

## 2. WHERE WILL DEVELOPMENT TAKE PLACE

2.2

**Ref.No: 163 Rep.No: 5**

**Representor:** Baker, Mantle Estates Limited **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills  
The Stansted Distribution Centre is an already established industrial complex with direct access to the current route of the A120. The representation site involves a small area by way of extension and redevelopment to complete the Stansted Distribution Centre project. It is located at the western end of the A120 corridor adjacent to Stansted Airport, the M11 and Bishops Stortford. The site fulfills the A120 corridor locational requirement.

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 137 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** No changes are required to the paragraph provided the interpretation in respect of High Roding as adduced in other objections can be accommodated.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Generally this statement is supported. There is clearly some potential within other villages on small previously developed sites for some appropriate development to take place. However, in the case of High Roding it is considered that this opportunity has not been maximised and that the settlement boundaries are too tightly drawn.

**Comments:** *Noted*

---

2.1-2.4

**Ref.No: 215 Rep.No: 6**

**Representor:** Vose, The Countryside Agency **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Policy S7 needs better expression and explanation.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Welcome the spatial strategy although concerned that an unnecessarily negative tone is apparent in relation to rural development. We are aware of the development pressures to which the District is subject and the need to maintain strict control of development. However we believe that a better explanation could be included in this Chapter of the distinction to be made between a resistance to general development pressures and a positive approach to the meeting of local needs for affordable housing and economic diversification in line with PPG7. We believe that the Essex and Southend Structure Plan does this rather better.

**Comments:** *Then structure plan is part of the development plan and both plans need to be read together. The local plan deliberately seeks to avoid duplicating what is in the structure plan.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 213 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** CPRESsex believes that it would be more logical to list the policies shown on pages 6-8 in the same order and the key elements listed on page 5

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Comments:** *There is a logic to the order in which the S policies are presented. S7 needs to follow S6 Green Belt and settlement site boundaries. If the preceding text were to deal with areas in a consistent order, it would need re-ordering.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 163 Rep.No: 6**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Introduction of new text as set out in letter and introduction of new policy Start Hill Local Policy 1 "Land between Tile Kiln Lane and the western edge of the Stansted Distribution Centre is proposed as an employment site for uses falling within Class B8 Development will be permitted if it is compatible with adjoining existing residential development.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Start Hill should be subject to a similar listing in the selected areas of the plan for Elsenham Village with it's own local policy 1.

**Comments:** *A local policy as sought is recommended and consequential text will need to be inserted into the "A120 corridor".*

**Recommendation:** *Insert "An extension to the Stansted Distribution Centre is proposed" before "These sites have good access to Stansted Airport."*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 125 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Newport should be redefined as a Key Rural Settlement.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Cala Homes objects to the Council's Strategy because the rural restraint area is drawn too tightly around Newport. Newport should be identified as a Key Rural Settlement. It is well served by amenities and facilities including a primary school as well as a railway station. It is considered that Newport is capable of absorbing additional residential development in sustainable locations which would not harm the character of the village. Object to the inclusion of Newport within the "Other Villages" category for these reasons.

**Comments:** *It is not accepted that Newport has appropriate sites in the context of the scale of structure plan requirements.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 5**

**Representor:** Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Amend last line of Para

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The last sentence of Para on Metropolitan Green Belt is not required as any development that does not comply with these criteria would trigger the need to consider "very special circumstances"

**Comments:** *Agreed.*

**Recommendation:** *Delete "Except in very special circumstances"*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 224 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** With the restrictions drawn tightly around a large number of the smaller villages there appears to be no room for modest development for local people and a lot of the character of these villages are suffering from this lack of suitable and particularly affordable housing. The White Paper on Our Countryside sets out a vision for a living countryside with thriving communities. This small scale development would enliven the village and create a younger population which would live and work locally.

**Comments:** *Affordable housing can be considered on exception sites under Policy H10, as the text already states.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 223 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Williams, Elsenham Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Further residential development should not be allowed in Elsenham. Strong resistance to exception sites outside the village envelope as any extra building will impose further strain on an already overburdened infrastructure. Vehicular access to the village is inadequate and parking in Elsenham is impossible. There is little or no scope for infilling.

**Comments:** *It is unlikely that a modest exception site would have significant transport effects.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 160 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Coston, Wimbish Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Wimbish Parish Council are in full support of the Local Plan and are very pleased that the village of Wimbish is not part of the plan as there is not any land designated for a significant development keeping Wimbish a rural community

**Comments:** *Noted*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 43 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Lough, Strategic Rail Authority **Agent (if applicable):** Littman and Robeson

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Make reference to proposals to extend Stansted Airport

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The Deposit Plan does not take into account proposals to extend Stansted Airport and the effects of an expanded airport on other policy subjects. We believe the Councils' policies should consider the implications of airport growth and include LA21 strategy considerations.

**Comments:** *Structure Plan Policy BIW9 provides an appropriate framework for considering the current planning application.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 10 Rep.No: 3**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The National Trust supports policy S8

**Comments:** *Noted.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 205 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The general strategy set out in paragraph 2.2 seems appropriate for the circumstances of Uttlesford District and as such are supported. However, in subsequent sections of the document it is considered that insufficient weight is placed on the need to maximise the use of previously developed land.

**Comments:** *Noted.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 7**

**Representor:**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Support the identification of key rural settlements and their role based on an intention to encourage people to live and work locally

**Comments:** *Noted.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 6**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Delete bullet point and whole of text relating to the CPZ.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** This designation serves no countryside purpose in terms of recognising particular features which need to be respected or enhanced. Normal planning policies address the location for new development and provide necessary protection. This designation isn't necessary or appropriate. Guidance in PPG7 at Para 4.16 supports this objection and this is a new factor that must be taken into account since the preparation of the current local plan. The maintenance of the countryside around the airport should not, therefore by given status as an overriding objective.

**Comments:** *The CPZ has value as a spatial concept and helps to shape the proposed pattern of development.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 185 Rep.No: 6**

**Representor:** McGowan, Hatfield Regis Grange Farm **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** This representation is in respect of a parcel of land which is covered by the Takeley/Little Canfield (Priors Green) proposed settlement expansion and the land will be brought forward to contribute to this development so support the reference to development within the A120 corridor.

**Comments:** *Noted.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 221 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** I strongly support that Saffron Walden be subject to constraints of traffic congestion and maintaining air quality.

**Comments:** *Noted.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 5**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Delete text and inset the airport is a major economic driver for the region and largest employer in the area. It is also acknowledged as a key

transport hub in the region. It already has good quality air rail motorway and principal road connections

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The text fails to explain the fundamental role of the airport in the proposed plan's spatial strategy. It is a very important economic driver and main focus for employment. It is also acknowledged as a key transport hub. The second sentence related to its setting and not its role

**Comments:** *The plan reflects a widely held community perspective of the airport. Its economic driver and employment centre roles are the subject of studies in relation to the current planning application.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 92 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** In the event that the allocate business parks at Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden are retained amend as follows: "urban extensions are also included within the settlement boundaries for housing or business parks. These locations have been identified with regard to proximity to public transport provision and will benefit from new investment in the new A120.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Land at Ashdon Road is at least 5km east of the nearest railway station at Audley End and there is no rail station in Great Dunmow at all to secure the proposed employment sites set out in the draft plan. In addition both sites are located on the edge of the existing urban areas and therefore do not benefit from being close to central or strategic public transport hubs, main bus corridors or indeed pedestrian or good cycle routes.

**Comments:** *Both sites are within walking distance of residential areas and regular bus services.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 4**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Support text at fourth bullet point

**Comments:** *Noted*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 7**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Airport in the countryside - delete "coalescing developments"

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Statement in relation to the Airport is unclear

**Comments:** *The CPZ is all about maintaining a strategic gap between the airport and other settlements. Coalescence is the key concern.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 219 Rep.No: 5**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** This chapter should include text covering the protection of the character of historic settlements. Protection of settlement character should also be addressed more comprehensively in policy.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** A key consideration in determining the location of development in the district should be the protection of the character of its historic settlements. While policy S1 makes a welcome reference in the context of sites on the edges of settlements careful development within towns as well as the management of traffic is just as important to ensuring the integrity of the whole.

**Comments:** *This chapter is about the location of development. Integration of development into historic settlements is addressed in the Environment Chapter.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 161 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Brackenbury, The Stebbing Society **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The society objects to the inclusion of the phrase "including gardens of existing houses" which will unnecessarily encourage inappropriate planning applications.

**Comments:** *Development in the gardens of existing houses can enhance the built environment as well as meeting housing needs. The development control process should ensure that it is done successfully and that inappropriate sites and schemes are rejected.*

---

2.2

**Ref.No: 10 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Feel that the wording "development that needs to take place there or is appropriate to a rural area is imprecise" and would benefit from tighter definition For the avoidance of doubt it should be stated that policy S7 applies in the Countryside Protection Zone also

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Support S7

**Comments:** *Both Policy S7 and S8 apply in the CPZ and this can be stated in the explanatory text and Policy S8. PPG7 and Structure plan Policy C5 provide a comprehensive framework for assessing development proposals.*

**Recommendation:** *Add new sentence at the end of this bullet point: "Both Policy S7 and S8 apply in the Countryside Protection Zone."*

---

2.2 third point

**Ref.No: 15 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Para 3 on Urban Areas should reflect this constraint and allow for the development of pedestrian networks - After 'air quality' in line 5 suggest insert "the need for pedestrian networking".

**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.

**Comments:** *Development in urban areas does enable journeys to be made by walking and suitable reference can briefly be made.*

**Recommendation:** *After "public transport services." Add "Development in urban areas enables some journeys to be made on foot, particularly to and from work and school."*

---

2.3

**Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 8**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** This is an appropriate location for development in strategic and local terms. It has a range of sustainable advantages and benefits

**Comments:** *Noted.*

---

2.3

**Ref.No: 93 Rep.No: 2**

**Representor:** , Hastoe Housing Association/Springboard HA **Agent (if applicable):** Oldfield King Planning

**Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Disappointed that there is no 'S' policy which seeks to ensure sufficient affordable housing can be provided in areas where need exists.

**Comments:** *Generally people in housing need seek accommodation in the urban areas and locations with reasonable public transport and facilities. These are the locations to which the plan directs development. Elsewhere exception schemes can be met in communities where it arises.*

---

2.3

**Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 8**

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



**Amendment(s) Sought:** Move 2.3 to Section 3 after 3.1 Add "subject to other policies of the development plan" after the end of Policy S1

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Comments:** *This would not improve the plan. All policies in the plan always need to be considered.*

---

2.4

**Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 12**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Refer to rail and bus links in this Para. If implementation hasn't been secured then problems should be set out along with steps to be taken to overcome them

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Comments:** *Investment is certainly anticipated in bus and coach services during the plan period. There is more uncertainty over the timescale for significant rail investment that delivers extra capacity.*

**Recommendation:** *Add new sentence at the end of Para 2.4: "Private sector investment in new bus and coach services is anticipated."*

---

## **POLICY S1 – SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES FOR THE MAIN URBAN AREAS**

Deposit Policy

**The settlement boundaries of the existing main urban areas and proposed urban extensions for Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden and Stansted Mountfitchet are defined on the Proposals Map. The following development will be permitted within these boundaries:**

- **Major urban extensions, if in accordance with this Plan;**
- **Development within the existing built up areas, if compatible with the character of the settlement and, in addition, for sites on the edge of the built up area, its countryside setting.**

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

### **Representations of Support**

**S1**

**Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 1**

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

The Town Council supports the policy of defining Settlement Boundaries. It believes that the present identified limits for Saffron Walden are correct.

### **Representations of Objection**

S1-S3 Settlement Boundaries

**Ref.No: 217 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** , Pelham Homes Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Barton Willmore Planning Partnership

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Policies S1 to S3 should be incorporated into one new policy S1 with four new parts to highlight the sequential order for development locations in the District. New policy - In accordance with PPG3 the following sequential order of development locations will be appropriate (i) on previously developed land within the main urban areas of Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden and Stansted Mountfitchet as defined on the proposals map. (ii) on land identified as urban extensions to the main urban areas of Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden and Stansted as defined by the proposed settlement boundaries for these areas. (iii) on land identified as major extensions to the settlements of Takeley and Felsted as defined by the proposed settlement boundaries for these areas (iv) as settlement expansion schemes in the settlements of Elsenham, Great Chesterford, Takeley, and Thaxted as defined by the proposed settlement boundaries. Development should be compatible with the settlements character and setting etc...see rep

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Object to the lack of any sequential order of development locations as in PPG3 for settlement policies within the plan. Without a sequential order of development for the settlement areas and sites, sites that should not be developed before other sequentially superior sites will be developed. This will not comply with the provisions of PPG3.

**Comments:** *Sites on previously developed land in the main urban areas are readily coming forward in response to strong market demand. The scale of major urban extensions and settlement expansions at Takeley is such that, where they do not already have planning permission, this needs to be granted at a relatively early stage in the plan period to secure completion by 2011. Oakwood Park already has outline permission for 650 dwellings.*

---

**S1**

**Ref.No: 15 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Policy needs a cross reference to paragraph 1.10 (3) and encourage walking.

**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 and make towns more attractive to live in and have significant health benefits. Walking important to household without cars and include the poorest and most disadvantaged sections of society.

**Comments:** *This is not the right place in the plan to have a policy reference to encouraging journeys on foot.*

---

**S1**

**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

**Comments:** *No new greenfield site allocation is needed to meet structure plan requirements, and no change is needed to Policy S1.*

---

**S1**

**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 developments 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 enclosed 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 for Great Dunmow 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

**Comments:** *No new greenfield site allocation is needed to meet structure plan requirements, and no change is needed to Policy S1.*

---

**S1**

**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 effects on landscape. Current boundary is illogical .

**Comments:** *No new greenfield site allocation is needed to meet structure plan requirements, and no change is needed to Policy S1.*

---

**S1**

**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:**

**Comments:** *No new greenfield site allocation is needed to meet structure plan requirements, and no change is needed to Policy S1.*

---

**S1**

**Ref.No: 202 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Extension of the defined settlement boundary to include land at Dunmow Park, its immediate curtilage and the parkland between the house and Braintree Road as shown on the attached Plan

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Land at Dunmow Park is an appropriate and sustainable location for an urban extension. Reviews of the settlement boundary should be considered at each local plan review. Too much emphasis is attached to assumed development of unspecified sites within the existing urban areas in the Deposit Draft Plan. Further growth will be required in Uttlesford generally beyond the current replacement structure plan figures to meet the needs resulting from a combination of factors e.g. growth of Stansted, potential growth in the M11 corridor. It is essential for effective planning that appropriate sites and contingency sites should be identified now and development limits relaxed in key areas in order to meet both shorter and longer term needs and requirements. The proposed change to the settlement boundary will incorporate Dunmow Park and its immediate curtilage together with the parkland between the house and Braintree Road. As part of this two areas should be designated as a riverside park.

**Comments:** *No new greenfield site allocation is needed to meet structure plan requirements, and no change is needed to Policy S1.*

---

**S1**

**Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 8**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Move 2.3 to Section 3 after 3.1 Add "subject to other policies of the development plan" after the end of Policy S1

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Comments:** *This addition is unnecessary as it goes without saying that this is the case.*

---

**Recommendation:** *no change to Policy S1.*

---

**Representation of Support**

S2-S8

**Ref.No: 156 Rep.No: 2**

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

The Town Council recognises the development pressures on the District and although not directly affected by the Metropolitan Green Belt or the Stansted Airport Countryside Protection feel strongly that these policies should be included in the new plan.

**POLICY S2 – SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES FOR OAKWOOD PARK, LITTLE DUNMOW AND PRIORS GREEN, TAKELEY/LITTLE CANFIELD**

Deposit Policy

**The settlement boundaries of:**

- **the proposed Priors Green development in Takeley and Little Canfield; and**
- **the proposed Oakwood Park development between Felsted and Little Dunmow**

**are defined on the Proposals Map. Development will be permitted within these boundaries if it is in accordance with this Plan.**

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

**Objections**

**S2**

**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 to 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 is an objection to where the boundaries are drawn, not to the Policy itself.*

---

**S2**

**Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 1**

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

**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.

**Comments:** *No new greenfield site allocation is needed to meet structure plan requirements. A better reserve site is recommended at Saffron Walden.*

---

**S2**

**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:** *This is an objection to where the boundaries are drawn, not to the Policy itself.*

---

**Recommendations:** *No change to Policy S1.*

---

**POLICY S3 – OTHER SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES**

Deposit Policy

**Elsenham, Great Chesterford, Takeley and Thaxted are identified as Key Rural Settlements. Their boundaries, including village extensions at Takeley and Thaxted, and the boundaries of other settlements are defined on the Proposals Map. Development compatible with the settlement's character and countryside setting will be permitted within these boundaries.**

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

**Representations of Support**

**Ref.No: 153 Rep.No: 2**

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

Agree this policy

**Ref.No: 164 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** , Bellway Homes **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills

The identification of Thaxted as an S3 vilage aknowledges that the settlement has an important role to play in the plan period up to 2016. Submit that identification of Thaxted as a key rural settlement is an aknowledgement that the settlement has aresidential and employment profile confirming its potential and appropriateness for new growth to sustain its role in the settlement hierarchy.

**Ref.No: 201 Rep.No: 2**

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

Support the concept behind the key rural settlements I.e. to strengthen the role of those communities where there is the potential to encourage people to line and work locally. We particularly support the identification of Takeley as one of thesesettelements in vew of its good range of existing and planning social and community facilities, local employment and public transport services. In our view the stated intention to allow some further, albeit limited employment and residential developmentin these key settlements and to safeguard existing employment where appropriate is clearly in accord with the Plan's overall strategy for sustainable development.

**Objections**

**S3**

**Ref.No: 5 Rep.No: 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) its 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 removingthe industrual uses & the vehicle haulage depot.

**Comments:** *This is an objection to where the boundaries are drawn, not to the Policy itself.*

---

**S3**

**Ref.No: 92 Rep.No: 3**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Amend the settlement boundary for Wendens Ambo.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Land to the north east of Wendens Ambo is within easy walking distance of the Audley End railway. The site is well screened from views from the existing built up area of Wendens Ambo as from the land to the north and west of the site. The boundary should be extended to the north-east providing potential release of land for modern offices. Site would provide ideal space for high tech business uses close to the railway line and the surrounding road network. This site would be more attractive to modern businesses and would be more likely to attract new employment uses to the District than land at Ashdon Road, Saffron Walden. The site also provides the opportunity for a park and ride facility

**Comments:** *Although it is the location of Audley End railway station, Wendens Ambo is not as appropriate scale settlement or with a sufficient range of facilities to be a key rural settlement.*

---

**S3**

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

**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.

**Comments:** *This is an objection to where the boundaries are drawn, not to the Policy itself.*

---

**S3**

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

**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.

**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 and extension is proposed

**Comments:** *This is an objection to where the boundaries are drawn, not to the Policy itself.*

---

**S3**

**Ref.No: 120 Rep.No: 7**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Insert Newport into Policy S3 as a Key Rural Settlement



**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The village of Newport should be added to the list of Key Rural Settlements. Given its range of facilities, schools shops and rail station it performs a similar role to Elsenham and Great Chesterford

**Comments:** *Newport is of an appropriate scale and has adequate facilities to be a key rural settlement, but no suitable sites for development.*

---

**S3**

**Ref.No: 125 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Amend Policy wording to include Newport as a Key Rural Settlement,

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Cala Homes objects to Policy S3 as it fails to identify Newport as a Key Rural Settlement

**Comments:** *Newport is of an appropriate scale and has adequate facilities to be a key rural settlement, but no suitable sites for development.*

---

**S3**

**Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Amend the Proposal Map/Inset Map to include clients land within the settlement boundary of Takeley

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Land at North West Takeley should be included in the settlement boundary of Takeley.

**Comments:** *This is an objection to where the boundaries are drawn, not to the Policy itself.*

---

**S3**

**Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 9**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Add "subject to compliance with other policies in the Development Plan" at the end of Policy S3

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Comments:** *It is not necessary to say this.*

---

S2 & S3 Spatial Strategy

**Ref.No: 143 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Recognition of potential for major development at Elsenham.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Elsenham is as sustainable a location for development as Takeley and its merits should be recognised within the text of the

plan. Elsenham is more sustainable than the other key rural areas. Potential to encourage people to live and work locally or travel by train to work. This potential should be recognised when considering the location of housing allocations.

**Comment:** *Elsenham is identified as a Key Rural Settlement, but no new housing site allocations are needed to meet structure plan requirements.*

---

**Recommendations:** *No change to Policy S3*

---

#### **POLICY S4 – STANSTED AIRPORT BOUNDARY**

Deposit Policy

**The boundary of Stansted Airport is defined on the Proposals Map. Provision is made for development directly related to or associated with Stansted Airport to be located within the boundaries of the airport. Industrial and commercial development unrelated to the airport will not be permitted on the site.**

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

#### **Representations of Support**

S4

**Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 6**

**Representor:** Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

The continuance of the policy content of S4 is noted and supported. STAL will continue to safeguard land to accommodate development directly to or associated with the airport within its permitted development boundary

#### **Objections**

**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 area available for development within the boundary is insufficient to the economic activity associated with the growth of the airport. There is a need for further development land associated with the airport. The current limitations 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. 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 the countryside further away and to use land around the airport for development.

**Comments:** *This would be contrary to the Countryside Protection Zone concept, which is the subject of Policy S8.*

---

S4

**Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 9**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Amend second and third lines of policy S4 to read "provision is made for development directly related to Stansted Airport and some limited kinds of associated activities within the boundaries of the .....

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** There is a need for stricter, more precise definition of "associated" this will become particularly important as a consequence of any expansion to 25 mppa when land will need to be primarily protected for directly related development so that the operational efficiency of the airport is maximised to the region's and areas's economic advantage.

**Comments:** *Greater explanation of "associated development" is found in the Stansted Airport Chapter. Although not definitive, it indicates that the range of activities appropriate on the airport is quite narrow.*

---

S4

**Ref.No: 165 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Add to the final sentence of Policy S4 ".....Industrial and Commercial development not essential to the operation of the airport or development that is unrelated to the primary use of the airport will not be permitted on any part of designated site area.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Support the policy in general terms but concerned that it is not sufficiently clear. The need to contain the built form within the boundaries of the airport reflects the importance of the surrounding countryside. In order to prevent the coalescence of the airport development and the existing development in the open countryside it is essential that any new development even within the boundaries should only be permitted if it is essential to the operation of and wholly related to the Airport.

**Comments:** *Greater explanation of "associated development" is found in the Stansted Airport Chapter. Although not definitive, it indicates that the range of activities appropriate on the airport is quite narrow.*

---

**Recommendations:** *no change to Policy S4*

---

## POLICY S5 – CHESTERFORD PARK BOUNDARY

Deposit Policy

**The boundary of the Chesterford Park Research and Development Site is defined on the Proposals Map as a developed site in the countryside. Facilities for research and development will be permitted within these boundaries if they are in accordance with this Plan.**

## REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

### Representations of Support

S5

**Ref.No: 72 Rep.No: 2**

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

The definition of a boundary for Chesterford Park is supported. This provides clarity on the extent of the area of the commercial and related uses and a clear policy context for changes within the site.

**Ref.No: 92 Rep.No: 4**

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

Chesterford Park is an ideal site for provision of research and development uses. Due to the close proximity of the site to the M11, which in turn provides excellent access to Cambridge and London. Chesterford could also be usefully utilised for other uses falling within Use Class B1, Class B2 or Class B8. It is submitted that this site would be far more attractive to modern business and would be more likely to attract new employment uses to the District than land at Ashdon Road and Thaxted Road, Saffron Walden. There is also scope to optimise employment opportunities through intensification of development on the site.

**Comments:** *This site is ideal for research and development, which is why it is so proposed.*

---

**Recommendations:** *No change to Policy S5*

---

## POLICY S6 – METROPOLITAN GREEN BELT

### Deposit Policy

**The area and boundaries of the Metropolitan Green Belt within Uttlesford are defined on the Proposals Map.**

**Infilling, limited development or redevelopment compatible with the character of the settlement and its setting will be permitted within the following villages, which are excluded from the Green Belt:**

- **Hatfield Heath**
- **Leaden Roding**
- **Little Hallingbury and**
- **White Roding.**

**The boundaries of the Green Belt around these villages are defined on the Proposals Map.**

**A site at Mountfitchet School, Stansted Mountfitchet is defined on the Proposals Map as an area in which infilling development for educational or community uses will be permitted. A site at Parsonage Farm, Stansted Mountfitchet is defined on the Proposals Map as an area in which redevelopment for business uses will be permitted. Development**

**compatible with the countryside setting will be permitted within these boundaries.**

## REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

### Representations of Support

S6

**Ref.No: 10 Rep.No: 1**

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

The National Trust supports the maintenance of the MGB as shown on the Proposals map and with the limitations on development set out in para 2.2.

**Ref.No: 38 Rep.No: 3**

**Representor:** , Gosling & Robson Trusts **Agent (if applicable):** Bidwells  
Support policy which is practical and reasonable in relation to clients concerns as landowners

### Objections

S6

**Ref.No: 34 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Ovenden, (Officer) **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Requires a clear and strong statement that the MGB will be protected from all but a very limited range of development, making it clear that within the MGB development will be more tightly controlled than outside it.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The policy says nothing about the stance to be taken when considering development within the greenbelt is outside the 6 areas specified in the policy. The protection of the area depends totally on the ESP and PPG policies. When viewed in isolation it provides less protection than policy S7. This cannot logically be the intention.

**Comments:** *The policy on development in the MGB is clearly and strongly stated in the Structure Plan and national planning policy. No purpose is served by repeating this.*

---

S6

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

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** 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 BGboundary 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.

**Comments:** *The objection is not to Policy S6. It relates to where the Green Belt boundary around Hatfield Heath is drawn.*

---

S6

**Ref.No: 214 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Wilson, Thames Water Property **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Amend policy S6 by adding "limited infilling or redevelopment of the following major existing developed sites will be permitted in line with PPG2 Annex C 1) Bishops Stortford Sewage Treatment works as defined on the Proposals Map (2) Stansted Sewage Treatment works.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The Bishops Stortford Sewage Works and Stansted STW should be identified on the attached plans so as to permit infilling or redevelopment. Para C1 of Annex C to PPG2 clearly refers to sewage and water treatment works as being major developed sites. It is noted that these substantial sites may be in continuing use or be redundant.

**Comments:** *There is no programmed infrastructure that would result in these sites becoming redundant, especially by 2011.*

---

S6

**Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 10**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Add "and subject to other policies in the Development Plan" after setting in the 2nd para. Add "provided it also accords with other policies in the Development Plan" at the end of the policy

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Comments:** *These additions are unnecessary.*

---

S6

**Ref.No: 228 Rep.No: 5**

**Representor:** Clifford, Stansted Parish Council **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** The expansion of The Mountfitchet High School should include the development of a sixth form.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Secondary education is short of spaces.

**Comments:** *The policy allows for development for educational purposes on this school site.*

---

**Recommendations:** *No change to Policy S6*

---

## POLICY S7 – THE COUNTRYSIDE

### Deposit Policy

**The countryside to which this policy applies is defined as all those parts of the Plan area beyond the Green Belt that are not within the settlement or other site boundaries. In the countryside, planning permission will only be given for development that needs to take place there, or is appropriate to a rural area. There will be strict control on new building.**

### REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

#### Representations of Support

S7

**Ref.No: 206 Rep.No: 3**

**Representor:** Walker, Uttlesford LA21 Group2 **Agent (if applicable):**

The Farming, Wildlife & Countryside Group of Uttlesford Local Agenda 21 UK supports this policy as drawn.

#### Objections

S7

**Ref.No: 10 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Feel that the wording "development that needs to take place there or is appropriate to a rural area is imprecise" and would benefit from tighter definition. For the avoidance of doubt it should be stated that policy S7 applies in the Countryside Protection Zone also.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Support S7

**Comments:** *Reference to S7 in S8 would provide helpful clarification.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 32 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Fyffes Group Ltd **Agent (if applicable):** WS Atkins

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Policy S7 should be modified - see suggested wording

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Policy S7, as worded is unduly restrictive and could preclude forms of development on sites where the principle of development is already long established, which would not be detrimental to conserving the quality of the countryside but which would help to secure the vitality of the rural economy. Strict application of Policy S7 could lead to the creation of unused, underused and derelict sites in the countryside and could stifle the legitimate expansion of businesses which would also be contrary to the spirit of PPG4.

**Comments:** *Policy S7 needs to be read with the Structure Plan Policies C5 and RE3, which provide for development on major development sites in the countryside as identified in local plans.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 34 Rep.No: 2**

**Representor:** Ovenden, (Officer) **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Requires clear statement about protectign the coutryside for its own sake. Define terms clearly. Indicate that there will be strict control on development other than (and as well as) new buildings. Require applicants to demonstrate why the developmentshould be permitted and that they have mitigated its harmful affects.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** No clear statement about protecting the countryside for its own sake. The terms 'needs to take place' and 'appropriate to a rural area' are too vague. The term 'strict control on new building' indicates a lack of strict control over other developments even though they can be just as damaging.

**Comments:** *This policy needs to be read with Structure Plan Policy C5 and its cross reference to Structure plan policies H5, RE2 and RE3.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 103 Rep.No: 4**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Amend policy to say " ... in the countryside, planning permission will only be given for development that needs to take place there, is appropriate to a rural area, or is residential infill under the terms of policy (insert new policy number).

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** In light of objection to para 6.6, Policy S7 also requires partial amendment in wording. Object to Policy S7, until such time as this alteration is made or the objections to Policies S3, H2 and the Inset map are accepted.

**Comments:** *A residential infill policy for sites outside settlement boundaries is not recommended.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 107 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Rosper Estates Limited **Agent (if applicable):** Birketts

**Amendment(s) Sought:** The following words should be added to this policy at the end of the penultimte sentence "or would lead to a significant environmental improvement in an existing established commercial site in accordance with Policy E5

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** This plan is too restrictive and will unnecessarily restrict the economic and social development of the countryside contrary to PPG7



**Comments:** *Policy S7 needs to be read with the Structure Plan Policies C5 and RE3, which provide for development on major development sites in the countryside as identified in local plans.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 10**

**Representor:** Proto Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Delete policy S7 or alternatively add “or meets another identified need which cannot be met elsewhere”.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** There is no need for this policy as the plan will provide the statutory basis for directing development to appropriate locations. If it is retained the phrase " needs to take place there" should be better defined. It should not be limited to rural needsbut should permit development for which a need is found to exist and which cannot otherwise be accommodated in an urban area

**Comments:** *The structure plan provides the guidance sought.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 141 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Land off Vernon's Close, Henham should be included within the Settlement Boundary for the village as defined on the Henham Inset Map.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Object to Policy S7 in respect of land at the edge of Henham. Land off Vernon's Close is physically part of the built up area of the settlement and should be included within the boundary. As site lies outside boudary we object to the fact that the policypolicy constraints implicit in Policy S7 are to be applied to the land concerned.

**Comments:** *This is an objection to the exclusion of the site from the settlement boundary rather than a case for changes to Policy S7 itself.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 161 Rep.No: 2**

**Representor:** Brackenbury, The Stebbing Society **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** The phrase "that needs to take place" should be omitted .

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The inclusion of the phrase "that needs to take place" should be removed. It unnecessarily opens the countryside to development applications because need is highly subjective.

**Comments:** *The structure plan is part of the development plan framework for considering development proposals in the countryside.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 165 Rep.No: 2**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Add to the second sentence of Policy S7 "That needs to take place there or in the case of Roadside Services where over-riding need has been demonstrated as required by Policy T2 of this plan, or is....."

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The policy is acceptable in principle but the second sentence should be expanded to include the development of roadside services where need has been demonstrated under the terms of Policy T2 - Roadside services and the new A120.

**Comments:** *The cross reference is unnecessary.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 188 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Raiswell, Sport England **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Outdoor sport and recreation should be promoted as a compatible use in the countryside and therefore should be included in the policy wording.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** There is no reference to sport and recreation in this policy.

**Comments:** *Policy LC4 allows outdoor sport and recreation development outside settlement boundaries. This clearly is the sort of development that is appropriate in the countryside, in principle, and may need to take place there.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 204 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Delete Policy S7

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Policy S7 duplicates Replacement Structure Plan Policy C5, but only partially, and therefore weakens it.

**Comments:** *There is nothing in Policy S7 in conflict with structure plan policy C5 or that implies a weaker stance.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 213 Rep.No: 3**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** The use of the word "need" in this sense requires further consideration and should always be defined or the phrase omitted. Final sentence should be deleted. The penultimate sentence should be altered to read "In the countryside planning permission will only be given for development that is appropriate to a rural area, and such development will be subject to strict controls as outlined in Essex Structure Plan Policy C5 - rural areas not in the Green Belt.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** CPREssex is concerned at the use of the word "need" in line 4 of this policy. It is the first of many such uses of the word to be found throughout the policies in the Plan where an undefined need is to be allowed to outweigh normal planning consideration. We believe that there will be considerable

difficulties in defining and enforcing the Council's definition of need in this and other policies and therefore object to its use wherever it is used in the sense that consent could be granted where an undefined need is expressed. The final sentence of the policy does not make clear what kind or kinds of controls are envisaged.

**Comments:** *Development proposals need to be considered against policies S7 and C5 and it is not necessary to cross refer in the policy.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 215 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Vose, Countryside Agency **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** The wording of the policy should be revised to more accurately reflect that of Structure Plan Policy C5. "furthermore revisions should be made to the supporting text (currently the first two bullet points of para 2.2) so as to provide a more reasoned explanation of the policy approach towards development in rural areas and the need to encourage, consistent with sustainable development principles, business development and agricultural diversification , promote housing schemes for local needs, protect the countryside from inappropriate development and promote local distinctiveness and identify in development patterns and design

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Policy S7 and the explanatory text to be found in para 2.2 provide an unduly negative picture of the Plan's policy approach to rural development as evidenced by other, more specific policies. Nor is it entirely consistent with the policy framework provided by the Essex and Southend on Sea replacement Structure Plan or with guidance provided by PPG7

**Comments:** *The principles of Policy S7 are not in conflict with the Structure plan or national planning policy. If the tone of the policy seems cautious, this is because of the development pressures in this particular rural area.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 218 Rep.No: 11**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Delete "needs to take place there" and "there will be strict control on new building" and add additional wording.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:**

**Comments:** *The policy should be read with the structure plan and national planning policy as stated in Para 2.2 first bullet point.*

---

S7

**Ref.No: 222 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Suggest the following alternative wording to policy S7 In rural areas provisions will be made for the development of; sustainable farm diversification: tourist attractions based on Uttlesford's Heritage and/or countryside. The re-use/conversion of rural buildings; outdoor recreation

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The policy does not give a positive description of what sort of development will be allowed in the countryside. The policy states that planning permission will only be given for development that needs to take place, or it appropriate to rural areas and that there will be strict control over new buildings. We consider the first statement to be too vague to add value to the Local Plan whilst the second could restrict the ability of farm enterprises to diversify into new markets. The definition of which parts of the countryside are effected should be taken out of the main policy text. It could be made explicit in a short preamble to the policy

**Comments:** *The principles of Policy S7 are not in conflict with the Structure plan or national planning policy. If the tone of the policy seems cautious, this is because of the development pressures in this particular rural area.*

---

**Recommendations:**

*Add at the end of Para 2.2 first bullet point: “The countryside needs to be protected for its own sake, but not in such a way that the plan prevents evolution of economic activity that is part of life in rural areas and is in sympathy with its character. Examples of development that may be permitted in principle include re-use of rural buildings, suitable farm diversification, outdoor sport and recreation uses, and affordable housing and other facilities to meet local community needs.”*

*No change to Policy S7.*

---

**POLICY S8 - THE COUNTRYSIDE PROTECTION ZONE**

**Deposit Policy**

**The area and boundaries of the Countryside Protection Zone around Stansted Airport are defined on the Proposals Map. In the Countryside Protection Zone development will not be permitted if either of the following apply:**

- a) New buildings or uses would promote coalescence between the airport and existing development in the surrounding countryside;**
- b) It would adversely affect the open characteristics of the zone.**

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

**Representations of Support**

S8

**Ref.No: 10 Rep.No: 3**

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

The National Trust supports policy S8

S8

**Ref.No: 121 Rep.No: 7**

**Representor:** Bush, Stansted Airport Limited **Agent (if applicable):**

STAL supports Policy S8 and the continuance of the Countryside Protection Zone which surrounds the airport and the objective of maintaining Stansted Airport as the airport in the Countryside

S8

**Ref.No: 165 Rep.No: 3**

**Representor:** , Riverbrook Estates Limited **Agent (if applicable):** FPD Savills  
The policy is supported. It is essential in our view to maintain a buffer/green belt between the airport and surrounding development. The Birchanger Green Services already present an incursion into the Green Belt which should not be repeated.

S8

**Ref.No: 206 Rep.No: 4**

**Representor:** Walker, Uttlesford LA21 Group2 **Agent (if applicable):**  
The Farming, Wildlife & Countryside Group of Uttlesford Local Agenda 21 UK supports this policy as drawn.

### Objections

S8

**Ref.No: 4 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** , F Cannon & Sons Ltd **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Exclude site from Countryside Protection Zone.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The site contains permanent structures (with planning permission) associated with a long established builders yard and offices. It also accommodates a roofing contractors premises and an LPG store enclosed. A mature tree/hedgrows defines the northern boundary and visually and physically segregates the site from the open land further north and east. These long established commercial premises do not contribute to the open characteristics of the Protection Zone to the north and east. It should be recognised that the site is an integral part of the settlement of Bedlars Green.

**Comments:** *This objection is to the definition of the extent of the CPZ, not to the policy itself.*

---

S8

**Ref.No: 34 Rep.No: 3**

**Representor:** Ovenden, (Officer) **Agent (if applicable):**

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Should include a requirement to follow the restriction in a more robust S7 so that issues of coalescence and loss of openness are in addition to not instead of S7 requirements.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The policy doesn't refer to S7. Are they mutually exclusive? If they are it indicates a lesser restriction on development (unless it gives rise to coalescence or loss of openness) than outside settlement boundaries outside the CPZ. If the two policies are not mutually exclusive, it is not clear.

**Comments:** *The explanatory text makes it clear that the S8 tests are additional to Policy S7. It seems necessary, however, to make this clear in the policy as well.*

---

S8

**Ref.No: 51 Rep.No: 1**

**Representor:** Johnstone, Cheergay Properties **Agent (if applicable):** Lambert Smith Hampton

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Make provision for the future extension and expansion of the activities on the Elsenham Quality Foods site.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Raise objection to the nature of uses and zoning of the Elsenham Quality Foods site. Adequate provision has not been made for the future extension and expansion of business activities on this established industrial and manufacturing site to the detriment of the long term health of the businesses established there.

**Comments:** *A significant amount of development has been permitted on this site and further proposals may undermine the concept of the CPZ.*

---

S8

**Ref.No: 115 Rep.No: 4**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Propose that the boundary of the CPZ should be redrawn as recommended by the previous inspector to follow the line of the railway.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Object to the boundary of the CPZ as it affects land on the south eastern side of Elsenham as shown on the Inset Map and specifically in respect of land south of Stansted Road. This land is not prominent in the wider landscape and forms a minor component to the visual scene when seen from vantage points close to the airport. It makes little or no contribution to the objectives of the CPZ. The Inspector at the previous inquiry recommended that land north of the railway and east of the M11 should not form part of the CPZ.

**Comments:** *The CPZ is an established and popular concept as part of the development plan framework for determining the location of development in Uttlesford. It is consistent with the structure plan strategy.*

---

S8

**Ref.No: 119 Rep.No: 11**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Delete Policy

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** This is a totally inappropriate policy and has no relationship with the approach in the recently adopted replacement structure plan. That follows the landscape character approach. The policy has no relationship to the inherent quality of the countryside and is not based on any proper assessment of the character of this area of the countryside. There is no countryside or landscape justification for it being focussed on the area around Stansted. It is the type of policy that paragraph 4.16 of PPG7 advises against. The plan will provide the statutory planning basis for directing development to appropriate places.

**Comments:** *The CPZ is an established and popular concept as part of the development plan framework for determining the location of development in Uttlesford. It is consistent with the structure plan strategy.*

---

S8

**Ref.No: 144 Rep.No: 3**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Proposals map/inset maps should be amended to exclude our clients land from the CPZ. Alternatively the southern boundary of the zone should be amended so that it follows the A120 bypass, which is shortly to be constructed.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** Land to the north west of Takeley should be excluded from the CPZ. The land is a suitable site for residential development related to Stansted Airport. It is conveniently located to the airport thereby maximising opportunities for utilising sustainable forms of transport and minimising the number and length of journeys by other less sustainable forms of transport particularly by car. By concentrating development close to the airport where it is most needed the impact on the wider district will be minimised. Alternative strategies of spreading development around the District will impact on a wider area. The site will soon be separated from the airport by the A120 bypass, much of which will be located on an embankment. The road will act as a logical defensible outer boundary for a Countryside Protection Zone around the airport.

**Comments:** *The construction of the new A120 increases the fragility of the gap between Takeley and the airport and reinforces the need for the policy and its extent.*

---

S8

**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:** *The construction of the new A120 increases the fragility of the gap between Takeley and the airport and reinforces the need for the policy and its extent.*

---

S8

**Ref.No: 182 Rep.No: 1**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** The area of land bounded by the Parsonage Road and the New A120, Takeley, should be excluded from the CPZ.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** The area indicated as the countryside protection zone 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 countryside protection Zone.

**Comments:** *The construction of the new A120 increases the fragility of the gap between Takeley and the airport and reinforces the need for the policy and its extent.*

---

S8

**Ref.No: 201 Rep.No: 3**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Preferably delete policy S8 or redraw the boundary to exclude the whole area south of the new A120.

**Reason(s) for Amendment(s) Sought:** When the CPZ was first conceived Stansted Airports expansion programme was in the very earliest stages. Its impact was as yet unknown and planning policies for the countryside at both local and national levels were much less well developed than today. The airport development and planning policies have moved on a long way in the meantime. It is no longer necessary to have a CPZ because adequate protection is now available for the open countryside under other local and structure plan policies and ppg7. If the policy is retained the southern boundary should be redrawn to follow the line of the new A120 by pass. Once this new dual carriageway road is in place this will provide a permanent separation between the Airport and the villages to the south and coalescence will not be possible. The areas to the south of the new road should therefore be deleted.

**Comments:** *The construction of the new A120 increases the fragility of the gap between Takeley and the airport and reinforces the need for the policy and its extent.*

---

**Recommendations:** *Insert into Policy S8 after “In the CPZ” the following: “, planning permission will only be granted for development that needs to take place there, or is appropriate to a rural area. There will be strict control on new development. In particular,…”*

---

### **New Paragraph – Longer Term Strategy**

**Ref.No: 202 Rep.No: 5**

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

**Amendment(s) Sought:** Add new paragraph 2.5 Longer Term Strategy - see representation letter

**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:** *Local plan proposals need to be consistent with regional strategy and there are significant strategic issues that need to be resolved first.*

**Recommendation:** *No change.*

---