

**Summary of representations
Issues and Options Consultation
22 October – 4 December 2015**

Questions

- 1: Vision and Development Strategy
- 2: Cross boundary strategic planning
- 3: Settlement Hierarchy
- 6: Housing Tenure Mix and Affordability
- 7: Leisure, Recreations and Open Space
- 9: Other Areas of Search
- 10: New Settlements
- 12: Saffron Walden
- 13: Bishops Stortford
- 14: Great Dunmow

February 2016

Question 1

Vision and Development Strategy

What do you think the Council should include in its Local Plan vision and development strategy for the District 2033?

This question was responded to by 426 people/organisations. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

Issues for aims

- **Support for aim 1 including County, Heritage England, Parishes, and many individuals**
- **Aim 2 seen widely as very challenging with need to avoid prejudgement of eventual strategy/use of a more generic vision**
- **Suggested aims and the eventual strategy are separated to achieve above**
- **Lack of growth priority/NPPF priority to significantly uplift housing supply**
- **Inability to recognise serious housing shortage in the district or deal effectively with poor housing affordability**
- **Role of sustainability in aims unclear/not reflecting that in NPPF**
- **Role of infrastructure/need for co-ordination/Duty to Cooperate**
- **Need for broader consideration of transport/a Transport Strategy**
- **Need to recognise strategic role of Stansted Airport in growth strategy**
- **Many alternative aims put/emphasising much of the above**
- **Support for extending plan period to 2033 although some prefer a much longer period**

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Heritage England - Previous vision contained useful reference to historic environment/maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of the districts towns & could be retained.

Consider in strategy how to balance growth with the conservation of historic environment. Considerer Good practice note as part of a positive strategy

Address Inter-relationship of different topics with historic environment/issue of taking new development without harming environment/heritage assets.

Explore different options against historic environment impacts from further expansion of historic towns/villages to the provision of a stand-alone new settlement.

Highways Agency - Welcome the fact that Uttlesford are developing a Sustainable Transport Policy.

Thames Water Utilities - Note vision/strategy needs positive context for managing growth and development including specific infrastructure to support it.

List of infrastructure is not exhaustive although plan should help to ensure necessary upgrades to wastewater infrastructure are delivered

Consider existing capacity of the sewerage network/developers show how these will be delivered ahead of the occupation of development for necessary upgrades.

Environment Agency - Vision and Development Strategy should include commitments to: 1) protect maintain and enhance the natural environment; and, 2) provide environmentally sustainable development with regard to controlled waters receptors and water resources.

Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways -

Welcomes a clear/concise vision seeking to address the needs in relation to housing, the economy, community facilities and infrastructure/basis for safeguarding the environment, adapting to climate change and securing good design

Supports retained of previous vision item 1 - protection of the natural and built heritage

Review item 2 given the rural nature of UDC, distributing development more challenging for facilitating sustainable travel/more difficult to resolve issues associated with rural roads.

Articulate NPPF sustainability/social role in vision - reference to school aged residents having access to high quality primary and secondary education facilities across UDC and neighbouring districts, located within a reasonable travelling distance of where they live.

Sustainable Uttlesford - 1.) Vision be more explicit that Local Plan is the first stage of a 30 year strategy for the development of the district (2) Add "The houses and facilities people across the socio-economic spectrum need will be available and affordable locally, new sustainable housing locations will be accessible from the key strategic transport corridors serving the district; (3) The plan should seek to reduce (a) the amount of commuting in and out of the district to work, (b) the length of distances travelled to work and to encourage modal shift to reduce the high dependency on the private car transport within the district; (4) Future housing developments should properly reflect the current employment base within the district (especially Stansted Airport) and an ambition to support and create jobs in the knowledge economy locally and regionally.

We are residents - No mention of the word "sustainable" but key requirement of the NPPF with fundamental change/move away from the high energy usage/unsustainable development

Commit to Sustainability, and a desire to promote development which is actually sustainable

Need an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to determine how and where infrastructure can be provided and how it might lead to sustainable development, we struggle to see how UDC can arrive at a sustainable development strategy.

Uttlesford has an ecological footprint of 5.8 global hectares per person, which is above the Essex and England averages and is substantially higher than the sustainable level/guiding light of the Vision. 4.

Vision should be one of conservation of the built and natural environment of the District in its present form, allowing for sustainable growth where local needs and wishes are given priority. Development strategy should be based on;

Statement about the legacy of the old plan and its impact on the District/set of proposals to deal with the legacy of the old plan across the District/Section for Dunmow setting out how UDC plans to deal with the infrastructure gap/A section explaining how UDC has taken account of the GDTC Neighbourhood Plan/ taken account of any other advanced NPs. View of the Districts economy, society & environment/how this impacts on housing needs over the new plan period. Explain housing strategy options available to meet those needs/actions taken by UDC to appraise each housing strategy option. Produce a Masterplan/easily understood stand by agreements reached with GDTC.

Birchanger Wood Trust - Additional houses yes but large areas of open environment must be included too

National Trust - Include a Green Infrastructure Strategy/recognise the importance of strategic green infrastructure as a key feature in planning for the sustainable future

Stebbing Society - Existing infrastructure generally is already at bursting point with Schools/Doctors Practices/Transport Links/et al at full capacity or more. Must ensure corresponding improvement in essential infrastructure commensurate with/pro rata to the capita per new development. This applies equally to which ever Scenario(s) is chosen. Any large scale housing development should be sited closer to those major sources of employment i.e. Stansted and the high tech industry in Cambridgeshire and should therefore be focused on the M11 corridor and mainline rail links/ compatible with past UDCs stance in the past where did not support the A120 as a housing corridor/consistent with EERAs stance that the A120 should not be a driver for development but the current proposals contravenes UDCs previous position. Should safeguard Districts attractive open rural nature and farming communities and maintain greenbelt space between any future developments/avoiding the creation of large undesirable conurbations and urban sprawl. Any future development therefore should be a sensible balance between this and realistic future housing needs.

Essex Wildlife Trust - Vision should include a clear reference to protecting and enhancing biodiversity. NPPF (para. 109) states the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.

Contribute to the natural environment by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils; recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible

NPPF para 110 states that Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value/LPAs should develop criteria-based policies on how developments on, or affecting, protected wildlife sites should be judged, making distinctions between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites.

Seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. with the least environmental or amenity value•

Minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should: plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries; promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection.

Show that biodiversity conservation and enhancement is appropriately integrated

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group - Must include an aim to both protect and enhance biodiversity. There must be a commitment to create green networks, Lawton Review, "Making Space for Nature", more, bigger, better and joined up sites to create a sustainable, resilient and more effective ecological network. Compared to the situation in 2000, biodiversity is enhanced and the diversity, functioning and resilience of ecosystems re-established in a network of spaces for nature that can sustain these levels into the future, even given continuing environmental change and human pressures.

Hands Off Thaxted - Pay full regard to the landscape and character ensure developments are sustainable with NPPF definition/ United Nations definition/continued building on good agricultural land unsustainable.

Look at the unsustainable developments which have been granted planning permission in the past and instigate a control/checking system to ensure they never happen again

Friends Of The Flich Way - A clear commitment from the council to safeguard the integrity of the flitch way from encroachment by future housing developments bordering this route through the countryside of north Essex.

The Hundred Parishes Society – Whilst preserving character of The Hundred Parishes is essential recognise a living community/must continue to evolve to serve the needs of its residents. There is pressure for more housing, but any developments should be sensitive and sympathetic to their natural and historic environment. With sensitive planning, it should be possible to continue the process of evolution, enhancing our environment and creating heritage for the future. To preserve the character of the Hundred Parishes oppose any further expansion beyond the existing authorised limits at Stansted Airport.

National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups - Item 2 should refer to homes, not houses. Those who wish to live in mobile homes and caravans should not be ignored.

Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - Vision and Strategy needs to be sufficiently well thought out that at least one new settlement will be included with the purpose and intention that it will have the long term potential to take the challenges beyond 2033. If that is achieved then the natural growth of towns like Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden, Thaxted and Stansted can continue in historic line and with the infrastructure growing at the same pace.

The Thaxted Society - Crystal clear view of the developed conservation of the areas uniqueness as it affects sustainability and value added quality of life benefits to maintain "best place to live" status in balance.

Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation - Retain previous reference to "high quality natural and historic environment will have been maintained and the settlements will continue to be separate entities with green space between them".

Go further regards the Green Belt designated in the most southern part of the district, in the areas bordering East Herts and Epping District Councils as reference to it does not feature greatly in your planning policies

Preservation of the Green Belt is one of the few policy considerations to which more weight should be attached than the general presumption in favour of sustainable development regards NPPF

Suggest make explicit reference to safeguarding the Green Belt from any threat of the vision and development strategy to be included citing need for protection is greatest where it is potentially most at risk

Helena Romaine Secondary School - Vision is generally acceptable on characteristics of the District/setting tone for achieving sustainable development. Stronger reference to delivering a range of modern education facilities for changing education needs of a growing population/invest in the future education needs/provide a flexible workforce with opportunities, including re-skilling. Continuous need to review education facilities with changing technologies, practices, classroom/outdoor activities/choice-based education.

References in paragraph 2 of the Vision to facilities people need and in paragraph 3 to vitality of our towns should be strengthened to emphasise the importance of supporting a high quality education sector throughout the district wherever opportunities arise.

Stansted Airport -

Stansted Airport 3rd largest airport in London and currently handles over 22 million passengers per annum (mppa) owned/operated by Manchester Airports Group (M.A.G). It is the primary airport for the East of England and is one of the UKs principal international gateways and a key driver of the regional economy providing a wide range of employment opportunities and supports economic activity within Uttlesford, the region and further afield throughout the UK. The function of Stansted Airport and the role it plays within Uttlesford, the wider region and UK should be recognised in vision/development strategy.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Wimbish Parish Council - Overriding consideration to retain the rural nature of the district as far as possible.

The Sampfords Parish Council - Place more emphasis on employment issues/locate major housing development in areas with high levels of employment opportunity reducing the need to travel/minimise out-commuting.

Build homes to the highest eco standards to minimise energy requirements for heating and lighting considering promotion of an 'Eco Town'.

Little Easton Parish Council - Point 1 should be split into 2 points 1.

3. Add; Infrastructure will be planned and delivered to support employment opportunities for companies to grow and establish in Uttlesford.

6. Add; take account of a 30-year vision because the vision for development over the next 15 years will need to have the capacity and potential to provide homes beyond 2031 with continued demand for growth.

Great Canfield Parish Council - Developing Takeley and Dunmow area in a piecemeal fashion is short sighted/detrimental to the area as a whole. Most suitable plan would involve a new Garden City type arrangement with rail and access links to Cambridge and London.

Elsenham/Henham/Ugley and Widdington Parish Council - Recycling original vision although that Plan rejected by the inspector/subsequently withdrawn with the seeds of rejection of the original plan sown in its vision.

Sustainable development is the key requirement/golden thread running through plan-making but vision mentions sustainable once, and then in relation to housing development.

Sustainability is more holistic than just housing while distributing housing across the District may not achieve sustainability.

Housing, especially in larger developments, needs to be developed where people can live sustainably, not least by minimising travel

The location of major new development can achieve sustainability by being self-sufficient/by being located alongside a major settlement which can offer full facilities.

Proposes add to Vision: by 2033....

1. "settlements will continue to have their own identify"
2. "new strategic mixed use sites will be either self-sufficient or located close to the major towns to be able to share their facilities until self sufficiency is achieved."
4. "public transport as real alternatives to the private car"

Little Chesterford Parish Council - Housing development should be situated where it would benefit those working in district so access to the M11 and the Liverpool Street/Cambridge railway line is of relatively minor importance.

Important that the district is able to supply housing for ALL of its inhabitants. With housing demand coming from Cambridge region more sensible that provision be where it most benefits those working in Uttlesford, rather than where houses would be used by commuters to London or Cambridge.

Great Chesterford Parish Council - Supports the previous vision included within the withdrawn Local Plan and considers that the new Vision should reflect this

However, emphasis should be placed on provision of sustainable development within the District; concentrated in the Main Towns ensuring continued sustainability in accordance with NPPF

Stebbing Parish Council – Disappointed plan does not have cohesive vision of what a future Uttlesford should look like.

Retain rural and agricultural communities/continuance of districts high quality natural/historic environment with green space between developments always maintained.

Recognise that Stansted Airport is the major source of employment in the district and that any large housing development should be close to/by the airport

Focused significant growth on the strategic transport route of the M11 and mainline rail links but not under the flight path

Saffron Walden Town and Great Dunmow Parish Council - Previous Vision and Development Strategy is not fit-for-purpose/echoing reasoning given in Elsenham joint statement.

Vision to 2033 should include;

Retain/enhance the existing character of the villages and towns

Optimise the use and quality of pre-existing infrastructure capacity

Ensure physical/social infrastructure in the towns and villages meets the needs of residents and businesses

Ensure necessary physical infrastructure requirements and essential social infrastructure are available to meet the needs of new developments

Development not led to a diminution in the quality of life of its residents but maximised the scope for an improvement in that of existing and future residents;

Ensure location of new development has with public transport provision maximised the opportunity to travel to and from work by sustainable means of transport

Reduce air pollution (to the extent Saffron Walden AQMA is removed) and the average person's carbon footprint

Capture the maximum possible amount of financial benefits associated with new development

Contribute significantly to the proper planning of neighbouring districts when the opportunity presented itself/needs could be accommodated in the district in a sustainable manner.

Thaxted Parish Council - Uttlesford should recognise the precious rural resource of the District and retain the beautiful countryside. There is good quality agricultural land. There are issues with spoiling the landscape with new roads. There should be a commitment to slow organic growth of communities which would maintain and encourage a sense of community in new or existing developments.

Proper infrastructure should be in place which should be developer funded. There should be employment opportunities. The historic character and rural quality of the District should be maintained.

Open spaces are important. Quality of life should be maintained for existing residents.

Arkesden PC - Vision should protect the character of the market towns of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow as well as the surrounding villages. It is imperative that the rural nature of the landscape, the historic assets and the setting and character of the smaller villages are protected at all stages of the planning process.

Felsted Parish Council - Vision of maintaining/enhancing high quality natural and historic environment will be compromised if settlements do not continue to be separate entities with

green space between them while already threatened by current planning decisions/by many of the scenarios in this document.

Ensure the preservation of green spaces, countryside and historic hedges and trees within developments. Strategic considerations must include realistic assumptions e.g. employment expectations existing commute to work in other districts.

Littlebury Parish Council - Littlebury PC have discussed the Plan and prefer to have a single settlement with the appropriate infrastructure and schools

Sewards End Parish Council – Sewards End has discussed the Plan and prefer to have a single settlement with the appropriate infrastructure and schools.

Takeley Parish Council - a. Vision to protect the 'rural' amenity of the district through the protection of existing settlements from unsustainable development meeting future housing needs for the plan period and beyond through identification of key 'new' settlements that allow new & future growth and infrastructure to be provided.

b. Important that such 'new' settlements are strategically placed in the district to afford maximum benefit for the existing communities along with the new communities they will become'.

c Need comprehensive collaboration with neighbouring authorities, with ECC, NHS England etc to ensure that the Local Plan is both strategic and sustainable. All the agencies must be on board to create communities rather than just housing estates.

d. The 'benefits' of housing development should be seen in the community where development takes place (affordable homes, community facilities etc).

Newport Parish Council - Major improvements to infrastructure in Newport and surrounding areas. Infrastructure improvements should be planned in advance of building work commencement. This issue is continually overlooked.

Strethall Parish Meeting - Matter of record UDC is one of the best rural districts in the UK to live while there is a large housing need/no sign of abating. Balance is required to maintain the first and satisfy, if possible, the second. Protect and enhance should be to the goal.

Need more affordable and therefore smaller units; This will enable those on lesser incomes but doing vital jobs and local and external 1st time buyers into home ownership. This equates to smaller properties meaning less space required therefore equalling sustainability, answering social need and providing numerous economic benefits in areas where employment is readily available. A new settlement located in open countryside away from infrastructure such as areas 2 and 8 would provide NONE of those 3 criteria.

Rayne Parish Council - Need to organise and have effective Cross Boundary Strategic Planning as could be a major item when considering the infrastructure both within and without UDC. The impact on the A120 and the M11 is only a part of the issue. Other key routes need full and proper consideration.

Quendon & Rickling Parish Council - Keep numbers 1 and 3 of the Local Plan 2005, however add the following: Additional infrastructure compulsory in all larger developments and those where additional housing would put a strain on already diminished facilities.

The need for facilities should be assessed not only by external, relevant bodies but in discussion with the communities themselves.

Broaden the definition of affordable housing to include not only those houses offered to specific eligible households, but also to include lower cost, smaller properties available to all potential homeowners.

Birchanger Parish Council - Need preservation of rural area. Dwellings should sit appropriately within a community. New settlements should be self contained. Avoid coalescence.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council - Affordable housing is safeguarded for those of local heritage and not open to highjack by those wishing to buy for rent or economic migration out of London.

Agree with previous vision/ if Plan is to be adopted in 2017 for a 15 year period then should be a vision to 2032 rather than 2031 (as stated in vision) or 2033 (as stated in consultation question)? We also believe that affordable housing should be provided for local people who wish to remain in the area.

G W Balaam & Son

It is not only the towns that should be maintained and enhanced, but all settlements in order that all settlements are vibrant. All should also be served with good public transport links.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LANDOWNERS

- Several developers/agents advocate positive overarching objective recognising Stansted Airport as a District asset attracting people to live, work and visit.
- Harness the strategic potential of the London-Stansted-Cambridge Corridor.
- Co-ordinate with infrastructure by ensuring alignment with wider economic initiatives including those promoted by the Greater Cambridge/Greater Peterborough LEP
- Proactively drive joined up approach to sustainable economic development
- Recognise the strategic economic importance of Stansted Airport and its potential to attract inward investment and business development.
- Economic strategies identify a more central role for the Airport as a driver of economic activity, a catalyst for economic growth and as an Opportunity Site for business development.
- Acknowledge Stansted future growth/influence on the growth potential and spatial distribution of such growth
- Support a commitment to minimise the impact of Stansted Airport while its importance to the regional economy recognised/planned for/not compromised.
- Vision should reflect employment needs/commuting patterns of the local population/ location on the M11 corridor between Cambridge and London/acknowledge external influences - high levels of out commuting.
- For reference point 5 to the impact of Stansted Airport this is welcome/ point 4, refer to cycleway network.
- Include the growth of the biomedical and research sectors in the M11 corridor.
- Extend the plan period to 2033/consider extending further.

- Supports the concept of new sustainable housing developments being distributed across the District as a sensible approach within a large and geographically diverse District and preferable to over-concentration in a limited number of settlements.
- Include measures to reduce the need for out-commuting trickling down to localised measures to make each settlement more sustainable
- More positively worded with respect to meeting housing needs, particularly the proposed wording of draft objective 2
- Meet 'housing need' within housing market area which may be beyond the District's boundaries (East Herts, Epping Forest and Harlow)
- Aim to substantially boosting the supply of housing across the District including the demands of the market
- Deliver a wide choice of high quality homes and meet objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing in the housing market area
- Show how Uttlesford will grow and change over the period up to 2033
- Show where new development will be focused identifying opportunities and aspirations/roles of the two largest settlements (Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow)
- ensure that sufficient homes are created to match the new jobs that will be require
- Proceed swiftly to ensure a plan is in place by 2017
- Plans found sound since NPPF have aimed to provide more homes than indicated in the household projections for their areas/adopted a larger than local approach
- Additional buffer of 20% to compensate for persistent under delivery of housing
- In line with other Essex LPAs plan period of greater than 15 years.
- Focused on delivery/ practicalities of housing the population in a predominantly rural area where the opportunities for development are limited.
- Support previously proposed spatial strategy for growth that promotes the dispersal of new development throughout the District in locations within and adjacent to existing settlements
- Supports growth in proportion to each settlements overall size/ level of infrastructure capacity and different modes of transport/ key services and facilities will indicate the sustainability of a settlement and its ability to accept further growth
- Delivering housing through a larger number of smaller sites ensures it can be well related to the existing form and help to maintain the rural nature of the District.
- Some settlements cannot make a proportionate contribution to housing delivery, for example the village of Hatfield Heath that is surrounded by Green Belt.
- The emerging plan was found unsound because it was not evidence based.
- Consultation is premature as evidence gathering appears to have barely started
- By definition a Strategic Plan must be based on strategy.
- Extra housing in smaller settlements. Supporting existing schools and facilities
- Increasing local employment and reducing the need to travel.
- Encouraging community led solar schemes/ efficient use of land must be considered.
- For above need input from a wider variety of disciplines.
- Working group of the most suitable people appointed to guide the District Plan.
- Rightly refers to sustainably planned new housing development. The overarching strategy should focus growth where best served/cost effective new infrastructure.
- The market towns identified for a higher order of growth correctly includes Great Dunmow, but incorrectly excludes Stansted Mountfitchet.
- The southern part of the town is unnecessarily washed over with Green Belt/remove from the settlement to achieve sustainable growth in the town.
- The Vision and Development Strategy seems generally sound/need referred to in point 2 should include those people wishing to custom or self-build Custom-build schemes in sustainable locations will provide enhanced place making, contributing to the vitality and viability of towns as per the aim set out in point 3.

- The vision should be aspirational but realistic and ultimately be deliverable ensuring needs of all sectors of the community are provided for in full and that urban and rural services and facilities are maintained and enhanced to provide for both existing and new residents.
- Vision should set out that the housing needs of the community will be fully met both in urban and rural areas with sufficient development to make a real contribution to supporting infrastructure and services.
- Proximity of Stansted Airport should be emphasised as a benefit to the area in providing jobs and economic prosperity for residents.
- Encourage continued expansion of the airport/support with sufficient homes to provide workforce.
- Stress the importance/pressing need for housing growth to be delivered through at least one new Settlement, as a Garden Village, to include location of Andrewsfield.
- Vision should state: Housing will have been planned/delivered in a comprehensive manner to achieve a housing requirement of at least 750 dwellings pa.
- Include in vision/strategy: To preserve the character and integrity of the district market towns, by seeking out new settlement locations to accommodate sustainable growth proposals. •
- Evident the recent peripheral expansion of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow is changing the character/integrity with examples of constraints given for both
- Support new settlement solution in line with NPPF 52 and inspectors report
- Support many of aspirations of previous vision but amend as follows:
- How a garden village based spatial strategy would address issue 2/inspectors report
- Aim 3 - The attractiveness/vitality of existing towns will be maintained and enhanced by ensuring that they are not ringed by further blocks of dormitory suburbs developed piecemeal
- Aim 4 - One or more new settlements have potential to provide critical mass for new public transport provision and the enhancement of existing public transport provision e.g. improve east-west public transport between Bishops Stortford, Stansted Airport, Great Dunmow and to improve connections to Braintree, with the potential for the old A120 to be used as a priority bus route, as well as the B1256 and beyond to other sub-regional centres such as Colchester and Chelmsford
- Aim 5 - Need to direct growth to locations away from the airport.
- Provide housing in easy reach of employment - Stansted Airport and Cambridge/Hinxton/Chesterford Park and Bishops Stortford/small scale housing schemes in small settlements as likely to become even less sustainable if limited expansion not permitted.
- Small settlements and villages have evolved by natural expansion of a few dwellings where appropriate.
- Due to the high cost of housing some small villages have few residents between the ages of 20-45 year and few young children
- Vision contained in withdrawn Local Plan provides an appropriate starting point for a new Vision for the plan period up to 2033/ essentially capture the realistic aspirations
- A vision not the same as a development strategy since the latter delivers the former.
- Sound approach to hierarchy linking development/availability of services/ infrastructure/key elements of sustainability/those settlements with the greatest level of services and facilities. Align with delivery of commensurate infrastructure.

- Plan for full objectively assessed development needs to ensure that homes, jobs and community facilities needed are adequately delivered in accordance with NPPF
- The Council should aim to deliver enough housing to address the affordability issues in the District referred to in the emerging Housing Strategy
- Draft Housing Strategy confirms the mismatch between house prices and incomes is pushing more people into rented accommodation forcing those in key services out of the District with average house prices 11 times the average income - an unsustainable situation that must be addressed.
- Sustainability Appraisal must factor this in when assessing the options/consider the social and economic consequences
- Make a concerted effort to addressing existing and long term affordability issues in this District – make explicit intention of the criterion 2 of the vision.
- The Council should make the most of existing settlements/facilities acknowledging potential for new development to enhance existing infrastructure
- Maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of villages as well as towns.
- Expand Criterion 4 to facilitate the improvement of public transport options across the rest of the District recognising the limitations in some rural areas.
- Aim to reduce existing commuting patterns by increasing the opportunities to live and work in the District.
- Vision for expanding the economy of the District/ sufficient employment land, protecting existing employment facilities where an on-going need, supporting growth of existing facilities and ensure sufficient homes are built to support the jobs created NPPF 17 notes requires succinct Plan to set out positive vision for the area's future
- NPPF 21 requires Plans to set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth. Set out a positive vision and reflect the specific context
- The previous Vision provides an appropriate starting point for a Local Plan to 2033. The Plan should set out a positive vision to achieve economic, environmental and social gains.
- Support the Council's aspiration for a Vision/Strategy that set a positive context for how growth and development will be managed over the plan period.
- Note Inspector conclusion on new settlement(s)/Vision and Strategy should reflect likelihood of new settlements – e.g. 1. add existing settlements and new settlements maintained as separate entities with green space between them. 4. Sustainable transport a key aspiration of new settlements in terms of proximity to jobs and facilities and through cycle and public transport infrastructure. 6. The long term needs of the District considered with new settlements sought in sustainable locations to create balanced growth.
- Vision from the withdrawn Plan still relevant/carry forward into the new plan.
- Objective 2 "Deliver a wide choice of high quality homes and meet the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, how Uttlesford will grow and change up to 2033 and where, new development will be focused/roles of the two largest settlements
- Vision should be more positive about Stansted Airport itself / job creation generally ensuring sufficient homes are created to match the new jobs required

- Broadly agree with vision as a basis for addressing the needs/opportunities of area and safeguarding environmental constraints in District. Ensure makes objective and balanced decisions on growth apportionment and restraint based on evidence.
- Include direction of growth on edge of existing settlements identified in the hierarchy
- Agree the high quality natural and historic environment should be safeguarded/housing and facilities are distributed across the district, rather than being focused in particular growth points. Vitality and viability of towns can only be maintained by additional development within them.
- Amend 3 to '....viability of our towns and key villages' in order to clarify that this includes the settlements within section 4. Regarding 4 recognise that high levels of personal motorised mobility will be demanded by nearly all occupants of residential dwellings, and by employers/ alternative means of private transport.
- Recognise increased sustainability of private transport/desirability means that the key villages should be able to accommodate higher levels of new development
- The supply of previously developed land in District is limited/thus its contribution towards housing growth relatively minimal. However, the sustainability benefits of redeveloping brownfield sites are widely recognised/opportunities need prioritising
- Support (2.) - the concept of new sustainable housing developments being distributed across the District reflects large and geographically diverse District/preferable to over-concentration in a limited number of settlements.
- Support sustainability measures which will make the District as a whole more sustainable e.g. reduce the need for out-commuting “trickling down to localised measures to make each settlement more sustainable”.
- Supports vision to provide new sustainable housing development across the District to make houses and facilities available locally/ strategy to balance housing growth across towns and villages/where sustainable addition growth in category A villages
- Support high quality development/ensure all housing in particular family housing is given equal priority in policy to the delivery of the smaller dwellings.
- Given acknowledged housing aspirations towards under occupation there is a shortage of family housing coming onto the market/freeing up smaller housing
- Ensure housing mix not prescriptive/meets needs of present and future generations.
- Direct development to most sustainable locations maximising environmental benefits; capitalise on existing infrastructure and services to maximise economic opportunities
- Significantly boosting the supply of housing, including affordable and special forms of housing, access to employment opportunities and transport
- Work cooperatively with neighbouring authorities to ensure sustainable development.
- Ridgeons state that We do not have any specific additions over and above those listed in Section 2.1.The key focus of the vision should set out how the identified growth for the development is to be distributed across the District and what the Council is seeking to achieve through the planned growth of the area.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

The following general comments were made

- Maintain historic and natural environment/character
- Against dispersed pattern of development in previous vision
- Principals of development access to facilities/jobs or good transport access to them/in town subject to impact/start up business able to grow
- Need alternative vision based enhancement of environment/communities separated by green space/suit local housing needs/distribute across district/enhance vitality of towns
- Effective role for Bishops Stortford/Separate new village settlements of 1000
- Issues are affordable housing/focus on public transport/provision of local services, police, doctors, dentists and schools
- Holistic planning approach for traffic/education/environment/negative impact of infill housing on settlements
- New settlement close to rail links/M11 lessens traffic flowing through existing towns and villages
- Need stronger reference to economic development and employment opportunities
- Recognise Saffron special town - history, buildings and culture
- Cities/big town able to support higher populations should be focus of housing policy
- Regard to the size of sustainable community that the town centre can support.
- Utilise Brown field sites to the maximum.
- Match additional housing with infrastructure that can accommodate required facilities
- Statement 2 at odds with statement 3 especially in the case of Saffron Walden
- Single settlement around the area of Takeley/good connections with both the A120 and the M11 along with proximity to Stansted airport.
- Take commercial development opportunities parallel with houses/blocks of flats. Road widening/future road building where poorly connected to motorways/A-roads
- Not change small communities
- Small developments in the right place for facilities
- More on villages/thriving small centres of population own charm preserved. Development gradual/logical/available infrastructure/infill spaces within the village
- Maintain the rural nature of the district/cohesive structure of communities/facilities for communities are in place before development
- Keep development to minimum with renewable energy systems architecturally sensitive
- Employment in neighbouring areas/not so much as a location for employment
- Stansted Airport largest local employer/developments close to the airport
- Plan should look beyond 2033/council take in house all provision for infrastructure
- Co-housing ventures - apartments with green allotment space to grow food
- Preserve the integrity and character of the existing settlements in Uttlesford by new settlement(s) not add new housing in a piecemeal way to existing towns and villages
- Need more people in small villages/hamlets for their survival e.g. Langley Upper Green
- Promote alternative housing options e.g. affordable housing/minimum room sizes
- Appears appropriate/rightly refers to sustainably planned new housing development
- Prioritise development best served by existing/cost effective new infrastructure in strategy
- Consider superior capacity of Great Dunmow to absorb further growth

- Resolve on only minimum amount of housing required/not accept any quota of other authorities
- Avoid previous ribbon development between Takerly/Priors Green/Great Dunmore
- The B1256 (e.g. Takeley) beginning to struggle/returning to levels prior to A120 routing
- Takeley lacks Doctors, amenities, village pubs, fuel essential shops
- Understand bulk of new residents will commute to Cambridge, London and Stansted airport
- Priority “high quality natural and historic environment” as before
- House affordability for key workers/young families a problem/not lack of executive homes
- Extend Plan/Vision period to 25 years
- Need a Cambourne with lateral thinking
- Much of proposed vision from the previous DLP laudable
- Consider cumulative impacts of development on environment
- Companies forced out of Saffron Walden/sites converted into residential areas. Stansted will soon be the only employer in the area, so why stifle its development/use as employment hub
- Reinstate rail links between Dunmow and Braintree
- Keep adequate amount of green space within the boundary of Saffron Walden
- Make clear the plan will address the urgent need to meet housing demand
- Lack of urgency in plan making given inspector wanted revised plan asap
- No need for issues/option consultation as inspector established these
- Stop consuming Farmland/aspire to become self-sufficient in food production by 2033
- Ensure house building keeps up with demand/fresh planned approach to building in the vicinity of existing villages
- Need first class infrastructure operational before any housing is developed
- Item 2 should refer to truly affordable housing
- Significantly less harm will be done to the district by focussing development in one place
- Item 4 refer to non-car transport
- Need organic growth of Saffron Walden/Dunmow alongside significant growth at Elsenham
- If a brand new settlement is needed it should be located south of A120 close to the two junctions serving Dunmow extending Stansted rail spur to service it/Dunmow
- Need transport integration especially if Andrewsfield chosen
- Better transport links e.g. Bishops Stortford and Little Canfield/villages
- Strategy should look towards access to the transport infrastructure rather than potential employment areas within the district
- Preserve integrity and character of area with regard to the countryside, natural environment and villages.
- New developments must be supported by road and rail links, schools, transport and medical facilities. The green space between developments must be maintained

- Develop with surrounding councils as joint approach/people from Saffron Walden, Great Chesterford, Newport and other villages travel to Cambridge/science parks near Gt Abington and Hinxton. Transport links are limited/roads are congested
- Do not build new developments under flight paths
- Vision statement 2 is incompatible with 1 and 3, based on a dispersed strategy in which Saffron Walden and Dunmow will inevitably take the majority of the new houses with loss of the character of both towns/villages
- Vision should outline how issues will resolve these problems e.g. transport strategy
- A co-ordinated approach so scale of housing combined with adequate infrastructure
- Sustainability and infra-structure should be at the heart of the local plan
- Preserve/enhance special character as recognised by inclusion of much of the district within The Hundred Parishes
- New developments should respect that special character, especially locations that may affect the setting of ancient countryside, conservation areas or historic buildings
- Elsenham/Henham in areas of search undermines new plan from the outset
- The “Continued viability and maintenance of our towns” no less applicable to the Key and other Villages
- Road Transport - consideration of the A120 and M11 and their junctions. Rail Transport: consideration of Bishops Stortford- Liverpool Street line
- Item 2 & 3 fail to make provision for any alternative to spreading housing developments across the District such as concentrating the majority in a single new settlement
- Strategy in withdrawn plan fine but could have defined in more detail criteria for new settlement e.g. have its own identity/not be bolted on/too close to a town or village
- New settlements need concrete plans to improve infrastructure: new roads, increased means of transportation (bus services, more trains), more cycle-paths.
- Assess traffic impact before and after new developments/incentive use of trains/decrease parking fares/provide bus to the station
- Need for housing at all stages of the life-cycle/ lifetime homes is important but few people stay in the same home for a lifetime/need a good supply of housing at a reasonable cost
- Location driven by where people want to go- primarily for work, schooling/shopping
- Sustainable development concentrated in the Main Towns ensuring continued sustainability
- Saffron Walden needs a bespoke vehicle strategy
- Stansted Airport will grow in passenger numbers/impact on Junction 8 M11/effect on future decisions.
- Consider where people are going to work/unlikely many will be working locally e.g. Stebbing none. Locate new housing near to places of work/public transport hubs/place small pockets of new housing in strategic areas
- Ensure new development integrated with communities avoiding isolated unconnected new housing in barren environment/disproportionate distances for employment
- The vision is too broad brush in approach not capturing detail necessary for future development. Item 2 presupposes the housing need will be 'distributed across the District'.

- Road improvements that simply put more traffic on overcrowded roads/motorway system discouraged.
- Vision good but add “care should be taken to protect and preserve the rural landscape”•
- Not clear if a vision or strategy but concentrates on Options before a Vision. A possible long term vision might be to set out a 2 stage strategy with a detailed plan up to 2033 and then a more strategic outlook beyond. Need to prioritise: New developments support and enhance existing settlements/not draw resources away. The rural character of the District should be upheld/separate identity of existing villages maintained.
- Stansted Airport/Cambridge Enterprise natural employment growth areas and developments should be connected to these
- Maintain the relative sizes/facilities of settlements. Any new housing should be accompanied by encouragement of new local businesses in Saffron Walden, Dunmow, Chesterford.
- Provide "affordable" housing to new generations, as well as market houses that people aspire to with services and infrastructure that maintain quality of life in UDC
- Social cohesion and "community" of the Uttlesford district is something that sets it apart but at risk if there was a rush to create a new settlement as a short-term "fix".
- Ensure the vision is truly sustainable - socially, economically and environmentally

Question2

Cross Boundary Strategic Planning

Are there any specific cross boundary planning issues that the district council should consider in putting together its Local Plan. Please provide details

This question was responded to by 419 people. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

Overarching summary

- UDC need to identify list of strategic issues
- Timely delivery of M11 Junction 8 and 7a measures/impact on regeneration in Harlow and strategic education provision
- GLA request understanding on any links to Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area
- Braintree Council note engagement is taking place
- Broxbourne Council requests West Essex LPAs consider principal of contributing towards its needs including UDC albeit in advance of evidence
- Epping District identify strategic issues as 2015 SHMA, updated Essex GTAA, neighbouring authorities constraints; implications for housing needs, jobs/commuting patterns from growth at Stansted Airport/Harlow Enterprise Zone; major infrastructure
- Concerns from Epping Council over lack of reference to key joint documents
- Meet unmet housing needs of the HMA/London/not clear if Harlow can meet its needs/impacts for already poor housing affordability
- Consider strategic corridors especially A120 Haven Gateway
- Braintree Council require aspiration of improving A120 to feature far stronger
- Role of jobs growth centres Stansted Airport/Cambridge/Bishops Stortford
- Need Green Infrastructure Strategy/Encourage habitats

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

North Hertfordshire District Council -The majority of the strategic options associated allocations are unlikely to have any significant impact of North Hertfordshire, therefore in terms of Duty to Cooperate there would not appear to be any strategic cross boundary issues at this stage. Further discussions with regards to the Duty to Cooperate may be required in the future as the Plan progresses, however, on the basis of the extent of the shared boundary this is most appropriately done via email.

Hertfordshire County Council - One specific cross-boundary strategic planning issue relates to the provision of school places. HCC has previously advised in response to earlier UDC plan consultation that a number of Reception to Year 13 children who attend schools in Hertfordshire reside in several settlements in UDC. Reasonable to expect the provision of additional housing development in any of the existing or proposed settlements located close to the county boundary is likely to have an impact upon school places in Hertfordshire.

Greater London Authority - Range of strategic issues raised, some of which may bear on the relationship between London, the wider South East and UDC. Specifically UDC is

located on the M11 corridor and therefore linked in terms of logistics with the Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area, useful to understand UDCs thoughts on land for industry and logistics and the potential opportunities arising from the development of the Opportunity area. As members of the Strategic Spatial Planning Liaison Group for the wider South East we are both working to develop a common understanding of strategic evidence including collaboration on existing and emerging population, household and employment projections, analysis of travel demands and associated transport improvement/inform evidence base for emerging plan.

Essex County Council - Considers cross boundary issues requiring further deliberation in delivering the plan particularly the A120 corridor. UDC links to the Haven Gateway and also the M11 London Stansted - Cambridge corridor. Consider growth opportunities adjacent to the A120 within Braintree, Colchester and Tendring/proposals for ports of Harwich and Felixstowe/Haven Gateway - low carbon/renewables, manufactures, and logistics. Consider also the West Anglia Main Line linking London, Harlow, Stansted and Cambridge. ECC recognises that several key transport investments are required to unlock the full growth potential of West Essex/neighbouring authority growth potential in A120 corridor. Highways infrastructure may be required for growth include improved capacity at the M11 Junction 8 for future airport traffic, housing and employment growth in Essex (e.g. Elsenham and East Herts - Bishops Stortford and along the A120 West corridor/no spare capacity). Short term M11 J8 improvements estimated at £5m/medium to long term - £50 million. Need timely delivery of these & M11 Junction 7a works/wider improvements.

Companies enquiring about Harlow EZ want better links to Stansted/M11 J7A. Consider strategic accessibility issues of West Anglian Mainline/ECC supporting improved passenger services between London and Stansted/Cambridge. Consider increased frequency and capacity on the West Anglian Mainline/Cross Rail 2 impact. UDC to show liaison/working with neighbouring authorities e.g. appreciation of growth in Braintree, Colchester, Chelmsford, Harlow, East Herts and S Cambs may impact upon UDC/impacts e.g. logistics sector. Consider Public Health England proposal for Harlow Medical Tech Sector. Consider cross border movement of secondary aged pupils between the Stansted area of UDC and the Bishops Stortford area in Herts/impact of housing planned for Bishops Stortford North/new secondary for it, especially potential for further housing in the Stansted/ Birchanger/Takeley areas of UDC. Impact of new settlement on UDC/S Cambs border requires discussion with Cambs County on secondary school places.

Environment Agency - The consideration of land contamination, protection and enhancement of controlled waters via the planning regime has always been a key material consideration. However, in many instances consideration of land contamination and controlled waters at planning stage is too late. Groundwater in particular, is not a boundary issue and ensuring an area wide holistic approach when considering such a valuable resource is much more effective at strategic design stage.

Thames Water Utilities - Sewage treatment works (STW) catchments do not sit neatly with local authority boundaries. As such Thames Water has to consider the allocations and aspirations of neighbouring local authorities within the same catchment. The scale, timing and location of connections within one local authority can result in a requirement for network upgrades downstream and potentially within a different local authority boundary.

Highways England - The plan will need to consider the impact of neighbouring Districts growth proposals and the combined impact to transportation and the road network needs to be considered, specifically junctions on the M11 and A120 which are nearing capacity at peak times.

Epping Forest Council - It was considered inappropriate to answer individual consultation questions, the following recommendations were agreed: a) Cross-boundary strategic planning in issues include: housing provision for the settled and travelling communities, taking account of the 2015 SHMA, the updated Essex GTAA and the planning constraints of neighbouring authorities; implications for housing needs, employment demand and commuting patterns from development at Stansted Airport and Harlow Enterprise Zone; major infrastructure projects including J7a of the M11 and the upgrading of the A414 in Hertford area b) unfortunate the timing of consultation has meant that final version of joint SHMA (September 2015)/Hardisty Jones report on Economy (October 2015) not included. Such evidence should be explicitly referred/ helpful in explaining the option figures for housing growth. Document might also refer to Co-operation for Sustainable Development Group/ key mechanism for SHMA partners to continue to be engaged on strategic issues— housing, jobs, distribution and infrastructure.

Broxbourne Council - Broxbourne Council recently published a discussion paper indicating the likely direction of travel for the Broxbourne Local Plan entitles 'The Broxbourne Local Plan, A Framework for the future Development of the Borough - A Duty to Co-Operate document'. Suggested in presentation Co-Op Board 26 October 2015 possibility Broxbourne may not be able to meet its housing FOAN given local constraints in the Borough. The Council continues to investigate the options and the possibility that Broxbourne Council may need to seek assistance from other Local Planning Authorities to help address potential unmet housing needs. Council raising issue with all four authorities in adjoining M11 Housing Market Area (Harlow, East Herts, Epping Forest and UDC) and those in nearby Housing Market Areas to consider the implications for sustainable development in their own areas. UDC will want to understand whether any such request is reasonable and Broxbourne will publish its evidence base in due course.

Braintree Council - Braintree District Council/Uttlesford District Council actively engaging to ensure that we meet the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate and to examine all strategic cross boundary issues. The A120 is a major strategic corridor which runs from the M11 in Uttlesford, through the Braintree District towards the east coast. It acts as a major east west distributor road linking London Stansted Airport to the west and the Haven gateway ports to the east. As such the A120 is critical for the delivery of economic growth in the region, both through the opportunities to locate businesses and business parks adjacent to the A120 (such as Skyline near Braintree) but also in terms of the free flow of vehicles and goods between the key settlements and ports. Essex County Council and Highways England are currently carrying out a study on the potential options for improving the A120 between Braintree and Colchester which we would expect to ease congestion and release economic potential. All authorities along the A120 should work together with the Haven Gateway Partnership, Essex County Council and Highways England to push for improvements along the whole route of the A120 which will be beneficial for all the authorities in the region.

The aspiration for improvements to the A120 does not appear to be feature strongly within the current document/ask for this to be reflected within subsequent drafts. We note the

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for West Essex and East Herts which confirms the results of our SHMA, which states that Uttlesford and Braintree are in separate Strategic Housing Market Areas. However we continue to have dialogue with neighbouring authorities even if they sit outside the housing market area on housing issues. We strongly support the approach taken in the Issues and Options document in relation to housing numbers which test options which meet and exceed the requirements for housing identified in the SHMA. We would expect all authorities, including our own, to meet their objectively assessed need for homes, within the District boundary where possible.

South Cambridgeshire District Council - Two areas of search for development lie very close to the administrative boundary. If either is taken forward into the Local Plan, Uttlesford should engage positively with this Council and neighbouring Parish Councils in South Cambridgeshire. There are a number of key issues that would need to be considered, including transport, and the relationship with the major business parks in this part of South Cambridgeshire, including the Welcome Trust Genome Campus and Granta Park. We are aware of potential employment-led proposals being worked up to the north of Uttlesford in South Cambridgeshire. If they come forward they will be relevant considerations for the Uttlesford Local Plan.

Historic England - Conservation of the historic environment may involve cross-boundary issues, for example, where development proposals near the boundary of one local authority area potentially affect the setting of heritage assets in another. In exercising the duty to cooperate, each authority would need to take into account the impact on the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment as one of the strategic priorities of national policy. Historic England is a duty to cooperate body and would need to be involved where applicable.

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group - When planning ecological corridors reference should be taken from the Essex Wildlife Trust Living Landscapes documentation, which proposes such ecological corridors, many of which cross District Council boundaries.

Birchanger Wood Trust - Pressure on roads, the motorway accesses, and railway from: Bishop's Stortford North to the south of Stansted. Cambridge to the north of Stansted.

The Ickleton Society - New settlement near Great Chesterford/sizeable expansion big impacts on South Cambs e.g. Cambridge and junction 10 of the M11, A1301, the A505, the Pampisford roundabout, the roads through Ickleton and Duxford. Negative impacts on communities in South Cambs.

National Trust - Need to provide a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the district/meet informal recreation needs/ provision of new areas/protection of existing heritage assets such as Hatfield Forest.

National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups - Consider the distribution of Gypsy and Traveller sites

The Thaxted Society - Yes, where cross boundary planning assists in the above or in the case of both large scale new settlements or future proofed hi tech and research employment. Also see question 5.

Stebbing Society - Concern relates to the area around Stebbing in particular to Scenario A New Settlement AOS 9/read in conjunction with response to Question 10, where state opposition to such a new settlement. We believe that the extent and geographic location of the New Settlement blue blob is misleading when compared with the previous area earmarked for the Boxted Wood/Andrewsfield development to which we have already voiced our objections in response to the EERA Consultation in November 2009. This new Area 9 is now considerably larger and covers a much greater area than before and virtually blights all properties in Stebbing. The previous site lies predominantly in Braintree, with some encroachment into UDC/ arisen simply on the unsound basis that the cross- boundary land concerned belongs to the same landowner. Extent of this whole site is being landowner driven instead of based on meet the housing needs, thereby risking an unnecessary over-provision. Braintree has provision for 50,000 houses/unnecessary to extend this single settlement into UDC.

Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation - Amongst the development options reviewed you have raised the possibility of a new free standing settlement to meet the housing needs of the district. Given the development pressures facing East Herts and Epping Councils in the south and South Cambridgeshire in the north we suggest that this is a strategic issue which goes beyond simply meeting the identified housing demand in Uttlesford over the next 20 years.

Helena Romaine Secondary School - Dunmow is expected to experience a declining surplus of spaces up to 2019/neighbouring authorities projected to experience deficits of pupil places. Deficit of pupil places for HRS in meeting the demand for school places from a growing catchment area. In setting out the need for community facilities such as secondary school/sixth form places UDC encouraged to consider unmet need for places in neighbouring authorities/impact on the diminishing surplus of projected places in schools such as HRS Great Dunmow. Need flexibility to ensure schools capable of meeting more than local need alone while promoting modern facilities. Specifically, the longer-term expansion and modernisation of secondary education facilities in Great Dunmow cannot be viably achieved on the existing HRS site which is constrained. Submissions show opportunities available to provide a new facility on an alternative site for a modern facility also capable of taking need arising from surrounding districts. Consider education demands a cross boundary issue that should be investigated by the LPA. Need to relocate HRS to a larger site to the west of Great Dunmow/ significant level of capital funding from release of the existing school site for housing. Consider unmet development housing needs of neighbouring authorities/potential for UDC to take growth.

Essex Wildlife Trust - NPPF 117 requires plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale across LPA boundaries and identify the local ecological networks.

GI needs to be planned and integrated at every geographical scale, from a cross-boundary local authority scale to a single development/identify strategic GI within Local Plans which are informed by cross-boundary strategies and cooperation. The focus should be on strategic planning of an integrated network of linked priority habitats to create ecologically functional green wedges/corridors. Green Infrastructure should join up designated sites and creates new wildlife habitat, as well as providing much needed green spaces which are accessible to the public.

LPA's have a duty to co-operate on cross-boundary strategic matters relating to sustainable development/ pursuing sustainable development should mean achieving net gains for nature. As such, the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment is considered a strategic priority.

Work with local partnerships to ensure strategic issues are co-ordinated/sustainable enabling local leadership/benefits of a healthy natural environment. In order to plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale, UDC may wish to develop joint approaches with other LPA's. Integration with other plans can play a role in delivering landscape-scale conservation. Consider creation of ecological networks and where possible/exploit win-win GI opportunities e.g. Local Flood Risk Management Strategies/approaches that work with natural processes. Working with natural processes means taking action to manage flood erosion risk by protecting/ restoring natural function of catchments, rivers and floodplains.

Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - Epping Forest has a major problem in that it is surrounded by extensive Green Belt. The only plus is that North Weald Aerodrome could be the perfect site for a large new settlement. Harlow has similar constraints but has the potential to expand the further education facilities that it has into a full blown University, which would be a major boost to East Herts, UDC, Epping Forest District Council areas educational needs. Junction 8 of the M11 is already operating over capacity and this needs to be resolved before any new development near the A120. E.Herts share our difficulties with J8.

Stansted Airport - Stansted Airport is the third largest airport in London and currently handles over 22 million passengers pa/primary airport for the East of England and is one of the UK's principal international gateways and a key driver of the regional economy providing a wide range of employment opportunities and supports economic activity within UDC, the region and further afield throughout the UK. The function of Stansted Airport and the role it plays within UDC, the wider region and UK should be recognised.

The Hundred Parishes Society - The plan should recognise that Uttlesford and adjoining districts have a shared responsibility to preserve the special character of the wider area known as The Hundred Parishes.

We Are Residents - Surprised at the open- ended nature of question/how respondents can reasonably give an informed response in the absence of evidence. There are a huge number of cross-boundary strategic issues that need to be addressed, which should have been identified. We noted in our response to the 2014 Submission Draft consultation a number of the implications of the failure to consult with neighbouring authorities/identified cross-border issues which should have been considered primarily issues relating to Saffron Walden and the north of the district but no doubt similar issues exist affecting the rest of the district.

Hands Off Thaxted - Take into account potential developments in the adjoining districts and the effect on the road infrastructure in Uttlesford such as the substantial planned developments in Braintree and the proposed expansion of Bishops Stortford to the north which will completely overwhelm the A120 and junction 8 of the M11 resulting in traffic chaos in the south of the district.

Friends Of The Flich Way - An improvement in cross boundary planning with Braintree district council with regard to avoiding granting permission to housing developments that

threaten the unique nature of the flitch way as a wildlife and ecological asset. The councils to have regard for the people who use this route and there possible loss of amenity caused by intrusive house building adjacent to the flitch way.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCIL

The Sampfords Parish Council - The hub of bio/scientific and research establishments comprising the Babraham Institute, the Genome Campus, Little Chesterford Research Park, Granta Park and the Welding Institute are all located within a few miles of each other on the boundary between Uttlesford and South Cambridgeshire District - entirely logical to consider a new settlement in this area.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council & Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - UDC should consider the impact of major developments already planned for Stortford North. These could have significant impact on Stansted Mountfitchet, e.g. increased traffic from commuters using Stansted Mountfitchet rail station rather than Bishops Stortford, even though the proposed new houses are in East Herts rather than Uttlesford. This needs to be considered alongside the strict settlement hierarchy which might imply that Stansted Mountfitchet could take further large scale development if the settlement hierarchy were used alone without consideration of these cross border issues. The Green Belt to the south of Stansted Mountfitchet should be protected.

Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow Town Councils - Housing: Development necessary to meet the districts own needs must inevitably mean either extensions to one or both of the existing towns or one or more new settlements. The first of those alternatives would result in the complete change in character, function and appearance of one, if not both, of the two existing market towns. Given the scale of development involved, and capacity of the two market towns to absorb it would inevitably result in a change for the worse e.g. of how Bishops Stortford changed from what was, not long ago, an attractive country market town.

The Duty to Co-operate statement could also have had greater focus on genuinely strategic matters as per inspectors report.

Take account of South Cambridgeshire District and Cambridge City local plans/examination suspended to enable to revisit sustainability appraisals/reasonable alternatives/modifications

If the strategy is to focus on new settlements location/cannot set out upon the formulation of it until it has had discussions with its neighbouring authorities.

Not limited to South Cambs but also East Herts- Bishops Stortford and Braintree, where there may be scope for a major development straddling the boundary, and Epping Forest district where major development is likely to warrant the rolling back of the Green Belt.

Such an approach may be to the mutual benefit of Uttlesford and neighbouring councils with regard to the proper planning of this and the neighbouring local authority areas and, as such, merit serious consideration under the duty to co-operate.

Gypsies and travellers. Issue of pitch provision is often contentious such that, if there is an opportunity for authorities to meet any unmet needs of their neighbours and ensure the delivery of development which is acceptable, then it should be seized. However, given that

the definition of gypsies and travellers has recently been changed, it is important to factor that into the determination of the actual need.

Capacity of Junction 8 on the M11. Any major developments in relatively close proximity to this junction will inevitably create more traffic through it. That applies to developments in other authorities, particularly East Herts, as well as Uttlesford. Given that and the fact that traffic flows can be expected to increase through time, it is imperative to ensure that this will not result in any adverse impact upon the free flow of traffic and/or safety implications at the junction. It will be important to ensure that increased traffic movements through the junction can be readily accommodated.

Rayne Parish Council - Issues on the non-alignment of plan timetables for the implementation of respective plans could be a potential source of conflict - In table 1 it shows that the major towns receiving focus for larger scale development are noted as Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow. - The map indicating development areas are very heavily biased towards Dunmow. This is an important issue that has to be addressed early on in the Planning cycle and replacement maps produced urgently.

Elmdon & Wendens Lofts Parish Council - AoS 1 and AoS 2, both these sites cross boundaries. Crossing-boundary planning must create increased consultation with the relevant Parish Councils, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge County Council. Significant expansion either side of Great Chesterford will impact traffic to and from Cambridge via roads and junctions within Uttlesford communities. With these two cross-boundary planning whose housing needs would the District council be solving, Uttlesford or Cambridge. Whilst assuming the major benefit it would be Cambridge the real impact would be on Uttlesford.

Felsted Parish Council - Strategy in all of the neighbouring authorities (North Herts, South Cambridgeshire, Braintree, Chelmsford and East Herts) will have an impact on Uttlesford residents and settlements. All should be consulted. Where major settlements are proposed on or close to Uttlesford borders, then a full assessment of the impact on Uttlesford must be carried out. This specifically applies to the site identified on the Braintree Local Plan call for sites, which includes an area within Felsted Parish (close to Uttlesford's area 9), should it be taken forward to consideration.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council - Transport - road and rail + see below. Employment - a realistic assessment of employment within Uttlesford – i.e. that most employment is outside Uttlesford and that travel to and from work will often include travel by car. Provision of basic services such as mains electricity, broadband, sewerage, water supplies. Doctors surgeries and other health provision: these should be included at an early stage when agreeing more residential development. UDC should also be thinking about whether Addenbrookes Hospital will be able to take patients from Uttlesford. Losing Addenbrookes as the local hospital for those in the north of the district could have a detrimental impact on the health of residents. Schools: extra school places and, if needed, new schools should be planned and keep pace with development.

Clavering Parish Council - There is an obligation for UDC to do this. Namely Braintree DC & Epping Forest & Harlow & East Herts & South Cambridgeshire

Stebbing Parish Council - Cross boundary strategic planning should concentrate on the M11 corridor as indicated by Central Government. The positive effects of high tech industry in Cambridgeshire should be a consideration for cross boundary strategic planning. None of UDCs neighbouring districts have an issue with land availability, therefore any cross boundary planning should concentrate on strategic transport issues. The rural character and settlement pattern of Uttlesford does not provide scope to accommodate growth for neighbouring authorities.

Ickleton Parish Council - Two of the search areas identified as potentially suitable for new settlements located near Great Chesterford have substantial adverse impacts on South Cambridgeshire if either areas selected. As would any significant expansion of Great Chesterford itself beyond what was envisaged in the previous withdrawn plan. Access to the M11 from areas of search 1 and 2 is restricted or poor. The local road network already suffers from congestion, particularly on approaches to Cambridge and the A505, which suffers from daily volumes of vehicle movements many thousands beyond its build capacity. Villages such as Ickleton and Duxford in South Cambs are blighted by rat-running to M11. South Cambs and Cambridge City submitted updated joint plans/do not include a new settlement or settlements between Cambridge City and UDC, infrastructure constraints and impacts on existing settlements being major considerations. Need close working/extensive consultation with Cambridgeshire LPAs, Cambs County Council, and South Cambs Parishes on any proposals for new settlements nearby. Should not meet housebuilding obligations in new settlements if the downside is offloaded onto neighbouring local authorities/existing settlements and residents in those areas.

Little Chesterford Parish Council - The potential new settlements around Great Chesterford are on the boundary of South Cambridgeshire District Council. A bid to build a new development at Hanley Grange just over the border was successfully defeated recently. Wellcome Trust planning a commercial/residential development just to the north of Stumps Cross, new development on the Essex side effectively coalesce with this in excess of the individual applications, with concomitant effects on infrastructure. Since two district councils are in different counties implications at County level regarding schooling, highways, health, fire, police etc. Settlements this close to the border unlikely to be of benefit to the district workforce/ most likely used by greatly expanding workforce of Cambridge where house prices expensive.

Quendon & Rickling Parish Council - Detailed discussions will need to lead to allocations of homes across different local authorities so there is no confusion regarding targets. Rail services MUST be improved significantly as many people living in Uttlesford and South Cambridgeshire commute to either London or Cambridge and more houses means more commuters therefore rail links must be improved to accommodate these increases in passenger numbers. The addition of an on/off ramp to the M11 at Sparrows Hill roundabout to the north of Newport could reduce additional traffic on already busy B1383.

Great Canfield Parish Council - Road layout of M11 and junctions, in particular an exit from the M11 at Saffron Walden to ease traffic and a junction from the M11 between Harlow and Stansted to ease congestion.

Little Easton Parish Council - Existing road and rail links to Cambridge and employment growth industries, particularly science and technology, should provide employment

opportunities for new settlements to the north of the district. Suffolk and Norfolk boundaries are accessed by A11 and A14, easily accessed from the north of the district for employment opportunities and growth industries.

Thaxted Parish Council - There is no reference to working cross boundary with, for example, Braintree. The inspector's comments should not be discounted. Employment is largely to the north of the District. There is no acute hospital or education beyond secondary level in the District. How will people access these services in terms of transport? How will they access the commercial centres? Does J8 of the M11 have sufficient capacity? What will happen to gypsies and travellers? UDC should work co-operatively to achieve these targets.

Little Chesterford Parish Council - The Genome Campus/WellcomeTrust site located just over the northern border in South Cambridgeshire, is planning significant expansion, including 1500 residential dwellings as well as very substantive increases the numbers working at the site. This will have a significant impact on the surrounding villages including Little Chesterford. The impact of this proposed development must be taken together with the north Uttlesford proposed areas of search (AOS1 and AOS2) which are immediately adjacent, and a duty to co-operate extended to South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Birchanger Parish Council - Should consider proposed building to north of Bishop's Stortford bordering A120 and the impact on the existing over strained road system particularly Junction 8.

Takeley Parish Council - M11 Jtn8: Already operating a capacity at certain times of the day/week. It is not fit for purpose. Where is Highways assessment for strategic planning? B. 2500 dwellings already approved for Bishop's Stortford. UDC must consider the impact of both East Herts & Uttlesford development proposals on Jtn 8. C. Rail capacity on the main line to Liverpool Street (Bishop's Stortford) D. The SHMA covers 4 districts but Uttlesford is allocated 37% of the housing development - why?

Newport Parish Council - We should work closely with our neighbouring authorities, and particularly South Cambs who UDC have chosen to ignore at all times.

Arkesden Parish Council - The rural nature of the district means that meeting Uttlesford's own housing needs will be difficult enough and it is vital that these needs are met first. However it is essential that transport infrastructure does form a significant part of any cross boundary planning issues.

Elsenham/ Henham/Ugley/Widdington Parish Councils - NPPF require plan making must be exercised with a duty to cooperate with adjoining authorities, especially within the Housing Market Area. West Essex (Epping Forest, Harlow and Uttlesford) and East Hertfordshire to undertake a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to identify the functional Housing Market Area and establish the Objectively Assessed Need for housing. Response to Question 2 is that the duty to cooperate with adjoining authorities has been met through the publications of the joint SHMA. Planning for the future growth of Uttlesford should be based upon its findings that the District must deliver an extra 12,500 dwellings by 2033.

Strethall Parish Meeting - Any large new settlement will have cross boundary issues. Relating to areas 1 & 2 there are already plans in south of Cambridge for 4,400 new homes

although lacking any major provision for new and improved transport facilities. The rail link is only two track, local bus services are negligible, and the M11 dual between Saffron Walden and Bishop's Stortford. The impact of those 4,400 new homes alone will be immense so a new settlement of thousands of more new homes on the Essex side of the border in areas 1 and 2 would bring these transport links to a standstill. The other existing infrastructure (social, educational and recreational) would equally be unable to cope with such developments.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- Wellcome Campus a major employment location with high visitors numbers/25-year Vision will lead to increased employment, new homes and improved infrastructure.
- Existing cross-boundary flow of commuters/visitors to Campus increase/impacting transport infrastructure/Interdependence/commutes between UDC/Campus likely. Infrastructure investment strategic issue requiring cross boundary collaboration.
- Consider role sustainable urban extensions to Bishop's Stortford can make to delivery of housing and employment needs/ existing transport links and patterns of commuting from Uttlesford to Bishop's Stortford/ work closely with ECDC HCC on further urban extension to south east of Bishop's Stortford
- Strong relationship with adjoining local authorities/ M11 and the A120 strategic roads/commuting patterns and access to key employment and education locations.
- The SHMA shows LPA housing requirements and where constraints do affect the physical capacity to take further growth/where Green Belt rigours apply
- Embrace PAS review on strategy for the Duty to Cooperate/plan that set out how the requirement had been fulfilled. Such a strategy should form part of the public consultation exercise for the Plan.
- Meet needs within the HMA e.g. Epping Forest /London unmet housing need/ Districts with large areas of Green Belt such as. Epping DC has resolved to draw this to your attention - committee meeting on 18/11/15.
- The Sustainability Appraisal must consider the consequential impact of increased in-migration in the options that it assesses.
- Uttlesford District experiences high levels of in and out-commuting, driven by the high levels of employment at Stansted Airport and the high-end employment opportunities offered in London and other economic centres on key commuter routes.
- Commuting flows suggest policies that could support more sustainable commuting patterns and self containment.
- The nature and geography of Uttlesford District is such that there are a number of key specific cross-boundary planning issues needing to be considered
- Epping Forest, Harlow, East Herts, Braintree, Chelmsford and South Cambs have geographic, social, economic and environmental relationships with Uttlesford
- UDC will continue to have significant cross-boundary movements because of the demands of its own and neighbouring residents/effect economy of surrounding area.
- Stansted Airport is a key factor given the regional/national importance of its function and its direct/indirect impact on the economy, including a growing labour force
- Clavering on border of Cambs and Herts over looked for settlement hierarchy.
- Geographic location of UDC results in not just forming part of the market area for West Essex/East Herts but interacts with Cambridge, Chelmsford and London

- Address housing market area/immediate neighbours/bigger housing OAN required for unmet needs of neighbours. Not clear if Harlow/East Herts can meet FOAN/ UDC subject to higher levels of immigration as households search for housing. UDC must engage with Harlow/East Herts to understand their intentions.
- Increased housing development in this location may help to reduce commuting (as observed in section 2.5). Area of Search 8 relates to the south of the district and the area around Hatfield Forest/possible location to accommodate a new settlement. Consider how it might need to work with the Green Belt constrained Epping Forest in case it needs to assist that Council with accommodating its needs.
- For Braintree AOS9 unclear if because this location would meet an unmet housing need in Braintree/ increase infrastructure demands in Braintree town.
- Strong London in-migration/unmet needs/Maldon Plan made a modest allowance for London needs.
- Long-term migration assumptions/UPC discount unjustified/less than CLG
- Increasing pressure for more subsidised affordable housing.
- Average UDC house price £312,892 much higher than national average £228,385 High housing costs led to growing number of households who do not require affordable housing but due to inflated house prices are restricted from private housing market.
- Rather than improving affordability by lifting supply above trend the HMA authorities are making such problems worse
- SHMA needs re-basing on the 2012 household projections as the demographic starting point. Unclear what the plan period is?

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

The following general comments were made

- Ensure fair housing distribution between different authorities/across Hertfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Essex
- Danger of dispersed patch-work quilt development linking Bishops Stortford to Braintree via Takeley/Dunmow along A120 corridor. Unlikely J8/M11 improvements for at least 10 years.
- The A120 Corridor between M11 J8/Braintree seems well placed for growth but constrained at both ends
- Stansted Airport contributes little to Dunmow/surrounding parishes/few local people work there/ few local people commute from there due to high rail fares, no car/cycle parking for locals, and inadequate local bus service. The vast majority of the workforce live out of area and commute to work.
- Transport links /patterns of commuting Uttlesford to Bishop's Stortford for leisure, retail requires UDC to work with EHDC/HCC- urban extension south east of Bishop's Stortford
- Ensure green belt on southern boundary/E. Herts separating Bishops Stortford from Stansted Mountfitchet and Birchanger villages, is preserved.
- Areas adjacent to Bishops Stortford town within the bounds of the A120 and south of Beldams Lane situated where access to reasonable road infrastructure is available
- Transport is the key issues/not worsening congestion

- Big numbers of new jobs and residents will come from S Cambs developments.
- What plans do South Cambs have for the areas around Sawston and Granta Park?
- With DfT, Herts, Cambs, London Boroughs, and TfL, plan rail capacity for Stansted Airport and stations in the district
- Development in Takeley, Elsenham and Stansted will impact on East Herts/Bishops Stortford. Any discussion on housing in this area must include Stansted Airport.
- Development near M11J 8 reliant on services (shopping, leisure, transport, healthcare, etc) in Bishop's Stortford/poor access to centre (hockerill traffic lights)
- SCDC against Hanley Grange/Hinxton- same problems for others without big road/rail uplifts
- Bishops Stortford development north& northwest/secondary school provision
- Focus growth north of UDC/South Cambs to minimise through commuter traffic
- Limit to where neighbouring districts have insufficient land available to fulfil their own needs
- Greater Anglia rail service inadequate for local, Cambridge and London destinations
- Exploit dynamic of Cambridge & Braintree/Bishops Stortford rail services in latter
- Bishops Stortford south congested due to a lack of river crossing points/no access to M11 junction via Hockerill.
- Better links with East Herts DC including arrangements regarding recycling and transport.
- UDC rural environment /position towns and villages makes taking growth from other LPAs difficult
- DTC on employment growth e.g. Stansted Airport, M11 corridor, border with Cambs.
- Recognise role of larger settlements outside UDC/impact on highway links e.g M11, A414 near Chelmsford, A1307at Haverhill and between Hatfield Heath and Harlow
- Impacts of adjoining Neighbourhood Plans eg Bishops Stortford
- Impact on S Cambs from new settlement eg traffic to Cambridge, the M11; the A1301, A505 and Pampisford roundabout/roads through Ickleton and Duxford. Consultation with parish councils, SCDC and Cambs CC required.
- Braintree - workers for Stansted Airport)/Cambridge - growing UDC employment
- South of UDC especially Stansted Mountfitchet can expect the people from new Bishops Stortford village to use public transport /other facilities in Stansted Mountfitchet/ impacts
- Most proposed sites for growth are near UDC perimeter/consultation with neighbouring authorities essential e.g. S Cambs Great Chesterford proposals between Sawston/Genome Centre/Need Masterplan/Greater Cambridge Assembly
- Alternative road links and upgrade of B roads through UDC/beyond. Consideration of new rail spurs to serve any new settlements with 3000 homes. Establish green development-free zones between new housing developments outside UDC/villages.
- Need for housing in the cross boundary area e.g. Cambs/ East Herts. No advantage of strategic working UDC/Braintree as A120 had no reasonable access to public transport hubs without use of private cars. Braintree is not a main line rail station
- Impact of S Cambs housing in villages like Ickleton, Wittlesford and Duxford will increase the demands on local infrastructure/ impact on M11/ Cambridge Liverpool Street line.

- Whilst Bishops Stortford would involve junction 8 problem, J9 at Great Chesterford could be upgraded more easily
- Reserve land to add additional lanes to the M11 and that needed for possible railway
- Urban sprawl between Braintree, Rayne, Stebbing and Great Dunmow
- A new secondary school based in the south of the District should be planned
- Traffic issues need to be solved on a regional basis
- Braintree plan to develop area bordering UDCs Boxted Wood in west of their district
- Eco-settlement really fit for the 21st century
- Take account of Essex Hundred/quality and character

Question 3

Settlement Hierarchy

Do you agree with the Planning Inspector that the settlement hierarchy is “generally soundly set out” and represents a pragmatic way forward for the Local Plan?

The Council is particularly interested to know:

- If there has been any significant change in the services and facilities in any settlement which should lead to its reclassification?
- Is the proposed function for each type of settlement appropriate?
- Are there other relevant factors which suggest that a greater or lesser amount of development should be directed to a settlement than would reflect its strict place in the settlement hierarchy?

This question was responded to by 520 people. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to

<http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

Overarching summary

- Support for existing settlement hierarchy from some parishes or at least agree good starting point
- Some Parishes do not consider it relevant given scale of growth proposed/its role in determining growth unclear
- South Cambridgeshire Council require settlement hierarchy clear on place of any new settlement within hierarchy
- Some larger villages wish to downgrade existing position
- Some smaller villages continue to require some growth
- Developers suggest proposals are assessed on individual merits/not position within the settlement hierarchy
- Adopting one size fits all approach for growth of settlements unsound/NPPG - supports sustainable rural communities/housing supply and affordability
- Avoid a settlements position in the hierarchy being only determining factor of growth/ sound starting point /but needs to be more nuanced about growth
- Suggest applying a further “sense” test as advised by inspector
- Use settlement hierarchy only for contextual purpose

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways -

Recommends consider the extent to which Key/Type Villages A can take future growth in a sustainable manner. Can assist UDC with information on surplus places that may be available within existing primary/secondary schools and capacity for the existing school to expand or whether land available to build a new school.

South Cambridgeshire District Council - If the plan includes any new settlements it should be clear about their place in the settlement hierarchy.

Helena Romaine Secondary School - The proposed settlement hierarchy is considered to be acceptable in relation to Great Dunmow being identified as a Market Town, suitable for a major focus of development of a large scale.

Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - We agree that the settlement hierarchy is generally soundly set out and represents a pragmatic way forward for the Local Plan. No significant changes for Stansted Mountfitchet. The proposed function for each type of settlement is appropriate. Account should still be taken of the scale of development at Forest Hall Park which significantly increased the population of Stansted Mountfitchet suggesting a smaller scale of development than that of the strict hierarchy would be appropriate for Stansted Mountfitchet.

Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - The inspector also commented that Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden to a lesser extent had had sufficient development added on and the Local Plan should be looking at a new settlement or settlements rather than damage these towns by allowing them to lose their character through overdevelopment. Great Dunmow with all the current additional applications approved and two questionable ones in addition, has reached this point. We would consider Thaxted to be a Market Town. Hatfield Broad Oak and Felsted would be regarded as key villages.

Friends of the Earth - Disagree with the Settlement Hierarchy proposed namely that Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow should be the major focus for development in UDC. Not aware of evidence that shows either town could sustainably accommodate a further 1,500 new homes in addition to those already approved.

The Thaxted Society - UDC's own evidence in defence of their decision to refuse Gladman at Thaxted at appeal showed that both the health provision and education at Thaxted were now oversubscribed. These factors were reiterated in the inspectors decision to deny the appeal as a result Thaxted does not currently fulfill the criteria for a key settlement.

The Ickleton Society - The settlement hierarchy outlined seems sensible and one that will provide housing for residents throughout the district. While there can be a place for new settlements in local plans/if brownfield sites are available, one of the major problems is new housing in one specific place does not really help people wanting housing elsewhere.

Stebbing Society - Although Stebbing is classed as a Type A village (with pub, church and a shop), we would stress that our shop is Community run and not a part of any larger commercial conglomerate. So it could be argued that Stebbing only marginally falls into the Type A classification. Stebbing has already seen considerable development in the past, relative to its size and apart from current proposals at Bran End area and behind Garden Fields, it would be very difficult for the village to support much more without serious impact on the already stretched infrastructure-School, Parking, Medical Facilities.

Birchanger Wood Trust - The current settlement hierarchy appears sound, but... There appears to be a certain amount of available land each side of the B184? Need forward plan for a potential new settlement - where?

We Are Residents - Disagree with question/ use to which the settlement hierarchy is proposed to be put. If the settlement hierarchy was a list of settlements by size then it would be correct, but this is not the purpose to which it has been put. Note fail to mention the concerns inspector expressed at the extent to which for example Saffron Walden or Great Dunmow can expand further in any sustainable way.

If a new settlement(s) is determined to be the most sustainable solution for the location of the remaining 3,000 homes which the Plan needs to provide for, then the hierarchy is irrelevant, as all other new homes have already been permitted. Settlement hierarchy only has meaning if it is used to allocate development, and as has been shown from the rejection of the 2014 Submission Plan it is not appropriate for this purpose in the way it is used.

This question also presupposes the answer to Questions 10 onwards, and is therefore also inappropriate for this Consultation. Clear that material new development in Saffron Walden cannot be achieved in a sustainable way. This is clear both from the Kier appeal Inspectors findings, the Submission Plan Inspectors comments and the evidence UDC has published.

UDC had always rejected large scale development in either Saffron Walden or Great Dunmow as unsustainable prior to their change of strategy in 2012 not evidence-based or justified.

Once a sustainable Spatial Strategy has been determined then that should be included in the Local Plan; we do not see that the hierarchy serves any useful, and indeed it is clearly unsustainable

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group - The location and degree of connection which Saffron Walden has via existing transport links, i.e. M11 motorway and the West Anglia Railway place it at the head of any hierarchy, even above Great Dunmow, and this should be recognised, making it the principal place for expansion. The remainder of the hierarchy seems satisfactory.

Sustainable Uttlesford - Agree an additional tier should be added to the hierarchy to cover the potential of new settlement(s). Another analysis of Type A villages may be required to distinguish those villages that have multiple services i.e. shop, school, pubs, and village hall and are close to or are located on one of the main corridors of movement within the district e.g. B1383, , B184, A1060, A120, B1008. Otherwise the Settlement Hierarchy is acceptable.

Hands Off Thaxted - The settlement hierarchy based on the settlement size. Each settlement should be evaluated on the basis of whether any further development would be sustainable taking account of the distance to main roads and railway stations, the distance to a hospital, the capacity of schools and health facilities, employment opportunities, the effect on the landscape and historic buildings. Although 250 -300 houses have been constructed in Thaxted in last 3/4 years no change in infrastructure. Local facilities inadequate for existing housing so regardless of size more new housing inThaxted unsustainable.

Friends of The Flich Way - There are relevant factors to restricting development adjacent to the flitch way, a greater density of housing will create an increased usage by the occupants on the flitch way which in turn will degrade the value of this asset with the presence of a larger number of users at any given time.

Stansted Airport - In assessing the Settlement Hierarchy UDC should consider Aerodrome Safeguarding and environmental matters (such as noise/air quality) related to the proximity of the settlement to the airport as relevant factors which may suggest a lesser amount of development should be directed to particular settlements, as detailed in response to Q11.

Ridgeons - Support identification of Saffron Walden as a Market Town which, together with Great Dunmow, should form the major focus for development in the district. Given the size and the range of services provided within the town, Saffron Walden is considered suitable for development.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow Town Councils - Existing settlement hierarchy bad place to start planning the district. Irrelevant when planning for suggested scale of growth that fundamentally changes the nature of that hierarchy. Applies irrespective of the development strategy chosen. The resulting settlement hierarchy will, as a result, be very different no matter what happens. Therefore best to plan the district in an unfettered manner rather than have to begin with the current situation. Disagree with the questions raised certainly insofar as the settlement hierarchy was previously used. Given that the issue of future housing needs to be properly determined on the basis of sustainability criteria do not see settlement hierarchy serves a useful purpose.

Little Hallingbury Parish Council - Understood housing within/on the boundaries of Type A & B villages may benefit local people but development limited depending on facilities and infrastructure currently in place, and planned with consideration to existing residents

Great Hallingbury Parish Council - As above/Great Hallingbury is listed as a Type B village but our services at present consist of the village hall and church - one restaurant/hotel and a private school also.

Elmdon & Wendens Lofts Parish Council - Yes on the basis that this is provide housing that is actually needed in the District, i.e. providing housing for the existing community. Regarding the specific points above, in respect of our own locality no other comments. However the Settlement Hierarchy does not put an emphasis on the brown field development which must be preferable to building on prime farming land.

Clavering Parish Council - Transport sustainability of each village. There is anticipated loss to the bus services in Clavering and Clavering does not have sustainable transport links to the railway stations

Stebbing Parish Council - Stebbing is classed as a Type A village. One of the facilities is the village shop a community venture not a commercial one .The Type A village function is appropriate but larger developments have been approved over the recommended numbers that these (Stebbing) village/scan support. There should be a strict place in settlement hierarchy.

Elsenham/Henham/Ugley/Widdington Parish Councils - No apparent relationship between hierarchy and expected capacity for new development. The largest development proposals in LP14 was for 2648 dwellings at Elsenham - level 2 in the hierarchy - whereas the two major settlements/market towns received lower allocations . This mismatch must be

avoided in the new Local Plan. Hatfield Heath a key village suitable for growth to reinforce its role as provider of services but is protected from any future development. Need to look again at Green Belt boundaries to see whether development can be accommodated. Whilst the hierarchy is recognised for its capacity to absorb growth, it must mean what it says when new large sites are allocated these must be at Saffron Walden and Gt Dunmow. AOS 3 would not produce a new settlement/does not fit with Elsenham's position in the hierarchy.

Little Chesterford Parish Council - Yes agree with a settlement hierarchy/ expansion of the two largest towns in Uttlesford is sound i.e. where amenities are close at hand, thus reducing the need for car journeys. Larger villages where facilities such as shops and doctors surgeries exist could also take some smaller scale development, but not large scale developments. Some villages have better services than others e.g. Newport and Stansted have numerous shops, Post Office, Pharmacy and secondary schools. Great Chesterford has NO Post Office, bank, petrol station, hairdressers, or other facilities required by a medium sized settlement. There is only one boutique bakers/deli, two pubs and two doctors surgeries, requiring residents travel into Saffron Walden/Sawston or Cambridge for other facilities. Some second tier villages are thus better placed to accommodate development than others.

Great Chesterford Parish Council - Considers Great Chesterford could either be a key village or a type A village as it has characteristics relating to both. The range of services available in Great Chesterford are probably more consistent with a key village, however, the size of its population is similar to those in the type A village category Where justified by economic, social and environmental factors a case may be made to direct a greater or lesser amount of development to a settlement than would reflect its strict place in the settlement hierarchy (e.g. locally identified demographic and other needs, local constraints and opportunities, patterns of bus services and inter-relationships between particular settlements). Therefore the level of proposed development should take into account the existing size of the village and its population, the limited bus service, the sensitive surrounding landscape, potential impact on Heritage/ Conservation Area/ and the impact of recent housing developments .

Quendon & Rickling Parish Council - Hierarchy does not protect/respect the old properties and historical character of the many towns and villages in Uttlesford. Making a concerted effort to keep green spaces and prevent a corridor of development linking all towns from Dunmow to Saffron Walden. A big flaw in this hierarchy system is that it ranks villages based on any service provision currently existing in the villages. There is NO account taken of the fact that most of these services are seriously oversubscribed e.g. village school. Biggest concern raised at the Local Plan meeting (28.9.15) and by residents across Uttlesford is infrastructure. The smaller villages and towns cannot cope with more development.

Great Canfield Parish Council - Agrees with the classification of Great Canfield as a Type B village. There has been no development in the village - only facility is a village hall. Question evidence that Great Dunmow can grow sustainably to accommodate further homes. The roads leading to the A120 are constantly busy with queues at rush hour/ no rail link/ possibility of one in the future. Public transport can only be minimal and as traffic increases, be slow as there are no dedicated bus lanes and no space to add them on the country road.

Little Easton Parish Council - Agree settlement hierarchy is a logical breakdown of current settlements and can be used as a guide for locating small-scale development but not for major sites. Developments over 50 units can only be judged on a site-by-site basis rather than using the hierarchy to locate development. Large sites will be unsuitable, over and above those that already have consent, without infrastructure to support current and planned growth and in most cases will be unsustainable. Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden heavily constrained. However, towns such as Great Chesterford and Stansted still have the potential to grow.

High Easter Parish Council - No change in the services and facilities available in High Easter. The Parish agrees with the classification of the village as a 'Type B' village, which make it suitable for a scale of development that would reinforce its role as a provider of services mainly to its own community.

Thaxted Parish Council - Thaxted is designated as a key village. Many of its facilities are at capacity. New housing has put services under pressure. The classification does not take into account that services are stretched i.e. village school cannot expand/GP surgery is stretched. If Thaxted was reclassified it should be identified as not fit for further development/need an additional tier.

Takeley Parish Council - Refutes classification of Takeley as a 'Key Village'. Does not fit UDC's definition of Key villages suitable for a scale of development which reinforces their role of providing services to a wide rural area. While the number of dwellings in Takeley has increased by 121% in 15 years infrastructure to support this housing growth has not. Little capacity in existing infrastructure also Takeley Day Centre - threat of closure (UDC/ECC cuts). Lost, butcher, pub, garden centre, electrical store, locum doctor. Gained pharmacy not open Saturday/Sunday. No GP service/ lack of primary school places. Takeley fits the criteria of a Type A village rather than a key village i.e. 'village with a primary school which acts as a local service centre for the surrounding villages e.g. Hatfield Broad Oak has GP services is designated Type A, but Takeley with no GP service is a key village. The classification is arbitrary/ based on the volume of housing development.

Strethall Parish Meeting - Broadly yes, but it is flawed. We would concur with, and refer you to C.Woodhouses' (Catmere End) summation in his succinct answer to this question.

Newport Parish Council - We disagree with the hierarchy proposed and would be in favour of a single settlement. Further development in Newport is not sustainable.

Arkesden Parish Council - Agree with the Inspector that the settlement hierarchy is soundly set out. Note Inspector commented hierarchy should not be the only determining factor in whether or not settlement could take further expansion. For instance, many small schools are at capacity, village shops are closing and bus services are for ever being cut back. The transport infrastructure supporting a settlement is equally as important as the services provided within the village.

Felsted Parish Council - In classifying the hierarchy, greatest weight should be given to the existence - or approved development - of permanent infrastructure (i.e. road and rail access and capacity, adequacy of water, gas, electricity and broadband supplies). This needs interrogation rather than simple overview e.g. the lack of an Eastbound exit from the A120 between Dunmow and Rayne severely limits the practicality of accessing the A120 without

using routes through villages for other exits. The continued existence of services such as shops, halls, pubs, post offices, GP surgeries and bus routes cannot be assumed, and should carry far less weight as an indicator of a local centre suitability for development. It should be noted that the Felsted FKS school for 4-7 year olds closed in 2015, reducing the local school capacity. The shop at Stebbing is also only kept open through volunteers.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council - Suggest that a lesser amount of development should be directed towards settlements which are in a very rural setting, without good transport links and where mains drainage is unavailable or limited. UDC should examine carefully those villages classified as Type A - simply having a primary school may not be enough to consider increased housing, where it can be shown that other infrastructure is insufficient to cope with that development.

Ickleton Parish Council - We agree the settlement hierarchy is generally soundly set out. The difficulty with adding a tier catering for one or more new settlements to the hierarchy is that you first have to decide the numbers of new settlements and the size of each one, otherwise the category is too open-ended. A new settlement proposal could have more to commend it if it made use of a substantial brownfield site. UDC search areas only green field sites/loss of agricultural land/ do not raise enough from would-be developers to put necessary infrastructure in place unless the proposed new settlement is really large. This implies you have to go for one large settlement for the bulk of the Districts new housing. Would it be sustainable if it involved people driving across much of the District to reach their jobs in the south of the District? Doubtful that even a large settlement would generate sufficient developer contributions to fund M11 junction improvements.

Broxted Parish Council - Refer to Type B villages as being suitable for some development, but nowhere explain what form that development might take. Even quite small villages, such as ours, should be allowed and encouraged to accommodate some new housing/even twenty or thirty new homes would do much to invigorate what is often an ageing community and give much needed support to local pubs, shops, churches and community activities, which are often struggling to prosper.

Rayne Parish Council - No major disagreement with PI but have to be cognisant of the fact that the infrastructure within, between and around villages has to be considered and adjustments made accordingly. - It is important that the burden of any new initiative or development is shared across the whole district and not just in the south.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council - We agree that the settlement hierarchy is generally soundly set out and represents a pragmatic way forward for the Local Plan. No significant changes for Stansted Mountfitchet The proposed function for each type of settlement is appropriate Account should still be taken of the significant scale of development at Forest Hall Park (even though it dates back a few years) which has significantly increased the population of Stansted Mountfitchet - this would lead to the conclusion that a smaller scale of development than that suggested by the strict hierarchy would be appropriate for Stansted Mountfitchet

Wimbish Parish Council - Not clear why this question is posed. Is the hierarchy intended to represent a batting order for where development is being considered? If not then why is it needed? If it is then we would make the following point. The significance of the distinction

between Type A and Type B villages is not clear/ question the existence of a Primary school being the major criteria for this distinction. For example, Farnham has a tiny school and is smaller in size than most of the Type B villages. Wimbish is also smaller than a number of Type B villages, with its major settlement (Tye Green) consisting of a mere 70 homes, and its school would not exist but for the number of barracks children attending.

The Sampfords Parish Council - Suggested settlement hierarchy is reasonably sound. However it should not be assumed that all of the type A villages have equal ability to accommodate additional housing development. For example, availability of rail and good bus services is beneficial, and the proximity to shopping and employment opportunities within reasonable walking or cycling distance should also be considered as giving some villages an advantage in sustainability terms.

DEVELOPER, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- Supports in principle the approach (Table 1) insofar as it seeks to ensure patterns of housing growth are managed to direct housing to sustainable locations
- Fails to recognise role of Bishop's Stortford on UDC for employment, transport, facilities, leisure and retail/include Bishop's Stortford as a Market Town
- Great Dunmow correctly classified as a Market Town/highest order of settlement within cascade of hierarchy.
- Planned expansion of secondary education, sports/GI, health centre provision, new primary school in above location sound to focus a higher order of growth there.
- Inspectors views on Settlement Hierarchy good starting point for moving the plan forward quickly/ critical that policies designed to facilitate delivery as per NPPF
- Emphasise potential of individual settlements on NPPF 34 – locate where use of sustainable transport modes maximised e.g. Stansted/Bishops Stortford bus no. 133 and 42a between Takeley and Great Dunmow/no. 309 runs between Bishops Stortford and Stansted Airport
- Agree the settlement hierarchy is generally sound/an extension to Saffron Walden would utilise existing services/minimise the impact on the countryside in the district.
- Inspector envisaged plan avoid only using settlement position in hierarchy for growth e.g. also use demographic/other needs, local constraints/opportunities, patterns of bus services and inter-relationships between settlements/hierarchy as a sound starting point only.
- Adopting one size fits all approach for all housing allocations to settlements in hierarchy is unsound/ NPPG - support sustainable rural communities/housing supply and affordability
- Approach applied by many of the rural authorities in the Eastern Region with similar settlement hierarchies to UDC characterised by large numbers of villages and several market towns - endorsed by many Inspectors since the 1990s.
- Continue to show Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow at the top of the hierarchy based on their service base and the role that they perform within the District.
- Section 78 appeal Thaxted Road, Saffron Walden (APP/ C1520/A/14/2221494) acknowledge Saffron Walden principal town in the District with a wide range of services and facilities.

- Any New Settlements should be assessed and classified separately based on the merits of each case but would not wish to see the insertion of this classification as a matter of course.
- Matter for the Council to decide whether new settlements feature in its overall development strategy, and what size and status they have
- Realistic - New settlements not a quick fix taking many years to be completed particularly if on a larger-scale/not done to detriment of growth needs elsewhere within the district.
- Some developers also support a dispersed strategy suits a predominantly rural district/ those locations with the best transport links and social infrastructure/housing needs
- Fails to take account potential to plan strategically for large scale development through new settlements/brown-field sites/growth elsewhere/towns reduce accordingly
- Fails to recognise the existing infrastructure, heritage and environmental constraints applicable to many of the market towns and villages
- Deliver scale/type required as a step change to meet the housing requirement
- Recording scale and function of settlements/helpful tool to set the context for the Plan as a whole but not as a strict means to distribute future growth
- If do retain the settlement hierarchy then decouple from future growth
- Strict approach makes NPPF statement on new settlements meaningless
- Recent peripheral expansion of Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow changing character and integrity of these market towns
- Consider how far relatively small towns with characters of Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow can grow sustainably
- Need wider consideration of growth opportunities/scope to deliver new settlements.
- Expand the Market Towns category to include new settlements - focus district growth/ role such locations would play in the delivery of growth
- Supports growth in Takeley provision of school here or Hatfield Broad Oak
- This hierarchy ensures that LPA concentrates on delivering sites in locations with best transport links and social infrastructure/supports Felstead for growth/re-enforcing role
- Stansted Mountfitchet could be viewed as being constrained by its position in the hierarchy, yet it has direct access to all the key infrastructure required to support sustainable growth
- Quendon and Rickling Green has the capacity to support a minimum of 50 units
- Barnston, in addition to facilities of its own has a strong functional relationship with nearby Great Dunmow and appropriate for larger scale development
- Henham has excellent access to Elsenham railway station and Stansted Airport and should be considered capable of accommodating a larger share of housing
- Supports a dispersed strategy including the provision of new settlement(s) as Uttlesford challenging place to plan for

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

The following general comments were made:

- Development must be sympathetic/enhance the character of settlement it relates to
- Mindfull, Felsted/Flitch Green/Little Dunmow within close proximity and growth between them could eradicate green spaces/create a town the size of the Notleys.
- Needs mention of transport/ road / rail / cycle links- e.g. East of Walden has different congestion impact than Great Chesterford close to major road interchanges, so why should Walden be of higher priority than Chesterford?
- Too simplistic when settlements adjacent e.g. Felsted/Flitch Green
- This heirarchy negates the infrastructure needed to support it
- Investigate new settlement close to rail/road links instead of focusing on hierarchy
- Settlement hierarchy just avoids issue of new settlement/towns first
- The two towns have such different characteristics wrong to put them in the same tier
- Not just take into account the size of current towns and villages, but also their : - proximity to major centres of employment, including London, Cambridge, Stansted
- Need to develop an infrastructure plan namely with regards to roads, NHS services, school and others before making any decision where growth to be
- By designating just 7 villages as key, the council acknowledges that this is their preference for any major development and this approach is fundamentally flawed
- The huge amount of housing which has been completed or is already planned in Elsenham means that the houses have been built without cohesive thought
- Wendens Ambo would be better classed as Type A because of the rail infrastructure
- Poor landscape quality of other areas (perhaps around Takeley for example) make that suitable for larger scale development
- Cannot bolt-on all extra housing to our existing towns and villages/avoid narrow streets of Saffron Walden to reach Cambridge - close to the M11
- Type A & Type B villages need to bear an increased role in the provision of dwellings & services to avoid overloading Elsenham e.g. Great Chesterford & Hatfield Heath
- New Settlements necessary but adjacent to urban areas not out-of-the-way rural areas where most travel to places of work/social activities
- The settlement hierarchy seems a sensible way forward which would provide houses across the district rather than on just one or possibly 2 locations
- Newport Key village already has approval for 355 houses/no more capacity
- Need evidence to show that Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow take 1,500 homes
- New settlement best or expand existing towns with e.g. ring road round west of Saffron Walden linking Ashdon Road, Radwinter Road and Thaxted Road
- Type A & B villages differ greatly & should all be looked at on their individual merits
- Little employment in Saffron Walden/out commuting
- New settlement at head of hierarchy/devote all resources to establishing it
- Grow villages on a small scale in keeping with its surroundings
- OK if homes in/around villages to meet the needs of all ages, various sizes/ cost
- Impact on Strethall, Elmdon, Ickleton, Duxford and Hinxton be taken into account
- Public services at breaking point/no infrastructure to support scale of growth
- District is essentially of a rural nature and to spread development would be destroy to the nature of the district which is one of the main reasons that it is popular
- Little Canfield merges with Takeley/Priors Green estate is almost a village in itself
- Commitment to bus services to some villages will affect their place in hierarchy
- Recognise UDC a commuter hinterland for the larger towns outside its boundary

- Sustainability criteria contained within the SHLAA out of date
- The proposed number of houses would be twice the size of Saffron Walden, so it is clear that no village could withstand this type of expansion
- better understanding of influences driving growth pressure in specific areas of Uttlesford e.g. of migration Stansted Airport/ Cambridge, London
- Stansted Mountfitchet grown by about 30% in recent years - Forest Hall Park
- Village with a part-time community shop should not be classed as a Type A Village
- Limited range of services/facilities currently available in Great Chesterford
- Some Type A villages have bus links which can comment to rail links/ others do not
- Complex relationship between Stansted Mountfitchet/Elsenham restricts latter's role
- Great Chesterford has smallest Key village population (1494) with A Types Wimbish (1629) and Clavering (1238)
- Saffron Walden 's countryside prevents bypass so all traffic uses in-town roads that lack the capacity or are unsuitable adapt to the current level or type of vehicles, there is nothing in this plan to resolve make the Settlement Hierarchy expansion viable.
- All settlements should have some growth to ensure that the smaller village do not become enclaves of the wealthy
- Categorising a village because it has a primary school is not correct/Stebbing has more in common with type B Villages than it does with some of the Type A
- Consider reclassification if significant change -ease of road access, local employment opportunities and the effects on the environment
- Remoteness of villages best served by infill
- Consider distribution of new housing/more brownfield/pocket developments to increase density rather than focusing on large new build settlements
- Need up to date data about the effect on health and education facilities
- If designates Saffron Walden "suitable for larger scale development", then future available support services and infrastructure will require much greater attention
- The location and ease of access and road provision between the settlement and its nearest town is of huge importance and can override the settlement hierarchy
- Too many villages high in the classification dependent on junction 8 should be capped by a limit
- Ashdon, Chrishall, Clavering, Debden, Sampford, Rickling, Radwinter and Wimbish relatively remote and dependent on unimproved rural roads.
- Development at Radwinter and Wimbish would be likely to add to traffic problems in Saffron Walden. If the locations of conservation areas are also included in this classification it will lead to further constraint
- Settlements which would increase traffic or development in the countryside protection zone Great Hallingbury and Little Canfield should be removed
- Thaxted has taken a lot of new development. The school and surgery are already stretched so it should not be considered for further development
- New settlements should be near the top of the hierarchy but below Market Towns
- Towns have to be first priority for development because where (some) work/ health care/shops need custom to continue/not become historic sites and charity shops
- Saffron Walden no key access roads/almost no scope to develop the town's interior
- Pre-supposes spare capacity in the "today" situation in all these locations and is biased towards the Council's rejected distribution strategy

- Top of list should be a new settlement located to reflect the inevitable pull of London
- Not change character of UDC with another level of hierarchy i.e. major town. Any settlements should not grow beyond what would be considered a market town
- No strategy to accommodate the existing developments i.e. more school places
- Development on multiple sites around existing towns/villages will come forward quicker than a larger single site
- Farnham has tiny school and is smaller in size than most of the Type B villages.
- Wimbish is also smaller than a number of Type B villages, with its major settlement (Tye Green) consisting of a mere 70 homes
- Continued existence of services cannot be assumed and should carry far less weight
- Approach will cause too much disruption by destroying the character of many villages
- If build more houses on the east side need a ring road to alleviate the congestion on Ashdon Road, Radwinter Road and Thaxted Road
- A hybrid solution inevitable/Filling in brown field sites in the larger towns and villages
- Need to take account of high-speed broadband access
- Saffron Walden is nearly twice the size of Great Dunmow that has first class road traffic links but no railway link as opposed to station at Audley End
- Use weighting system to identify key differences between settlements
- Chrishall Neighbourhood Plan states preference for limited housing development in with any new housing development being kept to groups of 10 houses or less
- Four key villages have a Railway Station and others have easy access to A roads so should be treated differently to Thaxted
- Growth in locations that already have a significant population (say over 5,000 people)
- Hierarchy is correctly balanced/has to be an equitable spread of new housing across the district/ still opportunity for settlement(s) of larger proportion
- To keep distinctive character/identity of villages, the extent of new development should be limited to 15% of their existing housing stock and avoid agricultural land
- Takeley has no doctors surgery unlike Hatfield Broad Oak a Type A village
- Other factors e.g. local landscape and historic environment, existing infrastructure, access to strategic transport connections all form part of an integrated approach
- Road infrastructure around Elsenham is inadequate so not a key village
- Direct growth to towns/create new towns, rather than promoting small scale development in villages that do not have the infrastructure to support it
- Dunmow should have a special place in the settlement hierarchy due to unprecedented level of development the town has already experienced
- First decide the issue of housing strategy. Is it single site (s)? Is it a dispersed strategy? Is it a combination of the two or is it some other?

Question 6

Housing Tenure Mix and Affordability

What are the main issues relating to housing tenure mix and affordability which the Council should consider?

This question was responded to by 390 people/organisations. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Birchanger Wood Trust: There should be more starter homes, but the facilities and infrastructure should be provided at the same time. Shared ownership homes need to be considered. Self-builds are difficult because their construction times and need for infrastructure - water, gas, electricity, lighting, sewers invariably does not match that of the larger development companies managing the site.

Essex County Council: In reviewing the West Essex and East Hertfordshire SHMA (ORS, 2015), there are some key messages that UDC will consider in developing the Local Plan. ECC notes that household numbers across the SHMA area are projected to increase over the 22 year period (2011-2033). The evidence for the planned jobs and workers identifies a need to increase housing delivery to provide enough workers for the likely increase in jobs; There will be a backlog of additional unmet need for housing to be counted at the start of the plan period; and the SHMA highlighted that, following an assessment of house prices, rents, affordability, overcrowding and rates of development there is a need for an uplift of at least 20% of housing need identified for the West Essex and East Herts LPAs. From a market signal perspective ORS indicated this was one of the most severe areas they have ever analysed, therefore hinted that to ensure success at EiP LPAs will need to consider an uplift in numbers.

It is recommended that the Local Plan considers the future requirements for the Independent Living Sector, and Older Persons accommodation. ECC has produced a Position Statement for Independent Living (October, 2015), which is housing for people over the age of 55 whose current home no longer meets their needs. The Position Statement may assist in seeking to deliver sufficient units to meet existing and future needs for independent living. It may also assist UDC in developing Local Plan criteria based policies to ensure the delivery of appropriate Independent Living accommodation throughout UDC over the plan period. ECC welcomes further discussions with UDC to ensure the delivery of appropriate accommodation that meets the needs of the future Essex community.

Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group: With long waiting lists from local resident families, priority must be applied to people living and working locally already. The mix of tenure is probably about right but a more appropriate method should be used to do the calculation. Social housing should be prioritised for local people who want to stay and work in the area. Affordable housing should be interspersed into developments to avoid concentrations of such housing forming ghettos.

Hands Off Thaxted: Many local people cannot afford the high price of the 3,4 and 5 bedroom houses currently being provided in the new developments across Uttlesford. House prices in London are higher therefore demand for these houses come not from local people but from people relocating to Uttlesford. (They will travel back to London to earn the salary necessary to finance their mortgage). This is clearly an unsustainable arrangement. As a housing action group our surveys and consultation with local people have identified that most residents in Thaxted want 1, 2 and 3 bedroom houses or bungalows, starter houses, 'affordable' affordable housing and homes for the elderly. Not unaffordable large houses. Smaller houses are more expensive for a constructor to build (cost/sq m) therefore public sector subsidy is the only solution to getting people on the "housing ladder".

Helena Romanes School: Paragraph 50 of the NPPF confirms that it is important to facilitate the delivery of a wide choice of quality homes and widen opportunities for home ownership. In addition, it is important that policies in the Local Plan relating to the mix of house types and tenure do not threaten the viability of sites coming forward to deliver homes (paragraph 173 of the NPPF). In relation to the HRS site, it is imperative that the Local Plan provides a viable scale of development to secure sufficient funding to provide a high quality facility elsewhere. The Local Plan should ensure that efficient and effective use of land is promoted through the plan policies and any site allocations. Paragraphs 14 and 55 of the NPPF are also pertinent to this issue. Bullet 2 of paragraph 14 emphasises that Local Plans should be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change. Similarly and more specific to housing mix, the third bullet point of paragraph 50 states it is important to take account of changing market conditions over time. We note the Local Plan is proposed to address development in the District up to 2033. The housing mix demand will inevitably fluctuate over this period. It is important that Local Plan policies are not overly prescriptive in relation to housing mix through any spatial policies or site specific allocations, and that they do not prevent developers from responding to future market conditions and demands.

Highways England: A mixture of tenure types and numbers of bedrooms has been shown to have a positive influence on sustainable transport use. Consideration should be given to the mix and types of dwelling so that the sustainable transport strategy is not undermined.

National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups: It is disappointing to note that the needs of Gypsies and Travellers are given little attention. The issue of provision of suitable locations is not the only consideration. The level of provision and the issue of where and how needs will be met should be considered.

Rainbow Fire Group: We need more homes, but there are NIMBY attitudes. Community is the main issue - Social Housing to allow families & friends to stay close if they wish to; but new private houses bring mostly new blood to communities. New developments can bolt on to established communities as long as the logistics are carefully planned. New towns are good, large or small as everything can be included to serve the dwellings and bring new facilities for the local communities. A mix is best, but with a high level, say 60% of social housing, that way we keep 30% for our existing local communities/families/people.

Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group: See Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council's comments.

Stebbing Society: Housing mix should have a sensible proportion of affordable and starter homes, with priority for local residents. It should also include properties suitable for downsizing and thereby making larger existing properties more readily available for families. Since almost all of the development in Uttlesford has so far been and continues to be in the south of the District, it is important that the north of the District takes its fair share, thereby making affordable housing available over the whole of Uttlesford.

Sustainable Uttlesford: It is essential that the 1300 units of social housing and 2600 units of intermediate affordable housing for middle to low income families are provided through the Local Plan to ensure that district population is structured. Market housing should not take precedence over this demand. Housing provision should reflect current and future employment opportunities in the district and a range of abilities.

Thaxted Society: Supports the provision of any form of social housing – low cost, affordable, first time buyer. Currently we are required to take too many homes for too little of what's needed. Supports the choice of intergeneration permanence as both a sustainable and long term future.

We Are Residents: The main issue with housing mix and affordability is Government policy, which consistently reduces the supply of social houses and makes it increasingly expensive. We would urge UDC to do what it can to resist and lobby for change in Government policy, so as to try to maximise the supply of affordable housing and also to try to ensure that it is actually affordable. We haven't answered the question, but only because there is so much to say and it is difficult to know where to start

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Arkesden Parish Council: Smaller houses are in high demand in the rural villages where the existing smaller houses have been extended over previous years and are consequently no longer affordable for younger people. It is essential to consult with the local residents to find out what type of housing is required in their villages rather than letting the developer decide. Smaller more affordable homes will not only allow young people to remain in their villages but will also give the older residents a chance to downsize and yet still remain part of their community.

Birchanger Parish Council: Starter homes and small family units. Shared equity schemes. Rental housing.

Clavering Parish Council: Look to OANS & predicted population to determine future housing mixes. Look at the provision of sustainable, affordable, low cost and social homes for local & key workers (such as teachers, nurses etc.) in the area. Also housing to permit downsizing.

Elsenham and Henham Parish Council: The SHMA provides guidance on housing tenure mix and need for affordable homes. No doubt it will be an important part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan. Government Policy towards provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers is changing. The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 has changed the definition of Gypsies and Travellers to exclude those who are static residents who have

ceased travelling. The emerging Housing and Planning Bill 2015, which passed its second reading in the House of Commons recently, says that local authorities in England would no longer have to assess Gypsies and Travellers housing needs in a separate category to other residents within their areas. At the moment, councils are required to forecast the number of new pitches needed under clauses in the Housing Act 2004. But the Bill says these clauses should be removed from the act. The Bill's explanatory note says that councils must consider the needs of all people residing in or resorting to their district without any references to Gypsy and Travellers. The effect of these changes will be to decrease the provision to be made specifically for Gypsies and Travellers.

Felsted Parish Council: Excluding social housing, there are insufficient smaller properties built for open market purchase by single/younger people or for older people to downsize. Most new developments have an emphasis on either three/four bed houses. This may include some smaller social housing, but not enough one to two bed properties of the right types of property, and in an appropriate environment and location, for retirees to outright purchase. Not everyone wanting a smaller home requires financial subsidy. •

Great Canfield Parish Council: Supports affordable housing and a mix of housing to suit people at all stages of life. It sees the main issue is ensuring the employment market matches this same variety of housing.

Great Chesterford Parish Council: A range of housing mix should be provided in all developments to ensure choice and affordability.

Great Dunmow Town Council: The main issue will spring from the SHMA in combination with the total amount of housing that may need to be provided. Any such additional housing may be in response to any agreement(s) reached through the Duty to Cooperate and/or revised demographic/household figures. A secondary issue will be whether and how the affordable housing is distributed across the district in order to meet any very specific local needs that may be identified.

Little Chesterford Parish Council: Housing support for key workers is necessary as housing prices in the district increase in excess of public sector wages. Smaller houses for first time buyers should feature prominently in any new developments. Housing suitable for older people who wish to downsize would also have the effect of letting some of the larger housing stock in the district be put up for sale. The type of housing that might be useful is bungalows with small gardens within existing communities so older people can remain within their support network. There is also a shortage of suitable housing both in the public and private sector for people with disabilities, especially those who are on disability benefits.

Little Easton Parish Council: More bungalows should be provided for elderly and disabled in the community. Affordable starter homes should be promoted and the total amount of executive homes should be restricted on each development. Social housing should be pepperpotted to avoid ghettos on the larger housing estates.

Newport Parish Council: A proportion of affordable housing should be included in all developments and should always be retained and not sold off in order to maintain the housing stock.

Quendon & Rickling Parish Council: Many Uttlesford residents are forced to commute to large towns in order to earn the incomes to afford properties in Uttlesford. Again, we come back to the ambiguity of the word “affordable”. Uttlesford is in dire need of both affordable homes that are for key workers on special schemes AS WELL AS cheaper, smaller homes for first time buyers, retired people looking to downsize (and free up larger homes) & stay locally as well as single people. There is a shortage of affordable apartments / maisonettes being built for the young, old, downsizers and the growing number of separated couples. across the district - why? Because they are not financially beneficial to developers! This type of housing should be a compulsory part of any larger developments and should not be allowed to be altered after planning permission is granted.

In the recent Parish Forum, it was highlighted that household sizes have reduced from over 4 to 2.2 - surely this, together with the declining affordability mentioned, should make UDC take note and insist on the provision of smaller, cheaper homes. Quendon and Rickling has a very current example of this problem with the development at Foxley House by Cala Homes. Here, the smaller 2 bedroom properties that were supposed to be included in the development have been replaced with 3 bedroom homes despite the dire need for smaller homes in our villages. It is up to planning to ensure that local housing needs are met and in this case, clearly this has NOT been done. Two new settlements will cater for a wide variety of housing to be provided to meet diverse housing needs and would ensure that the necessary facilities and infrastructure could be provided at the same time. This is far better than a “tack on the houses and hope for the best” strategy. With regard to Gypsy and Traveller sites - it is critical that local residents and their views are taken into account when assessing these sites.

Rayne Parish Council: The average occupancy of dwellings has dropped from 4 persons per dwelling to 2.2 persons. This will have a significant impact on the mix of dwelling types planned and what families can afford. There is capacity to consider new effective methods of build within the overall plan. These could offer significant benefits in terms of early availability and affordability. UDC should exercise a stronger degree of control over what developments should be granted permission to ensure they offer what is required by the residents of Uttlesford and not to line the pockets of the developers.

Saffron Walden Town Council: The main issue will spring from the SHMA in combination with the total amount of housing that may need to be provided. Any such additional housing may be in response to any agreement(s) reached through the Duty to Cooperate and/or revised demographic/household figures. A secondary issue will be whether and how the affordable housing is distributed across the district in order to meet any very specific local needs identified.

The Sampfords Parish Council: More affordable housing is required, especially in rural villages.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council: In Stansted Mountfitchet we require more small affordable homes for young people and more bungalows for those wishing to downsize at or after retirement. We have large numbers of larger family homes but new developments seem to add to this without providing the smaller/affordable/bungalow homes mentioned here (presumably because the larger family homes maximise the profit for developers). All

efforts should be made to safeguard a sustainable and proportionate level of affordable housing in any new development.

Stebbing Parish Council: Affordable housing / starter homes should be prioritised for local families, couples and single people. Key worker housing policy should be considered. Houses should not be available for London boroughs to purchase. Gypsy and Traveller sites should be spread equally throughout the district with consultation with the gypsy and traveller community themselves; otherwise they are simply not used.

Strethall Parish Meeting: UDC should concentrate on providing affordable homes of 1,2,3, bedroom in size and across the district and not large 4/5/6 bedroom homes which take up much more space and inevitably are less sustainable, make less of a social contribution and are economically less viable. Smaller homes need less space, provide accommodation for young singles, young couples and young families and, of course, if evenly spread provide an employment pool to both large and small employers across the whole district.

Takeley Parish Council: Advocates UDC resist selling Council owned housing. The Local Plan needs to reflect the future needs of the population. Advocates a requirement for developers to provide council housing stock. There should be provision for affordable rental property for those that do not wish to/ or are unable to own their own homes. In addition, UDC needs a strong policy on 'affordable' housing which abides by fixed minimums and does not deviate below the target. The target should be a minimum of 30% affordable (West Essex & Herts Strategic Market Assessment 5:90). UDC should explore innovative types of building. 'Affordable' should not be a byword for unimaginative red brick boxes that do nothing to enhance the character of the community or the lives of the people who live in them (as per parts of Takeley). Given the pressures on housing, education and services it is important that local needs as that of gypsies & travellers should be treated equally.

Thaxted Parish Council: Housing, especially affordable, should be built where the jobs are. Providing low cost housing should not be at the expense of design. Affordable housing should be 'tenure blind' with housing in new developments being built to the same specification and quality of build as open market housing. Affordable homes should be 'pepper potted' through new developments to support the sense of community. UDC should review the percentages of affordable housing required within new developments.

Ugley Parish Council: See Elsenham Parish Council's comments.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council: Housing development should focus on affordability for those living and working in the district. Priority should be given to developments which will cut the number of people on the Council waiting list for a council/housing association home. The building of four and five bedroomed homes should be low priority with new builds aiming to meet the actual housing need for one, two or three bed homes, to reflect the smaller household sizes. New housing also needs to take account of the local demographics. Mixed developments should be encouraged to promote the sense of community and integration. Please ensure that the impact of "Right to Buy" is considered within planning.

Widdington Parish Council: See Elsenham Parish Council's comments.

Wimbish Parish Council: Over the last 20 years or so, housing provision in Wimbish has increased by over 25%, half of which has been affordable housing. We believe that UDC

should do more to encourage affordable provision by the use of Rural Exception sites. This could have greater significance following the proposed changes to “Right to Buy” etc.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- Necessary to build across all housing tenures to meet the housing challenge
- The Plan should address the needs of older people and those with specific needs
- Policy must allow for sufficient flexibility to ensure viable developments
- Great consideration should be given to the provision of starter homes
- Affordable housing targets must be realistic
- Housing policy should align with the emerging aspiration of the housing and planning bill 2015
- LA should apply flexibility on affordable housing policy for small scale development sites
- Certainty that affordable housing requirements can be met
- Affordable housing must be of a high standard
- Developer promoting site at Andrewsfield stating they will provide a good mix of housing
- Developer promoting site at Chelmer Mead stating they will provide 40% affordable dwellings
- In accordance with the NPPF local plan policy must ensure an appropriate mix of affordable housing including starter homes
- Housing mix/demand will fluctuate over the plan period, it is important the policies are not overly prescriptive that they prevent developers from responding to market demands and conditions
- Different parts of the district have different needs regarding affordable housing
- The NPPF paragraph 14 emphasises that local plans should be flexible.
- New settlements will provide the best mix and opportunity to deliver a mix of tenures and affordable housing
- The higher housing target should be considered as this will enable higher delivery of affordable housing
- Viability is key
- Imperative that housing sites are delivered promptly to address existing shortfall of provision
- Developer promoting Kier site in Saffron Walden stating that they are supportive of housing mix policy
- Lifetimes homes should be a key part of housing policy
- Shared equity properties are encouraged
- The Council needs to update the viability assessment undertaken as part of the withdrawn plan
- In certain circumstances it may be needed to prioritise delivery of other types of infrastructure instead of affordable housing
- The plan must cater for self-build housing. The Planning Bill reinforces the government’s commitment to self-build.
- When developing policies UDC should give consideration to the potential future requirements of the Planning and Housing Bill

- The SHMA demonstrates that the majority of unmet need is for affordable rented properties and 2 – 3 bed.
- The Uttlesford local plan needs to help meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing the SMA
- The needs of those with disabilities must be considered
- Policy must reflect the commercial position
- Land owner promoting site at Pyes Farm stating that starter homes will be provided as part of the development
- All housing policies must be on conformity with national policy
- Policy should be drafted to make reference to viability and the cascade mechanism

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

A summary of these is set out below. Many merely stated that they wished to be associated with the views of Elsenham / Henham / Takeley / Ugley and Widdington Parish Councils, some emphasising that Area of Search 3 should be deleted following the last Local Plan Inspector's comments:

- "Affordable" is a misnomer. 80% of market rent is not affordable for those on typical local wages. Shared ownership/equity has the worst of both worlds and does not meet expectations. Social housing stock has to be increased to maintain communities, and retained in local authority ownership.
- Should consider affordable housing for first time buyers who have local roots or family ties.
- Far too many 4 or 5-bedroom houses have been allowed. Need a mix of housing types. Multi-storey dwellings and flats may be the answer to avoid using up agricultural land and to provide homes for local people.
- Very few affordable houses have been built by the Council.
- Developers don't consider the needs of elderly residents or downsizers, but who don't want to live in boxy starter homes with tiny gardens. Also need to consider sheltered housing and care homes.
- Should be stricter conditions on what constitutes care facilities and sheltered accommodation for the over 55s.
- Must be within easy reach of public transport as car ownership can't be assumed.
- Do need to be realistic about car ownership, and provide adequate off-road car parking.
- Affordable housing must be in urban areas where cheap public transport is accessible as well as educational facilities and also medical facilities. Development in the more rural areas will increase car ownership which will not help families in more difficult financial situations.
- Allocate plots for self-build.
- More use should be made of building above shops and offices.
- Encourage shared ownership schemes. Eco-co-housing ventures for the young and old would satisfy a great need. Create viable communities, linking houses with jobs and businesses. Pointless building affordable housing where there is little or no local employment.

- Villages (especially Type B) are unsuitable for low-cost housing. Makes no economic sense to locate low earning families in the more remote parts of the district where living costs are higher.
- Useless to build affordable housing, as once it is sold market forces will raise prices. Money raised via the sale of council / social housing must be reinvested to build more.
- Affordable to buy is possible if the developer is allowed to build and sell others at market value, but may be difficult for young people. Affordable housing will only succeed if the Government controls land prices.
- Very small blocks of local authority flats may help younger people. Also bungalows. Should resist claims that bungalows are not profitable.
- Councils must invest in council houses and not leave to housing associations. Hard to see how affordable housing can be provided against the prevailing market forces. Autumn Statement makes it less likely that private landlords will provide affordable rented accommodation.
- Need mixed developments, not affordable ghettos.
- Affordable should not mean settling for houses that are not energy efficient. Must press developers to employ the latest technologies to design zero / low CO² houses. Affordable should not just mean price – also running costs.
- Should remain affordable by preventing major extension or enlargement.
- Post-war council house scheme is a good model of small scale additions to villages.
- Tax land profits to subsidise building costs. Need ownership by non-profit organisations.
- All new Saffron Walden developments are unaffordable for local people, creating a commuter town environment and adversely affecting jobs and retail businesses.
- Need to take into account the Government's new Right to Buy scheme which will allow council and housing association tenants to buy their homes at below-market prices.
- Each proposal must be assessed against the infrastructure and facilities locally available and the impact on the existing community.
- No housing should be available to London boroughs.
- Travellers' sites should be spread throughout the district. There does not appear to be any provision for them in the plan.
- Government guidelines state that no development should take place under airport flightpaths – this should include the A120 corridor.
- The Council will have done its housing needs assessment and should be able to judge where the greatest needs lie. The Planning Department needs more resources so it can challenge so-called viability assessments.
- Affordable homes are needed throughout the district, which is probably the biggest single reason not to go for a new settlement and /or add-ons to existing settlements. Needed for those in low paid jobs at Stansted Airport and those in essential public services. Better transport links needed to Stansted for local employees.
- Keep to the existing 60/40 mix of open market vs affordable housing. The Council should not permit any variation to the original number of affordable houses agreed in a planning permission.
- Problem where developers delay construction in order to limit supply and maintain higher prices.

- Plan should provide for compulsory purchase of land at agricultural value in villages where is proven demand. It could encourage smaller builders to co-operate in a joint scheme.
- Saffron Walden has a higher proportion of affordable housing than does Cambridge and is thus a suitable town from whence to commute (adding to its traffic congestion). I think the mix is about right at the moment - we have people of all ages and requirements finding suitable accommodation, but not roads or education.
- S106 contributions are not a substitute for affordable housing in developments.
- If housing is to be constructed it must be worthwhile for landowners to release land and housebuilders to develop, so the real ways to improve affordability are to increase supply, particularly of housing capable of being rented.
- Developers should not be allowed just to build the high value properties first.
- An independent housing needs survey needs to be carried out in each location.
- The Council shouldn't be opposing Right to Buy for social housing tenants as many local Housing Associations do not look after their stock and treat their tenants poorly. Right to buy will enable people not only to look after their own home but make the necessary improvements the Housing Associations won't. The Council should carry out its own reviews of Housing Association tenants to ensure the properties are maintained to higher standards than they are presently.

Some individual comments relate to specific developments or places:

- No facilities initially at Flich Green. Planning / enforcement needs to be more rigorous in the future.
- Developments in the Felsted area have been for larger 3 & 4-bed houses. Need more smaller properties.
- Delay in the construction of the Dunmow NW bypass was poor planning.
- Horrid to see detached houses taking all the space and affordable houses in flats on the least favoured part of the estate (Peaslands Road, Saffron Walden).
- Great Chesterford proposed settlement area cannot take any more housing due to congestion.
- Stebbing's appeal as an historic beautiful village could make it less likely for developers to build low-cost homes and young, local residents could be even further priced-out of the area.
- You have it right in Orchard Crescent.
- Concern that most new housing in the Dunmow area is aimed at high-earning, two income families. The Council's primary responsibility should be towards local people. Where it is not practical to discourage building for affluent commuters or buy to let speculation, higher than average financial contributions should be sought to bolster Dunmow's infrastructure. CIL should be implemented so the Town Council can spend its allocation on town projects.
- More sheltered housing needed in Clavering.
- Complaints that council housing in Saffron Walden was poorly maintained – unacceptable given the wealth of the Council. The Council should rebuild its stock when sold off, and maintained to high standards.
- Self-build is a key element to affordable housing
- Key working housing should be an integral part to the plan
- Care homes are needed for an aging population

- Joint discussions with town and parish council to ensure local affordable housing need is met
- Increasing housing supply will make homes more affordable

Question 7

Leisure, Recreation, and Open Space

What do you think are the main issues the Council should consider in relation to Leisure, Recreation, and Open Space?

This question was responded to by 396 people/organisations. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Historic England consider that historic buildings, parks, sites and routes contribute towards leisure, recreation and open space and should be protected and enhanced wherever possible.

The Environment Agency considers that the Local Plan should recognise the multi-functional benefits of Green Infrastructure and Open Space. For instance, policies should promote Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as the first method of surface water disposal and Green Infrastructure as part of this, for example, promoting de-culverting, creation and management of ecological buffer strips and corridors, new wetland areas to help manage flood risk and reduce diffuse pollution, whilst reconnecting people with nature. Reference should be made to the Biodiversity Planning Toolkit in preparing the Local Plan.

Natural England recommends that provision of open space should, as a minimum, meet our Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt).

Essex County Council suggest that locating new settlements close to historic open spaces can have a detrimental impact on them and needs to be planned carefully to ensure that the significance and setting of these heritage assets are retained, whilst also providing open spaces for people's enjoyment. They recommended that UDC promote mixed use development, encouraging multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, and recognising that some open land can perform many functions. Furthermore they recommend that areas of Open Space and recreation provide Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) which promote infiltration of water, minimising the incidence of surface water flooding. It is also important that the Plan recognises the cycle network in the district alongside the network of footpaths and bridleways.

Sport England commends the use of their various published guidance on the development of Local Plan policies, planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, and master planning process for new residential developments. They are concerned that the emerging Uttlesford Sports Strategy 2015 is not a robust and up to date evidence base and will be inadequate to inform the relevant policies.

The National Trust considers that the Plan needs to include an effective strategic approach which will include the knitting together of existing and new green infrastructure that transcends urban and rural spaces but also new spaces/ and improvement of existing provision which are currently substandard. The Plan should also recognise the potential of neighbouring areas to mutually benefit from such green infrastructure provision. The

distribution of such facilities and the network in which they can connect will be important for ensuring equality of access and remove unnecessary burdens on any single individual facility, such as Hatfield Forest, in terms of protecting its value for the future.

Essex Wildlife Trust state that there is a need for the creation of at least one new country park in the district as there is a current identified shortfall of natural, accessible open space. There is also a need for a more coherent network of ecologically functional wildlife corridors linking existing priority habitats. The Council should use existing measureable standards for Green Infrastructure in policy development as they provide both a starting point for the outcomes of plan policy and a clear framework to measure progress over time. Similar comments have been received from **Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group**.

The Stebbing Society consider that the Council should protect and maintain the rural, open spaces that our Community currently enjoys and values and not approve such large scale settlements that would be wholly inappropriate and destructive to this environment. Existing footpaths/bridleways etc should be protected and not encompassed by housing development and should continue to be easily accessible and within walking distance of our community. There should be a proper mix of Leisure and Recreational facilities for all ages and again the scale of these should be in proportion to the size of the development.

The Thaxted Society suggests that access to the countryside is a sustainable option. All urban green space should be protected and the society discourages further provision of urban space as this distorts the vernacular setting and confirms urban primacy. Policy should reflect planning requirements for provision of paths and walks access to the surrounding countryside rather than green space within.

The Essex Bridleway Association wishes to see a pro-active stance taken by the Council in ensuring that the protection of the existing Rights of Way and the creation, where practicable, of multi-user paths linked to major developments, which can be legally used by ALL users whether pedestrians, cyclists or horse riders.

Birchanger Wood Trust considers that there needs to be a viable integrated plan with lit pedestrian, cycle and buggy routes to link each Leisure, Recreation, and Open Space with each new Development site and existing residential areas/hubs.

Friends of the Flitch Way ask that UDC take a more active role in the establishment of the Dunmow link as part of the reinstatement of the flitch way around Dunmow town joining the two sections of the existing route. This project could be given a priority status in the coming financial year 2016 - an endeavour that would fulfil both recreational, leisure and open space use for the local population.

The Trustees of Gardens of Easton Lodge considers that large-scale development will need to provide formal and informal recreation opportunities. The Gardens of Easton Lodge are Grade 2 listed and are of local, district and wider importance. Area of search 7 would border the Gardens, areas 8 and 9 are close by, and there are several areas of search within and around Great Dunmow. The Land Securities owned part of the Gardens of Easton Lodge should remain accessible to the general public for informal leisure activities.

The Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group comment that there will never be enough facilities and the matter is covered in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group reiterates the comments made by Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council – see below.

Helena Romanes Secondary School consider that policies for the long term security of suitable, attractive sports facilities around schools should be provided within the Local Plan and any site allocations.

Saffron Walden Skate Group and Hub Management Committee wish to see accessibility to the whole community and a recreational strategy based on the views of residents.

The **Hundred Parishes Society** asks that the Council encourage and facilitate enjoyment of the area through the provision of information about places and by encouraging maintenance and use of Public Rights of Way. Any new development should respect and, where possible, enhance such amenities and the provision of information.

Friends of the Earth (Saffron Walden branch) considers that the Council needs to adopt a strategy that maximises the provision rather than losing it through piecemeal development.

Sustainable Uttlesford considers that the plan should improve access to informal open space possibly using the existing network of public footpaths and rights of way and increase the provision of publicly maintained sports grounds.

Hands off Thaxted consider that all developments should include adequate open space. A new settlement should be sited near to existing leisure and recreational facilities where possible. Consultation with local residents will identify to what extent these facilities are required and, equally importantly, whether existing facilities are used.

We are Residents requests that the Local Plan makes full provision for the needs identified in the January 2012 Open Space, Sport Facility and Playing Pitch Strategy. The new Plan needs to adopt a CIL -based approach which plans properly for infrastructure and ensures that all development contributes, whether large or small.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Great Dunmow Town Council consider that sufficient work has already been done to enable the specific requirements, in terms of both facilities and standards associated with new development to be met.

Saffron Walden Town Council consider that sufficient work has already been done to enable the specific requirements, in terms of both facilities and standards associated with new development to be met. UDC should however note the lack of leisure, recreation and open space, and the fact that the Developer Contributions Guide does not provide for the space identified as required in its Open Spaces evidence base. The Town Council believe that the Community Infrastructure Levy is much more likely to provide proper infrastructure.

Birchanger Parish Council considers that recreational areas be easily reachable with good off road parking.

Clavering Parish Council considers that all existing public rights of way need to be retained and the Council should consider including Green Wedges to the countryside in the Plan.

Elsenham Parish Council, Henham Parish Council, Ugley Parish Council and Widdington Parish Council consider that the existing major leisure facilities at Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and Stansted Mountfitchet should be another factor in deciding the location of future development.

Felsted Parish Council and **Newport Parish Council** consider that additional leisure and recreational facilities should be included in any developments.

Great Canfield Parish Council wishes to ensure that children in particular have access to suitable open space. The current piece-meal planning can result in open space and particularly indoor public leisure facilities being overlooked

Great Easton & Tilty Parish Council consider that sufficient open space should be provided being mindful of the need for footpaths and bridleways especially with the increased traffic on local roads and rural lanes.

Little Easton Parish Council and **Quendon and Rickling Parish Council** consider that the open space should be part of the development and provide space within the development.

Stebbing Parish Council considers that sports facilities are essential and that footpaths bridleways and byways need to be protected and not wedged in-between houses on new estates.

Strethall Parish Meeting considers that the Plan should protect, improve, maintain and enhance. A brand new settlement in the countryside is not considered the answer. They note that the Icknield Way footpath traverses Area 2 and is much used for recreational purposes.

The **Sampfords Parish council** considers that the consultation document sufficiently covers the issue.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council comments that the proximity to open countryside is an important component of leisure/recreation in the village and needs to be protected as the village develops. The creation of meaningful and useful Public Open Space should be an integrated part of site development with land for sustainable drainage being additional and not inclusive. New pedestrian and cycle routes should create circular routes connecting to existing networks. There is strong support from residents for a swimming pool at the leisure centre in Stansted. Land requirements should take account of Natural England's Access to Natural Green Space initiative. A strategic approach is needed to the buffer zones around settlements particularly in the areas between Bishop's Stortford, Birchanger, Stansted Mountfitchet and Elsenham. New development can make farming on retained land uneconomic and conversion to structural open space may be a viable and sustainable alternative. Blue and Green Infrastructure should be the backbone of any open space strategy.

Takeley Parish Council advocates that a Green Structure Plan be kept up to date in order to strategically plan to meet the needs of an increasing population. They note that there is pressure on existing open spaces, such as Hatfield Forest. The Parish Council would support a policy that encourages developers to enhance existing open spaces. UDC should

improve the criteria/specifications for informal and formal recreational spaces. The Parish Council consider that it is imperative that the Countryside Protection Zone around the airport is maintained.

Thaxted Parish Council comments that the recent UDC Sports Strategy should be used to inform the main issues; that CIL would assist with provision; that access to facilities is difficult; that development of smaller scale facilities across the District is required; and that publicly subsidised facilities should be encouraged.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council states that the minimum consideration should be retaining what currently exists.

Rayne Parish Council (Braintree District) asks that every effort has to be made to protect the facilities currently planned or already in place. S106 funding must include ongoing running costs as well as the initial capital cost. Alternatively, contributions could be directed to the refurbishment and/or running costs of any current facility, removing the focus on capital projects.

Great Chesterford Parish Council raises no comments on this question.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

The general view from developers is that developments should include high quality, multifunctional open spaces and suitable access to opportunities for recreation and leisure, meeting all needs, either within the site or nearby to facilities which can be further developed and expanded to meet the needs of a growing population.

In the context that much provision will be provided by landowners and developers rather than the Council, it is imperative that recreational provision is commensurate with the amount of development coming forward in accordance with CIL regulations. As such this may not address existing deficiencies and gaps in provision.

Those developers promoting new settlements argue that new open space is best provided for as part of a comprehensively planned new settlement with sufficient critical mass to deliver the quantity and quality of new open space required.

Other developers suggest that policy should support the enhancement and maintenance of existing provision and the extension of such facilities which are located in larger settlements with higher concentrations of population and can be accessed by sustainable means.

An issue raised relates to finding the appropriate future management arrangements and adoptions.

Policies should not set blanket standards as they can inhibit the development potential of some sites and in doing so limit the benefits that can arise for that development.

One developer considers that providing leisure, recreation and open space within the site in addition to the garden sizes and parking standards required by the Council this can cause difficulties in maintaining the viability of the site.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

The following general comments were made

- Existing facilities should be protected and enhanced
- New footpaths, cycle ways and bridleways should be built. Such routes could be multi-user by equestrians, cyclists, runners and walkers.
- The Plan needs to recognise that large scale development will require either new sport facilities within the district or upgrade of existing facilities. Proper provision on or near sites will reduce the need to drive to participate in activities.
- The provision of smaller sized facilities that do not require large population to use them or multiple-use facilities will help viability.
- Development of a new settlement or extending existing settlements will impact on the availability and attractiveness of footpaths and bridleways. The rural character of the areas needs to be retained and that open space and not just playing fields are included in the developments.
- Policies should support the unique character of the area such as the museum, historic buildings, woodlands in recognition of their part in attracting visitors to the towns and countryside.
- A strategic focus on sporting activity should cover the competitive and leisure ends of the sporting spectrum. Facilities in the towns will cater for a large proportion of the population, but not to forget the smaller and specialist sports activities and satellite communities.
- There should be consultation with the community to find out what facilities people want. Town and Parish Council's should be consulted on facilities such as children's play areas
- Policy should ensure that recreation provision is provided during a site's construction and not as an add-on at a later period.
- A number of people supported the response made by Henham/ Elsenham/ Ugley and Widdington Parish Councils.
- A number of people made the same response as that of the Saffron Walden Branch of Friends of the Earth.

Question 9: Other Areas of Search

Are there any other potential Areas of Search not shown in Figure 1 which should be assessed by the Council?

This question was responded to by 207 people/organisations. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Historic England We do not have any other potential areas of search to suggest, but request that historic environment issues are considered with each area of search.

Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways No comment at this stage. ECC welcomes discussions if new locations are proposed following this consultation.

Birchanger Wood Trust Areas 4 and 5 should be totally excluded.

Essex Bridleways Association No comment

Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group There should be a new M11 Intersection 8A between Quendon and Rickling and Newport to access the area centrally between Elsenham, Thaxted and Debden.

Hands Off Thaxted In view of the position of the M11 and main line railway stations : the area between Newport and Stansted and the area between Audley End and Area 2

Stebbing Society More emphasis be placed on the M11 corridor, particularly further north. Consequently AOS 1,2 and 4 should be enlarged accordingly to be more in line with AOS 7,8 and 9, thereby more directly supporting the employment needs of both Cambridge and Stansted. A further AOS should be investigated around M11/A11 interchange at Junction 9.

Sustainable Uttlesford Has consideration been given with South Cambs district to locations to the north of the district that could be accessed from the A1307?

Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group We do not propose any further areas of search.

We Are Residents We are not aware of any

Clavering Parish Council Greater consideration should be given to areas along M11 routes, where improvements in Jn 8 would offer true accessibility to London by both road and rail from the airport.

Felsted Parish Council No comment

Great Chesterford Parish Council In order to ensure a thorough and comprehensive assessment is undertaken it is considered that all locations for a new settlement should be included in the initial assessment

Great Dunmow Town Council None have been identified.

Great Easton & Tilty Parish Council The north east and north west of the District should also be considered as extra potential areas of search.

Little Chesterford Parish Council Little Chesterford Parish Council is concerned that AOS for new settlement appear to be located at the northern and southern edges of the district, and not around more central key villages, where the benefits would be felt within Uttlesford

Newport Parish Council No other areas.

Rayne Parish Council The current schematics show a few centres for development and a strong preference to development in the south-east of the District..

Saffron Walden Town Council None have been identified.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council We do not propose any further areas of search.

Stebbing Parish Council AOS 1,2,4,and 5 should be larger to be more in proportion with 7, 8 and 9 to meet the provision of Cambridge and Stansted employment needs A further area of search between north of Audley End estate and Great Chesterford should be added because of its good transport links to both London and South Cambridgeshire via the M11 / A11 and its easy access to mainline rail links.

Strethall Parish Meeting No

Takeley Parish Council TPC advocates a fresh call for sites in the north of the district that are of sufficient scale and accessibility that they could be considered for provision of a new settlement.

The Sampfords Parish Council No other areas of search are required.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

Area of Search No. 9 should be amended to reflect the site boundaries for land promoted by Capita P&I on behalf of ANSC for Andrewsfield Garden Village, along with land south and east of Bosted Wood.

The new settlement option should also encompass major growth of existing settlements

Where there is an Area of Search for a New Settlement abutting or in the vicinity of an existing settlement, as at Stebbing, then the whole settlement should be included in the AoS notation on Figure 1.

Quendon & Rickling, Newport.

Possible southern extension to at Silicon Fen

WNW of Newport, West of the M11.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

The following general comments were made:

- West of M11
- The area of Hadstock, near the Cambridgeshire border,
- There is land to the east of Area 1 towards Linton which could be considered.
- There should be scope for infilling/development of the smaller Type B villages too.
- The area around Audley End
- Around the railway stations such as Audley End.
- The areas of search need to be far more even in size. If the major sources of employment are expected to be Stansted Airport and spin-off from Cambridge then there should be a more equitable size of development.
- The northern most blue new settlement area could be extended further south towards Little Chesterford.
- A new village / habitation should be considered NE of Saffron Walden and N of Thaxted
- Clavering might be a possibility
- The area north of Newport up to Audley End Station should be considered.
- A new town development to the east or west of Newport
- Anywhere with access to good road and rail links and with good schools, healthcare and water.
- The area to the far north could be investigated as this would be convenient for M11, Cambridge, Newmarket.
- There should be consideration of more areas around the M11.
- Provided an eastern bypass could be built and the other supporting infrastructure provided I would have thought that Saffron Walden would benefit from some housing development in that area.
- The west of the district is close to Royston for rail links and the A10 for road links. The East and North East both have access to road networks out of the district to Cambridge, Haverhill, Braintree etc. None of these 3 areas appear to have been considered. Areas of Search do not have to be confined to the M11/A120 corridors or the Cambridge to Liverpool Street rail link.
- Attention should be paid to Chelmsford via the A1060, Haverhill and other places accessed via the A1307/A134 and the proximity of Harlow to areas in the centre and south of the district. Leaden Roding could be a focal point for Dunmow (and A120) and Chelmsford (and A414/A12) The area between Steeple Bumpstead and New England should be assessed for significant housing and employment development.
- Along the M11 corridor possibly between Newport and Gt. Chesterford
- The M11 corridor from Bishop's Stortford to Great Chesterford
- Areas to the north east and north west of our district need to be considered for new and significant settlements.
- Why are there no new settlement areas of search near the Epping Forest boundary?
- The three key villages of Hatfield Heath, Newport and Thaxted are included in Table 1 Settlement Hierarchy but are not amongst the Areas of Search.

- The council should be identifying an area for a single settlement as its major centre for new housing based in the North (Stumps Cross area), the South West (in conjunction with the proposed new junction 7A) the South East along the line of the A120.
- Access south of Newport at the crossing of B1383 and M11, with a new settlement to the south-east of Newport which would have Newport station in the vicinity. Access west of Newport at the crossing of B1038 (not shown on the map) and M11, with a new settlement to the north-west of the new crossing and access to either Audley End or Newport station via a new link road.
- I would suggest major improvements to the B184 (Thaxted/Dunmow Roads) and opening up the search to include areas along this route too.
- Despite Saffron Walden being a protected area by Audley Estate land there could be an AoS to the north of the town which would provide links to the M11, A11 and the rail routes.
- Why are there not any areas of search with the borders of Epping and Chelmsford?
- Areas of Search 1, 2, 4 and 5 should be extended as they are proximate to the Cambridge and Stansted employment growth areas. A further search area near Great Chesterford should be added due to its good transport links.
- It's noticeable that very few locations west of the M11 are included.
- Further AOS around key villages in the centre of the district should be considered.
- The Council should consider Areas of Search around the Key villages of Thaxted, Newport, Hatfield Heath and Stansted Mountfitchet.
- AOS 1,2,4, and 5 should be larger to be more in proportion with 7, 8 and 9 to meet the provision of Cambridge and Stansted employment needs.
- The joining of the new properties at Takeley with Woodlands Park would seem an obvious choice.
- An additional area of search should be between north of Audley End Estate and Great Chesterford.
- An additional Area of Search could be introduced north of Saffron Walden.
- There are possible development areas to the north of the Bishops Stortford ring road towards Farnham, and in the vicinity of Great Chesterford.
- There should be an Area of Search nearer Thaxted
- Chrishall to the North West, giving good access to the A505 / M11 / A10. Stebbing to the South East, giving good access to the A120 (and onto the Airport and the M11) and the A131 to Chelmsford.
- Near to Whittlesford/Chesterford/Stumps Cross. A14, A11, M11, Main railway line to Cambridge and London all intersect here
- Develop on a proportionate basis across the district adding to existing settlements and the major towns.
- The area around Farnham, North of Bishop's Stortford,
- Not clear why the road north between Elsenham and Gt Chesterford is not considered
- Concerned that AoS for a New Settlement have not been identified around or near to all key villages in the District including Thaxted, Newport, Hatfield Heath and Stansted Mountfitchet.
- Note that the area of Quendon and Rickling has been left out.

- The whole of Uttlesford Â should have been a search area.
- There are large areas in the North West and North East of the district where no developments have been proposed.
- Areas along the M11 corridor are the most obvious choice for new housing developments.
- The area between Clavering and Chrishall is a possibility to be looked at.

- **Question 10**

New Settlements

What do you think about the principle of a new settlement in providing for the future development needs of the District?

This question was responded to by 538 people/organisations. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Highways England There could be some advantages in a new settlement it gives the opportunity to design in sustainable transport objectives from the start rather than try to retrofit something. The difficulty always comes with trying to ensure that services and infrastructure comes on stream at the correct time to soak up the generated demand.

Historic England A new settlement could relieve pressure on existing towns and villages, but would need to be in a location that minimised harm to heritage assets and the wider historic environment.

Natural England Natural England considers that new settlements may be preferable to the over- development of existing settlements, which may place excessive strain on their infrastructure. However any new settlement needs to incorporate the full range of supporting infrastructure (including green infrastructure) and, crucially, this infrastructure must be put into place at a very early stage.

Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways ECC is broadly supportive of a new settlement providing for the future development and wider needs of the local community. In seeking to ensure the delivery of a sustainable new settlement, it is recommended that UDC involve ECC at an early stage given our role as a key delivery partner in developing proposals, and shaping the mechanisms for delivery. The development of new settlements often enables the infrastructure necessary to support the new population, including new schools, to be planned appropriately through a comprehensive masterplan. ECC considers that the location of any future settlement within UDC should reflect future economic growth aspirations. As well as the distribution of housing, it is recommended that UDC ensure that the tenure and mix of new housing reflects the needs of existing and future residents. Connectivity and the viability of sustainable transportation delivery to the key employment centres (within and outside UDC) from the new housing development should also be considered. Â ECC recommends that if UDC considers future growth in close proximity to the A120, then consideration should be given to contributions to improvements along the corridor. Further consideration should also be given to the mechanism for planning and securing any such contributions. ECC welcomes further discussions on the locations for new settlement(s) in UDC. ECC recommends that consideration be given to proposals for any new settlement that may straddle the administrative boundary of UDC.

Hertfordshire County Council Any new settlement should provide sufficient primary and secondary school places to meet the need arising from the proposed housing.

South Cambridgeshire District Council This Council considers that new settlements can make a sustainable contribution to meeting objectively assessed housing and employment needs in appropriate circumstances and in appropriate locations. The emerging Uttlesford Local Plan will need to give careful consideration to the appropriateness of a new settlement close to the boundary with South Cambridgeshire and its impacts on and relationship to the southern part of South Cambridgeshire. The A1301 and A1307 are heavily used towards Cambridge and the transport impacts of new developments in the northern part of Uttlesford need to be fully understood to inform future decision making.

Birchanger Wood Trust I believe this to be a really good idea, except how do we convince both the Government and Developers that no other sites will be approved until the 'biggy' is released.

Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation Given the development pressures facing East Herts and Epping Councils in the south and South Cambridgeshire in the north we suggest that this is a strategic issue which goes beyond simply meeting the identified housing demand in Uttlesford over the next 20 years.

Essex Wildlife Trust New settlements provide the opportunity to masterplan GI and create new wildlife habitat, link up existing sites, address Water Framework Directive requirements by including projects to enhance river habitats where appropriate, and provide new areas of accessible natural green space for public enjoyment.

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group New development must be as sustainable as possible, and this means minimising energy consumption in buildings, in transport, everywhere, minimising travel with all . Any wholly new free-standing settlement on greenfield land would be so deficient in local facilities that it could never be regarded as sustainable.

Friends of the Earth Not aware of any evidence showing that the new homes required can be accommodated sustainably in either the existing towns or villages or a combination of them. A new settlement, if located and built correctly appears to be the only option

Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group The new Local Plan should look at a new settlement or settlements rather than damage these towns allowing them to lose their character by over development. The best way to preserve these assets is to let the towns and villages grow at a slow pace and introduce new settlements in areas of beauty that are currently only available to the few.

Great Saling Action Group New development must be as sustainable as possible, and this means minimising energy consumption in buildings, in transport, everywhere, minimising travel.. Any wholly new free-standing settlement on greenfield land would be so deficient in local facilities that it could never be regarded as sustainable.

Hands Off Thaxted More than 1 new settlement may result in inadequate funding for infrastructure putting more pressure on already overloaded existing infrastructure. 1 new settlement will likely be the most sustainable and thus the least harmful The new settlement should be located where there are good transport links and away from areas of existing road congestion.

National Trust Not opposed to general principle where site settlements are appropriately located.

Stansted Airport The airport has no specific view on the principle of a new settlement in place of, or in addition to expanding existing towns.

Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group The principle of one or more new settlements in the District providing for future development needs should certainly be kept in as an option at this stage so that further feasibility work can be carried out before reaching conclusions.

Stebbing Society We are concerned about the capacity of our local infrastructure to support such large levels of development and as we stated above we believe that before any developments and their size are decided, there should be full Environmental/Infrastructure Appraisals undertaken to ensure that the right acceptable balance is achieved between the development and the associated local infrastructure, transport systems, employment opportunities and protection of the environment. Opposed to new settlement at Boxted Wood.

Sustainable Places - Planning Officer We consider that any new settlements should seek to follow the Garden Cities model promoted by The Town and Country Planning Association, with sustainability being the principal driver.

Sustainable Uttlesford Sustainable Uttlesford considers that a New Settlement is the most sustainable solution to Uttlesford's housing provision issue so long as it part of a longer term ie 30 years strategy. This would enable the new settlement to be delivered over a period of two local plans and to ultimately to provide 10,000 homes, employment land, schools, other public infrastructure including cycleways and footpaths, a viable public transport network along with leisure facilities and public open space.

The Ickleton Society In our view one or more new settlements would be very problematic for a number of reasons: The number of houses required to be built over the period does not seem to be large enough to make such new settlements viable. It is difficult to build a new settlement on land that is not Greenfield and which is not good quality agricultural land whereas smaller developments on the edges of towns and villages can make use of brownfield and lower quality land.

We Are Residents On the evidence that UDC has so far produced; a new settlement appears to be the only potentially sustainable solution for the remaining 3,000 new homes to be identified. It may well be that more than one new settlement is required, particularly given the actual likely housing requirement.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Arkesden PC Arkesden Parish Council believes that the only possible solution to meet the expected housing needs in the district is for one or more new settlements. This will ensure proper planning from the outset with new infrastructure carefully planned. Any new settlement will give the Council the opportunity to lead the way with a Garden Village type development, whereby the Council decides where development should take place and what mix of housing there should be.

Birchanger Parish Council If this line is followed development should be self-contained, not impacting on existing villages, also with good transport links, either existing or to be provided.

Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation Given the development pressures facing East Herts and Epping Councils in the south and South Cambridgeshire in the north we suggest that this is a strategic issue which goes beyond simply meeting the identified housing demand in Uttlesford over the next 20 years.

Broxted Parish Council The Council is not convinced that one or two extremely large new settlements is a satisfactory solution to the need to provide the necessary new housing. Wherever they are situated it would have a devastating effect on local towns and villages, and many of the Areas of Search listed contain irreplaceable landscape and historical features.

Clavering Parish Council A new settlement must address all infrastructure needs with provision for future expansion

Debden Parish Council Debden Parish Council would be minded towards a single settlement providing the necessary infrastructure is put in place, particularly schools.

Elmdon & Wendens Lofts Parish Council Building a new settlement to satisfy a large proportion of the housing needs for the whole District appears to be a flawed solution. People requiring accommodation near to their place of work and their families are unlikely to relocate to the other side of the District. On the basis that a new settlement in one place would not solve the needs of the whole District, it would therefore provide more accommodation than required locally.

Elsenham Parish Council Urban extensions offer the following advantages over new settlements, they are likely to be: more sustainable with access to existing services, employment, schooling, retailing etc, and can access those facilities as the urban extension grows, eventually providing additional facilities. more deliverable in the short/medium term incrementally utilising existing infrastructure and transport links with additional infrastructure/transport added as development proceeds. A new settlement would have to start delivering housing quickly if the five year housing supply is to be maintained.

Felsted Parish Council Believe that this is the wrong approach. Whilst the simplicity of a single new development is perhaps attractive in decision making, the reality is that individual major new settlements are an unreliable way of providing housing they do not reach a sustainable size for decades, which is often used as an excuse for delaying some of the infrastructure. Small local developments will still be needed in different areas of the District to provide for local needs.

Great Canfield Parish Council Parish Council is of the view that a a new settlement would provide the opportunity for proper planning to ensure that required infrastructure (rail and road links) is in place, including, leisure facilities and open spaces.

Great Chesterford Parish Council Great Chesterford Parish Council considers that a new settlement is unlikely to come forward within the plan period. An over-reliance on a new

settlement strategy will not deliver adequate housing in the short term and this will lead to increased speculative planning proposals.

Great Dunmow Town Council The potential scope for a new settlement was made very clear by the local plan Inspector in his conclusions on the previous draft plan. Seek a phased delivery of housing through the plan period such that it is lower than the average in the early years but well in excess of the average in the later years. This would reflect the practicalities of planning and delivering a new settlement.

Great Hallingbury Parish Council We do not favour the loss of more countryside to building on a large scale, we also believe it would be neither practical nor fair for any village to be expanded to a great extent. Therefore the proposals for a new 'Garden Village' with its own facilities and infrastructure appear to make much sense. Great Dunmow has already taken a great number of new housing, and numbers 7, 8 and 9 around Great Dunmow would create additional problems with increased traffic on the A120 and Junction 8 of the M11. The Areas 1 & 2 at Great Chesterford seem to be in the most favourable position.

Great Saling Parish Council Whilst we do not consider New Settlements to be required if they are we comment as follows. Any New Settlement must have good transport links ie M11 2. Any New Settlement must be as close to areas of employment as possible ie Stansted- Bishops Stortford and Cambridge. Any New Settlement must not result in existing Villages or Towns being absorbed or coalesced. Any New Settlement must not be to the detriment of the character of this rural environment.

Henham Parish Council Urban extensions offer the following advantages over new settlements, they are likely to be: more sustainable with access to existing services, employment, schooling, retailing etc, and can access those facilities as the urban extension grows, eventually providing additional facilities. more deliverable in the short/medium term incrementally utilising existing infrastructure and transport links with additional infrastructure/transport added as development proceeds. Urban extensions and new settlements are both advocated as options for larger scale development and both can display the principles of Garden Cities. A sequential test for additional housing must surely be as follows: examine spare capacity within existing urban areas consider the capacity of sustainable urban extensions to the Market Towns and Key Villages. Only if there is a substantial shortfall would new settlements be a realistic option. A new settlement is very unlikely to be considered as sustainable unless it can support a new secondary school. New settlements can take many years before they deliver meaningful numbers of new housing because of the scale of the project and the need for advance infrastructure.

Little Chesterford Parish Council Not opposed to a new settlement in principle but opposed to the two proposed in the vicinity to Great Chesterford. Stansted is the area's largest employer it makes more sense to locate any new development closer to the airport. Any new development should provide all the facilities required for the development to limit car usage.

Little Easton Parish Council Think that there is no sustainable alternative to the new settlement approach to introduce the volume of homes needed now and to provide potential growth locations for the next local plan period (15-30 years). One or more new villages

should be provided in areas with good access to railway stations, places of employment and motorways.

Little Hallingbury Parish Council While we do not favour losing more countryside to building on a large scale, we also understand that it would be neither practical nor fair for any village to be expanded to a great extent. Therefore the proposals for a new 'Garden Village' with its own facilities and infrastructure appear to make much sense.

Newport Parish Council We believe a new settlement would be the most appropriate solution and provide the necessary infrastructure which is totally lacking at the present time.

Quendon & Rickling Parish Council Quendon & Rickling PC are in support of 2 new settlements to provide the 12500 homes and corresponding infrastructure needed in the district - this cannot be achieved through windfall sites, brownfield sites and infilling. The infrastructure for this huge number of homes needs to be in place prior to occupancy so that it can meet the massive demand for services that will be generated by this number of new homes

Rayne Parish Council . - Various suggestions have been made in the Consultation supported by information in the Sustainability document. - These are complex issue and it is thought unreasonable to expect members of the public to have a formulated and effective response to such.

Saffron Walden Town Council The potential scope for a new settlement was made very clear by the local plan Inspector in his conclusions on the previous draft local plan. It appears, on the evidence available to us, to be the only potentially sustainable solution to the housing allocation numbers proposed. One issue that the consultation document avoids is that, assuming there is to be a new settlement, it will not be possible to deliver it in the short-term. Seek a phased delivery of housing through the plan period such that it is lower than the average in the early years but well in excess of the average in the later years. This would reflect the practicalities of planning and delivering a new settlement.

The Sampfords Parish Council The Parish Council agrees with new settlements, especially as it is considered that Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow are small towns which should not be burdened with any further development over and above that already committed.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council A New Settlement strategy would relieve pressure on existing communities. However, a fully integrated planning policy, with the full supporting commitment of Central Government for new infrastructure, needs to be in place.

Stebbing Parish Council We are against the principle of any new settlement. None provide the five year housing requirement• consents throughout the District. Â We are against new settlements in this area .Â We note in particular, Area of Search No: 9, embraces not only Andrewsfield and the historic Boxted Wood but also covers most of the Type A village of Stebbing.

Strethall Parish Meeting Such a 'new town' would destroy a large tract of open countryside and be simply unsustainable.

Takeley Parish Council TPC believes that major development in the south of the district is unsustainable. TPC recognises the need for housing development in Uttlesford. TPC would advocate 1 or 2 new settlements. Scenario 'E' appears to fit with this concept. Options 3-8 all introduce additional pressure on M11 Jtn 8 & increase pressure on both the education & health infrastructure which do not have sufficient capacity. Recommend the north of district.

Thaxted Parish Council The Council agrees that a new settlement would address the development needs of the District.

Ugley Parish Council If only half of the areas of search were to be developed for housing then the 6750 homes requirement would be exceeded. Urban extensions offer the following advantages over new settlements, they are likely to be: more sustainable with access to existing services, employment, schooling, retailing etc, and can access those facilities as the urban extension grows, eventually providing additional facilities. Urban extensions and new settlements are both advocated as options for larger scale development and both can display the principles of Garden Cities. It is very unlikely that more than one new settlement is required. New settlements can take many years before they deliver meaningful numbers of new housing because of the scale of the project and the need for advance infrastructure.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council The principle of one or more new settlements can only be supported if enough time and money is spent in planning a special place to live and work.

Wicken Bonhunt Parish Meeting Support the principle of a new settlement in providing for the future development needs of the District. Shared between two Areas of Search (1 and 7) would extend the development of Uttlesford but still keep its borders intact and not put the whole burden of development in one area.

Widdington Parish Council Urban extensions offer the following advantages over new settlements, they are likely to be: more sustainable with access to existing services, employment, schooling, retailing etc, and can access those facilities as the urban extension grows, eventually providing additional facilities. More deliverable in the short/medium term incrementally utilising existing infrastructure and transport links with additional infrastructure/transport added as development proceeds. Urban extensions and new settlements are both advocated as options for larger scale development and both can display the principles of Garden Cities. A sequential test for additional housing must surely be as follows: examine spare capacity within existing urban areas consider the capacity of sustainable urban extensions to the Market Towns and Key Villages. Only if there is a substantial shortfall would new settlements be a realistic option. A new settlement is very unlikely to be considered as sustainable unless it can support a new secondary school. New settlements can take many years before they deliver meaningful numbers of new housing because of the scale of the project and the need for advance infrastructure.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

Supporting: The principle of at least one new settlement is supported as the most appropriate strategy to deliver sustained and large scale housing growth to both Uttlesford and Braintree Districts.

It is evident that the recent peripheral expansion of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow is harming the character and integrity of these market towns. The nature of our towns and villages makes them totally unsuitable for further expansion without losing their characteristics and in Saffron Walden and Gt Dunmow Introducing ruinous traffic conditions. One or more new settlement is the only solution. Seeking out new settlement locations will enable UDC to meet its growth requirements, while preserving the character of the district's towns. The Inspector appointed to examine the previous Local Plan in 2014 has endorsed this general approach, and if so, that this should be on a scale bold enough to achieve maximum possible sustainable critical mass and a long term solution, especially if there are judged to be limits as to how far relatively small towns with the characters of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow can grow sustainably, attractively, and in an integrated way through successive phases of peripheral expansion• These comments are also in keeping with current thinking on Garden City Development and in particular paragraph 52 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which supports delivering new homes through larger scale development, such as new settlements that follow the principles of Garden Cities.

The principle of a new settlement can be seen to be a positive one regarding a number of sustainability objectives and it may be possible to turn constraints into positive impacts through effective masterplans and a spatial strategy that is advanced with awareness of these opportunities.

It is difficult to see how Uttlesford could meet its obligation to deliver even the lower emerging target of 580 units per annum solely through the incremental growth of existing settlements without negatively impacting on all of the five key principles of the DLP vision

At least one new settlement will need to be brought forward during 2017-2033. This is because the main towns have accommodated large amounts of growth over recent years and many of the settlements have already reached their development capacity or will do following delivery of the extant planning permissions.

Consider that the scale of growth required, the particular characteristics of the market towns within Uttlesford, the pattern of existing development commitments and the likely rates of delivery of growth will require at least two new settlement proposals to be identified within the Local Plan.

Objecting: The provision of new settlements does not make best use of the existing infrastructure and communities already established within existing towns and villages. Growth should be directed towards existing settlements to ensure that the infrastructure and community is established and functioning from the start of the development. Funding from government and developer contributions is best directed to the expansion of existing service provision rather than starting from scratch. The extension of existing settlements, particularly those that benefit from rail infrastructure is the more sustainable and effective approach to housing delivery and should be the focus of the Local Plan.

Development should be distributed over a range of settlements rather than in a single settlement. With regards to the principle of a new settlement in providing for the future development needs of the District there are concerns about deliverability in terms of: the amount of infrastructure required; its sustainability and environmental impact; and timing of delivery. A strategy based on developing a new settlement places an over reliance on one

location resulting in a lack of flexibility should circumstances change. A core issue with a new settlement is the timing of delivery and its ability to deliver early within the plan period. A strategy based purely on the provision of a new settlement will not deliver the number of houses required within life of the Local Plan or at the necessary build out rate to ensure a robust deliverable 5 year housing supply. Furthermore, planning new settlements requires a sound understanding of viability. The ability to connect infrastructure to existing sources some way from the site leads to considerable cost. To then secure the land at values acceptable to landowners then becomes a matter of potential dispute. A focus on a single settlement would not meet the needs that exist within individual established settlements. Therefore, by placing a greater emphasis on the expansion of existing village settlements as outlined, is necessary to ensure delivery at the necessary rate in the short to medium term.

Development of new settlements may undermine economic growth in existing settlements in the District, and risk harming the vibrancy and vitality of existing local centres. Further to environmental impacts that would arise as a result of the increased need to travel, provision of new housing through new settlements would also result in significant impacts on landscape character and would likely rely significantly on development of greenfield land. With regards to the option of a new settlement specifically, the SA/SEA ER should recognise the potential negative environmental, social and economic impacts of such an approach.

It is far better for many more settlements to gradually expand and absorb the housing need at a gradual rate that can fairly quickly be slowed or sped up according to demand.

It is inevitable that these new settlements will be housing led. In other words infrastructure will follow the delivery of housing. They would inevitably be less sustainable than providing services around all of the existing towns and key villages where new housing will enhance existing services and commercial outlets.

Growth in this rural district should be widely dispersed across numerous sites that relate to the established settlement hierarchy and take account of existing transport and social infrastructure network.

It would be extremely unwise for this emerging Local Plan to place any reliance on the delivery of new settlements within the proposed timescale of this plan.

Other: It is not the fact that it is a new settlement which makes a development sustainable, rather than it is the scale of the place created and the services and facilities it provides and are supported.

New Settlements should only be considered if it is manifestly clear that the District's growth requirements cannot be met sustainably through the expansion of existing settlements.

It cannot be considered as the sole element in any strategy because of the long lead in times and the uncertainty and difficulties of delivery.

Expansion of the larger urban areas should therefore be fully explored before greater levels of growth are directed towards the smaller settlements or the creation of a new settlement is considered.

In the event that a new settlement is considered necessary by the Council, the Council should ensure that it includes a sufficient spread of housing across existing settlements to ensure that the slow delivery of a new settlement does not undermine the need to maintain a five year supply of housing sites.

The Council should consider the role that sustainable urban extensions and new compact villages could have in accommodating growth. When located in sustainable locations they are capable of providing a ready source of deliverable development that a new settlement will not be capable of providing in the short term.

Such a strategy very often needs to be supported by growth in other sustainable locations to ensure a good balance between long term strategic sites and smaller deliverable sites are achieved.

Such new settlement proposals should not conflict with the provision of an appropriate spread of housing development across the District, for example by exclusively focusing growth in one or two locations at the expense of other sustainable locations within the District where there is locally identified need.

A new settlement will provide its own infrastructure and not overload that of existing settlements.

COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS

Supporting: There is no sustainable alternative to the new settlement approach to introduce the volume of homes needed now and to provide potential growth locations for the next local plan period (15-30 years). One or more new villages should be provided in areas with good access to railway stations, places of employment and motorways. The sites should be identified to consider the early delivery of a 200 unit site to boost the short-term housing supply, with plans to grow community facilities to a complete village centre and enhance infrastructure to support further phases of the settlement.

Some form of new settlement(s) in an appropriate location may form the most appropriate means for catering for the future long- term growth of the District on a scale bold enough to achieve maximum possible sustainable critical mass and a long term solution, especially as there may well be limits to how far relatively small towns with the characters of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow grow sustainably.

A completely new settlement would be better than ruining all the beautiful villages of Uttlesford.

A garden city would be the best option with links to road, rail and air. Given the number of houses required and the feedback from the inspector, on the previous local plan, this would be the best solution.

A large new development near the A120 and the airport would make a lot of sense since there are good road and rail connections and the space for perhaps an out-of-town retail centre. It would take a lot of pressure off the smaller villages which don't have the infrastructure or resources to cope with even a modest increase in population.

A new settlement is required. Adding to existing settlement is not beneficial as the infrastructure, roads, drainage, schools etc. cannot cope.

A new settlement with fully integrated infrastructure is a better option than the piecemeal approach of bolting an additional 500 homes into villages without adequate infrastructure to support the needs of the existing communities never mind these additional homes.

A new settlement with potential for future expansion should be the principal consideration in the plan process.

Eco-town done right with proper access and thought out provision of services.

Clearly we are not going to be able to bolt-on all this extra housing to our existing towns and villages. I believe that a new settlement is the answer to the housing development needs. New schools, health services, roads and easy access to trains and employment sites could be more easily incorporated into a new settlement and should be part of any planning approvals. At the moment houses are being bolted on to existing communities with no thought given to infrastructure.

The principle of a new settlement (or more than one) is the only satisfactory solution if we are to preserve the unique natures of our towns and villages.

The new Local Plan should look to providing a new settlement or settlements rather than damage the character of existing towns through overdevelopment.

When looking at the overall sustainability of new settlement(s) versus further town/village extensions, it seems clear that new settlement(s) will provide the most sustainable long term solution for the remaining housing requirement.

If we continue to allow developers to build houses on the edges of existing towns and villages without the appropriate infrastructure being put in place we will ruin Uttlesford beyond belief. If we go this route we will be having the same discussion in 5 years' time and everyone will agree that we made a mistake and should have approved the development of a settlement(s) back in 2015 with the potential to grow further well beyond the 2030 horizon. It really is the only answer to delivering any sort of sensible vision for the district start from scratch and build right.

A new settlement would ensure that infrastructure is carefully planned for, rather than new pockets of housing development causing unbearable strain on existing services and infrastructure.

Objecting: They do not meet all the housing requirements for the District and will not improve the infrastructure in villages where other development is planned. Nor will a new settlement improve the existing road network that serves it, or enhance the landscape and certainly will destroy designated wildlife habitats..

A new settlement has complex issues in terms of land ownership; infrastructure reliance; significant local opposition and slow delivery rates. A new settlement is unlikely to come forward within the plan period and will have a significant impact on housing provision in the District, which will lead to increased speculative planning proposals outside of any development strategy.

A New Settlement is not the way forward. It would not be large enough to generate sufficient infrastructure or input from ECC.

A new settlement would in time turn into a pocket of isolation, deprivation and crime. Any new development should be distributed between all villages, each taking its fair share. This would boost existing communities rather than creating soulless, socially isolated new settlements.

The planning and arguments against will roll on for years with the council not fulfilling its targets, thereby leading to uncontrolled sprawl throughout the remainder of the district.

Any one settlement would be an absolute travesty to our district. To wipe out acres and acres of wildlife and environment totally unnecessarily would be devastating.

it will irreparably ruin the open nature of the district and concentrate housing along with investment in infrastructure within one area to the disadvantage of the remainder of the communities within Uttlesford.

Build on brown field sites and infilling rather than agricultural land which would be lost forever.

It will take many years to develop the schools, infrastructure, doctors and shops before it becomes viable. In the meantime all the current facilities will get swamped with requests and the developers limit their costs. A single settlement does not help the whole of the UDC population/area and if housing is required in an opposite direction they will miss out.

Single large developments are not a reliable approach to delivering housing needs. Smaller local developments are both more likely to satisfy local need and more likely to receive community support and be built to schedule.

These rarely deliver on their promises; amenities are the last things to be built and few people end up working and living there so they don't solve the problem of commuting. They are too big and impersonal to build up any sense of community. One settlement for the whole district doesn't make sense for a large district like Uttlesford as it doesn't help people who want to stay local in their village,

Because many of our villages are small in size any major settlement will have a negative effect on the surrounding area.

It would ruin the rural character of the area

Better to retain the "village" atmosphere for this part of Essex. It also would not in itself satisfy the yearly housing need.

Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow already have key infrastructures and facilities that should allow them to grow in a sustainable manner.

They will take away mostly Grade 2 agricultural land I find it strange that the developers and planners talk about sustainability but are happy to reduce the UK ability to produce food and so the need to import thus reducing sustainability and increasing the environmental impact.

Wherever they are situated it would have a devastating effect on local towns and villages, and many of the Areas of Search listed contain irreplaceable landscape and historical features.

Many if not all of the established villages in the area already struggle to keep their amenities such as shops and pubs alive so it seems to me that new dwellings should be distributed around existing settlements to help provide an increased customer base for such amenities.

A large new settlement would change the character of this District irrevocably.

It is difficult to build a new settlement on land that is not Greenfield and which is not good quality agricultural land whereas smaller developments on the edges of towns and villages can make use of brownfield and lower quality land.

The problems of highway capacity, infrastructure and land assembly are unlikely to be capable of being solved in time to provide adequate development within the plan period and a more focussed approach, related as necessary to existing centres and infrastructure in the shorter term is required.

New settlements in Uttlesford are most likely to provide residential facilities for commuters rather than for Uttlesford people working in Uttlesford.

It will not remove pressures for housing elsewhere in the district if centred in one settlement. New settlement will create huge cross boundary infrastructure issues.

Any new settlement would certainly have a negative impact on our two main towns and would also spoil a predominantly rural area. Our two main towns already have the infrastructure to support growth and local businesses should welcome some level of nearby growth to help expand or at least maintain their customer base.

Too many of the sites are too close to existing communities and would eventually swamp the town or village they abut.

Other: New settlements should only be done if the infrastructures are generally present and only need expanding on

A hybrid solution is inevitable. Filling in brownfield sites in the larger towns and villages is appropriate and much preferable to creeping beyond the existing boundaries of the towns. However, that alone will not be sufficient to hit this targeted number. A properly planned new settlement with first rate infrastructure should be built.

A new settlement might be an answer providing it doesn't impinge on nearby villages spoiling their rural location.

It is difficult to see how precisely Uttlesford would apply and incorporate the principles of garden suburbs and/or garden city settlements into the current emerging local plan. If UDC is serious in pursuing this type of development strategy, then a much longer term planning timeframe, possibly spanning more than one local plan cycle, needs to be put in place. A garden suburb/garden city is not a quick fix solution.

There is a strong case for considering two new settlements, one in the north of the district and one in the south to support the demands of the likely new inhabitants of the district (i.e.

working at the major employment hub of Stansted Airport, in and around the two major settlements, Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow and commuting north and south to employment hotspots outside the district).

A new settlement should be a new "village" with planned facilities and good transport links or a larger settlement in conjunction with adjacent authorities.

UDC should adopt a policy to distribute development amongst all existing settlements whilst allowing them time to consider a new settlement for housing requirements beyond 2033. This would allow UDC the time to plan the site, draw up contracts, establish work schedules etc to ensure the district obtains the best, if required, new settlement. In the short term, urban extensions offer advantages over new settlements.

Any new settlement should be far enough away from existing ones to be a distinct entity so there is no danger of future merging.

In practice needs very careful siting where there is good access to strategic road and rail and existing employment.

New settlements should be placed where infrastructure already exists i.e. not near small villages where little bus links exist.

Question 12

Saffron Walden

What issues and evidence should the Council consider when assessing the potential for urban extensions to Saffron Walden at Areas of Search 10a-g? Please reference any specific Area of Search in your response.

This question was responded to by 300 people/organisations. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex County Council consideration should be given to how a link road can be delivered – there is no reference to the Radwinter Road/Thaxted Road link road. They recommend that consideration is given to how edge of settlement growth may be accommodated considering the air quality issues.

Essex County Council suggest that it may be necessary to link adjoining sites to minimise the traffic utilising the centre of the town e.g. 10a,b and c then provide a northern distributor road. Sites 10d – f may also be linked to deliver a south western distributor road. They suggest the SA uses the updated EA Flood Map for surface water. It is recommended that the strategy be proactive to ensure that future development does not increase flood risk and that there is adequate flood risk mitigation. ECC considers that the strategy may need to ensure the maintenance of existing flood management infrastructure and or the installation of new flood risk management infrastructure to minimise the impact of new development. There needs to be consideration to the availability of school places and the likelihood of schools expansion, also safe travel routes between developments and schools to enable walking and cycling. Consideration also needs to be given to existing and future early years and child care facilities.

Anglian Water Services Ltd ask that the Council consider the implications of locating development within these areas for the existing foul sewerage networks and what new and improved infrastructure may be required. Consideration should also be give to the impact of addition foul flows on Saffron Walden Recycling Centre.

Historic England The council needs to consider the possible impacts on the heritage assets including impact on their setting. The growth of Saffron Walden has to be handled very carefully to ensure that its historic environment is conserved. The town has an important setting with Audley End house and gardens and key approaches providing views of St Marys and other heritage assets. An update to the Historic Settlement Character Assessment of Saffron Walden should be carried out to provide robust evidence. Transport implications are a concern. They welcome the exclusion of Audley End Park as an AoS.

Highways England are concerned that there would be possible traffic affect upon M11 J9a which would need to be considered.

The Environment Agency state that all the areas of search are located over principle aquifer and SPZ2 and should be considered very sensitive in respect of controlled waters. They also note that the AoS 10a and 10f are located on designated SPZ1.

They point out that the watercourses in and around the town are flashy in nature and there are properties in the centre of Saffron Walden at risk of flooding. They consider that any discharge of surface water into watercourses that are connected to or from part of the Slade System must either be restricted to Greenfield runoff rates or reduced to ensure there is no increase in flood risk in Saffron Walden.

AoS10a,b,f and g are partly located within Flood Zone 3. The level 1 SFRA should be referred to when considering allocation and urban extensions should be directed to Flood Zone 1 where possible. It is considered that detailed hydraulic modelling of the flood risk from these watercourses would need to be undertaken as part of any level 2 SFRA.

Hands of Thaxted are concerned about the traffic congestion and the impact of further development on the historic town reducing its tourist appeal.

We Are Residents stress the importance of considering all aspects of sustainability and the evidence base. They are concerned that the road network is congested and would be difficult to improve it. Car use is a given in the town due to the lack of sustainable modes of transport, thus having a negative effect on health. Concerns regarding the lack of infrastructure such as GPs, schools, employment and green space. Air pollution is a major concern especially as the town has an AQMA and they stress that the NPPF and Public Health England policy is to reduce air pollution.

National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups question whether Traveller sites should be provided as part of urban extensions.

Sustainable Uttlesford do not endorse further development of Saffron Walden, instead they prefer a new settlement approach.

Birchanger Wood Trust an appalling loss of a lovely old market town by too many bolted on periphery developments which were not called upon to address the need for the retention/provision of open space.

Thaxted Society The developments proposed at Saffron Walden may be shown to impact surrounding villages with both traffic and visitors. The ECC Design Guide and UDCs planning guidelines do not protect historically sensitive areas such as Thaxted.

Stebbing Society already a range of facilities in Saffron Walden and existing bus links from town to train station. Improvements to M11/A11 junction 9 would further enhance this capability.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Saffron Walden Town Council state that a number of background studies are in need of updating, the Water Study Cycle and Transport Assessment are particular ones. Decision of appeal inspectors should be taken into account. There are significant issues regarding the impact on the historic character, this is expressed in the Historic Settlement Character which is still relevant today.

The Sampfords Parish Council consider all the areas of search 10a-10g are remote from the town centre and would encourage additional traffic through the historic road network.

Felsted Parish Council are concerned that most of the proposed locations are on the wrong side of town to permit access to railway station and would impose additional pressure on an already congested town centre. Bypass(es) would be needed connecting to Audley End Station and a new M11 junction with good commuter bus service from developments – town- station.

Ashdon Parish Council has particular concerns regarding future development of Saffron Walden particularly to the east of the town. Concerned that there will be an increase in traffic flow through the village which has narrow rural unclassified roads and a dangerous bend at Church End. Routes into Saffron Walden are already busy and improved infrastructure would be needed including access to Audley End Station, schools, medical facilities and parking.

Clavering Parish Council The historic towns must be protected. Saffron Walden primary and secondary schools are operating at capacity. Road structure is medieval and will require a bypass, junctions at Duxford and Stortford and Gt Chesterford need to be altered.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council Saffron Walden has already pushed incremental change near or over its limit.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council This historic centre of the town must be preserved and road infrastructure provided to enhance the towns environment by routing traffic around and not through it.

Little Easton Parish Council a bypass and a new M11 junction would be necessary before considering development sites around the town. It is possible that one or two of these areas would be suitable if combined with major road improvements and developer contributions to increase frequency of bus service to train stations.

Thaxted Parish Council Links to facilities and roads and rail are easier to the north and west of the town, any development should take account of this.

Quendon and Rickling Parish Council as pointed out by the Planning Inspector Saffron Walden is a historic town with antiquated roads that cannot cope with massive development. SWCHS is over subscribed.

Great Dunmow Town Council This is a matter for Saffron Walden Town Council to comment upon. However in the Inspectors conclusions on the withdrawn Plan effectively promoted a new settlement and stated that there were limits as to how far the town of Saffron Walden can grow sustainably. Given the Inspectors comments if development is to be promoted on the periphery of Saffron Walden then it is necessary for UDC to demonstrate that development can be undertaken sustainable way.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council and Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group feel that the existing permission in and around the town should be taken into account. They state that its historic character is already suffering due to developer – led development.

Wimbish Parish Council believes that Saffron Walden can only take a limited expansion. They have concerns regarding the infrastructure, in particular road network and air quality. Any expansion should avoid the south and east site for the town. Development should be concentrated on the nearest road, rail and employment links.

growth rather than concentrating development on the town.

Newport Parish Council the current road network cannot cope with existing traffic and cumulative effect of all development has not been considered.

DEVELOPER/AGENTS/LANDOWNERS

- 17% increase in total dwellings since 2011 this rate of growth is unsustainable, and will impact on the character of the town. Additional growth will exacerbate the air quality issues in the town.
- Historic town severely constrained.
- Remote from the strategic road network
- No further growth locations should be identified on the periphery of the town.
- Ought to pursue new settlement locations
- Most of the AoS contain public rights of way through open spaces. If development took place then access to these spaces would be reduced.
- The Character Assessment 2007 remains valid and should be used to assess the appropriateness of sites.
- As the largest settlement with the highest order of services and facilities, it is the most sustainable location for development.
- Saffron Walden is considered to be a sustainable settlement at the top of the hierarchy where significant housing and employment growth should be directed.
- Transportation, flood risk and drainage, landscape character, ecology, contamination, sustainability and deliverability all must be taken into account.
- The Council should ensure that the local plan seeks to deliver small scale development adjacent to the existing settlement.
- Large scale housing developments/new settlements are preferred for long term

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

A number of individuals are concerned that the SA has not been undertaken properly – they wish to see another SA undertaken which assesses all areas of sustainability including the effect on air pollution and health.

In relation to the SA it is not clear how a perception is an appropriate way to assess options, it should be done on an objective and evidence base assessments. It is not clear what relevance the ability to accommodate renewable energy schemes has in relation to the suitability for new housing. The ability for each AoS to accommodate supporting infrastructure is not considered on a consistent basis – some are assessed on the proximity to existing schools whilst others are assessed on the ability to accommodate new schools within them.

The 2015 Local Plan Inspector stated there may be limits to how far relatively small towns with the characters of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow can grow. Saffron Walden's limit may have already been reached.

All areas are misconceived as there is inadequate motorway access already and putting a lot more houses around Saffron Walden will wreck the historical and pleasing setting nestled in its own valley

A local **business** expresses the need for employment allocations in the plan to enable the relocation of business in the town that are inappropriately located having regard to the historic land patterns and development.

The best solution is for a satellite development to be built on green field site close to but not attached to the existing town allowing new facilities to be constructed.

The ECC Local Plan Highways Impact Assessment failed to note the heavy traffic turning right into George Street needed to use both lanes in the High Street.

- Road infrastructure would need to be improved – the town is often congested
- A new settlement is a better way to deliver housing and infrastructure
- An additional AoS could be introduced to the north of Saffron Walden.
- Water supply is a concern
- Concern regarding the impact on listed buildings
- Concern regarding flooding and increased water run-off
- Development should be spread across the hierarchy.
- Development should respect and where possible enhance the historic environment.
- Development will degrade the historic town
- Development should be focused to the west/south west of the town.
- Damaging to wildlife
- Development should be on the western borders of Saffron Walden allowing access to M11 and Audley End Station.
- Whilst sensitive protection is needed Saffron Walden must take its fair share.
- It is considered that tier 1 and tier 2 settlements represent the optimum opportunity for meeting housing needs.
- Infrastructure improvements needed including transport, road, schools, health and employment. .
- Unattractive to employers due to poor transport links
- Even large scale housing development are unlikely to result in moderation of house prices.
- Unsustainable for future expansion
- Ensure mixed use developments – employment in the town is limited.
- Significant heritage and landscape impacts. Development on the edge would urbanise the historic town and diminish the sense of place.
- Majority of search areas are located on Grade 2 agricultural land.
- All search areas have limited access to strategic road network
- Schools at or near capacity
- A bypass is required
- Protect the surrounding countryside

- The town is sufficiently sized to take development and not lose its identity
- Existing highway infrastructure will find it difficult to accommodate extension of the settlement – limited scope for development
- Further development could threaten the historic parks and gardens, listed buildings and historic core.
- Development should be dispersed not concentrated on Saffron Walden
- Developers will not fund the necessary infrastructure
- Local Plan Inspector said that the town had reached its limit.
- The town could accommodate small scale development adjacent to the existing settlement. The existing infrastructure could accommodate small growth.
- Car parking constraints
- Any development should ensure that it connects with the town and is not a un-coordinated. A mix of housing is needed.
- New development must be spacious enough for vehicles and good sized gardens
- Good location as there is access with rail and road with easy access to M11 and Stansted and employment in Cambridge
- The local plan should be employment led.
- Noise pollution has not been considered
- Saffron Walden meets more of the essential requirement for major housing development including transport and employment.
- Saffron Walden is best place to accept restrained incremental growth
- High out commuting due to lack of local employment opportunities
- Saffron Walden is preferable as it currently has existing facilities for further development
- Saffron Walden has limited potential if a link road is developed.
- Has good rail and transport links
- Saffron Walden is well placed with existing infrastructure. Improvements to M11/A11 junctions would enhance this capability
- Development should be to the north or south as there is better access to the strategic road network
- Saffron Walden is suitable for development but will require a bypass before development happens

COMMENTS ON AREA OF SEARCH A

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex CC recommends that 10a should make provision for strategic sites that may be used for flood storage area to alleviate existing flooding within the town and new developments.

Historic England Impact on the historic environment is likely to be less than other AoS, although impacts generated through transport cannot be ruled out. Consideration should be given to potential heritage impact. Concerns about this AoS and it requires further assessment and justification. It may not be possible to bring forward development here in terms of level of impact on historic environment.

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group - this AoS could only be add-on housing estates exacerbating shortcomings in access to infrastructure.

Sustainable Uttlesford whilst they do not endorse further development in Saffron Walden they consider 10a to have less detrimental impact as they are more accessible to the major road network, however consideration needs to be given to the landscape and impact on the town centre.

Hands off Thaxted The Audley End Estate effectively sterilises the area to the west of the town and therefore any development would have to be in areas 10 and 10g.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Stebbing Parish Council The AoS is sufficiently distanced from wildlife designation, there are a range of facilities in town which are accessible by Windmill Hill and Little Walden Road. The AoS would effectively be serviced by Audley End train station and bus links to the rail station from the High Street.

Saffron Walden Town Council – development in this area would very significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness. Heritage and landscape impacts associated with the proximity to Audley Park and Bridge End Gardens. Areas 10a,b,c,e,f and g should be rejected on the basis of the adverse impact of their development upon the town and its setting.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council 10a will visually damage Saffron Walden and would increase flooding

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

Developer - concern regarding the proximity to Audley Park and Bridge End Gardens. Limited access to strategic roads and potential detrimental impact upon the historic core.

Agent - promoting a site in this AoS of 41.6 acres made up of allotments and arable land. The allotments could be relocated.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

The following general comments were made:

- Requests that sports pitches are provided
- The allotments in this AoS form part of an important view into the town and these sensitive sites should be sustained.
- Close to the conservation area
- 10a has the benefit of a reasonable link to the M11/A11
- Good access to strategic road network so air quality impact would be less, walking distance to town and schools. However development would impact on visual appeal of the town.
- This will have unacceptable impact in terms of congestion and sprawl.
- This area has already had significant housing development, there is a need for improved road links.
- Severe impact on the landscape and setting of Saffron Walden.

- 10a would probably have less impact on traffic than the other AoS it does have several other issues including the visual impact on the approaches to the town and use of prime agricultural land.
- Development here would harm the most scenic approach into the town
- This area should never be considered for housing or road infrastructure as this is land which gives Saffron Walden so much of its beautiful character.

COMMENTS OF AREA OF SEARCH B

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Historic England agree with the SA that development beyond the town edge would diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness. Do not agree with the SA in relation to impact on the CA as there could be impacts on views and character of the town. Development could impact on transport movements and in turn affect the historic environment. Concerns about this AoS and it requires further assessment and justification.

Essex CC recommends that 10b should make provision for strategic sites that may be used for flood storage area to alleviate existing flooding within the town and new developments.

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group this AoS could only be add-on housing estates exacerbating shortcomings in access to infrastructure.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Saffron Walden Town Council – development in this area would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of this part of the town.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council This will not be successful without significant infrastructure planning, especially as regards traffic – at present all traffic will need to drive through the town, increasing pollution and congestion and adversely affecting the quality of life for residents in the town.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

Development in this area would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness – as identified in the 2007 Character Assessment.

There is the oil pipeline running through this general location.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- Individual suggests homes and employment to be developed along with wildlife corridors and green space
- No easy access to road network and high impact on transport and air quality on CA. outside recommended walking distances to facilities.
- This location would funnel extra traffic down ancient Church Street – this would require a new link road through to Windmill Hill
- Inappropriate location due to traffic with no access to train or main road networks without going through the town.

- This will have unacceptable impact in terms of congestion and sprawl.
- Unacceptable impact on the visual quality of the town as they are on prominent elevated ground.
- This area has already had significant housing development, there is a need for improved road links. This countryside in 10b is used for recreation. It is an elevated location and development in this area is not sensitive to local landscape

COMMENTS ON AREA OF SEARCH C

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex CC recommends that 10c should make provision for strategic sites that may be used for flood storage area to alleviate existing flooding within the town and new developments.

Historic England while there is scope for development in this AoS consideration should be given to potential heritage impacts and how they might be addressed.

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group this AoS could only be add-on housing estates exacerbating shortcomings in access to infrastructure.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Saffron Walden Town Council – development in this area would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of this part of the town.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council This will not be successful without significant infrastructure planning, especially as regards traffic – at present all traffic will need to drive through the town, increasing pollution and congestion and adversely affecting the quality of life for residents in the town.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

concerns about the loss of a rural approach road. Character Assessment 2007 considered that development would significantly diminish sense of place and local distinctiveness but acknowledges that the eastern edge of Saffron Walden is one of the least attractive edges of the town.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- A number of Individuals request a proper SA be carried out; air pollution has not been properly considered.
- This area has already had significant housing development, there is a need for improved road links.
- There seems little sense building here until we know what impact the current planning permissions will have on the infrastructure.
- High impact on traffic and air quality in CA. no direct access to strategic road network. Outside recommended walking distances to facilities.
- Inappropriate location due to traffic with no access to train or main road networks without going through the town.
- 10c would appear to be visually acceptable but fails the test of good transport links.

COMMENTS ON AREA OF SEARCH D

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group this AoS could only be add-on housing estates exacerbating shortcomings in access to infrastructure.

Historic England agree with the SA that development in the rural part of this area would result in loss of open farmland spilling into open countryside. Do not agree with the SA in relation to impact on the CA as there could be impacts on views and character of the town. Development could impact on transport movements and in turn affect the historic environment. They are concerned that the potential link road could act as the limit of urban development. It would introduce a harsh edge to the town which continues to have a clear rural setting. Concerns about this AoS and it requires further assessment and justification.

Essex CC recommends that 10a should make provision for strategic sites that may be used for flood storage area to alleviate existing flooding within the town and new developments.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Saffron Walden Town Council –this area was dismissed by the local plan inspector and was rejected by an appeals inspector as it was not sustainable development.

Wendens Ambo Parish Council This will not be successful without significant infrastructure planning, especially as regards traffic – at present all traffic will need to drive through the town, increasing pollution and congestion and adversely affecting the quality of life for residents in the town.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

This is a suitable area for development. Promoting the Kier site as a sustainable and appropriate development.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This looks like a viable option
- Development here is likely to increase traffic flow through Thaxted
- This area has already had significant housing development, there is a need for improved road links.
- Inappropriate location due to traffic with no access to train or main road networks without going through the town.
- Unacceptable impact on the visual quality of the town as they are on prominent elevated ground.
- High impact on traffic and air quality in CA. no direct access to strategic road network and outside recommended walking distances to facilities.
- This is a sustainable location in amongst more modern development.

COMMENTS ON AREA OF SEARCH E

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group this AoS could possibly acceptable but only in the context of development of a new town centred on Audley End station. Development between all the land between the M11 and existing western edge of Saffron Walden to provide housing, shops, schools and other infrastructure.

Historic England agree with the SA that development beyond the town edge would diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness. Do not agree with the SA in relation to impact on the CA as there could be impacts on views and character of the town. Development could impact on transport movements and in turn affect the historic environment. Concerns about this AoS and it requires further assessment and justification.

Essex CC recommends that 10a should make provision for strategic sites that may be used for flood storage area to alleviate existing flooding within the town and new developments.

PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

Saffron Walden Town Council – development in this sector would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of this part of Saffron Walden.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

The Character Assessment 2007 states that the landscape provides a quality rural approach. However, there are no known constraints in terms of designations and it is well related to existing developments. Developer promoting the Kier site as a suitable location for growth.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This was part of the Kier application which would offer a number of community benefits. Development of this area would be a benefit for everyone.
- Development here is likely to increase traffic flow through Thaxted
- Inappropriate location due to traffic with no access to train or main road networks without going through the town.
- 10e would have better access to the B1383, however both are areas of natural beauty and widely used for recreation.
- High impact on traffic and air quality in CA. no direct access to strategic road network and outside recommended walking distances to facilities.

Comments on Area of Search F

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group this AoS could possibly acceptable but only in the context of development of a new town centred on Audley End station. Development between all the land between the M11 and existing western edge of Saffron Walden to provide housing, shops, schools and other infrastructure.

Historic England agree with the SA that development beyond the town edge would diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness. There could be impacts on Shortgrove Park. Do not agree with the SA in relation to impact on the CA as there could be impacts on views and character of the town. Development could impact on transport movements and in turn affect

the historic environment. Considerable concerns with this AoS and impact on historic environment and would require further assessment. Development may have to be restricted or may not be possible at all.

Sustainable Uttlesford - whilst they do not endorse further development in Saffron Walden they consider 10a to have less detrimental impact as they are more accessible to the major road network, however consideration needs to be given to the landscape and impact on the town centre.

Essex CC recommends that 10a should make provision for strategic sites that may be used for flood storage area to alleviate existing flooding within the town and new developments.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Saffron Walden Town Council – There would be a loss of agricultural land with development on visually prominent slope onto farmland of visual quality. Development in this sector would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of this part of Saffron Walden.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

The Character Assessment 2007 describes the area as comprising wide open rolling landscape. Development would result in the loss of a quality approach to the town and diminish sense of place and local distinctiveness.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This will have unacceptable impact in terms of congestion and sprawl.
- AoS 10f seems to offer some opportunity for development.
- Has direct access to strategic road network so air quality impact would be less than other sites.
- Unacceptable impact on the visual quality of the town as they are on prominent elevated ground.
- 10f would have better access to the B1383, however both are areas of natural beauty and widely used for recreation.
- This would result in the town sprawling out and severely compromising the attractive landscape.
- 10f would probably have less impact on traffic than the other AoS it does have several other issues including the visual impact on the approaches to the town and use of prime agricultural land.

COMMENTS ON AREA OF SEARCH G

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group this AoS could possibly acceptable but only in the context of development of a new town centred on Audley End station. Development between all the land between the M11 and existing western edge of Saffron Walden to provide housing, shops, schools and other infrastructure.

Sustainable Uttlesford whilst they do not endorse further development in Saffron Walden they consider 10a to have less detrimental impact as they are more accessible to the major road network, however consideration needs to be given to the landscape and impact on the town centre.

Essex County Council considers from a historic environment potential within Saffron Walden the release of this site is questioned. The registered parks would have their settings and significance affected. The open countryside between these two parks forms part of the wider landscape setting.

Essex CC recommends that 10a should make provision for strategic sites that may be used for flood storage area to alleviate existing flooding within the town and new developments.

Saffron Walden Town Council – There would be a loss of agricultural land with development on visually prominent slope onto farmland of visual quality. Development in this sector would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of this part of Saffron Walden.

Hands off Thaxted Audley End Estate effectively sterilises the area to the west of the town and therefore any development would have to be in areas 10 and 10g.

Historic England agrees with the SA that there are issues to overcome with the loss of rural approach to Saffron Walden and loss of agricultural land with development on a visually prominent slope. Development would significantly diminish sense of place and local distinctiveness. Audley end adjoins the AoS – there are likely to be negative impacts as a result. Considerable concerns about this AoS and impact on historic environment. This AoS should not be taken forward.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Saffron Walden Parish Council – there would be a loss of agricultural land, with development on a visually prominent slope onto farmland of considerable visual quality. Development in this sector would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of this part of Saffron Walden

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

The Character Assessment 2007 raises concerns about new development on a visually prominent slope of visual quality. It states that there will be negative impacts with Audley Park and Audley End House.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This will have unacceptable impact in terms of congestion and sprawl.
- AoS 10g seems to offer some opportunity for development
- Severe impact on the landscape and setting of Saffron Walden.
- Only AoS that is acceptable as it would minimise the impact of new development on the town.
- 10h has the advantage of accessibility to the railway station
- Good access to strategic road network and station, air quality impact would be less than other sites.

- This would result in the town sprawling out and severely compromising the attractive landscape.
- 10g would probably have less impact on traffic than the other AoS it does have several other issues including the visual impact on the approaches to the town and use of prime agricultural land.

Question 13

Edge of Bishops Stortford

What issues and evidence should the Council consider when assessing the potential for urban extensions to Bishop's Stortford at Areas of Search 11a and b? Please reference any specific Areas of Search in your response.

This question was responded to by 189 people/organisations. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

ECC Sustainable Places – the potential expansion will need careful consideration on the availability of wastewater treatment capacity and water supply connection. Developers must work with sewerage undertakers and water companies.

Essex County Council it is recommended that the evidence base be updated to include the EA updated flood map for surface water. Allocations of sites at Bishops Stortford should make provision for strategic sites that may be used as flood storage areas to alleviate existing flooding issues and new planned developments.

ECC recommends that UDC considers the availability of school places at existing primary schools on the edge of Great Dunmow and at Forest Hall School and secondary school in Bishops Stortford. It is important to appreciate whether expansion at these schools is possible, the impact of development to warrant a new school and delivery of safe travel routes between new developments and schools.

Consideration should be given to existing and future early years child care facilities. There needs to be discussion with East Hertfordshire.

Hertfordshire County Council The residents of these development would look to Bishops Stortford for service provision, especially schools. The document suggests that 500 units could be provided in 11a and 11b, this equates to 1 form of primary and secondary school places. There is little capacity in the primary schools to expand. Any potential capacity across Bishops Stortford is required to deal with future growth from existing communities. HCC requests that developer contributions and/or a new school is sought by UDC.

Highways England this is likely to have a material impact upon M11 J8 which is already at capacity at certain times of the day

Natural England - in assessing the potential for urban extensions to Bishops Stortford the Council should include consideration of the potential increase in recreational pressure on the Hatfield Forest SSSI and NNR and the potential impacts of traffic derived air pollution upon nearby designated sites.

Sustainable Uttlesford do not support incursions in the Green Belt around Bishops Stortford

Stebbing Society the town is supported by a range of services. There are good interchange/transport links and an existing major by-pass. The proximity of M11 J8 is a positive, all of which makes potential urban extensions on the edge of Bishops Stortford as well as two new settlements at Birchanger and Hallingbury highly attractive.

Hands off Thaxted consider what East Herts are planning for the area and the effect in the road network. Difficult access to the town and train station.

The Thaxted Society opposed to all development which occurs outside village development limits. Development at Bishops Stortford may impact surrounding villages with traffic and visitors.

The Hundred Society – high priority should be given to enhancing the historic environment and ancient countryside

Bishops Stortford Neighbourhood Plan development here will have a major impact on the town, in particular the infrastructure and services such as health, education and recreation. There will be further strain on the town in terms of traffic congestion.

Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group these AoS will only add to the problems that Bishops Stortford already suffers with traffic congestion and overdevelopment. The expansion already taking place on its north west side will overwhelm the town. These would be bolt on housing estates not a sustainable form of development.

Bishops Stortford Civic Federation both sites are in the Green Belt. Bishops Stortford has already seen a large amount of development with no new infrastructure. This development will add pressure to the physical and social infrastructure. East Herts will have to provide for UDC residents. Children from these developments will go to schools in Bishops Stortford which are already near capacity.

Birchanger Wood Trust – this large open area should be retained in order to identify Essex from Hertfordshire. Birchanger Wood is ancient woodland with historic features. This is well used by local people and visitors, we should not allow remaining open farmland between the Wood and Bishops Stortford to be used for housing development.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Clavering Parish Council schools have capacity but the M11 junctions and the A120 junctions are already over utilised

Great Dunmow Town Council the sites are in the Green Belt, it may be difficult to argue and win the case for development. Whilst this does not mean that an urban extension to Bishops Stortford within the now Green Belt is not impossible, it cannot and must not be assumed to be successful.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council there is already new development under way west of the town. This has been combined with new road infrastructure and has not encroached on the town centres character, Great Dunmow's easy access on to the A120 and beyond is an asset.

Quendon and Rickling Parish Council – infrastructure not in place to accommodate such massive development

Birchanger Parish Council - coalescence between Herts/Essex boundaries. Area along A120 which includes Birchanger Wood should not be developed. Preservation of Stansted, Birchanger and Bishops Stortford as separate settlements.

The Sampfords Parish Council states that these two areas of search seem to be acceptable in locational terms where they adjoin the town centre.

Newport Parish Council the Bishops Stortford by pass should be improved and widened to take into account the potential for growth. In addition a bypass at Little Hadham should commence immediately.

Stebbing Parish Council the scale of the development maximises the possibility of housing to be well supported by a range of services, infrastructure and employment opportunities.

Saffron Walden Town Council These site are in the Green Belt, this means it will be difficult to argue the case for development in any one of them given the protection in The Framework

Felsted Parish Council upgrade to M11 J8 will be required and improvements to rail link. Local bus park and ride services would be essential. Airport employment opportunities good.

Rayne Parish Council it is unreasonable to expect members of the public to effectively respond on such complex issues.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- Land owner promoting site in Birchanger – Call for Sites reference number:
- Considerations should include the ability of the settlement to accommodate growth in the context of its existing services and facilities, environmental constraints, access to strategic road and rail network.
- Both AoS are within the green belt and would diminish the strategic separation between Bishop's Stortford
- The areas are relatively isolated from existing communities – pressures on healthcare facilities and schools
- Sustainable location for growth with infrastructure available. Green belt release is inevitable to meet housing need
- There are enough sites outside of the green belt to meet housing need. It is unlikely that there will be exceptional circumstances to justify development here.
- Bishop's Stortford is already at capacity – detrimental impact on existing infrastructure and the environment.
- Not suitable for housing or employment as it is within the green belt.
- Could be suitable for outdoor sport or education facilities.
- There needs to be clarity regarding housing numbers and whether UDC are taking some of East Herts requirement.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This area has excellent transport links
- An acceptable proposal
- Talks with East Herts and Bishops Stortford vital
- Good location for growth as has fantastic transport links and good job opportunities
- Would serve Stansted Airport well
- Neighbourhood Plans are being produce in Bishops Stortford, UDC must take these into consideration
- Traffic congestion will be an issue in and around the surrounding villages
- Insufficient capacity at J8 M11
- There is a shortage of school places
- Inadequate health care facilities
- East Herts have already approved a large number of developments in this area
- Housing should be divided evenly between all locations
- Incremental development should be possible with minimal impact
- Sewage works need updating
- Development should go to Harlow
- Noise and air pollution are issues of concern
- Close to excellent public transport links
- There is limited bus services and an inadequate train service
- Car parking in Bishops Stortford is an issue and more development will make this worse
- Opportunities for affordable housing
- Excellent transport links to London, Harlow and Cambridge, should be considered strongly
- Unclear why the area around Farnham, north of Bishops Stortford which is close to the road network and employment is not included
- A joint plan with East Herts is required
- J8 M11 would need improvements
- This would result in urban sprawl
- The fields are used to produce food, reducing the fields increases food air miles adding to food shortages
- A small development of 50 dwellings would be appropriate
- Large scale housing development would function as a satellite development of Bishops Stortford
- Development that already has planning permission should be taken into consideration
- Ideal location for development – good access to services and jobs
- Coalescence and threaten the individuality and character of existing communities
- 800+ homes approved at Bishops Stortford North - these AoS are not attractive the East Herts DC and HCC.
- Poor pedestrian and cycle access and traffic management.
- Development of a new settlement is more sustainable

- Needs to be an eastern by pass for Bishops Stortford
- Concerns regarding the proximity of local sewage treatment works and it is operating at near capacity
- Good location for a new settlement
- This proposal is contrary to government policy
- Loss of wildlife habitats
- Loss of high quality agricultural land
- Visually damaging to landscape
- Threat to viability of town centre
- Adverse effect on economy
- These areas would be good for housing and out of town retail parks
- Birchanger Wood is an important historic amenity site that needs to be preserved.

COMMENTS ON AREA OF SEARCH 11A

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Hertfordshire County Council the sustainability of this AoS would need to be proven. It is bounded by the A120 bypass, Stansted Road, an employment area and Birchanger Wood LWS. It is unclear how the site would link with Bishops Stortford and therefore access local services.

Historic England – there are no designated heritage assets affected by this location and no apparent historic environment issues

Stansted Mountfitchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group – area of search 11a could exacerbate traffic flow problems in Stansted Mountfitchet if rail commuters choose Stansted rail station rather than Bishops Stortford. Congestion in the centre of Stansted Mountfitchet, including access to and parking at the railway station requires long term vision.

MAG – control any noise sensitive development within areas that are subject to existing or future aircraft noise. The Council should consult with the CAA regarding their future policy for air space. Renewable energy schemes may be incompatible with the airport.

Essex County Council consider that edge of settlement development at site 11a may facilitate commercial development. A direct link with B1383 is likely to be required. UDC needs to discuss whether the site is appropriate with East Herts DC and HCC.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council - area of search 11a could exacerbate traffic flow problems in Stansted Mountfitchet if rail commuters choose Stansted rail station rather than Bishops Stortford. Congestion in the centre of Stansted Mountfitchet, including access to and parking at the railway station requires long term vision.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- AoS 11a could play a role in meeting employment need. UDC needs to consider the economic evidence produced from East Herts.

- Development can be accommodated with AoS 11a without any significant impacts on important designations

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This is a single site that illustrates the overcrowding being forced on this area
- Create urbanisation between Bishops Stortford and Birchanger
- Unsuitable for development

COMMENTS ON AREA OF SEARCH 11B

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Hertfordshire County Council 11b includes land previously identified by HCC as being required to enable the expansion of secondary schools in Bishops Stortford. The inclusion of this area for residential development would result in additional land being unavailable for school expansion. It is requested that this land is excluded from any development proposals.

Essex County Council it is important to note that parts of 11b are within flood risk zones 2 and 3. It is recommended that a strategy be adopted making sure developments do not increase flood risk.

Historic England there are six listed buildings within this area of search so it is not correct for the SA to state there are no significant historic environment designations within this area. However, there may be some scope for development in this location, although consideration should be given to potential heritage impacts and how they might be addressed.

Sustainable Uttlesford development at 11b would have additional impact on local road network and the Hockerill junction and potential for rat running through residential streets.

Haymeads Residents Association – we object to this proposal as infrastructure has failed to match the level of growth over recent years. There is inadequate local road networks with speed humps and unsuitable for the volume of traffic. There is existing traffic congestion and Linkside Road is an accident hot spot. There are a shortage of school places, inadequate healthcare, overcrowded rail services, poor air quality and loss of agricultural land. The site is under the flight path for Stansted Airport and proximity of sewage works could be an issue.

Bishops Stortford Neighbourhood Plan The Hertfordshire and Essex High School were looking at this area to provide sports pitch provision for pupils and local community. This will not happen if it is allocated for housing.

Bishops Stortford Civic Federation 11b is used as a rat run and development here would generate more traffic. It would also suffer from aircraft noise due to close proximity to Stansted Airport and the M11.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- 11b is some distance from road junctions and traffic would be directed through Bishop's Stortford

- 11b should include the land adjacent to the junction of Beldhams Lane and Hallingbury Road. Developer promoting site – Call for Sites reference number:

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- Totally inappropriate location
- The site is farmland and should stay that way
- The site is within the green belt
- The local road network is incapable of taking more traffic
- Stansted Airport noise and air pollution will worsen
- It is within the flight path meaning residents will suffer from noise
- Linkside road is dangerous
- It is within the Flight Path Safety Zones
- 11b has been earmarked by EHDC for open space, sporting and education
- Local facilities and infrastructure cannot cope with more development
- Development at 11b would rely on the services of Bishops Stortford
- UDC are relying on East Herts to provide services for their housing
- Where will the access road be – very dangerous road

Question 14

Great Dunmow

What issues and evidence should the Council consider when assessing the potential for urban extensions to Great Dunmow at Areas of Search 12a-f? Please reference any specific Areas of Search in your response.

This question was responded to by 187 people/organisations. The following is a summary of the key points raised by the representations. To read all the representations in full please go to <http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/3038/Planning-Policy-Consultations>.

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Anglian Water Services Ltd it is suggested that consideration is given to the implications of locating development within these areas for the existing foul sewerage network and to what extent new and improved infrastructure may be required. Consideration should be given to the impact of additional foul flows on Great Dunmow Water Recycling Centre.

Helena Romaine Secondary School The Local Plan needs to identify strategic sites, this consultation document is too high-level and not detailed enough. The Neighbourhood Plan does not provide the appropriate level of growth or certainty as a Local Plan.

Natural England in assessing the potential for urban extensions to Great Dunmow the Council should include consideration of the potential impacts of traffic derived air pollution on designated sites in particular High Wood SSSI.

Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways if additional growth is proposed consideration should be given to improve sustainable transport connectivity between Stansted Airport, Great Dunmow and Braintree. Consideration should be given to the future development within the east of the town due to the impact it may have on Hoblongs/A120 junction.

ECC acknowledges that the SA identified parts of the AoS within Great Dunmow that fall within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. It is recommended that the evidence base be updated to include the EA updated flood map for surface water. They suggest provision be made for strategic sites that may be utilised for flood storage areas to alleviate existing flooding within the town and any new planned developments.

It is recommended that UDC considers the availability of school places at the existing primary schools and the Helena Romanes schools and 6th form centre, in considering whether further growth and development is viable. It is importance to appreciate the ability for the school to expand and whether the scale of development is sufficient to warrant the establishment of a new schools. UDC should give further consideration to the proposals in relation to The Helena Romanes School.

Consideration should be given to existing and future Early Years and Child Care facilities and services.

Highways England – development in this area is likely to impact M11 J8 and the A120 corridor, public transport linkage both to Braintree and Stansted/Bishops Stortford would

need a step change if this scenario were to be seriously considered. Plugging extra development on to Great Dunmow would open the opportunity for the provision of more sustainable options as a large population would mean demand was available to make things economically viable that currently are not, such as more shops and entertainment venues.

Historic England – the Council should consider the possible impacts on the significance of heritage assets, including impact on setting. Reviewing and updating the Historic Settlement Character Assessment should also be carried out to provide robust evidence to inform any decisions. Great Dunmow is a historic town of considerable importance. The wider setting of the town is significant with the valley of the River Chelmer to the east and the historic landscape of Little Easton to the north west and the registered park and garden of Easton Lodge.

Sustainable Uttlesford prefers the allocation of housing in a single settlement, it does not endorse further development in Great Dunmow.

Friends of Flitch Way the Council should consult with the group on the results of botanical surveys completed on the areas that border the carriageway.

Hands off Thaxted any further development would be untenable and would completely destroy the character of the town. Some infrastructure is at/over capacity

The Hundred Parishes Society – high priority should be given to working with, respecting and where possible, enhancing the historic environment, especially historic settlements and areas of ancient countryside.

Stebbing Society – facilities in Dunmow are overloaded. There has already been considerable development. Development should be focused on the M11 corridor and not the A120.

The Thaxted Society – against all development which occurs outside development limits.

Town and Parish Councils

Birchanger Parish Council – Can the nature of the roads cope with more traffic. Width of road, dangerous bends. Infilling only within village envelope.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council The town has assets of cultural and historic significance. Facing developer led rather than plan led development

The Sampfords Parish Council Great Dunmow has already accommodated more than its fair share of new housing development. No further major development beyond that already committed should be permitted.

Saffron Walden Town Council – this is a matter for Great Dunmow Town Council to comment on. The Local Plan Inspector stated that there was a limit to how far towns such as Great Dunmow can sustainably grow.

Rayne Parish Council – these are complex issues and it is thought unreasonable to expect members of the public to have an effective response.

Felsted Parish Council – Dunmow offers access to the A120 and on to M11 and Stansted, for rail links and employment. However, the B1008 road access to Park and Ride/station at Chelmsford is inadequate.

Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group – as stated and evidenced in the Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan, views and the historic nature of Great Dunmow are to be protected. The Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan should be taken into consideration. There are policies and allocation within it that need to be taken into account. The town development limit is clearly set in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Newport Parish Council – all roads that would access developments should be improved with work to junctions and road width to cope with additional traffic

Thaxted Parish Council – development should take account of adequate transport links and should exploit brown field opportunities.

Stebbing Parish Council – there is far too much planned development or at best sufficient already. Woodlands Park and other developments permissioned land fulfil requirements. Dunmow has taken more than its fair share of the Districts development needs. Any further significant growth will alter the character of Dunmow as an historic market town and it will lose its identity

Quendon and Rickling Parish Council – infrastructure not in place to accommodate such massive development

Clavering Parish Council – Great Dunmow is historic and is being eroded. The market town road network cannot cope with the volume of traffic.

Agents, Developers and Land Owners

Consideration should include ability of settlement to accommodate growth in the context of existing services and facilities, environmental constraints, access to strategic road and rail network.

The Local Plan Inspector rightly said that there are limits to how far towns like Great Dunmow can grow sustainably.

There is no rail link in the town thus diminishing sustainable transport options.

The Neighbourhood Plan is likely to constrain locations for development

Development of these areas would likely see significant increase in traffic within the town to access to the strategic road network

landscape and heritage assess constraints may render some renewable energy schemes unsuitable

the town has significant growth and infrastructure issues to contend with before any future growth is contemplated. It is considered that Great Dunmow will be unable to make any significant further contribution to growth.

Great Dunmow is located near to Stansted Airport and the Local Plan must take account of potential growth at the Airport.

Consider that the development and transport potential of the A120 corridor could be significant and this was not properly or thoroughly assessed through the DLP process.

Urge the Council to consider the results of the 2007 and 2009 Historic Settlement Character Assessment in particular the significant extent of heritage constraints to development. It notes that development around the edge of Great Dunmow in any direction is constrained due to impact on heritage and landscape. This strengthens the case for a new settlement on the A120 corridor.

The potential to merge and coalesce with Little Easton should be prevented

Additional growth potential is very limited due to infrastructure limitations as well as environmental constraints.

No further growth locations should be identified on the periphery of Gt Dunmow due to the potential impact on the historic core and education capacity. A new settlement should be the preferred growth option

It is considered that the areas of search surrounding tier 1 and 2 settlements represent the optimum opportunity for meeting housing needs.

The main areas for consideration are transportation, flood risk, landscape, ecology, contamination, availability and deliverability

The Council needs to ensure the plan delivers the level of housing needed to take account of the planned changes to Stansted Airport.

Great Dunmow is the other main settlement which provides a wide range of services and facilities. It is close to the A120 and links to M11.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

The following general comments were made:

- Existing planning permissions must be taken into consideration
- The LP Inspectors view was that there is a limit to sustainable growth of towns such as Great Dunmow
- Great Dunmow has reached its limit
- Suitable location so long as the infrastructure grows
- Infrastructure and community facilities are already strained
- UDC must be in discussions with Great Dunmow Town Council in order to establish what sites, if any, should be allocated
- Historic town with conservation area – development should not have a detrimental impact
- Good employment opportunities at Stansted Airport and proximity to Bishops Stortford
- The Neighbourhood Plan sets out development in Great Dunmow – no more sites should be allocated

- The proposed areas are parts of the Chelmer Valley and should not be developed
- Dunmow with its bypass is better suited than other areas in the District
- Without a railway station and direct motorway access development is not sustainable
- Limited recreational facilities in the town
- It can accommodate some further development without destroying its historic integrity
- Some limited development will provide a boost for the shops
- The scenic approaches to the town need to be protected
- A new settlement would be better
- Consideration should be given to a new rail link between Stansted Airport and Dunmow which would help take some pressure off the roads

Comments on Area of Search 12a

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Historic England – we note the SA reference to development diminishing the sense of place and local distinctiveness of Great Dunmow, although this statement needs updating in light of development 2007 and the publication of the HSCA. While impacts on Great Dunmow to the east need to be clarified, there is still the potential for impacts on the historic environment to the north and west of this AoS, consideration should still be given to potential heritage impacts and how they might be addressed

Helena Romaine Secondary School: previous submission to the Council concerning the relocation of HRS have identified the suitability and deliverability of land within AoS 12a and 12f.

Sustainable Uttlesford whilst they do not endorse growth in the town they consider sites to the south of the town (AoS 12a and 12f) to have less long term impact. These sites would be more accessible to a major corridor of movement and national motorway network.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Felsted Parish Council – this could result in coalescence with Little Easton

Little Easton Parish Council – this is still being considered by the SoS, it would be an unacceptable extension. This would be harmful to the character of the landscape and natural environment.

Great Dunmow Parish Council – the central part of this site is the subject to a planning appeal – unless a decision to grant permission is made it is clearly nonsensical to contemplate the inclusion of this site for development given the recent sustained efforts that have been made to prevent it. To seek to develop the northern part of the AoS would, if the appeal part is dismissed, result in a development which would effectively be an urban extension of Little Easton. It is therefore quite clear that area of search 12a should not be considered further.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- How can an area that was rejected for development at appeal now be an area of search

- Development here would benefit the town

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- This AoS includes a site subject to an appeal which would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and has access issues.
- Developer promoting site at Woodside Way for residential development. Call for Sites reference number 07GtDun15
- Developer promoting site at Hoglands for residential development. Call for Sites reference number 04LtEas15

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This area is subject to a planning appeal
- Unsuitable for development

Comments on Area of Search 12b

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways the site allocations 12b and 12c may facilitate an eastern relief road.

It is important to note that parts of 12b fall within flood risk zone 2 and 3. It is recommended that proactive strategies be developed to ensure that there is not an increase in flood risk and appropriate mitigation is in place.

Historic England – the SA notes the potential for a large urban extension to diminish the separation of Great Dunmow from Church End and that development could detrimentally affect St Marys church from some vantage points. There are two ancient monuments and a conservation area. We have considerable concerns about the development of this area and its impact on the historic environment which would require further assessment. It may not be possible to bring forward development here in terms of the level of impact on the historic environment.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Felsted Parish Council this is on the wrong site of Dunmow for commuting and for access to the road and rail network. Unsustainable development without additional road access to the central road and rail network. This will create unacceptable pressure on town centre roads and facilities.

Little Easton Parish Council – this would be a poor location for development due to the negative impact on the Chelmer Valley landscape character and coalescence with Church End

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council – this area is set around flood risk areas. Development would destroy a prized natural landscape. This area should be discounted.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This area is outside the town development area

- Coalescence with Great Dunmow and Church End
- Create urban sprawl
- Classic ecological corridor and should be protected as a green infrastructure corridor

Comments on Area of Search 12c

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Environment Agency there is a historic landfill site known as Merks Hill Landfill operated by Essex CC. Any development proposed on the landfill would require Preliminary Risk Assessment followed by intrusive site investigation, risk assessment to assess whether remediation can be undertaken to ensure the protection of the water environment.

Historic England – there are potential landscape impacts from development above the river valley. We cannot immediately agree with the SA that there is sufficient separation between the conservation area and the AoS to not present an issue. This requires further assessment to establish potential impacts and the AoS might need to be refined accordingly to address heritage impacts.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Felsted Parish Council this is on the wrong site of Dunmow for commuting and for access to the road and rail network. Unsustainable development without additional road access to the central road and rail network. This will create unacceptable pressure on town centre roads and facilities.

Little Easton Parish Council – there is potential for small scale development to complement the development already under construction. There is an existing bus service and footpath link to the facilities of the town by foot or cycle.

DEVELOPER, AGENT AND LAND OWNER

- Promoting a new site north of Braintree Road within this AoS
- Development to the east of the town would provide more balance to the growth of Great Dunmow, with people being able to walk to facilities
- Developer promoting a self-build development within this AoS. Call for Sites reference number 11GtDun15

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This area is outside the town development area
- Unsuitable for development

Comments on Area of Search 12d

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Anglian Water Services Ltd This area appears to include the Water Recycling Centre. Anglian Water has an Encroachment Policy which states that we will undertake a risk assessment of development proposals within 400m. Any development in this area would not be located at a sufficient distance from this site to ensure new development is not adversely affected due to sewage treatment at the site.

Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways It is important to note that parts of 12b fall within flood risk zone 2 and 3. It is recommended that proactive strategies be developed to ensure that there is not an increase in flood risk and appropriate mitigation is in place.

Historic England – there are 3 listed buildings within this AoS so it is not correct for the SA to state there are no significant historic environment constraints within this area. However, there may be some scope for development in this location although consideration should be given to potential heritage impacts and how they might be addressed.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council – this area is set around flood risk areas. Development would destroy a prized natural landscape. This area should be discounted.

Little Easton Parish Council – has the potential for development as there is a bus service, the potential to access the A120 and the range of services in Great Dunmow can be accessed by foot and cycle routes.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- This area is outside the town development area
- Most plausible location given ease to the A120

Comments on Area of Search 12e

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Historic England – there are three listed buildings within this area of search and heritage assets, so it is not correct for the SA to state there are no significant historic environment constraints within this area. While there is scope for development in this location consideration should still be given to potential heritage impacts and how they might be assessed.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Little Easton Parish Council – there is little scope to add to the approved settlement unless there is an opportunity to enhance the area as a whole and introduce more character or amenities to the new part of the town.

Great Dunmow Town Council – Illogical given that virtually the whole of it comprises built development. Given that the contentious sites are outside the town development area and that the community did not wish to see the sites outside the town development area developed, then it is both logical and appropriate to delete this area of search.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- Comprises sites which are contentious and subject to legal proceedings
- Most plausible location given ease to the A120

Comments on Area of Search 12f

STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

Helena Romaine Secondary School: previous submission to the Council concerning the relocation of HRS have identified the suitability and deliverability of land within AoS 12a and 12f.

Sustainable Uttlesford whilst they do not endorse growth in the town they consider sites to the south of the town (AoS 12a and 12f) to have less long term impact. These sites would be more accessible to a major corridor of movement and national motorway network.

Historic England – the overall setting and character of Great Dunmow is a factor. While there is scope for development in this location, consideration should still be given to potential heritage impacts and how they might be addressed.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Little Easton Parish Council – has the potential for development, particularly if the secondary school is located in this area. There is good access to the primary road network, the superstore and amenities provided by West of Woodside Way development.

Great Dunmow Town Council – the greater part of this area is outside the town development area and is therefore unacceptable in principle. Only the north western part of the site is therefore a possibility. That north western area is in fact identified in the neighbourhood plan for development through policy DS3 TDA Land South of Stortford Road. The policy allocated the site for a mixed use development of 14ha of land for secondary school, 400 residential units and a health care. But this was because that allocation was included within UDCs previous draft plan. The reason for this allocation no longer exists but that is not to say that the site should not be developed for an appropriate use of mix of uses.

DEVELOPER, AGENT AND LAND OWNER

Developer is promoting a site in AoS12f stating that this is the most appropriate opportunity for housing, education and healthcare development. Call for Sites reference 12GtDun15

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- Most plausible location given ease to the A120