously developed land outside urban areas.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Object that under H1c) you have not identified locations suitable for housing and commercial development in the smaller villages. Policy does not mention settlements such as Wicken Bonhunt, however it is wholly appropriate in this case. Site at Howland Farm provides an opportunity for either residential allocation or a mix used and/or commercial opportunity to diversify the farm. It would provide much needed housing growth in Wicken Bonhunt which is well served by public transport and can link in with existing services and facilities in adjoining settlements like Newport.

Site: Land at New Cottages, Wicken Bonhunt

Ref.No: 190 Rep.No: 3

Representor: , Pegasi Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** Strutt and Parker

Amendment(s) Sought:

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Policy H1c) does not specifically state the preferred locations for the re use of existing building and previously developed land outside urban areas. It is considered appropriate to include Wicken Bonhunt in H1 c) as this would be a more suitable location than sporadic development. The site adjacent New Cottages is a suitable infill plot which would have no adverse impact on the wider open countryside and the village benefits from access to Newport railway station and employment at Newport and Saffron Walden.

Comments: *The three sites above all fall within an area of land which forms an important break between the two built up areas of the village. The land is open in character and it is considered appropriate that it is excluded from the settlement boundary. No additional housing land is required.*

Recommendation: *No change*

WIMBISH, TYE GREEN

Ref.No: 3 Rep.No: 5

Representor: Christian, Brian Christian Building Surveyor **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Define a settlement boundary for Tye Green Wimbish

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Tye Green Wimbish should be included within settlements having a defined development limit.

Ref.No: 3 Rep.No: 8

Representor: Christian, Brian Christian Building Surveyor **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Include Wimbish within policy H2 (need for settlement boundary).

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Wimbish should be added to the villages suitable for infilling. It has plenty of gaps and a falling school role

Comments: *In line with the strategy set out in the plan there are some settlements where it was considered unnecessary to define a settlement boundary since there were few opportunities, if any, for infill development. Wimbish is one such settlement. It is not considered that there are exceptional circumstances which would justify a change to this policy stance. Any opportunities for infill development which do become available can be considered in relation to other policies in the plan*

Recommendation: *No change*

Ref.No: 209 Rep.No: 6

Representor: , Three Valleys Water Plc **Agent (if applicable):** Freeth Melhuish

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend policy H2 to include the settlement of Tye Green/Wimbish and show the settlement boundary on the proposals map.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Water Company consider that the development boundary for the rural settlement of Wimbish/Tye Green should be shown on the proposals map/inset maps. In so doing it should include the Water Company's Wimbish Water tower within the settlement boundary. The Wimbish water tower is a substantial built structure plus area of land which forms an important landmark within the area. It is clearly related to the built settlement rather than the surrounding open countryside and if it became surplus to requirements would be suitable for residential development

Comments: *If the water tower site at Wimbish becomes surplus to requirements any proposals for its redevelopment could be considered in relation to other relevant policies in the plan.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Countryside Protection Zone

Ref.No: 168 Rep.No: 1

Representor: Ash, **Agent (if applicable):** Sworders Agricultural

Amendment(s) Sought: Area of land (2ha) bounded by Southern Ancillary Area and new A120 should be excluded from the CPZ.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The area indicated as the CPZ does not take into account the A120 bypass at Takeley which is currently under construction. The new road will create a natural boundary to the airport and therefore small parcels of land divided by the New road on the airport side should be excluded from the CPZ.

Comments: *No adjustments to the CPZ are justified.*

Recommendation: *No change*

HOUSING PROPOSALS OUTSIDE INSET AREAS

Site: The Forge, Keeres Green Aythorp Roding

Ref.No: 84 Rep.No: 1

Representor: , **Agent (if applicable):** Whirlledge and Nott

Amendment(s) Sought: Consider that this land should be designated as suitable for housing development (note - suggested allocation for H2 site - not specifically requested to be included within Settlement Boundary)

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The Forge Keeres Green, Aythorpe Roding is suitable for residential development. It is part of a small hamlet in open attractive countryside. Site is poorly maintained, untidy and in need of investment. Site has defendable boundaries. Site provides an opportunity to allocated residential development on a previously developed site, tidy up the site and help sustain local community services.

Notation in Adopted Plan: Beyond VDL

Notation in Deposit Plan: Beyond Settlement Boundary

Comments: *It would be inappropriate to define an isolated settlement boundary for this site. Sufficient housing land has been allocated to meet Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not needed. Any proposals for infill will be considered in relation to Policy S7*

Recommendation: *No change*

Pledgdon Green

Ref No: 97 Rep.No 1

Representor: Malins, **Agent (if applicable):** Mark Liell and Sons LLP

Amendment(s) Sought: The addition of Pledgdon Green to the list of settlements contained in Policy H2 or a widening of the general policy to allow positive consideration of infilling in smaller villages/hamlets.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Failure to include the hamlet of Pledgdon Green as a settlement in the Policy H2 list as appropriate for infilling with new houses within settlement gaps.

Comments: *It would be inappropriate to define a settlement boundary for Pledgdon Green. Sufficient housing land has been allocated to meet Structure Plan requirements. Additional land is not needed. Any proposals for infill will be considered in relation to Policy S7*

Recommendation: *No change*

Saling Airfield

Ref.No: 86 Rep.No: 2

Representor: Bucknell, Landowners **Agent (if applicable):** Andrew Martin Associates

Amendment(s) Sought: Urban capacity study should be carried out again to consider as many sources as possible. The capacity study should include Saling Airfield. Details should be set out in Policy H1 or the supporting text to explain the number of dwellings that are assumed to come forward over the plan period. The plan should include some "reserved" sites for longer term residential development Andrewsfield should be identified as a reserve site.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: The draft plan provides an inappropriate distribution of housing throughout the District including too much emphasis upon intensive development of urban areas. Too much emphasis is attached to assumed development of unspecified windfall sites within the existing urban areas. No provision is made for a pool of allocated sites to enable reserve sites to be brought forward in the event that anticipated windfalls, or allocated sites are not forthcoming. The Rochford Nurseries site is unsuitable for 600 dwellings The site is not suited to intensive residential development as it would result in detrimental traffic and environmental impacts to the immediate surrounding area. Insufficient precision is related to re-use of existing buildings and previously developed land outside urban areas. It is understood that the figure of 575 has been assumed based upon previous housing developments of this nature over recent years.

Comments: *The housing strategy is considered to be soundly based – no amendments on this scale are considered to be necessary.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Site: Little Canfield

Ref.No: 114 **Rep.No:** 1

Representor: , RMC (UK) **Agent (if applicable):** Boyer Planning Limited

Amendment(s) Sought: Amend policy H1 and provide an additional housing allocation of 1,035 dwellings - Land owned by RMC at Little Canfield should be allocated for an appropriate mixed used development in conjunction within the proposed Prior Green development.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Further housing allocations should be made in order to create certainty that the local plan will deliver the housing requirement as set out in the Replacement Structure Plan. The need to provide additional allocations based on the flexibility allowance of the Roger Tym Study is reinforced in the current instance by a comparatively low annual build rate. An increased rate of 420 dwellings per annum is needed. In order to achieve this increased rate it is particularly important to provide a range of housing opportunities. The plan indicates that there is limited scope for such development in Uttlesford and reliance will continue to be placed on greenfield release. The contribution from Previously Developed Land remains a significant component of the Deposit Plan housing supply and it is important to be clear that such sites can be delivered. Allocate land owned by RMC at Little Canfield.

Comments: *The housing strategy is considered to be soundly based – no amendments on this scale are considered to be necessary.*

Recommendation: *No change*

MAIN PROPOSALS MAP**County Wildlife Site****Ref.No: 7 Rep.No: 1****Representor:** , National Grid **Agent (if applicable):** Malcom Judd and Partners

Amendment(s) Sought: The National Grid would like to see the County Wildlife Site designation removed from within its landholding boundary and seeks assurance from the Council that its statutory duties will not be unduly restricted by the two County Wildlife Sites located to the east of the Pelham substation.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: National Grid has a policy to minimise the effects of its proposals and to consult with the LA and other consultees at an early stage. Careful consideration is given in line routing proposals to mitigate effects upon landscape, flora, fauna, etc. The National Grid landholding at Pelham has two County Wildlife Site designations immediately adjacent to the east of the site and one designation within National Grid's landholding boundary. Although they have no plans at present to further develop this site it is reserved to meet future operational requirements. National Grid considers that the gradual establishment of areas of wildlife conservation interest complements the operation of a substation and aids the mitigation of any visual impact. It is likely that the National Grid will continue to maintain the site in the interests of nature conservation but should it wish to expand the substation site it would not wish to see its operation needs restricted by this type of designation.

Comments: *The National's Grid's commitment to maintaining the wildlife interest is welcomed. In the event that it became necessary to expand for operational reasons Policy ENV7 allows for the need for the development to be weighed against the nature conservation interest.*

Recommendation: *No change*

Main Proposals Map - Delineation of Noise Contours and PSZ's**Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 14****Representor:** Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

Amendment(s) Sought: Correction of delineation of Respective Boundaries STAL is of the opinion that irrespective of arguments about the noise contour to be chosen that the alignment of the contour defined on the Proposals map needs to be checked especially in the area of Thaxted.

Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought: Noise contour boundary differs from those held by STAL. PSZ boundary does not accord with STAL's understanding. The PSZ's indicated on the Proposal and Inset Maps are based on risk contours generated by likely aircraft movements for year 2105 and therefore represent Stansted operating at far more than 15mppa and greater than 25mppa.

Comments: *Accuracy of noise contours and Public Safety Zone needs to be checked.*

Recommendation: *Make appropriate amendments to the mapping.*
