



**Uttlesford Local Plan  
Pre-Submission Consultation 2014  
17 April to 2 June 2014**

**Summary of Main Issues**



## **Introduction**

This document sets out the key issues arising from representations made to the Uttlesford Pre-Submission Local Plan 2014. It is set out in plan order.

Representations were invited on The Uttlesford Local Plan – Pre-submission Consultation April 2014 between and Thursday 17th April and Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2014. A total of 1230 people or organisations made a total 1824 representations. The representation from Elsenham Parish Council was supported by 973 signatories. The representation from the Joint Parish Councils of Henham, Ugley and Widdington was supported by 1261 signatories. The Representation from Save Newport Village was supported by 138 signatories.

Representations making reference to or directly responding to the Sustainability Appraisal are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum June 2014.

<b>Chapter : Introduction - Paragraphs 3.1-3.6</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 33 (1 representation was supported by 973 people and another by 1261 people )</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	4	17	12		5	23	5		4	14	15
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan does not take into account of development in Cambridge</li> <li>• The duty to co-operate has not been met</li> <li>• Flawed process</li> <li>• Inadequate infrastructure provision</li> <li>• Sites have not been tested against reasonable alternatives</li> <li>• Has not adhered to the Statement of community Involvement</li> <li>• Unsustainable sites allocated</li> <li>• Residents opinions have been ignored</li> <li>• <b>Home Builders Federation</b> states that the plan has not taken into account other local authority housing requirements</li> <li>• <b>Elsenham Parish Council</b> contrary to NPPF</li> <li>• <b>Ugley, Widdington and Henham Parish Council</b> housing numbers should be reduced and plan period is incorrect</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chelmsford City Council</b> support the plan and feels the duty to co-operate has been met</li> <li>• <b>Great Canfield Parish Council</b> is in support</li> <li>• <b>South Cambridgeshire</b> feels the Council has met the duty to co-operate</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 5: The District Vision</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 15</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	5	3	7		5	9	1		4	5	6
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsustainable vision</li> <li>• The plan is contrary to the vision</li> <li>• Doesn't include infrastructure provision</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage, Natural Environment, Little Easton Parish Council and Individuals</b> supports the vision</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 6: Objectives</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 9</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2		7		1	5	3		1	1	7

<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsustainable</li> <li>• Not SMART</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> request minor changes to have reference to the natural and historic environment</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England and Little Dunmow Parish Council</b> generally support the objectives</li> <li>• <b>Individual</b> support the objectives</li> </ul>

**Chapter 7: The Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram – paragraph 7.1 – 7.9**

**Total Representations: 1094 (1 representation was supported by 973 people and another by 1261 people )**

Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	8	1052	32		4	1062	23		6	1051	35
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individuals, Great Dunmow Town Council, Saffron Walden Town Council, Birchanger, Takeley, Wedens Ambo, Elsenham, Henham, Widdington and Ugley Parish Council</b> object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ not positively prepared</li> <li>○ housing numbers too high</li> <li>○ failed to comply with the duty to co-operate</li> <li>○ consultation does not comply with the SCI</li> <li>○ representations not duly considered</li> <li>○ has not assessed the reasonable alternatives</li> <li>○ Sustainability Appraisal is flawed</li> <li>○ Evidence base does not justify the choice of sites</li> <li>○ Failed on the duty to co-operate</li> <li>○ Contrary to the NPPF</li> <li>○ Plan period too long</li> <li>○ Failure to assess and meet the infrastructure needs of the district</li> <li>○ Unsustainable housing strategy</li> <li>○ Undeliverable housing strategy</li> <li>○ Housing strategy not based on evidence</li> <li>○ Air pollution has not been properly considered</li> <li>○ Politically driven not based on evidence</li> <li>○ Question deliverability of the sites within the plan</li> <li>○ Environmental effects not properly assessed</li> <li>○ Inflexible sites</li> <li>○ Elsenham allocation contravenes the hierarchy</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>South Cambridgeshire District Council</b> disagrees that the northern part of the District lies within the Cambridge sub-market area</li> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> wants reference made to protecting or enhancing rights of way</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> suggests Great Chesterford should have more allocations</li> <li>• <b>East Herts</b> are concerned with potential impact of development adjacent to Bishops Stortford</li> <li>• <b>Land owner/developer</b> High risk spatial strategy with large development at Elsenham, the housing strategy is not justified</li> <li>•</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>East Hertfordshire District Council</b> considers the plan complies with the duty to co-operate</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> supports paragraph 7.2</li> <li>• <b>Little Easton Parish Council</b> supports the hierarchy for their village</li> </ul>										



	3	2			2	3		to Co-operate	1	3	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be a review of development limits boundaries particularly at Wendens Ambo</li> <li>Development should be allowed just outside development limits and there should not be just a blanket ban</li> <li>Development limits have not been fully justified</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>English Heritage</b> broadly welcomes the criteria within this policy, particularly (b) and (c) which refer to development needing to be compatible with the character of the settlement and/or its countryside setting as well protecting the setting of existing buildings and the character of the area.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 8: General Development Principles - Policy DES1 and Supporting Text</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 12</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	4	2	6		2	9	1		3	2	7
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Developers</b> object to the inclusion of a target for Lifetime Homes or Neighbourhoods, there has been no justification for the need or the level required, it does not meet an identified local need, lacks flexibility and affects viability which has not been tested or demonstrated</li> <li>Sustainable construction standards may conflict with new standards over the plan period</li> <li>These elements of the policy have not been tested for viability as set out in NPPF.</li> <li>Respecting Local Character is not clear and may contradict NPPF and other policies as well as the Essex Design Guide, it is also backward looking and will stifle modern innovative and high quality design</li> <li>There needs to be greater emphasis on physical activity which particularly encourages walking and cycling and stricter design standards to ensure that this happens and it should apply to all areas of development.</li> <li>Development in Dunmow is too dense and the roads too narrow</li> <li>Development on large sites in Dunmow do not comply with Lifetime design</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Natural England</b> welcome the inclusion of Green Infrastructure</li> <li><b>English Heritage</b> broadly welcomes this policy and its references to design issues such as historic character, setting, local context and materials.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 9: Employment Strategy - Paragraph 9.1</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1					1				1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that employment land is being lost especially in Dunmow</li> </ul>										



		1				2		to Co-operate		1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is unsound to release 18 Ha of Employment land north of Stansted airport and it should be reconsidered</li> <li>The employment policy on the airport is too restrictive in keeping it airport related</li> <li>The policy is not clearly drafted and may permit any sort of development</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Chapter 9: Employment Strategy - Policy EMP1 and Supporting Text</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 5</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	1			1	3			2	1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy is negatively worded and does not allow the expansion of existing employment sites. It also stifles economic growth and ignores market signals contrary to the NPPF</li> <li>Any redevelopment should also allow for highway improvements where this is necessary</li> <li>The policy is too restrictive and does not allow enough clarity or flexibility for the redevelopment, particularly in relation to community use or what the local area is</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <b>County Council</b> support elements of the policy</li> <li>The policy is supported in principle, but it needs to be implemented and it should ensure that owners do not deliberately create vacancies to get consent for housing</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 9: Employment Strategy - Policy EMP2</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1				1					1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is support for the policy in principle but concern that it will not be implemented or applied</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Chapter 10: Retail Strategy - Paragraph 10.1</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											



Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1				1						
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Heritage consider that Thaxted and Stansted Mountfitchet should be referred to in this paragraph as well.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

Chapter 10: Retail - Policy SP5											
Total Representations: 5											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2	1			1	3			2	1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waitrose would like the threshold for a retail impact assessment to be reduced to 300 sq m</li> <li>There are questions about the policies which have been put forward from the evidence and whether the evidence supports them.</li> <li>Those allocations such as Land North East of Elsenham that include retail provision should be identified in Policy SP5.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Heritage welcome the statement within this policy that all development proposals will need to respect the historic and architectural character of the town and local centres and be of a high quality design. They also welcome the aim to prevent the loss of shops and other town centre uses in order to protect the vitality of the town and local centres.</li> </ul>										

Chapter 11: Housing Strategy District Housing Requirement Paragraphs 11.1 – 11.19 and Policy SP6											
Total Representations: 58 (1 representation was supported by 973 people and another by 1261 people )											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	12	14	32		1	46	11		8	17	33
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan does not clearly set out the assumed timescales of all the allocations so that Housing delivery can be properly examined and to ensure that infrastructure is delivered at the right time.</li> <li>The base date of the Local Plan cannot be 2011. It must be the current and be 2014. This is required to meet objectively assessed need for housing.</li> <li>The larger developments in Great Dunmow are too dense with non-compliant small gardens, insufficient parking and roads too narrow.</li> <li>UDC should build more social housing and not rely on developers</li> <li>The issue of affordable housing should not play a role in determining the overall housing requirement as affordable housing can be provided through other policies such as exception sites.</li> <li>Plan should show a detailed breakdown of the 11500 homes.</li> </ul>										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan is based on a flawed assessment of the future housing need and the housing target for the District should be reduced.</li> <li>• The plan is based on a flawed assessment of the future housing need and does not meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the district and the housing target for the district should be increased.</li> <li>• The number of dwellings to be delivered through sites which do not have planning permission is questioned.</li> <li>• There is no evidence to support an allowance of 900 dwellings being delivered through windfall sites.</li> <li>• The overall housing number should reflect the pressures in the three sub-market housing areas. The Plan does not take into account the needs of other authorities.</li> <li>• Growth in Uttlesford needs to be re-appraised in the light of Interim Report on the Airports Commission (December 2013) and the unlikelihood of a second runway at Stansted by 2030.</li> <li>• The council’s policy in relation to Lifetime Homes is unclear.</li> <li>• This number of homes is not needed as there is no industry, there is to be no major development at Stansted Airport for 30 years or more, and the district historically has a very low unemployment rate. There are little or no brown-field sites in the district to be redeveloped, so building so many houses, on vitally important farmland or the Green Belt, for people who must commute to London or Cambridge for work is truly unsustainable</li> <li>• The strategy makes no provision for ‘self-build’ as encouraged by the Government. Nor does it make provision for low cost ‘mobile home’ space</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>South Cambs DC and Epping Forest DC</b> support Uttlesford is making provision for its objectively assessed need.</li> <li>• <b>A number of developer</b> considers that the housing target of 10,460 new homes between 2011 and 2031 is supported on the grounds that it is supported by the objectively assessed housing needs of the District as required by the NPPF</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Policy SP7</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 59 (1 representation was supported by 973 people and another by 1261 people )</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>
	15	8	36		6	29	24		14	8	37
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No explanation or justification of the scale and distribution of housing.</li> <li>• Additional housing allocations should be made.</li> <li>• The suitability and delivery of proposed sites is questioned and therefore certain allocations should be deleted and alternative housing allocations should be made.</li> <li>• ‘Additional sites’ were selected on a different strategy to that which guided the selection of other sites. This mixture of approaches is unacceptable and reinforces the objection that only a comprehensive and universal methodology to assess all sites on the same basis would be ‘robust’.</li> <li>• Over reliance on a limited number of settlements to deliver the majority of the planned housing.</li> <li>• Many of the sites have already been granted planning permission and therefore the Plan does not plan for the longer term.</li> <li>• Amend policy to include additional safeguards with respect of the formal safeguarding of Aerodromes.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> believes that local authorities should consider the provision of natural</li> </ul>										

	<p>areas as part of a balanced policy to ensure that local communities have access to an appropriate mix of green-spaces providing for a range of recreational needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should include provision of multi user paths within the proposed improvements to the highway infrastructure. Currently there is no reference to use by horse riders.</li> <li>• The only acceptable form of development in Thaxted is infill. Further development would detract from the villages’ landscape setting, impact on tourism, capacity of schools, surgery, roads, water supply and lead to loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• Scale of development will ruin countryside.</li> <li>• The road network is unable to accommodate the traffic generated by the scale of growth.</li> <li>• Development in Saffron Walden has inadequate access to employment centres meaning cars will need to cross town, impacting on the already poor air quality of the town.</li> <li>• Insufficient infrastructure.</li> <li>• <b>Hertfordshire County Council</b> suggests that further work is needed to identify impacts of development on Hertfordshire road network ; and that some of the housing developments are likely to have an impact upon HCC school places.</li> <li>• Single or small developments should be allowed on carefully selected areas of green belt around the many small villages.</li> <li>• Development should be dispersed more equally across the district.</li> <li>• <b>Highways Agency</b> considers that the assessment work undertaken to date does not yet fully determine the operation of the strategic road network following the implementation of all District Plan development. However, it does provide an indication that a material impact could occur at a number of critical locations on the Strategic Road Network. Further modelling work should be undertaken. The larger developments are not proposed to come forward until the end of the plan period and in that respect there is time to work out an appropriate mitigation strategy.</li> <li>• Allocation of all sites to meet requirement does not allow for flexibility. It is not clear where or how the 300 dwellings in other villages or the windfall allowance will be delivered.</li> <li>• There is a difference in inflexion to what is being demanded in policy SP7 and Policy EN10. Both policies are unclear.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> consider that the policy should require development to respect the district’s historic environment as a whole, including significance and setting of heritage assets and historic settlements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of developers support the identification of certain proposal sites.</li> <li>• A resident of Great Chesterford supports the strategy on the basis that it conforms to the needs, facilities, resources and heritage considerations which affect the village.</li> <li>• <b>Essex CC</b> (Minerals and Waste) supports the policy reference to design and layout of housing developments including any infrastructure will incorporate the highest standards of low carbon development.</li> <li>• <b>Highways Agency</b> supports the emphasis on sustainable transport and travel.</li> <li>• <b>Little Dunmow PC</b> broadly supports the policy as it does not allow for other large developer led proposals in the area.</li> <li>• <b>Birchanger Parish Council</b> supports the protection of the Metropolitan Green Belt and Countryside Protection Zone.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Policy HO1 and Paragraph 11.20</b></p>
<p><b>Total Representations: 4</b></p>

Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	1			1	2			1	1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The larger developments in Dunmow are too dense with non-compliant small gardens insufficient parking and roads too narrow</li> <li>This policy may not be needed given the use of policy DES1 it is also too prescriptive</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the density range of 30-50 units/hectare within Development Limits of all identified settlements other than Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Policy HO3</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
						2					
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern is raised about the loss of small dwellings by combination of 2 smaller dwellings into one larger dwelling and this should not be permitted in order to safeguard the limited stock of smaller dwellings</li> <li>This subdivision policy offers no control or guidance over sustainable location for such additional dwellings to be created and in a rural area like Uttlesford this is unsound.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Policy HO5</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					1					1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern is expressed that the policy is more 'lax' than the policy for development within village which have limits.</li> <li>This infill policy offers no control or guidance over what constitutes 'infill' nor does it offer any sustainable location guidance for such additional dwellings to be created and in a rural area like Uttlesford this is unsound.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Lt Dunmow Parish Council</b> support Policy HO5 , in particular (a) and (e)</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Policy HO6</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											

Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					2				1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy does not allow flexibility if all the criterion are not met.</li> <li>Sections c. and d. remove the financial incentive to redevelop and is in effect a ban on development</li> <li>The building of large new homes in the countryside will not be permitted.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Paragraph 11.20</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy as presented is too 'flabby'. The council must ensure that developers deliver on the legal undertakings they enter into with regard to the delivery of social housing units. Too often in the past one finds instances of developers coming back with requests to 'renegotiate' because 'market conditions have changed', e.g. Wickfords. Drawing up these agreements entails tough talking, with no loopholes left.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Paragraph 11.31</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The onus is on the Council to demonstrate that its targets for affordable housing, and other local plan policy expectations, are viable and achievable so that the plan objectives can be delivered with the minimum of delay. The developer should not be obliged to demonstrate viability with each application.</li> <li>Protracted negotiations over planning contributions will slow housing delivery</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Policy H07</b>
--

Total Representations: 3											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
							1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy is unsound because the requirement for affordable housing at the rate proposed is unjustified</li> <li><b>The Fairfield Partnership</b> welcomes the additional wording recognising that viability will be taken into account in negotiating an appropriate provision. Large schemes such as Land North East of Elsenham that provide for a range of beneficial community infrastructure on site alongside new homes (such as schools), are exposed to development costs that are not borne by other purely residential allocations where contributions to off-site improvements might be more readily negotiated.</li> <li>40% Affordable Housing is not viable and not justified</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Policy HO8											
Total Representations: 2											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1							2		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district enjoys a long history of sound low cost rented options through 'charitable trusts' and also through private rented accommodation. Policy HO8 should be broadened in its scope to allow for 'charitable trusts' and private landlords to provide such affordable housing also and the control being set over rents levels by the fair rents officer under simple S.106 agreements. The narrowness of the Policy is unsound.</li> <li>There is one objection which suggests that the policy should be more open for criterion and worded as follows: a) "the development will meet a demonstrable local need <del>that cannot be met in any other way</del>"</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

Chapter 11: Housing Strategy - Policy HO11											
Total Representations: 2											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		2					2				

<b>Objections</b>	•
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>One developer</b> who say they can provide a site supports the policy.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> ‘welcome the first criteria in this policy which requires planning applications and site allocations to minimise impact on the historic environment.’</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Policy SP8 and paragraphs 12.1 to 12.6</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 4</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP 8 is supported as far as it goes but should take into account where development is located, development should be located where environmental impacts will be reduced</li> <li>• The plan does not minimise carbon emissions and the major allocations do the exact opposite</li> <li>• We are too dependent on imports for food as well as carbon producing energy to produce it. The plan should also say how we are going to find the additional land needed to meet the food needs of the increased population</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> ‘The protection of the natural environment is welcomed’;</li> <li>• Paragraph 12.3 refers to ‘ the built environment mitigates against and is resilient to the impacts of change, and identifies the provision of green infrastructure as one mechanism for achieving this’ this is also welcomed</li> <li>• <b>Essex CC</b> is pleased that UDC will support development which employs best practice in sustainable design and construction. The policy further promotes development which makes provision for waste recycling and which is located and designed to be energy efficient.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage:</b> welcomes the fourth bullet point of this policy which requires development to retain and enhancing the character, appearance and setting of areas, settlements and buildings that are worthy of protection.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Policy EN 1 and Paragraphs 12.7 to 12.10</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>
		<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>				<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater emphasis needs to be given to the reduction of traffic noise throughout the district, particularly in relation to major routes such as the M11 and the A120 and noise attenuation measures should be used more widely.</li> <li>• The policy should include: “should minimise pollution”.</li> </ul>										

<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Natural England</b> States: ‘effects to minimise effects of pollutants on the natural environment are to be encouraged.’</li> </ul>
----------------	---

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Policy EN 2 and Paragraphs 12.11 and 12.12</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 4</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		2					3				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cumulative effects of air pollution are not taken into account in the plan. The plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the with the policies in the NPPF as a result.</li> <li>The plan does not comply with EU legislation on air pollution.</li> <li>The policy does not consider the effects of new development on existing users and residents outside the development</li> <li>There is no method for ascertaining what is "poor" air quality</li> <li>The policy should be redrafted in the style of the South Cambs policy on the subject</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Paragraph 12.13</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1					1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan is unsound because it is not consistent with National Planning Policy Framework and illegal because it does not have regard to UDC's 2008 Sustainable Community Strategy of ensuring new development is sustainable because the AQMA.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Policy EN 4 and Paragraph 12.14</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1			1		1			1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Gt Dunmow</b> recycling centre is in the wrong place as it is near a hotel and housing, a new location should be found in the district</li> </ul>										



<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essex CC is supportive of the wording within the policy regarding ‘development will be supported where it makes appropriate provision for the recycling of waste and maximises the use of recycled building materials’.</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Policy EN 7</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1		2		1		2		1		2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SUDs systems should be designed so as not to increase the bird hazard risk or the safe operation of Stansted Airport or the movement of aircraft; where appropriate the implementation of a bird hazard management plan will be secured by condition or planning obligation.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Natural England:</b> Provision of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs) is welcomed as an example of green infrastructure through the use of permeable surfaces and soft landscaping. De-culverting of rivers and watercourses where feasible is also welcomed and encouraged.</li> <li>Surface Water Flooding, within the Local Plan is supported. <b>Thames Water</b> supports the use of properly maintained Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) in appropriate circumstances.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Policy EN8 and Paragraphs 12.23 to 12.27</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 8</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	1	6		1	4	3		1	2	5
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accordingly UDC’s policy for water conservation must take account of “virtual water” imports in clothing, food, drinks etc. Failure to do this exports shortages to other countries.</li> <li>UDC should do more than require new buildings “to meet Sustainable Homes Code Level 3.” It should require meters, and measures for recycling and rainwater collection for all new buildings</li> <li>Integration with building design is cheaper and more effective than retrofitting. The Plan has indications in this direction but is vague about best practice, design, and percentage of rainfall to be captured</li> <li>There should be a cross country water strategy</li> <li>The Local Plan cannot be considered sustainable without proper consideration and a realistic proposed solution that Uttlesford is capable of implementing prior to authorising the developments which gave rise to these concerns.</li> <li><b>Environment Agency</b> consider: ‘1, 2 and 3 at the end of Policy EN8 should be re-numbered</li> </ul>										

	<p>so that the following item is inserted between items 2 and 3. ☐ ‘that a risk assessment demonstrates an acceptable risk to groundwater; and’ The target of 105 l/h/d is in line with other developments across the area. Ideally we would have preferred to see targets for non-residential use based on the BREEAM standards. However the overall policy has been designed to minimise water use following agreed targets.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘We propose to introduce a new, tighter level of water efficiency into the Building Regulations, to be set at 110 litres/person/day (lpd). This would be an optional higher level in addition to the current level of 125 lpd which could only be applied in areas with specific local needs (such as water stress).’</li> <li>• Waste water infrastructure may not be delivered at a fast enough rate to meet the plans requirements and so jeopardise delivery of the plan, because it can take up to 10 years to complete</li> <li>• It is unjustified because developers are already, by law, required to make financial contributions to the provision and maintenance of water services.</li> <li>• The policy will militate against the delivery of the plan, including the development objectives. Part of the policy is also unlawful.</li> <li>• The Council is making planning permission conditional upon developers providing evidence to satisfy assessment criteria that are in themselves vague and imprecise.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Policy EN 9</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1				1				1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essex CC recommends that the ‘site requirements’ (the orange boxes) accompanying each site allocation from Section 20 onwards incorporates the requirement to consider the prior extraction of minerals as part of any development of that location, this could be done after the examination as a minor amendment</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 12: Environmental Protection - Policy EN 10</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 5</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1	4		1	4			1	1	3
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To remedy this objection our clients request that criterion (a) be deleted.</li> <li>• There is no need for the policy as much of the energy standards are being incorporated into</li> </ul>										

	<p>the building regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parts of the policy are unclear</li> <li>• The policy should apply to fewer than 10 homes</li> <li>• Policy EN10 does not go nearly far enough, particularly given Uttlesford's huge and unsustainable carbon footprint. We understand from the UDC Energy Efficiency Officer that new builds can be built to Passivhaus standards at a cost which is not significantly more than using traditional new build techniques.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex CC</b> welcomes reference to development will be supported where it is designed to include decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy sources.</li> </ul>

<b>Section : Policy SP9 and Paragraph 13.1 to 13.5</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 8</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	2	5			7	1		1	2	5
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy should be deleted or should refer only to the Green Belt which is designated for particular purposes.</li> <li>• Section 11 of the NPPF does not advocate the protection of the countryside for its own sake, which is the stance of this policy. It therefore goes beyond the requirements set out in the NPPF and as such conflicts with national policy.</li> <li>• As stated in response to other policies relying on the 'development' limits they should be re drawn on the basis of evidence or redefined.</li> <li>• We would like to see the 2010 Consultation language reinstated the current policy is a watered down version.</li> <li>• <b>Little Easton Parish Council</b> asks that the District Council amends or adds to this policy to better suit its objectives: Set out that development will only be allowed if it does not result in the coalescence of settlements either visually or by an increase in activity which has an urbanising effect on the area between settlements.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy is supported and <b>Natural England</b> is pleased to see reference to best and most versatile agricultural land, and its links to Policy C1.</li> <li>• We support the general thrust of draft policy SP9, but consider that where land is subject to an allocation, it should be clarified the provisions of SP9 should not apply.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 13: Development in the Countryside - Policy C1 and Paragraphs 13.6 to 13.12</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 10</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	6	2	2			2	6		2	3	4

<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Countryside Protection Zone should be rigidly enforced and only infill or brown field developments allowed therein. The map of the Countryside Protection Zone that accompanied Policy S8 should be reintroduced and rigidly enforced.</li> <li>In order to make the plan sound, the first sentence of paragraph 13.9 should read: “Applications for development affecting a registered historic park and garden should show how the proposed development does not harm the significance of the park and garden, unless there are outweighing public benefits”</li> <li>Full details of the Flitch way link project should be shown and highlighted as a strategic project and all developments along the proposed route should be made to make provision for this project. ECC Rights of Way team are fully aware of these plans.</li> <li><b>Essex Bridleway Association</b> would like the policy to protect bridleways from development</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Natural England</b> broadly supports the policy</li> <li><b>English Heritage:</b> broadly welcome this policy and its various references to specific landscape and heritage characteristics of the district.</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 13: Development in the Countryside - Policy C2</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 5</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	1	3			3	2			1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The types of potential future uses should not be prioritised as this does not comply with new permitted development rights it does not accord with the NPPF</li> <li>The wording of this policy is unclear with regards to the historic environment. As currently drafted, it allows for the re-use of rural buildings without mentioning the need to safeguard buildings of architectural and/or historic interest.</li> <li><b>English Heritage</b> suggest to make the plan sound another point should be added to criterion 1 – 4: “the development would conserve or enhance buildings of architectural and/or historic interest”</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Natural England:</b> broadly supports the policy, especially under sub section (3) which relates to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity of the site.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 14: The Historic Environment - Policy SP10 and Paragraphs 14.1 to 14.4</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 6</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
	3	1				1	4			1	1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non designated Heritage assets (such as Hatfield FOREST) are not given sufficient protection by the policy</li> </ul>										



	2				1	1		to Co-operate	1		1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>English Heritage</b> state: In order to make the plan sound, clarity should be given regarding archaeological sites of less than national importance, and the renewable energy section should refer to more than just scheduled monuments.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 15: The Natural Environment - Policy SP11</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1	1				1		1		1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Residents Group</b> object to the specific wording of draft Policy SP11. The equivalent 2010 Consultation policy, DC10, had requirements that “New development should not result in a reduction of the biodiversity value of sites or the priority habitats defined in the BAP” and that “Development will be required to contribute to a network of biodiversity sites, green infrastructure and open spaces which link communities”. No explanation is given as to why these provisions have been removed, they should be reinstated.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Natural England</b> welcomes and supports this policy</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 15: The Natural Environment - Paragraph 15.5</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
			1						1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Natural England</b> welcomes and supports this policy. Under paragraph 15.5 there is reference to the Essex Biodiversity project website, providing advice on incorporating biodiversity in developments, this is to be welcomed and encouraged.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 15: The Natural Environment - Policy NE1</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 4</b>											



	2		4			3	3	to Co-operate	2		4
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mention of the need to provide multi user routes through development, to make the plan sound we suggest that the wording is amended to read 'New development should be linked to existing services....and the countryside beyond by well designed, attractive and safe cycle, pedestrian and bridleway.</li> <li>Fitch Way should be accessible for horses at every access point</li> <li>The development West of Gt Dunmow is not compatible with the safeguarding of Fitch Way as an ecological and recreational resource</li> <li>To make the Plan sound it is suggested that the wording of the introductory paragraph is amended to read '...increase public transport use, cycling, walking and horse riding.' and in paragraph C 'new development should be located where it can be linked to safe and well designed footpath, cycle and bridleway networks.'</li> <li>Thresholds should be set out in the policy when Travel Plans and Transport/Statements will be needed, not just a general statement</li> <li>The Plan must be flawed and unsound without a major assessment of the real impact which Cambridge has over the district.</li> <li><b>The County Council</b> state that the policy should be amended to include reference to the 'provision of safe, secure cycle storage in all new developments where there is no provision'.</li> <li><b>The County Council</b> recommends that when developing more detailed site specific policies, master plans and/or pre applications discussions that sustainable transportation be promoted by considering the following – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car sharing;</li> <li>- Car club networks and mechanisms that may facilitate their use and operation;</li> <li>- Real time travel information;</li> <li>- Welcome Packs within new developments highlighting sustainable transportation options;</li> <li>- Promote the use of sustainable transportation modes by ensuring adequate and appropriate cycle rack storage (secured and covered), parking spaces, space for motorcyclists and suitable bus stops and routes;</li> <li>- Provision of travel vouchers.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 16: Access Strategy - Policy SP 13</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
					3					3	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Braintree District Council</b> would support policy SP13 - Access to Stansted Airport and considers that all appropriate measures should be taken to ensure that access to the airport from a range of transport modes is possible from the east.</li> </ul>										



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex CC</b> recommends that this policy emphasises the importance of strategic access to Stansted airport to neighbouring authorities, Counties, and London reflecting the airports catchment area.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Policy SP13 – Access to Stansted Airport. South Cambridgeshire welcomes the recognition given of the importance of the airport to the region.</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 16: Access Strategy - Policy TA1 and Paragraph 16.7</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1				2					1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The HBF states:</b> The Local Plan needs to articulate what these parking standards are. Developers should not have to refer to another document such as the standards provided by Essex County Council. The Council will need to justify these standards in its new local plan. Essex County Council is not the local planning authority with regard to the provision of car-parking in developments.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 17: Infrastructure - Policy SP 14 and Paragraphs 17.1 and 17.2</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 14</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	3	2	3			2	6		3		3
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Mobile Operators Association</b> suggest that there is a specific policy on Telecoms masts: they set out what that policy might be.</li> <li>• <b>The National Trust suggest:</b> The Plan should make a commitment to working up a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the District. An example would be the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.</li> <li>• It was not until April 2014 that UDC published an "Infrastructure Delivery Plan" but this contains no more than the details of infrastructure that might be needed. There is no real plan as to how it might be delivered to support the housing proposed and it has not been costed.</li> <li>• Policy SP14 should be made more robust by including a paragraph to protect other existing infrastructure.</li> <li>• It is important to recognise that there may need to be cross boundary contributions to infrastructure, such as schools and youth service provision, in particular for Hertfordshire</li> </ul>										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording of this policy is amended to read '...each development must address water supply...and make enough provision for children's play space, open space, green infrastructure and new or enhanced social/community infrastructure including enhancement of multi user rights of way within new development. '</li> <li>It is noted that infrastructure improvements will be funded through S106 Agreements and this is welcomed; however this policy does not include the consideration of the protection or enhancement of Rights of Way.</li> <li>The Infrastructure delivery section, appendix 2 is wholly inadequate and should be completely re drafted.</li> <li>The policy should be expanded to make clear that all obligations sought will accord with the tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and that all obligations sought will be directly related to the development.</li> <li>Educational health and transport needs are unlikely to be met by developers and the government are relying on private involvement which is unlikely to happen. Land therefore will revert to the developer who will build more houses</li> <li><b>The HBF Recommend:</b> The policy is deleted, because the Council cannot insist that a developer must meet all these requirements unless it has conducted a viability assessment that demonstrates that it is feasible to do so in the majority of cases. The Council is obliged to consider its planning priorities and assess whether it is viable for development to provide all these things, while still providing a competitive return to a willing land owner and willing developer (paragraph 173 of the NPPF). Paragraph 175 advises that a CIL should be developed alongside the local plan to ensure that expectations around planning gain are realistic and will not hinder the delivery of the plan.</li> <li>Policy SP14 should be amended to make clear that development will only be permitted where it makes proper contributions for infrastructure, both directly needed and for its pro rata share of indirect infrastructure needs.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Natural England:</b> Inclusion and support of open space provision and green infrastructure under this policy is welcomed and supported.</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 17: Infrastructure - Policy INF 1 and Paragraphs 17.3 to 17.9</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 9</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	1			2	4			1	2	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sport England States:</b> Clarification that policy INF1 protects playing fields and sports facilities that are not in active use (as well as those that are) and proposals that would prejudice the use of such facilities is supported as this assists with the interpretation of the policy and would help address some of the issues that regularly arise when applying a policy of this nature.</li> <li><b>Sport England</b> requests that paragraph 17.6 be amended to add more safeguards for sports pitches.</li> </ul>										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'New development will be required to make appropriate on site provision..for publicly accessible green space or improvement to existing accessible green space, which will include the use by pedestrians, cyclists and horseriders where possible in accordance with the following standards..'</li> <li>Due to the density of modern development public amenity space is more important.</li> <li>It is also important to safeguard existing open space</li> <li>To comply with the policy, it appears that the <b>NHS</b> would need to seek approval from the Council for its own strategy and it is requested that the policy is amended to clarify that proposals for healthcare facilities would be exempt from the policy criteria.</li> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sport England States:</b> Reference to the Council's evidence base on sport (the Uttlesford Open Space Sport Facility and Playing Pitch Strategy 2012) is supported as this provides the justification for the content of policy INF1.</li> <li><b>Natural England</b> broadly supports the policy.</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 17: Infrastructure - Policy INF 3</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
							1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sport England</b> request that criterion (b) of policy INF3 be deleted and the policy be amended to provide clarity on what the policy approach is to new/replacement facilities on sites both within and outside development boundaries.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 17: Infrastructure - Policy INF 4 and Paragraphs 17.13 and 17.14</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 7</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	3						5			2	1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Cambridgeshire CC</b> Comments: The Section on Health Impact Assessments 17.13-17.14 and Policy INF 4 is misleading in that the policy and associated guidance contained in section 17.13 and 17.14 refer to a both Health Needs Assessments and Health Impact Assessments and the two concepts are used interchangeably within both the policy and guidance. For clarification it would be better to split the policy into two policies one on Health Impact Assessment and one on Health Needs Assessments.</li> <li><b>NHS</b> requests that paragraph 17.14 is amended to read:</li> </ul>										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "the District Council will liaise with NHS England and West Essex Clinical Commissioning Group, or any successor body when assessing the scope and scale of likely impacts and the nature of mitigation required".</li> <li>● The policy should be rewritten as there are alternative means available to encourage or pursue the health evaluation of health impacts.</li> <li>● Policy INF4 in its current form is not effective. If the policy is retained it should be reworded to delete the mandatory requirement to submit a health impact assessment, and to instead introduce a requirement for the Director of Public Health to be consulted on any large applications.</li> <li>● Policy INF 4 is supported in general terms but there is little evidence that it is being supported or implemented at present.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 18: Monitoring and Delivery : Policy SP15</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1					1				1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is a need to achieve a step change in the reduction of car use and the plan does not set out to achieve that.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 20: Saffron Walden - Saffron Walden Policy 1 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations:</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	14	1	36			3	20		28		10
<b>Object</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Individuals</b> object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Harm to the historic character</li> <li>○ Inadequate infrastructure including roads, schools, health provision and sewerage provision</li> <li>○ Increase in emissions</li> <li>○ Questions over soundness and deliverability</li> <li>○ Unsustainable</li> <li>○ Suggested alternative sites need to be assessed, including Great Chesterford and sites west of Saffron Walden</li> </ul> </li> </ul>										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Questions how a comprehensive development can be achieved when the land is in multiple ownership</li> <li>○ questions regarding infrastructure delivery</li> <li>○ ignoring residents opinions</li> <li>○ Plan process is flawed</li> <li>○ Delivery of link road is questionable</li> <li>○ Previous applications on this site have been refused</li> <li>○ Piecemeal development</li> <li>○ Contrary to NPPF</li> <li>○ Air quality issues and increase in pollution</li> <li>○ Retail and employment provision will detract business from the town centre</li> <li>○ Questions deliverability of the site</li> <li>○ Site at odds with the evidence base</li> <li>○ The policy does not specify the necessary infrastructure requirements</li> <li>○ Site not located near train station or major highway network</li> <li>○ Highways assessment flawed</li> <li>○ Flooding issues</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Local retailer</b> wants the specified retail floorspace to be reduced and reference to discount foodstore removed</li> <li>● <b>Land owner/developers</b> suggests changes to map to reflect planning application UTT/13/3467</li> <li>● <b>Landowner</b> suggests minor changes to the policy to allow more flexibility</li> <li>● <b>Landowner/developer</b> Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment are flawed</li> <li>● <b>Landowner/developer</b> suggests alternative site at Chelmer Mead</li> <li>● <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> wants the policy to mention the protection or enhancement of the current bridleway</li> <li>● <b>English Heritage</b> concerns of the impact on the historic town and lack of clarity regarding the link road and no mention of the important views of the church</li> <li>● <b>Sport England</b> consider formal open space being in just one area of the development and delete reference to rugby pitches and replace with playing pitches</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Landowners/Developers</b> support the allocation of this site</li> <li>● <b>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways</b> feel that the impact of this allocation is not severe</li> <li>● <b>Sport England</b> support the inclusion of playing pitches within the facilities</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 20: Saffron Walden - Saffron Walden Policy 2 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>
	1	1			1	1				1	1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Individuals</b> object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ concerns regarding the deliverability and location of the cycle way,</li> <li>○ inadequate road infrastructure</li> <li>○ contrary to objective 6 and SP12</li> </ul> </li> </ul>										

<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>English Heritage</b> are pleased that there is an opportunity to enhance the site and approach into Saffron Walden</li> </ul>
----------------	---

<b>Chapter 20: Saffron Walden - Saffron Walden Policy 3 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2	1			2	1			1	1	?
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Individuals</b> object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>concerns regarding the deliverability and location of the cycle way,</li> <li>Air Quality Issues</li> <li>contrary to objective 6 and SP12</li> </ul> </li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>English Heritage</b> are pleased that there is an opportunity to enhance the site and approach into Saffron Walden</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 20: Saffron Walden - Saffron Walden Policy 4 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2				2				1		?
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sport England</b> welcome the allocation for playing pitches</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 20: Saffron Walden - Saffron Walden Policy 5 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1				1				1		

<b>Chapter 20: Saffron Walden - Saffron Walden Policy 6 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 8 (including 1 representation supported by 80 people)</b>											

Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	5	1	2		3	3	2		3	2	3
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individuals</b> object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Contrary to the NPPF</li> <li>○ Loss of open space</li> <li>○ Increase in traffic</li> <li>○ Lack of school capacity</li> <li>○ Lack of adequate infrastructure</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> suggest changes to the policy, to ensure that it allows some flexibility</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> concerns regarding traffic movements, setting of the town and lack of clarity regarding views of the church</li> </ul>										

Chapter 20: Saffron Walden - Saffron Walden Policy 7 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 2											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2				2				1		1
<b>Objections</b>											

Chapter 20: Saffron Walden - Saffron Walden Policy 8 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 4											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	4				4				3		1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> stress the importance of the historic environment</li> </ul>										

Map 47.1 Inset map: Saffron Walden											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					1			1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considerable questions remain over the Soundness and deliverability of Allocation SW 1.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 1 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 12											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	6	2	4		2	5	5		3	2	7
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individuals</b> object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Allocation on agricultural land</li> <li>○ The Retail Assessment does not specify retail space is needed here</li> <li>○ Questions regarding deliverability</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleway Association</b> wants specific reference to the protection of the current bridleway</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> are concerned about urban sprawl and the historic character</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council</b> do not considered the proposed growth severe</li> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> support reference to playing pitches</li> </ul>										

Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 2 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 10											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	6		4		2	5	3		4	1	5
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council</b> request word to the policy to ensure the site is viable</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> suggests changes to the policy to allow more flexibility and set 400 dwellings as a minimum as well as other detailed changes</li> <li>• <b>Individuals</b> object due to public opinion being ignored, and the loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• <b>Land owner</b> is concerned that no allocations are made in Great Dunmow for A class uses and suggests allocation of a site west of Butleys lane</li> <li>• <b>West Essex CCG and NHS England, West Essex and NHS England</b> request changes to the policy to include reference to NHS Business Case approval</li> <li>• <b>Land owner/developer</b> is concerned with the impact on the countryside and deliverability and suggests Dunmow Park as an alternative site</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> request the policy is more flexible regarding the number of dwellings</li> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> want the policy to specifically mention bridleway access onto the Flitch Way</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> want clarity in the policy with regards to conserving and enhancing listed building at Folly Farm</li> <li>•</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways</b> do not consider the proposed growth severe</li> <li>• <b>Developer/Landowner</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										



Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 3 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 9											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	5	2	2		1	6	2		3	3	3
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individuals</b> object as the site is too close to the A120 and no evaluation/analysis has been carried out and alternative sites assessed</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> suggests alternative site east of the town and suggests that the impact on heritage assessments need to be considered</li> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> wants the policy to specifically state that it is for school playing fields and replacement artificial grass pitch</li> <li>•</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways</b> do not consider the proposed growth severe</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> support the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										

Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 4 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 12											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	5	1	6		1	9	2		4	3	5
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council</b> suggest changes to the policy wording to include reference about offsetting the cost of additional primary school places</li> <li>• <b>Individual</b> objects as the proposal is unviable</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> requests appraisal of alternative sites</li> <li>• <b>Essex County Council</b> request the site be viability tested</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> suggests an alternative site at Dunmow Park</li> <li>• <b>The landowner/developer</b> requests the housing numbers are minimum and suggest policy word changes</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> recommend that clarity is provided to conserve and enhance the conservation area</li> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> contrary to paragraph 74 of the NPPF – suggest policy text changes</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Helena Romanes School</b> support the allocation of this site</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> support the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										

Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 5 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations:											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty	Yes	No	Not Specified

	2	1	2			4	1	to Co-operate	2	1	2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individual</b> should be allocated for employment</li> <li>• <b>Local retailer</b> suggests policy word changes to set out the retail floorspace more precisely</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> suggests alternative site at Dunmow Park</li> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleway Association</b> requests the policy make reference to the Flich Way and bridle access</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways</b> do not consider the proposed growth severe</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 6 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 5</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	5					5				3	2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A <b>landowner/developer</b> questions the sites deliverability over the plan period and suggests the allocation should be reduced and other sites found</li> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association and an individual</b> want reference to a multi user track</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 7 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 5</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2	2	1			1	3		1	2	2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individuals</b> questions the deliverability of this site in light of the high court decision</li> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> wants reference to a bridleway in the policy</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways</b> do not consider the proposed growth severe</li> <li>• <b>A developer/landowner</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 8 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations:</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2	1	1				3		1	1	2

<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsustainable</li> <li>• Local opinion ignored</li> <li>• The site is ancient woodland</li> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> wants reference to a bridleway in the policy</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways</b> do not consider the proposed growth severe</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 9 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2		1			2	1		1	1	1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> wants reference to multiuser access in the policy</li> <li>• Local opinion has been ignored</li> <li>• Sits outside current VDL</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways</b> do not consider the proposed growth severe</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 10 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					1			1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> point out that development need to enhance and conserve the conservation area and heritage assets</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 11 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
		2					2				2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is an Essex County Council project and has nothing to do with Uttlesford</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways</b> do not consider the proposed growth severe</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 21: Great Dunmow - Great Dunmow Policy 12 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		2	1				1		2		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Great Dunmow Town Council</b> wants the allocation to be a public car park</li> <li>• Minor amendment to the labelling of the site in the map</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> support the principle of development on this site</li> </ul>										

<b>Map 47.2 Inset map: Great Dunmow</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
					1					1	
<b>Objections</b>											
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exclusion of a new settlement to the west of Great Dunmow is supported on the basis that a new settlement in that location is not considered to comply with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework and would lead to a piecemeal and unacceptable extension of the built up area of Great Dunmow into the open countryside such that it would not provide a comprehensive approach to the future expansion of Great Dunmow and result in coalescence with Little Easton</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 22: Elsenham - Elsenham Policy 1 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 48 (1 representation was supported by 973 people and another by 1261 people )</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		10	14		24		5		34	9	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individuals</b> object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ considerable questions remain over the soundness and deliverability of this allocation</li> <li>○ unsustainable area for such large growth</li> <li>○ allocation not justified when considered against reasonable alternatives</li> <li>○ allocation unbalances the Districts spatial strategy</li> <li>○ lack of duty to co-operate evidence with East Herts Dc</li> <li>○ Great Chesterford is a sustainable alternative location for development of this scale</li> </ul> </li> </ul>										

- Inadequate infrastructure including roads, schools health facilities and water
- Urban sprawl – coalescence of Elsenham and Henham
- Poor access to major roads
- Uncertainties concerning the cost of infrastructure needed to support the development without breaching other policy aims
- Questions over site viability
- Lack of evidence around how the site will support local employment and services
- The housing should be dispersed around the district
- Views of local people have been ignored
- The site has been refused planning application in the past for fewer houses
- Flawed decision making process
- The plan has not objectively assessed all major infrastructure needs
- The proposed link road goes in the wrong direction and it will not be used
- A new access road is suggested going directly west to the B1383
- No local employment opportunities
- Contrary to the plans Objectives, Vision and NPPF
- Failed the Duty to Co-operate
- Impact on the CPZ has not been considered
- Impact on Birchanger Wood has not been considered
- No adequate traffic assessment
- Alternative sites not adequately assessed
- **landowners/developers** object for the following reasons:
  - Impact on Henham conservation area
  - Site may be constrained by the presence of archaeological deposits
  - Potential aircraft noise would have a detrimental impact on residents
  - Access by sustainable modes of transport is limited
  - other sites are suggested including Chelmer Mead and Greater Priors Green
  - more smaller sites should be allocated to ensure delivery over the first half of the plan period
  - undeliverable in the plan period
  - flooding issues
  - more detailed Highway Assessment needs to be carried out
  - inconsistent with the Plans Spatial Strategy
- **West Essex and NHS England, West Essex CCG and NHS England** suggest amendment to the policy to clarify that proposals for health care provision would be subject to NHS business Case approval procedure
- **Essex County Council** make the following points:
  - Concerned about the inadequate access to strategic road network
  - Development in this area and in neighbouring authorities will result in junction 8 exceeding capacity
  - Impact on the primary road to Stansted Mountfitchet
  - They recommend UDC indicates the precise nature of the phasing of future infrastructure to deliver growth in Elsenham
  - The road hierarchy from Elsenham to the strategic road system should be defined and further detail is needed regarding connectivity to the strategic road network
- **Elsenham Parish Council** object for the following reasons:
  - Too many affordable homes in one area of the district
  - The Retail Study did not take account of this site
  - Land proposed for development is classified as best and most versatile agricultural land
  - The principle for development on this site has been refused – planning application

	<p>UTT/13/0808</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Contrary to Policy SP8 – Environmental protection</li> <li>○ Extensive public opposition for this allocation</li> <li>○ The Highway Impact Assessment proves that this allocation will have a serve adverse impact on surrounding highway network</li> <li>○ Flawed Sustainability Appraisal in relation to this allocation</li> <li>○ Unlikely that 2100 dwellings would be delivered within the plan period due to the infrastructure required</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Ugley, Widdington, Henham, Broxted and Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Councils</b> object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ it takes no account of the impact on Stansted Mountfitchet, in particular the road network</li> <li>○ unsustainable location</li> <li>○ inadequate infrastructure</li> <li>○ M11 junction 8 and 9 will have to be improved</li> <li>○ Impact on Forest Hall School has not been assessed</li> <li>○ Impact on health provision has not been assessed</li> <li>○ The policy should be excluded from the plan and alternative sites assessed closer to the strategic road network</li> <li>○ Coalescence of Elsenham and Henham</li> <li>○ Schools are at capacity</li> <li>○ Contrary to policy SP8</li> <li>○ Contrary to NPPF specifically in relation to highway issues</li> <li>○ Flawed sustainability assessment</li> <li>○ Affordable housing will not be spread around the district</li> <li>○ Destroy local landscape</li> <li>○ Local opinion has been ignored</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>The landowner/developer</b> suggests changes to the allocations map to reflect what they are proposing and including another site allocation for land under their control in Old Mead Lane for future growth either within the plan period or to meet longer term needs. Changes to the policy wording are also suggested</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Individual and the landowner/developer</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> <li>● <b>Hertfordshire CC</b> support the inclusion of a primary school in the policy</li> <li>● <b>Sport England</b> welcomes the inclusion of provision for playing pitches</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 22: Elsenham - Elsenham Policy 2 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1		1		2		1		1		1
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Hertfordshire County Council and the landowner/developer</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 22: Elsenham - Elsenham Policy 3 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Total Representations: 4											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
			1		3		1		3		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individuals</b> wish the site name to be changed</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> wants the 55 bed extra care unit provision removed from the policy</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sport England</b> support the inclusion of providing additional open space within the policy</li> </ul>										

Chapter 22: Elsenham - Elsenham Policy 5 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
			1						1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individual</b> objects as the site is contrary to SP9 and C1</li> </ul>										

Chapter 22: Elsenham - Elsenham Policy 6 – Preamble, Site Allocation											
Total Representations: 3											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1			2		1		1	1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hertfordshire County Council</b> note that there is no reference to planning obligations and are concerned that the developments will have an impact on Hertfordshire schools</li> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> suggests a new site west of policy area 3</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Landowner/developer</b> supports this policy</li> </ul>										

Chapter 22: Elsenham - Elsenham Policy 7 – Preamble, Site Allocation and map											
Total Representations: 2											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1			1				2		





	1				1			<b>to Co-operate</b>	1		
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An <b>individual</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										

<b>Map 44.3 Inset map: Great Chesterford</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1	2			2	1			1	2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great Chesterford is considered to be a sustainable location for residential development to meet the local and District's need. Land between Walden Road and Newmarket Road, potentially up to Stump Cross, Great Chesterford should be allocated for residential development</li> <li>The allocations already have permission and are likely to be developed before the Plan is approved. The housing strategy for the village makes no real provision for the employment growth at Chesterford Park. Additional sites should be allocated at land off Ickleton Road which is close to the railway station, the motorway and small retail park.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sites and number of houses planned for Great Chesterford are appropriate in terms of location and size.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 24: Newport - Newport Policy 1 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 6</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	3	1	2			2	2		2		3
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Essex Bridleway Association</b> wants reference made to the existing byway in the policy</li> <li><b>Newport PC</b> object to the site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unsustainable</li> <li>○ Outside current VDL</li> <li>○ The policy does not specify a maximum number of dwellings</li> <li>○ There is inadequate existing infrastructure</li> <li>○ too far from key amenities</li> <li>○ Concerns about increased traffic and emissions</li> <li>○ Primary school would have to expand</li> <li>○ Impact on conservation area</li> <li>○ Public safety – no pedestrian links to village facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>An individual</b> wishes the policy to specify a dedicated bus stop for Newport Free Grammar be provided</li> <li><b>An individual</b> feels there is inadequate evidence to support the site and local views have not been considered.</li> <li><b>Individuals</b> are concerned about flooding issues</li> </ul>										

<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>An individual</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> </ul>
----------------	---

<b>Chapter 24: Newport - Newport Policy 2 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 4</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	1	2		1	1	2		1	1	2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The landowner</b> requests the policy be changed from its current description to one for market housing</li> <li>• <b>Newport PC</b> object to the site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unsustainable</li> <li>○ Outside current VDL</li> <li>○ The policy does not specify a maximum number of dwellings</li> <li>○ There is inadequate existing infrastructure</li> <li>○ too far from key amenities</li> <li>○ Concerns about increased traffic and emissions</li> <li>○ Primary school would have to expand</li> <li>○ Impact on conservation area</li> <li>○ Public safety – no pedestrian links to village facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• an <b>individual</b> objects as the site is not viable as an economic enterprise</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>An individual</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 24: Newport - Newport Policy 3 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
<b>Legally compliant</b>	yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Sound</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified	<b>Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</b>	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	1	1			2	1		1	1	1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An <b>individual</b> objects to increase traffic and pollution levels</li> <li>• <b>Newport PC</b> object to the site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unsustainable</li> <li>○ Outside current VDL</li> <li>○ The policy does not specify a maximum number of dwellings</li> <li>○ Flood risk issues</li> <li>○ Sewage pipes at capacity</li> <li>○ Density of this site is inconsistent with policy HO1</li> <li>○ Increase in traffic will cause problems</li> <li>○ Whole assessment is flawed</li> </ul> </li> <li>• An <b>individual</b> requests that specific junction improvements take place as part of this development.</li> </ul>										

<b>Map 44.6 Inset map: Newport</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
					1					1	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocate land to north of NEW1 for up to 15 houses to compensate for the reduced number of housing being allocated should the planning application relating to NEW2 for 35 houses be approved.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Chapter 25: Stansted Mountfitchet - Stansted Mountfitchet Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 5</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		5					4		1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Hertfordshire CC</b> Express some concern regarding impact of development on school places in Hertfordshire</li> <li><b>A Retail Firm</b> wants the policy to be specific about the amount of retail floorspace allowed</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Individuals and English Heritage</b> support the allocation</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 25: Stansted Mountfitchet - Stansted Mountfitchet Policy 3 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		2			1		2		1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacking a path linking the site to High Land and Lower Street</li> <li><b>The Landowner</b> suggests amendments to the policy including to exclude requirements for 5% older persons dwellings</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Landowner and an Individual</b> support the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 25: Stansted Mountfitchet - Stansted Mountfitchet Policy 4 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 4</b>											

Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	3	1				1	3				2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individual</b> concerned about flooding issues</li> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleway Association</b> wants assurance that rights away are protected or enhanced</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> wants reference in the policy and supporting text to scheduled monument</li> <li>• <b>The Landowner</b> wants the policy changed to reflect the approved planning permission</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Individual</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> <li>• <b>The Landowner</b> supports the allocation of this site</li> </ul>										

Chapter 25: Stansted Mountfitchet - Stansted Mountfitchet Policy 5 - Site Allocation											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1						1				1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> wants assurance that rights of way are protected or enhanced</li> </ul>										

Chapter 25: Stansted Mountfitchet - Stansted Mountfitchet Policy 7 - Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 2											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1						1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> hope that the historic environment issues are properly addressed</li> <li>• <b>An individual</b> questions how the site can be delivered with three different land owners</li> </ul>										

Chapter 25: Stansted Mountfitchet - Stansted Mountfitchet Policy 9 - Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
					1					1	
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>An agent</b> wants the Council to assess district employment need and assess the most appropriate sites</li> </ul>										

Chapter 26: Takeley/Little Canfield - Takeley/Little Canfield Policy 1 – Preamble, Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 2											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2						2				2
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> are concerned that no provision is made for bridleway access</li> <li>• <b>Hertfordshire CC</b> Express some concern regarding impact of development on school places in Hertfordshire</li> </ul>										

Chapter 26: Takeley/Little Canfield - Takeley/Little Canfield Policy 2 - Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1						1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An <b>Individual</b> is concerned that no provision is made for a bridleway</li> </ul>										

Chapter 26: Takeley/Little Canfield - Takeley/Little Canfield Policy 3 - Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1						1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> are concerned that no provision is made for bridleway link</li> </ul>										

Chapter 26: Takeley/Little Canfield - Takeley/Little Canfield Policy 4 - Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1						1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> are concerned that no provision is made for bridleway link</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 26: Takeley/Little Canfield - Takeley/Little Canfield Policy 5 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1						1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essex Bridleways Association are concerned that no provision is made for bridleway link</li> </ul>										

<b>Map 44.9 Inset map: Takeley</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1	1					2				1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A greater quantity of land should be allocated for residential development in Takeley to reflect its position as a key village and to meet the unmet need in neighbouring authorities.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Map 44.10 Inset map: Takeley (Priors Green)</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
			1						1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is uncertainty over the delivery from a number of proposed allocations and therefore there is a need to redistribute the housing allocations within the district and include further housing around Priors Green.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Map 44.11 Inset map: Takeley Street</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 2</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2						2				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of small sites at Takeley Street are considered appropriate for residential development.</li> </ul>										



	1				1			<b>to Co-operate</b>	1		
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Hertfordshire CC</b> support the reference within the policy to the need for planning obligations</li> </ul>										

<b>Map 45.9 Inset map: Clavering Hill Green</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					1					1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land to the west of The Cricketers represents a logical and sustainable location to contribute to the future growth of the District and help meet its objectively assessed needs.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Chapter 29: Felsted - Felsted Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					1					
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Landowner/Developer</b> supports the allocation but wishes to see greater flexibility on the quantum of housing to be delivered.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 31: Great Hallingbury - Great Hallingbury Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					1					
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Landowner/Developer</b> supports this allocation</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 32: Henham - Henham Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											



Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					1			1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Landowner/Developer wants the requirement for the LEAP to be removed from the policy as it is not justified by the Council's evidence base.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Landowner/Developer supports the allocation</li> </ul>										

<b>Map 45.27 Inset map: Henham</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
			1						1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village Development Limit should include Lodge Cottages and adjoining land to mirror eastward extent of development limit around HEN1.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Chapter 35: Little Chesterford - Little Chesterford Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	Yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
			1				1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Landowner requests an amendment to the site boundary to increase it slightly to ensure the additional development plots are well suited to the requirements of the research business.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 36: Little Dunmow - Little Dunmow Policy 1 - Site Allocation</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	2		1			2			1		1
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Heritage, Little Dunmow PC and the Landowner/Developer all support the allocation</li> </ul>										

Chapter 37: Manuden - Manuden Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1					1					1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Hertfordshire CC</b> Express some concern regarding impact of development on school places in Hertfordshire</li> </ul>										

Map 45.37 Inset map: Manuden											
Total Representations: 2											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1		1				1		1		1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site at Cock Farm is suitable for additional housing along with a replacement for the Alms Houses which were recently sold on.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

Chapter 39: Radwinter - Radwinter Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
					1				1		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Landowner/developer</b> suggests the Policy needs to be amended to reflect the planning application for the site</li> <li><b>The Landowner/developer</b> wants the map Amended to ensure site boundaries reflect the planning permission UTT/13/3118/OP</li> </ul>										

Chapter 40: Stebbing - Stebbing Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map											
Total Representations: 1											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1								1		1

<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Landowner</b> suggests the site should include an extra 1.08 ha of land and development limits extended to include land south east of the allocation.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Landowner</b> in support for the allocation</li> </ul>

<b>Chapter 41: Wendens Ambo - Wendens Ambo Policy 1 - Site Allocation and Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1				1				1		
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Landowner</b> supports the Plan in its proposals to identify the land for development as a rural business centre.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 42: Stansted Airport - Policy AIR 1</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1				1				1		
<b>Objections</b>											
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> support the policy in terms of new development at Stansted Airport needing to respect its countryside setting and landscape.</li> </ul>										

<b>Chapter 43: Monitoring:</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 3</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1		2			1	2		3		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> request that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Target and Performance Measure for Objective 1 should refer to all heritage assets at risk and not just buildings to reflect English Heritage’s national register and the fact that Policy SP10 refers to heritage assets at risk and not just buildings.</li> <li>○ There should be an additional indicator for keeping conservation area appraisals up to date (eg every five years)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Essex County Council</b> (Historic Environment Officer) request that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The relevant Policies listed under Objective 2 should include Policy HE3</li> </ul> </li> </ul>										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The relevant Policies listed under Objective 3 should include policies HE1, HE2, and HE3.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	

<b>Map 45.6 Inset map: Birchanger and Parsonage Farm</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
			1				1				
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land adjacent to the Parsonage Farm employment site is suitable and available for development to allow expansion of the site.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Map 45.16 Inset map: Flich Green</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1					1				1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The developer</b> states that the settlement limits are arbitrary by reference to a 2004 master plan. The previously approved master plan should not inhibit the potential for residential use of previously developed land which should be determined through the application process or, alternatively, with a more flexible boundary than currently envisaged.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Map 45.36 Inset map: Littlebury</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1					1				1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land east of Strehall Road (SHLAA ref LIT2) represents sustainable option for delivery of 40 dwellings and should be allocated on the inset map.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Map 45.38 Inset map: Quendon and Rickling</b>											
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>Total Representations: 1</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1						1				1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land at Coney Acre, Rickling Green be included as a rural exception site to assist Uttlesford District Council in its delivery of affordable housing.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>										

<b>Map 48 Policies Map</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 4</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
	1		3				2		2		1
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land should be allocated at Great Canfield Park for between 9 and 16 dwellings</li> <li>No minerals consultation areas are identified</li> <li>No existing rights of way of any designation are shown on Policies Map or inset maps</li> <li>Ensure that Historic Parks and Gardens are correctly mapped.</li> </ul>										
<b>Support</b>											

<b>Appendix 2 Infrastructure Delivery:</b>											
<b>Total Representations: 7</b>											
Legally compliant	yes	No	Not Specified	Sound	Yes	No	Not Specified	Complies with the Duty to Co-operate	Yes	No	Not Specified
		1	6				1		2	4	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Anglian Water</b> request that the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Details for Saffron Walden Policy 1 is changed from ‘Strategic Sewer linking development site with wastewater treatment works’ to ‘Upgrades to foul network to accommodate development’; and Funding is amended to ‘Anglian Water Services and Developer Contributions.</li> <li>Project Details for Saffron Walden Policy 1 of ‘Increase capacity of wastewater treatment works’ is deleted as this is not needed as there is currently capacity to serve this development.</li> <li>Project Details for Great Dunmow Policy 1 and Great Dunmow Policy 5 is changed from ‘Strategic Sewer linking development site with wastewater treatment works’ to ‘Upgrades to foul network to accommodate development’.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Essex County Council</b> request changes to the phasing of elements of the infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The delivery of the Secondary School on land adjacent to Buttleys Lane would be required in Phase 2.</li> <li>Consideration should be given to the thresholds of development that will require</li> </ul> </li> </ul>										

	<p>specific mitigation and intervention to accommodate the delivery of Elsenham Policy 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Highways Agency</b> will engage in the process of detailed consideration of the provision of infrastructure</li><li>• The infrastructure proposed meets the needs of more than one if not all of the sites. It is unhelpful and misleading to structure the table in this way. There is no explanation of how the phasing will be implemented. There is no indication or reassurance that the critical works will be completed and hence no confidence in the 5-year land supply.</li><li>• Failure to adequately consider the infrastructure requirements of the major development allocation at Elsenham Policy 1 and Saffron Walden Policy 1, and the links between the major infrastructure works necessary; and in particular failure to consider these as cross-boundary issues.</li><li>• Overall lack of provision of infrastructure</li></ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>