

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

**Questions**

- 4: Infrastructure Planning
- 5: Employment
- 8: Natural Environment and Historic Environment
- 11: New Settlement Areas of Search
- 15: Villages
- 16: Development at 580 dwellings per year
- 17: Development at 750 dwellings per year
- 18: Other Scenarios
- 19: Other Points

**March 2016**

## Question 4

### Infrastructure Planning

Please provide details of any particular infrastructure issues which you feel the Council needs to consider if possible providing evidence.

This question was responded to by 514 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

- Sport England view evidence base on sports provision inadequate
- Greater London Authority note study on enhancing the West Anglia Mainline could improve rail links between Uttlesford and key locations along the line
- Environment Agency require update of Water Cycle Study
- Highways England note Congestion on approaches to junction 8 M11. Some junctions on the A120 are reaching capacity, notably Galleys Corner Braintree
- Essex County Council key issues were childcare/education/Surface water flooding/involvement in latest UDC transport study
- South Cambridgeshire District Council require the impacts of new developments on the A1301 and A1307 in the northern part of UDC to be fully understood
- Most consider an existing deficit of infrastructure in all areas of the district
- Transport, education, health most mentioned as lacking
- Transport often mentioned as most pressing issue as effects most others
- Saffron Walden travel/traffic considered the worst by most
- Need for a Saffron Walden bypass often suggested

### STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

**Sport England** - Sport England developed guidance for local authorities to assist with Local Plan policies and for sports facilities. Sport England/Public Health England, has produced Active Design (October 2015), a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. It sets out ten principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity. The Active Design principles are aimed at contributing towards the Governments desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design/use in the master planning process. Sport England previously raised concerns on the emerging Uttlesford Sports Strategy 2015 not robust/up to date evidence base. Considers emerging UDC Sports Strategy inadequate to inform plan.

**Natural England** - All new residential development (or mixed development with a significant residential component) should include sufficient accessible green space, including informal semi-natural areas, to meet a significant proportion of the residents daily needs (especially dog walking). Reason to provide a good quality of life for residents and to minimise any increase in the level of recreational pressure placed upon existing semi-natural areas and, in particular, Hatfield Forest.

**Greater London Authority** - The West Anglia Task Force is currently assessing a range of potential opportunities for enhancing the West Anglia Mainline. These potential investments could improve rail links between Uttlesford and key locations along the line, as well as helping to support housing and economic development opportunities across the wider London Stansted Cambridge corridor. The Task Force is looking at options including four-tracking the railway in the Upper Lea Valley, and having a branch of the potential future Crossrail 2 scheme serve the Corridor reporting in Summer 2016. The Council may therefore wish to consider the potential growth opportunities arising from such improvements to the West Anglia Mainline.

**Thames Water Utilities** - Water companies investment programmes are based on a 5 year cycle - Asset Management Plan (AMP) process. AMP6 covers 2015 to 2020. As part of Thames Waters five year business plan they advise OFWAT on the funding required to accommodate planned growth. Thames Water base their investment programmes on a range of factors, including population projections and development plan allocations, which help to form the clearest picture of the future shape of the community.

Thames Water relies heavily on the planning system to ensure infrastructure upgrades are provided ahead of development. Insert paragraph /policy in the local plan:

Supporting text: The LPA will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers required to show adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to adverse amenity impacts for existing or future users in the form of internal and external sewer flooding, pollution of land and water courses and/or issues with water supply in the form of no or low water pressure. •

Policy: Planning permission will only be granted for developments which increase the demand for off-site water and wastewater infrastructure where: 1) Sufficient capacity already exists; or 2) Extra capacity can be provided in time to serve the development ensuring environment/ amenities of other users not adversely affected. When there is a capacity constraint and improvements in off-site infrastructure are not programmed, planning permission will only be granted where the appropriate infrastructure improvements will be completed prior to occupation of the development.

Where development is being proposed within 800m of a sewage treatment works, the developer or LPA should liaise with Thames Water to consider an odour impact assessment.

**Anglian Water Services Ltd** - UDC commissioned a Water Cycle Study to inform the preparation of the Draft Local Plan 2014. This study outlined the implications for water resources and supply infrastructure and wastewater treatment and sewer network. It is suggested that the findings of this study should be reviewed or updated to take account of any significant changes to the development strategy outlined in the Local Plan submitted to Government in July 2014. Anglian Water would welcome the opportunity to be involved as part of any review or update of this study.

**Environment Agency** - Important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion including Wastewater infrastructure NPPF177. Acknowledge section 2.4 p8 mentions improvement to utilities/infrastructure/expect some specifics around the existing water and wastewater infrastructure/capacity for planned

housing growth. Take account of phasing and adequacy of capacity/ impact on the growth strategy if delays to funding of infrastructure upgrades. Given existing WCS was completed recently, it may not be necessary to undertake a completely new study. Instead WCS refresh through provision of an addendum/ focus on new areas of search/increases in housing provision to settlements and consider the latest AMP plans.

Limited capacity at Thaxted and Dunmow/expect refreshed WCS to look at capacity matters. Majority of district is Drinking Water Protected Area (DrWPA) safeguard zone and Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ). Several wastewater treatment works (WwTWs) within catchment are at, or close to, their permitted flow/larger works at Saffron Walden, Great Chesterford and Newport. If significant development is connected into these WwTWs, revisions to the discharge permits will be required. Impact of proposed development on foul water infrastructure needs to be assessed if the numbers of dwellings in any given location is beyond that assessed in the existing Water Cycle Study (WCS). Impact of more foul water discharge on receiving rivers needs to be assessed if the numbers of dwellings in any given location is beyond that assessed in the WCS. Much work done on proposed Elsenham Eco-town/Issue with sewage treatment provision/present arrangement involves transfer of foul water to the Stansted WwTW. Limited scope to expand the transfer of foul water due to engineering constraints linked to the pipe network passing under the M11.

Local water supplies are already heavily used with additional supplies being imported from other parts of Hertfordshire and/or Cambridge Water. Local plans can help to ensure that water resources are protected and, where evidence justifies, that water efficiency measures are adopted. Water efficiency in new buildings is encouraged to reduce water use and cut domestic carbon emissions/water treatment. Where evidence justifies include policies requiring all new homes to minimise internal water use based on local pressures.

**Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highway** - Need to provide infrastructure (via developer funding) as part of any new housing proposals. ECC needs to be satisfied with impact of the scale and distribution of growth on its areas of responsibility, or identify infrastructure/mitigation is required. Need delivery of a viable bus service - scale/proximity of growth to larger settlements may ensure an adequate bus service is provided. Development needs a bus service provided from start. Use Uttlesford Cycling Strategy (2014) identifying infrastructure deficits in cycling network/missing links on Fitch Way/strategic cycle link across the District. Use Highway Impact Assessment (2014) to identify key junctions that are at or approaching capacity/assist the identification of new infrastructure required. ECC need input into updated Assessment /highway mitigation.

No reference to Early Years and childcare/uptake of employment or training is often dependent on the ability to access childcare. Insufficient child care provision in UDC to enable parents to easily access free entitlement E.g. those without transport childcare is difficult to access. Growth needs to take this situation into account/plan for more demand. Dispersed nature of UDC means growth will lead to many children travelling to school, especially for secondary schools. Ensure/plan safe direct walking and cycling routes to school available. If standards cannot be achieved ECC seek contributions from developers towards providing transport to schools but these can never fully mitigate the impact once health, congestion, air quality and cost in perpetuity are considered. School travel plans/promote sustainable travel to school via location of new housing.

ECC is required to provide free transport for all pupils of compulsory school age/make transport arrangements for all children who cannot reasonably be expected to walk to nearest suitable school because the nature of the route is deemed unsafe to walk. The location of sites for new housing within UDC, together with the necessary infrastructure to support them, should seek to ensure, wherever possible, to minimise the distance and journey times between home and school and ensure that there are safe walking and cycling routes for pupils to use on their journey between home and school. UDC to consider sufficiency of school places for particular proposals. Commissioning School Places in Essex published annually with information including capacity of existing schools.

UDC Sustainability Appraisal states Surface water flooding risk highlighted in the modelling of surface water in Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and Stansted Mountfitchet. Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk, and water supply/demand. Plan for Flood storage areas around Towns AOS/Control SuDS.

Telecoms/Broadband provides economic and social benefit/needs to emphasis e.g. prosperous economy/attract new businesses and jobs to UDC; increase home/remote-working/reduce the demand on travel networks at peak periods.

**Highways England** - Need to consider impact upon the road infrastructure. Congestion is evident at, and on the approaches to junction 8 of the M11. Some junctions on the A120 are reaching capacity, notably Galleys Corner interchange. Whilst Galleys Corner is within Braintree District need to consider the transportation impact beyond UDC.

**Essex Wildlife Trust** - Address current deficit in publicly accessible green open spaces in UDC. Mapping and assessment of existing GI network across the district can identify opportunities for enhancement of existing designated sites, creation of new habitats and linkages joining up existing sites to create a landscape-scale green network. The aim should be to significantly enhance biodiversity, protect and enhance riverine corridors, and provide areas of accessible natural open space for public enjoyment. At a strategic level, effective local planning for GI requires a strong evidence base to understand both the risks to GI assets and opportunities for enhancement to enable resilient plans to be developed. Need to have access to baseline figures for biodiversity in their area - Essex Wildlife Trust Biological Records Centre and the Essex Biodiversity Action Plan. A principle of no net loss of GI should be used, with a general aim that a minimum of 40% of the total land should constitute GI. Where there are policies or designations that require greater green space provision (for example in Community Forests, where 30% woodland cover is required), these requirements should be provided as a minimum, as part of the GI plan. Existing biodiversity features of environmental, historical or cultural interest, such as habitats of principal importance, ancient woodland and hedgerows, the remains of previous settlements, open spaces, and routes long used by local communities, should all be conserved and integrated into the design. GI can be harnessed as a positive place-shaping tool, and where appropriate can be used to positively transform local character.

**South Cambridgeshire District Council** - The emerging 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 UDC need to be fully

understood to inform decisions. The viability assessment of the emerging Local Plan and its policies should take account of need to mitigate transport impacts outside UDC along corridor towards Cambridge. Consideration should be given to the outcome of the emerging City Deal A1307 study.

**Hertfordshire County Council** - Infrastructure planning needs to consider the cross-boundary issues relating to the provision of school places mentioned in question 2.

**Heritage England** - It would seem that there are infrastructure issues in Saffron Walden, particularly in terms of the road network. With new development predominantly located on the east side of the town, but the major transport corridors (railway/motorway) located to the west, this has an impact on traffic movements through the town, particularly in the historic town centre. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss how the Local Plan might address such issues in Saffron Walden to conserve and enhance its historic environment. Elsewhere knock-on impacts from growth on the capacity of road infrastructure in some settlements, which could impact on the historic environment.

**Essex Bridleways Association** - No mention of rights of way is included within paragraph 2.4 relating to Infrastructure and we request that when the final document is drawn up that the protection and enhancement of the Rights of Way network is included within new development and related infrastructure planning. It is far more cost-effective to plan such infrastructure at the beginning of any development and have it included in the initial draft plans, and we request that such new rights of way and enhancements are written into the policy against which applications for new developments will be determined.

**Hands Off Thaxted** - Infrastructure in UDC is already operating beyond its capacity with congestion on the roads, overfull schools and health centres with waiting lists stretched beyond stated capacities. As an example in Thaxted further growth will involve busing children to other primary schools outside the village/wholly unacceptable for small children and would destroy the cohesion of the village. It is also on record that regular flooding with sewage on Thaxted's streets is as a result of an inadequate drainage system. All proposed new developments including any new settlements should be accompanied by a proper plan related to the development of the associated infrastructure to ensure that this is in place before new houses can be occupied. This is a fundamental principle of the NPPF.

**We Are Residents** - Difficult to know where to start with this question or what is expected? It is worth noting however that there has been a huge under-provision of any infrastructure in the last 10 years, and the policy of piecemeal development has undoubtedly contributed to it, as has UDCs refusal to move from S106s to CIL system. To state obvious, not enough school places have been provided, there has been very little open space provision (UDCs deficient Developer Contributions Policy); there has been almost no green transport infrastructure; drainage systems haven't been improved. This has been pointed out repeatedly, yet s.106 contributions have not been made. Main issue is lack of any proper infrastructure delivery plan and the lack of any co-ordinated or strategic delivery of infrastructure. UDC Infrastructure Delivery Plan failed to plan for almost any necessary infrastructure, had no detailed proposals and no costings. Rather than trying to list every single piece of infrastructure which might be provided, urge UDC to prepare a proper Infrastructure Delivery Plan. We would also once again urge UDC to move as quickly as

possible to a CIL (UDC failing even to get developers to make contributions to school places), ensuring developments big or small, contribute to infrastructure provision.

**Sustainable Uttlesford** -Particularly concerned about the timely provision of school places in light of the recent experience of poor planning causing the reopening of old primary school sites in Stansted Mountfitchet and Takeley. How will be the traditional cross border movement of pupils into Hertfordshire schools in the south west of the district be provided for when the 2,500 new homes allocated to Bishops Stortford area become occupied? Also in light of current planned changes in bus routes within the district especially serving some of the Type A villages we would want the maintenance of current public transport network in the District to be a factor in the decision making.

**Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** - The Infrastructure in Great Dunmow, the villages around are at full stretch. Children are being bussed to and fro to find places and the surgeries can barely cope. It is true that there will be more schools as a result of existing applications but there will be delays whilst houses are built before the new schools become operational. It is therefore unrealistic for the new Local Plan to consider adding to the problem. The Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan has considered this extensively and we would refer you to that document.

**Stebbing Society** - As stated above, any infrastructure planning must consider and incorporate proper provision for key issues such Education, Health and Transport (Public and Private) and associated Links, the scale of which has to be commensurate with and in proportion to the size of development. In our local area there are 1900 patients per doctor compared with 1700 nationally! All other infrastructure facilities are already bursting and really can't support any more. Stebbing Residents are very reliant on their cars, as are many other similar Type A villages. So a sound, coherent transport network system must be a crucial infrastructure priority. In this increasingly hi-tech environment, faster Broadband should now also be added to the more traditional infrastructure needs.

**The Thaxted Society** - Rural communication is essential to effective sustainability of a rural landscape. It is a greater need at the micro local level than the over supplied national and global. Therefore broadband provision should be seen as essential part of a future for rural living.

**Essex Bridleways Association** - No mention of rights of way is included within paragraph 2.4 relating to Infrastructure and we request that when the final document is drawn up that the protection and enhancement of the Rights of Way network is included within new development and related infrastructure planning. It is far more cost-effective to plan such infrastructure at the beginning of any development and have it included in the initial draft plans, and we request that such new rights of way and enhancements are written into the policy against which applications for new developments will be determined.

**Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group** - The Council is only making reference to built infrastructure and has completely ignored Green Infrastructure here. Planning guidance makes abundant reference to the integration of green infrastructure into development and plans, and its omission here makes the plan unsound. There is a current deficit in publicly accessible green open spaces in the district which urgently needs to be addressed/worse than London Borough of Haringey. Assessment of existing GI network across the district

carried out by Essex Wildlife Trust showed UDC to be deficient in Accessible Natural Greenspace at every level. Before additional development is accepted the existing deficiencies must be addressed. A proper GI assessment can identify opportunities for enhancement of existing designated sites, creation of new habitats and linkages joining up existing sites to create landscape scale green network. The aim should be to significantly enhance biodiversity, protect and enhance riverine corridors, and provide areas of accessible natural open space for public enjoyment.

**Birchanger Wood Trust** - The western A120 should be dual-carriageway up to Junction 8 on the M11/direct link to the A120 is essential for Elsenham and Henham/absurd to direct their traffic into the north of Stansted. The Cambridge Road/Silver Street, the B1383 is already full and has narrow impossible footways. The alternative routes, both North/south and east/west through Stansted village are also incapable of holding any more traffic.

**The Theatres Trust** - Important to protect/promote cultural infrastructure. A variety of community and cultural infrastructure are vital for their contribution to the life of residents and visitors. To support the NPPF include policy to resist the loss of existing community/cultural facilities unless replacement facilities are provided, or not needed. Criteria for encouraging new facilities to serve the District's growing population.

**Friends of the Earth** - Very little infrastructure has been provided in conjunction with recent housing developments. UDC needs to adopt a strategy that maximises infrastructure provision rather than losing it through piecemeal growth. The same applies to Question 7 - Open Spaces, etc.J, where again UDC have failed to require developers to make proper provision.

**Helena Romaine Secondary School** - The current HRS and sixth form will need to be re-provided to meet the growing demand on its facilities over the plan period and to maintain a high quality education environment for pupils. Significant work has been undertaken to demonstrate the feasibility of re-locating the school on land South of Stortford Road, and the adjacent land at Buttleys Lane, Great Dunmow, in combination with related site submissions. It is intended that these sites will provide enabling development for the provision of a new secondary school and sixth form, with greater pupil capacity. This enabling residential development would provide for a new secondary school on land adjacent to Buttleys Lane, a Health Centre, parking and ambulance pick up/drop off point on the site. Essex Commissioning School Places 2014-19 Forecasting Group 1 projects growth in secondary school places in Dunmow/with declining surplus of spaces up to 2019/ deficit of places by 2021-22. Additional demand is likely to arise from surrounding districts as set out in Question 2 of this response/ early allocation of land/enabling development securing a new secondary school/sixth form to meet demands. Expanded secondary school provision is essential to the delivery of sustainable growth in and around Great Dunmow. New modern facility superior to expansion of buildings on existing site - insufficient outdoor space.

**Stansted Airport** - Crucial that the road network, both strategic and local, is addressed. Need for high quality, efficient and reliable road connections to airports is recognised by the Aviation Policy Framework. The Airports Commission and the Transport Select Committee have recognised that surface access to airports is vital in unlocking existing airport capacity. Road connectivity to the airport has suffered over several years with piecemeal investment on key road junctions resulting in limited resilience, reliability and increased congestion,

particularly along key sections of the M11 to the north of the airport. Although Stansted has a robust surface access strategy in place and an active transport forum, the road infrastructure shortcomings limit the airports ability to reach its full potential for the economic benefit of the district and East of England. Welcome the partnership approach with the Council, Essex CC, Highways England and airport over last 18 months/must continue if a suitable solution is to be found to the capacity on the M11 and A120. There is agreed mitigation in place for a 35mppa airport, but fair and proportionate contributions from all development sectors need to be capable of being secured into the future.

**G W Balaam & Son** - Clavering should be able to support a larger primary school/possibly a new secondary school in time. Within Villages there should be more off street parking and a complete ban of on street parking, considering this a rural area and a large amount of food is grown in the area and large agricultural equipment and HGVs need to operate in the area.

**Ridgeons** - Need infrastructure improvements in the town to support additional growth/includes link roads and school extensions. The delivery of infrastructure enhancements will clearly need to be fully investigated as part of the Local Plan process. Regard should be given to sites that might be able to be brought forward without the need for significant infrastructure enhancements e.g. brownfield sites.

#### TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Ickleton Parish Council** - Careful consideration must to be given to the need to address the present limitations of the M11 motorway the absence of a northbound motorway access at J9 of the M11 and the absence of a southbound exit at the same junction. The combination of an inadequate local road network and inadequate connections to the M11 renders any proposal for significant new development in the north of the District unsustainable in present circumstances. Saffron Walden itself needs better access to the M11 a nearby junction, and new or improved means of accessing it.

**Great Easton & Tilty Parish Council** - Schools, doctors surgeries and community services must be built in tandem with growth not as an add on after the event. This area is already suffering from the increased population from on going development (e.g. surgeries are full, difficult to get early appointments, and schools are at capacity)

**Elmdon & Wendens Lofts Parish Council** - A new settlement at either AoS 1 or 2 would impact significantly on the road system. Essex CC currently unable to maintain our existing road system in satisfactory condition. Traffic from either new settlement going south on the B184 or B1382 would naturally impact on these already busy routes.

**Clavering Parish Council** - Any new development should incorporate the required infrastructure needs

**Stebbing Parish Council** - A transport network is a crucial infrastructure issue that needs great consideration. Residents of Stebbing are reliant on their cars. Broadband is an essential element for any development Infrastructure planning needs to consider Education and Health.

**Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow Town Council** - Existing spare capacity and the quality of the spare capacity; feasibility of increasing the existing capacity - financial cost and

associated likely phasing; and the social, economic and environmental consequences. The cumulative nature of the possible consequences clearly relate directly to the concept of sustainability. As such, they can have a fundamental impact upon the acceptability, or otherwise, of major development proposals. Must be a guarantee that either they will be delivered on schedule or, if they are not, development does not go ahead “ or, at least, does not become operational until they are in place and functioning. It would, as a half-way house, be easy to suggest the possible alternative of a contingency plan that is a short-term interim solution, to a less than fully acceptable standard but which might suffice for a short-term interim period. However such solutions, once in place, become permanent and the quality of life for residents declines.

The question is so open-ended not able to provide a detailed answer listing all necessary infrastructure. We would like to see a proper infrastructure plan from UDC setting out the infrastructure that they believe should be delivered as part of the plan, for us to comment on. Need a properly costed infrastructure plan both so that the feasibility and delivery of infrastructure can be tested, and Community Infrastructure Levy adopted but no mention of the CIL and it was omitted from the last plan. Believe that it is extremely important if infrastructure is to be delivered properly.

**Elsenham/Henham/Ugley/Widdington Parish Councils** - Any development in Area of Search 3 has no ready access to secondary schooling and that is unlikely to be remedied. The road system is wholly inadequate to serve major development as found by the Local Plan inspector either Hall Road or through Stansted Mountfitchet and the inspector noted that improvements were unlikely to be achievable in either case.

**Little Chesterford Parish Council** - If further development is to take place to the east and north-east of Saffron Walden some sort of ring road would be beneficial to prevent traffic from these developments going through the town centre to travel north or south. The ring road around Great Dunmow has been very successful in reducing traffic in that town.

**Quendon&Rickling Parish Council** - Very little is actually being done about it, despite all development is required by the NPPF to have necessary infrastructure. Often Highways make no objection to planning applications where local residents are at their wits end with frustration regarding their roads, speeding traffic, increased volume of traffic, large trucks travelling on single lane country roads etc. We see water companies having no objection to developments where many additional houses will be added to an antiquated drainage and sewage system that has locals extremely frustrated with blockages and poor functioning. Essex CC agrees to every development as long as they are paid their education contribution but this does not provide any additional schools or school places in the long term. E.g. Takeley 2014 where local children didn't get a place at Takeley Primary because it did not have the space to accommodate them having to go to either Hatfield Broad Oak or Elsenham. The predicted pupil forecasts issued by Essex County Council have not matched the amount of housing development that has taken place in the area and therefore the school was not built with the capacity to cope with the current demand. • Consultation with local residents and Parish Councils will easily identify ongoing problems with infrastructure. This is key reason for supporting two large new settlements rather than trying to meet enormous housing target by overburdening small towns and villages.

**Great Canfield Parish Council** - Constant housing development in the Great Dunmow and Takeley area, infrastructure is not keeping pace with these developments. There are currently no additional GP services and a lack of primary school places for the housing that have been built. There are no rail links and the roads are already busy with no planning for bus lanes. Private vehicle use is the main means of transport and this will not change. If further homes are added to the area between Dunmow and Takeley, it is essential consideration is given to ease traffic congestion, improve public transport and to provide suitable GP and education services without over stretching those already in existence still further.

**Thaxted Parish Council** - Public sector investment should be put in to delivering services with development following on from this as happens in London. Developer contributions should then follow on from this. There needs to be a proper costed infrastructure plan. More use should be made of CIL. Flooding, drainage and concretisation should be considered. The sense of community is dissipated by shipping children out to schools outside of the local area.

**Birchanger Parish Council** - Congestion at Junction 8, and surrounding road network/impact on rural lanes

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council** - The road infrastructure to the southwest of the district is inadequate for present day transport demands and UDC needs to have strategy in place to improve the road network without causing irreparable damage to protected lanes or, destroying the character of smaller communities. A ring road around Stansted Airport, closer to the perimeter, could offer a means of reducing commuter traffic by drawing it away from bottle necks such as that created at Grove Hill in Stansted Mountfitchet. Consider extra junctions on the M11 to help alleviate inevitable further deterioration of main routes, eg B1383, through village centres. A sensible collaborative venture with developers at the 14 Cambridge Road site Stansted Mountfitchet needed to relieve the present chaos caused on the Cambridge Road and present impasse on planning.

**Takeley Parish Council** - M11 Jtn8 already operating at capacity at certain times of the day/week/not fit for purpose/no Highways Agency assessment/evidence for strategic planning? 2500 dwellings already approved for Bishop's Stortford. UDC must consider the impact of both East Herts & UDC development proposals on Jtn 8. It would be wrong to plan further housing development that would impact on Jtn 8. d.M11Jtn 9 has capacity & we suggest should be modified to provide a 4-way junction.

Rail capacity limited on main line to Liverpool Street (Bishop's Stortford). Poor access to rail service at Stansted Airport. As a rail destination fares are at premium rates (up to 33% more expensive than Bishop's Stortford). Stansted Airport is inaccessible via public transport as a commuter destination/ bus service is poor running hourly/no early am or evening services to accommodate commuters. Parking for commuters is too expensive at the Airport. In addition, there is no pedestrian access to the Airport despite request to MAG for pedestrian footway and cycle lane access.

Better road access & employment opportunities in the north of the district. Why is growth again concentrated in the south of the district? Of 5000 permitted most are in the south of district & impact on M11 Jtn 8. Education (Primary & Secondary): Essex CC recently

highlighted the shortfall in capacity of primary and secondary education places in the south of the district to meet future demand (June 2015). How will additional capacity be facilitated without new settlements? GP services: in the key settlements are stretched (Bishops' Stortford, Elsenham, Dunmow, Hatfield Broad Oak, Stansted)

**Newport Parish Council** - Our current infrastructure in Newport is not fit for purpose. Radical improvements are required to cope with the permissions which have already been granted. In Newport we can see no evidence for additional provision for the doctors surgery, schools, leisure facilities and foul water treatment facility (despite repeatedly reporting this as not fit for purpose). We have grave concerns relating to flooding issues/all our representations have been ignored.

**Arkesden Parish Council** - Need to consider ALL infrastructure issues, but transport in particular is vital to the success of any proposed development. Transport infrastructure could/should, be provided at outset of any development s, whilst schools, surgeries, shops, recreational areas etc. should be provided at an early stage.

**Sewards End Parish Council** - Sewards End have discussed the Local Plan and would prefer to have a single settlement with the appropriate infrastructure and schools.

**Felsted Parish Council** - Where major settlements proposed on/close to UDC borders a full assessment of the impact on UDC infrastructure must be carried out in particular the site identified on the Braintree Plan/UDCs area 9. Take more account of the impact of developments on historic villages, particularly the creation of rat runs through villages such as Felsted which have narrow and restricted roads/junctions. Developments such as Oakwood Park, Fritch Green, have a dramatic impact on adjacent villages. In October 2015 3914 vehicle movements in and around Felsted village centre were recorded in a two hour period. There is no opportunity to avoid the main crossroads junction in the village centre/unsustainable now and already struggle to find effective proposals to help ease the flow of traffic. While the A120 is quoted as offering road access the reality is that the short length of dual carriageway ends in a bottleneck at Braintree (Marks Farm roundabout) and has no Eastbound exit between Dunmow and Rayne, limiting its usability for Area 9. Braintree offers only limited rail access to London, with 1 train per hour/extremely limited parking. Hard even now to reach Braintree train station from the east due to road congestion. Access to Chelmsford mainline rail station (and planned north Chelmsford station), is also limited due to congestion during rush hour after the Great Leighs bypass. Some rat runs but these involve unacceptable traffic through small villages. The only realistic rail option for increased commuter traffic into London remains Stansted.

Consideration must be given to water and sewage system capacity (e.g. prolonged recent outages in Dunmow/Felsted; loss of Felsted school buildings to fire because of inadequate water pressure). Stansted takes its water from London. Where would supplies for 10,000 houses in Area 9 come from? The capacity of the M11 north of J8 must be considered in addition to Jn8 improvements. Broadband provision must also be reviewed and vastly improved for business and home use.

**Wendens Ambo Parish Council** - Roads: housing development should not be agreed without the appropriate provision and planning for new roads where needed. Sewerage: development in areas which are not connected to mains drainage should be limited and

should take proper account of potential damage to water courses/rivers etc. Water companies should be asked for more detailed explanations of why development is/is not acceptable and, if necessary, for appropriate work to be carried out by the water company to protect the natural environment. Public transport: development in villages with very little public transport should either be limited or not allowed without improvements to bus services. 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.

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

**Rayne Parish Council** - Making the assumption that transport includes road infrastructure it is important this is regarded as a key issue. The impact on roads over at least a 25-mile radius from the edge of any significant development should be considered. In terms of its knock-on effect, the decision by HMG to not allocate special funds to the A120 is highly disturbing. This has to receive special attention, in a public environment, before any major development begins or planning permission is given. - BDC considers the current poor road situation as a very significant risk to the success of its Local Plan. This should not be read as a reason not to address the risks around all classifications of infrastructure.

**Strethall Parish Meeting** - We are not familiar, in detail, with the southern area of the district so have no comment to make there. But Saffron Walden is 'our' market town just 3 miles distant. So poor public transport, unacceptable pressures on school places despite what the county council might say, slow broadband speeds, more GP's required, Saffron Walden desperately requires east/south ring/by pass road the town is a traffic nightmare as all the finished and proposed development has taken, or will take place, on the east and south of the town so all traffic has to pass through the old town centre to get anywhere. And with future development in place and suggested in this consultative plan such infrastructure as a new link road has to be put in place to avoid gridlock at all times, poor air quality for residents and a big disincentive to outsiders to visit the town; therefore impacting on local business and employment.

**The Sampfords Parish Council** - In considering locations for housing and employment development the availability of high speed broadband is an extremely important factor which does not seem to have been considered. The very poor connectivity speeds of locations to the east of Saffron Walden such as the Sampfords and Thaxted needs to be recognised as a limiting factor and a disadvantage.

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council/Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** - In Stansted Mountfitchet one of the major infrastructure issues is traffic congestion on Cambridge Road there are some possible solutions to this but they require the involvement of Essex Highways we would welcome the opportunity to engage with the UDC transport consultant to address these issues. Traffic congestion is also evident on Chapel Hill, Grove Hill and other roads in the village. Any development at Elsenham/Henham will exacerbate the traffic congestion on Grove Hill and Chapel Hill. This point was made in the recent Local

Plan examination and the road constraints in Stansted Mountfitchet must be taken into account when considering any developments at Elsenham/Henham.

#### DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- Object/Delete the final sentence of paragraph 2.4 "Infrastructure provision is likely to have a major impact on the phasing and deliverability of development" as it is a repetition
- Recognise the reduced infrastructure needs offered by edge of town growth locations
- Sustainable growth best where existing infrastructure/cost effective expansion available.
- Locations needing extensive new infrastructure be secondary as carry a higher burden
- Expand the capacity of existing infrastructure by liaising with the relevant statutory providers before considering provision outside settlements including in SA
- Undertake the necessary work to ensure that the infrastructural demands of an increasing population are addressed
- Ensure infrastructure relating to roads is addressed at a very early stage of the plan
- Common knowledge that growth of Stansted Airport is expected to bring huge economic benefits to the district and the wider south east
- One way of delivering these infrastructure improvements is by the delivery of new housing/reduce commuting time for residents
- The levels of growth envisaged provide major opportunities to fund and improve infrastructure and community services and facilities
- Suggestion that Braintree station is suitable to serve a major development (Boxted Wood, Andrewsfield, and AOS 9) shows ignorance of the district
- Focus on the Liverpool Street/Cambridge main line and the M11 Motorway.
- Major east-west road serving commercial vehicles passing through is the A14 not A120
- The Council needs to build upon the transport and social infrastructure already in place by developing in accordance with the existing settlement hierarchy.
- Centres have been categorised according to the level of infrastructure in place
- Infrastructure improvements secured through new housing development will be distributed across the District and benefit a wide range of communities
- Ability to plan for incremental improvements to, for example local schools or healthcare often challenging and may be restricted by an ability to expand existing services.
- Alternatively, planning for growth on a strategic scale, through one or more new settlements allows for a comprehensive approach to be taken with required new infrastructure built-in to, and delivered for, the new community from the outset.
- Development Vision for a new Garden Village at Andrewsfield, provides for a comprehensive new development with associated infrastructure including primary schools/secondary school/country park with wetland / water sports area/ bus service serving entire Garden Village (including Boxted Wood)
- Little Dunmow is not large enough to sustain any meaningful infrastructure and much of that planned at Flitch Green over a decade ago has still not materialised.
- The Little Dunmow/Flitch Green are deficient in terms of local retail and service facilities, primary healthcare, education (beyond the already over-subscribed primary school in Flitch Green), employment and public open space.
- Provide for a variety of new local infrastructure elsewhere in the locality/Chelmer Mead will enhance the sustainability of this part of the district generally.

- Promote mixed use developments and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs NPPF 38
- TFP promotes supporting retail, healthcare, transport, utilities e.g. a waste water treatment works community facilities alongside new homes/jobs North East of Elsenham.
- Address J8 of the M11 motorway/ limited capacity of this junction, interim solution provides headroom for growth up to mid-2020/ increasing pressure for growth in area likelihood capacity of the junction may be reached earlier
- TFP therefore consider that a comprehensive upgrade to J8 of the M11 is a fundamental infrastructure issue/opens up the potential for improvements to access arrangements to LSA, and new infrastructure opportunities to improve the local network
- Council has to consider how it can get the best use out of the existing infrastructure available. Where there are deficiencies, it has to look to see whether additional development can help to address and rectify these
- Housing should itself be considered as critical, necessary infrastructure so as not to stifle business needs for a growing workforce/planning to meet housing needs should not be suppressed on the basis of existing infrastructure deficiencies
- Wellcome Trust invested in transport improvements as part of Wellcome Campus/ aware further development will create the need for further investment/UDCs proposals to deliver new homes in the north of the District will also place pressure on infrastructure
- Highway capacity problems A1301/ A505 junction/ inability to use junction 9 to access the northbound carriageway of the M11 when travelling south on the A11
- Need new north bound entrance to the M11 from the A11 and south bound exit from the M11 to the A11. This would provide both a North and South side access to the Wellcome Genome Campus and help alleviate the A1301 bottleneck
- The A1301 transport corridor has generally suffered from underinvestment when compared with other corridors in the area, such as the A1307
- Investment from range of sources to improving bus and cycle facilities on the A1307/ similar focus should now seek investment to the A1301 corridor to Great Chesterford
- Wellcome Campus transports c800 staff daily on weekdays across nine privately funded bus routes into Cambridge and beyond and two to Saffron Walden/funded the cycle path between the Campus and the A505
- Great Chesterford and Whittlesford Parkway rail service/sustainable travel options/Trust might be able to make land available for a park and ride to the south of Campus
- To the North of Campus/North-South axis, need connection to Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Addenbrookes Hospital as well as to Cambridge City and North Cambridge
- New settlement offers potential to deliver community and transport infrastructure in a comprehensive way/large enough to meet a range of day-to-day needs maximise internal trips.
- Note Commissioning School Places in Essex 2012-2017 report set out significant capacity constraints at a number of existing primary and secondary schools in UDC
- AECOM has evidence of what new settlements can deliver and the 'trigger points' associated with providing new facilities.
- New development needs to be able to provide high quality access to and from the local road network at locations where suitable road links are available
- Extensive use of rural road links to connect with the wider area should be avoided, and this was for the DLP Inspector a significant constraint for growth at Elsenham/Henham

- In this context, the A120 corridor does appear to offer untapped access opportunities/ locate close to the strategic network to reduce potential impacts
- Able in association with external funding sources, to deliver or fund highway improvements or new infrastructure to facilitate access to the strategic highway network
- If the housing supply requirements are likely to tail off due to reduction in inward migration then it is quite possible that by careful position or dispersal of housing very little highway improvements are required.
- Larger developments can be high risk/ infrastructure requirements are prone to placing financial burdens on large scale developments that could affect their delivery/ requirement to keep a rolling 5 year land supply/smaller, less risky sites with provision of would assist in maintaining short term delivery
- Where significant new infrastructure is necessary, such developments should be appropriately phased to allow the District to grow at a steady rate and in particular deliver housing in locations which will help maintain a five-year housing land supply.
- The recent investment in new community facilities in Manuden should be regarded as an opportunity which can support further housing growth in the village and maximise the benefit of the investment which has already taken place
- Need to build upon transport and social infrastructure already in place by developing in accordance with the existing settlement hierarchy.
- Upgrade and lengthen both trains (carriage numbers) and platforms on the stations situated in UDC on London (Liverpool Street) Cambridge railway line, to increase capacity
- Where significant new infrastructure is necessary, such developments should be appropriately phased to allow the District to grow at a steady rate and in particular deliver housing in locations which will help maintain a five-year housing land supply
- Further growth can be justified where it is commensurate with that spatial hierarchy and to reinforce the role of individual settlements. Infrastructure improvement secured through new housing development will be distributed across the District and benefit a wide range of communities
- The key sustainable growth drivers, as identified on the plans pack produced by JTP should form the basis of future infrastructure planning
- Support growth in category A villages/primary schools which have the capacity to increase pupil intake.

#### COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- Many commented that infrastructure lagged behind growth with lack of public facilities such as doctors surgeries/school places and public transport/improvements needed upfront/ new settlement was best way of meeting infrastructure needs
- Need better local public transport needed between towns and transport hubs at Stansted and Chelmsford. Better cycle routes and cycle parking
- UDC has poor road network, particularly in Towns and villages/congestion, railway line only covering west UDC to Cambridge/London lack of Primary/Secondary Schools
- If focus is existing settlements huge growth necessary for such infrastructure
- fixed and mobile broadband access vital for modern living/small businesses
- Maintenance of existing facilities e.g. village halls
- School places in both primary and secondary schools

- Consider increased traffic flows that results from inappropriate siting of developments
- Use infrastructure in the west of the district/spend where growth arises
- Saffron Waldens roads not fit for purpose/even more so if planned developments proceed/long queues on Thaxted Road/Redwinter Road and the High Street
- East side growth of Saffron Walden without better access links to the west where most of the residents want to get to/Relief roads/inner by-passes are required to link: Tescos to Thaxted Road Ridgeons to Little Walden Road Little Walden Road to Windmill Hill
- Schools must be provided such that they are largely within walking distance of their pupils/ chaos at South Road/Ashdon Road by driving children to school by car
- One-way system causing Shire Hill traffic to come through the town is ill considered
- Proposed one way system for Thaxted Road will not work.
- Poor access to rail station in Saffron Walden
- Priority should be new roads and other services e.g. a ring road around the south, east, and north sides of Saffron Walden
- Insufficient to do infrastructure planning, it needs to be implemented
- Commuters using Newport station park outside residents houses instead of car park
- Audley End/Bishops Stortford stations poorly served - Elsenham crossing downtime
- Buses serving Audley End station should be low emission/ Hydrogen/electric
- Need Cycle paths/safe footpaths an integral part of growth
- Consult Transport providers planning matters/referring to good transport links
- Sustainable development relies on suitable infrastructure
- The water supply in the eastern side of the district is already over extracted
- Elsenham has 18 inch pipe feeding into 9 inch pipe in Station Road/big backup
- Don't expect small rural roads/medieval towns to absorb huge amounts of extra traffic
- Roads near M11, A120, A11, A505, A14 and A1301 already congested
- Victorian school buildings within a congested village/town quaint, but age and location may be holding back the schools potential/ new replacement schools on the edge of the village/town, alleviating school run congestion and allowing future expansion
- Improve winding country lanes with no formal footways
- Restore Haverhill to Shelford line to Granta Park/Sawston taking pressure of the roads
- Proper provision of open spaces and protection of existing ones/new woodlands
- Stop traffic using medieval streets Saffron Walden and Dunmow
- Needs strategy maximises infrastructure provision/not losing it in piece-meal growth
- Water and sewage can't cope/run-off/flooding on roads whenever there is heavy rain
- The "rat run" traffic through Ickleton to junction 10 is already chronic
- Takeley needs their own GP surgery/ Need for another superstore in the vicinity
- Relocate the Fire Station and/or Laundry sites as proposed
- Importance of A1060 beyond Chelmsford/need for a better link to the A414 and A12
- A120 congestion going both ways at Stebbing/Rayne –poor broadband/full school
- A1301/A505 junction( and Pampisford roundabout) overloaded at peak times/rat running
- Estates narrow pavements, inadequate off-road parking/width for buses
- M11/Cambridge to London railway pass through UDC but it is poorly served by them
- Number of private taxi companies in Saffron Walden indicates of lack of bus services
- Dunmow /Braintree no west-bound access to the A120/double back on B1256/ no employment/public transport /local road network/amenities in that area.

- No viable public transport connections to Braintree, Chelmsford, Stansted or Bishops Stortford railway stations/ A120 heavily congested at M11 and Gallows Corner/Freeport
- Restricted parking at Stansted Mountfitchet station
- key transport infrastructure planning/ ability to walk to a railway station/go to the airport/ major hubs (e.g. Stansted, safe cycling. Arterial roads/swift accessible/ less CO2 / NOX
- Bypass Ickleton/Duxford to avoid rat-run traffic accessing motorway at Jn 10
- Health in southern UDC. Hospitals are in north - Saffron and - west Bishops Stortford
- Re-open rail link from Braintree to Stortford, and the one to Thaxted
- Commute down the M11 15ys ago 45 minutes to Barking now 1h 30
- Infrastructure planning an iterative process during development of the Local Plan
- People will travel to nearest fast train station e.g. Audley End/not use a poor one
- Andrewsfield Aerodrome a local amenity/local employer
- Best rail links at Stansted Airport

## Question 5

### Employment

**What should be the main influences on the employment strategy? Are there any locations which you feel would be suitable for employment.**

This question was responded to by 378 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>.

#### Overview summary

- Highways England suggest a sustainable transport strategy for employment sites
- Essex County Council emphasise travel to work patterns for employment
- South Cambridgeshire District Council require employment be considered if any new settlement subject to scale and location
- For location, employment growth locations/transport links or main settlements/villages were suggested in roughly equal numbers i.e. where market wants or where people live
- Some individuals suggest that employment needs be met in other LPAs
- Developers consider commuting patterns suggest more employment/housing needed within the district
- Stansted Airport support 18ha allocation/flexible approach to land use
- Wide range of respondents suggest relaxing restriction on airport-related growth ranging from modest/incremental changes suggested by County to allowing wide range of uses suggested by developers

#### STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

**Highways England** - It would be useful to have a sustainable transport strategy for employment land.

**Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways** - Need to consider travel to work patterns/only 58% of working residents work within UDC including those residents employed at Stansted Airport. The major destinations in travel to work data include the City of London (10.9%), Cambridge (5.5%), and Harlow (2.3%). Issues to address include; predominance of small/medium scale employment stock/shortage of industrial space. Continue restrictions on non-aviation uses at Stansted Airport apart from North Side commercial area to enable a wider range of regional operators to locate close to the airport. Consider evidence for further dedicated research space to be developed outside of Chesterford Research Park. ECC supports employment centres within Stansted Airport and Great Chesterford Research Park/Start up space for Saffron Walden Stansted/Mountfitchet.

**South Cambridgeshire District Council** - If Plan includes new settlements should include appropriate provision for employment, scale/nature dependant on its location.

**Stansted Airport** - support allocation of 18ha area of North Side (Northern Ancillary Area) for non-aviation commercial development being suitable for employment provision/working towards a scheme for development. For the 18ha, issues remain that as airport has grown, a marked shift in land use patterns within it; namely core aviation uses to the south and

decreased reliance on land north of the runway for exclusive aviation purposes. The Inspector acknowledged general employment at this location was sound/this remains the case. Indeed emerging demand supports the airport being a business destination in its own right, underpinned by airports growth in passengers/cargo. Need to consider expanding employment allocation to the north side of the airport. Important that for any allocation a flexible approach to employment uses and development is achieved.

**Birchanger Wood Trust** - The main influence on the Uttlesford employment strategy will be further growth of Stansted Airport. The anticipated growth of Stansted will therefore clearly have a significant impact on the housing market area, including both Uttlesford (and Braintree) District. Land at Andrewsfield, falling between Uttlesford and Braintree Districts is located 16km east of Stansted Airport and is accessible via the A120 and local road network. Andrewsfield Garden Village will include a number of employment parks offering jobs for local people. The uses will range from B1 and B8. Other uses within Andrewsfield Garden Village such as the A1, and A2 and D1 such as schools and clinics will also generate jobs.

**Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group** - Sustainable locations for places of employment and availability of sustainable transport should be the principal considerations. The need to travel should be minimised. Currently the private motor vehicle is the default option for journeys from home to work, local employment sites have been given away to housing development, no part of the District has adequate public transport access. The existing retail employment locations are highly constrained and incapable of further growth.

**G W Balaam & Son** - Need provision for modern high spec office, warehouse / industrial style buildings which can allow smaller business to flourish which can provide key elements to larger settlements or the airport, whilst minimising commuting time for people to get to their places of employment.

**Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** - Stansted Airport may provide more opportunities for employment but by and large most of the newcomers to the area will be commuting by car and the A120 will overload Junction 8 of the M11, which in turn will be overloaded from traffic from a bigger Bishops Stortford, which suffers from inadequacies of the A120 West connecting to the A10. A single settlement option would carry a responsibility to provide employment in line with the number of working age people moving onto the site. Otherwise a dormitory settlement would be created. Clear policies are needed to minimise commuting which will result from the dispersal strategy.

**Hands Off Thaxted** - Limited opportunities in UDC for employment with pay rates high enough to finance the level of mortgage necessary to purchase the houses available. To earn salaries sufficient for house prices in the area people need to travel to London or Cambridge. Developments should therefore be located near the M11 and the nearby railway stations. The larger employers in Thaxted have relocated to Haverhill and Harlow where roads and other facilities are more suited to their needs.

**Sustainable Uttlesford** - New employment land in sustainable locations to compensate for land released for housing/main settlements. Locate employment land in areas that reduces the need to travel/encourages modal shift from private car to walking and cycling e.g. new settlement(s). Benefit from the job creation in the knowledge/hi-tech sectors adjoining regional/sub regional centres eg Cambridge and Chelmsford. Support for the current centres

of employment e.g. Stansted Airport by supporting a range of housing tenures that reflect the salary structure of the industry. Relaxing restrictions on airport related employment part of the Stansted Airport site.

**The Thaxted Society** - Local employment should derive in part from both local natural assets and history. Thaxted has had a waxing and waning relationship with small crafts and industry. Examples are potters, cutlers, weaving, metal works. At small scale encourage and welcome small craft and arts employment/resisting change of use from commercial to residential supports goal.

**Stebbing Society** - Locations should concentrate on the M11 corridor around Stansted Airport (major Employer) and further north to support employment needs in Cambridgeshire, both of which already have good rail link facilities. This would also help to accommodate present and future commuters into both London and Cambridge.

**We Are Residents** - Sensible to locate employment premises where employers actually want them to be. The Submission Plan located them without apparent regard for need/Saffron Walden/ much of UDC appears to be unattractive for employers because of the poor transport links. Most obvious locations for employment appear to be nearest to the best transportation links, and with connections to other services, whether inside or outside the district/Sustainability Appraisal. A much more holistic approach, in co-operation with other neighbouring LPAs, would be sensible. Need Employment led plan/employment strategy.

**Helena Romaine Secondary School** - HRS is an important employer within Great Dunmow and has a key role is educating/training part of future work force in UDC to sixth form level.

**Ridgeons** - Agree with the Council regard the changing modern economy. Future demands are going to extend beyond large expanses of employment sites restricted to traditional B Class uses. The marketing strategy for the commercial land at Ashdon Road supports this. In the 12 months+ commercial land has been marketed, interest limited but some has emerged in other sectors and these have an important role to play in satisfying future employment demands. Councils employment strategy be flexible given needs. If demand does not exist for a land use, sites should not be reserved in the long term/fulfil a useful purpose for alternative use/reduce demands on greenfield sites in less sustainable locations.

#### TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow Town Councils** - Retain existing employment land/buildings feasible (unless causing nuisance/ no other reasonable prospect); facilitate the development of new employment close to major new residential development provided that any proposed B2/B8 uses have ready access to a road junction on the M11/trunk road; where feasible, enable the development of new employment opportunities that are close to major new residential development in advance of the housing. Ensure workers have the opportunity to live near to their place of work when the housing becomes available. Optimum use should be made of the existing commercial premises at Stansted Airport/potential for future commercial growth regards taking future airport-related uses/amending airport-related restriction/exclude strategic warehousing.

**Great Canfield Parish Council** - New settlement would provide best for employment with links to Cambridge and London and connecting with the biotech centre that Cambridge has become. A major new shopping centre might be of some use for employment.

**Great Chesterford Parish Council** - Considers it is important to retain the existing employment uses in Great Chesterford and safeguard/retain Chesterford Research Park as a major employment area.

**Birchanger Parish Council** - Edges of main towns with good transport links and parking facilities.

**Clavering Parish Council** - The plan should encourage/ protect new and existing sites of small, local and start-up businesses in rural areas

**Little Chesterford Parish Council** - Locate new employment sites close to the transport network, particularly train and bus routes railway stations/within the towns close to housing so less reliance on the car. Stansted airport is well served by public transport, but Chesterford Research Park is in reality only accessible by car. A limiting factor for many small scale businesses in rural Uttlesford is lack of superfast broadband.

**Little Easton Parish Council** - Great Chesterford has excellent train links with London, Cambridge and important towns en-route Baldock/Royston. It is ideally located for the M11/ other major roads. Employment can be accessed in a wide range of locations north of the district with good road links to a series of science parks, starting at Little Chesterford/ in and around Cambridge. Need public transport strategy. Employment is primarily to the north of the district, with larger industrial estates and rail links to major employment centres. There is limited employment for local people or new residents at Stansted Airport due to the nature of the business/low pay. Some potential to locate a settlement along the A120 towards Braintree/better access to Chemsford for employment.

**Quendon & Rickling Parish Council** - Stansted airport is the obvious large provider of employment in the area and more could be done about offering work experience and apprenticeships for people who are looking to broaden their skills to enter into the work environment. Both road and rail links need to be improved as more houses means more commuters and the current facilities are below standard. Reference to working from home is taken lightly as many of the smaller villages/some towns are still forced to use extremely slow broadband and trying to run a business with this impossible.

**Wimbish Parish Council** - Our parish provides employment to about 150 people and we believe more could be done to foster employment opportunities in other villages.

**Elsenham/Henham/Ugley/Widdington Parish Councils** - Homes need to be close to employment. The main east west axis is centred on the A120 connecting to and from the M11 going south to London and north to Cambridge. Braintree (and Colchester) lies to the eastern end of this axis, Gt Dunmow in the middle and Bishops Stortford to the west. Stansted Airport is also at the western end of this axis. These towns and the airport are major centres of employment and should be given the opportunity for growth. Saffron Walden is the other major town in the District already with substantial employment, good road access to the M11 (and Cambridge) and rail access close by. It is also an obvious location to attract new employment.

**Felsted Parish Council** - Recent (and current) developments consist mainly of dormitory settlements for commuters employed outside the district (Cambridge, London and Chelmsford). Although Stansted Airport is the major local source of employment, many of its staff bussed-in from other districts with more affordable housing. The employment strategy must include a realistic attitude to future employment opportunities especial those to minimise the need for travel. Whilst any plan will include development of new enterprise opportunities and encouragement for home-based working, it must recognise that employment in line with those likely to live in the area will be largely provided by existing places of work (Cambridge, London, Chelmsford). Cannot assume work can be provided for thousands of people in a new area/more realistic that majority of residents will add to the transport demands into Cambridge, London, Chelmsford and Stansted.

**Rayne Parish Council** - Some centres of focus for employment already exist and these should be allowed to expand as business volumes grow. This will be incrementally spread over the timing of the plan and will be absorbed gradually without creating much issue. Any new proposed area of employment has to be examined in terms of the impact on all aspects of the infrastructure currently available. The impact of traffic will be significant but so will the ability to train for new skills, dependent upon the mix of new employment opportunities. Any proposed sites that offer employment have to be considered as a significant factor in any spatial strategy. Current indicators identified in AoS p12 shows a bias towards more significant development in the south of the District. This would place an unproportioned load onto the A120 which is already a highly utilised road with many issues. It is also a road that has not been selected for HMG funded improvement.

Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council/Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - Stansted Airport is the prime location for employment growth in Uttlesford with aviation support services. The M11 Link Business Park is one site where non-aviation related businesses are situated. Growth of businesses here, together with a direct link on to the A120/M11 junction, would enhance employment prospects for people in local the area.

**Takeley Parish Council** - Stansted Airport as a 'key' employer for Uttlesford is misleading. Many of the jobs are low paid/part time/employees cannot afford to live in UDC (only around 10% of its employees live in UDC). With dominance of low cost airlines this scenario is unlikely to change despite expansion plans of 35mppa/45mppa. In the north of the district there are opportunities for better paid highly skilled jobs. UDC should not put such emphasis on Stansted Airport as a major employer for UDC residents/needs a diverse economy.

**Strethall Parish Meeting** - Here again we concur with and refer you to Chris Woodhouses' (Catmere End) summation in his succinct answer to this question.

**Stebbing Parish Council** - Location should be to the west of the district around Stansted Airport with small to medium units Location should be to the north of the district to link with the hi-tech employment / industry over the boundary in Cambridgeshire. This consultation does not take into account the large number of commuters that live in this district who go to London/Cambridgeshire

**Thaxted Parish Council** - Industry should be built before houses so that worker's homes can be nearby. There should be more use of commercial premises and land near Stansted. Restrictions on buildings which could be put to business use around Stansted

should be removed. Need restrictions on change of use from shop to residential. New employment development needs to link with existing commercial centres which are already connected to a transport network. Need small scale incubator units/existing rural employment opportunities should be retained. A good public transport service is essential.

**The Sampfords Parish Council** - More emphasis on employment issues/ need to locate major housing development in areas with high levels of existing and potential employment. Need to build homes to the highest eco standards in order to minimise energy requirements for heating and lighting/promotion of 'Eco Town'. The hub of bio/scientific and research i.e. Babraham Institute, Genome Campus, Little Chesterford Research Park, Granta Park, Welding Institute located close together on boundary between UDC and South Cambridgeshire District/logical to consider a new settlement in this area.

**Wendens Ambo Parish Council** - A lot more work is needed by UDC to create any kind of 'vision' for employment in the district. Most new residents are essentially commuters to either London or Cambridge.

#### DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- Locating homes/infrastructure in broadest sense - transport, schools, health care, sports leisure facilities close to major employment centres brings sustainability benefits
- take account of travel to work patterns/the relationship of the District to other settlements
- The employment stimulus of residential growth/focussing growth at Great Dunmow scope to revitalise the town centre retail/employment spin-off from the retail sector
- Successful established employment locations/housing to support essential workers
- Meet housing needs of UDC in the north to reflect the sustainability of this location and the existing commuter patterns but linked to its own housing needs
- Focussing growth at Stansted Mountfitchet to revitalise the retail centre offer
- Need to reduce the level of out-commuting by promoting much greater localised employment opportunities promoted in appropriate locations throughout the District
- Stansted Airport is the largest employer and apart from employment areas in the larger settlements UDC has large number of rural businesses/many people working at home
- Need greater flexibility to respond to current local market signals and economic needs as well as ability to adapt to rapid change/requirement for purposes substantially related to the Airport a disincentive to build out remaining units at Stansted 600
- Stansted Airport low cost carrier hub/little demand from airport-related users/ airlines spend little time on the ground/do not carry cargo/few catering or service contracts.
- Need a more flexible approach to uses within the airport boundary. No obligations placed on airport-related users and a number have acquired premises in places such as Bishops Stortford and Braintree.
- Airport-related industry sectors mapping shows there is a strong concentration of airport-related employment along the A120 corridor to Braintree. This highlights that airport-related users do not necessarily need to be located directly on Stansted Airport.
- Limited supply of suitable premises in the immediate vicinity of Stansted Airport and the M11/Junction 8. Increasing flexibility within the airport boundary is promoted for East Midlands Airports include tourist related and business uses including a range of B Class
- Redevelopment of employment sites with no loss of employment e.g. Riverside Brook
- Locate close to potential new housing/land south of Hales Farm, Great Dunmow

- Stansted Airport/ Chesterford Research Park attracts a significant number of in-commuters from outside the district /sufficient new housing provision needed within the district to ensure that workers are not forced to travel long distances/executive housing
- Opportunity to expand range/quality of employment provision within the market towns
- Recent highway improvements at Great Dunmow/ location off the A120, proximity to M11, means attractive location to employers/employment as part of AofS 12f
- Manuden is desirable place for commuters to live, this is not necessarily a bad thing, new homes will bring further investment in the community and strengthen the social role
- Redevelop existing employment sites poorly located impact on residential uses, or where they contain buildings that are outdated e.g. Warners Field Depot caused traffic problems along Copt Hall Lane partly used for unrestricted access to the depot
- London Stansted Cambridge Corridor Growth Commission tasked to raise the economic potential of the LSCC/ Oxford Economics (Economic Impact of Stansted Scenarios, November 2013), considered the potential economic impacts
- Councils Commercial Workspace Study (June 2015), notes opportunities for further stock at and around Stansted for regionally-focused market that ignores UDC
- These are strong qualitative justifications for a more robust and positive land use planning policy towards Stansted Airport
- Land east of Stansted Airport, strategically located near to the Airports Southern Ancillary Area, the M11 (J8), the A120/ a review of the CPZ would be necessary
- Takeley Street is a better employment location than Elsenham given its proximity and accessibility to the strategic transport network
- New employment development (circa 15ha) at Takeley Street logical given good connectivity to the M11 and Stanstead airport railway interchange

#### COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- Largest Settlement to Stansted is Bishops Stortford. If housing is to be provided for a growing Stansted then Bishop's Stortford should be the focus of employment
- Employment needs to be near new housing/west of district, around Stansted airport with direct rail links/road/north to link with high-tech employment in Cambridge/areas of employment density/UDCs educated workforce
- Although an essential to consider local employment needs. Realistically the majority of residents do commute a fair way/links to public transport vital. Having those on London weighted wage in the area can only bring more money to the area to allow existing businesses to expand
- Airport employment is a red herring. Cheap labour bussed in from London/ no large employer in Great Dunmow/build housing closer to employment - Bishops Stortford, Harlow, Braintree, Chelmsford
- More higher quality jobs needed in UDC to minimise commuting/make homes affordable
- land between Bury Lodge Lane and M11 north of airport parking or area surrounded by M11/ Round Coppice Road/B1256/A120 spur and airport parking for employment
- Employment opportunities should be encouraged throughout the whole area particularly north of the district towards Cambridge/Baldock
- Apart from Stansted Airport, Great Dunmow/Saffron Walden best employment locations
- Least costly will be best served by districts to the West of the M11/A120 full up/traffic

- Area of Search 2 does not provide any meaningful local employment/highly unlikely that significant commercial activities will be created in the immediate vicinity of the Area
- Areas close to Stansted or Braintree, where the road links A 120 are already in place
- Employment within new settlements cannot support the needs of the new residents
- Great Chesterford village/access to the railway station and M11 from there
- High tech industry require specialised skill sets/new settlements/long commutes,
- Stimulate employment that is locally or virtually based, reducing pressure on transport
- Creating jobs within towns such as saffron walden so do not become commuter towns
- Limited level of local work so main influence on the employment strategy is the ability for people to travel, in numbers and without too great a delay
- Development of Broadband through out the rural areas and villages
- Improved public transport links to Stansted Airport and Cambridge a pre- requisite
- Saffron hall recognised as a world class concert venue/needs appropriate hotel
- Employment is across the District/beyond/housing strategy follow same pattern
- Change of use of existing buildings for business use should be encouraged in appropriate settings particularly if this brings redundant buildings into use
- Employment strategy needs to be developed for local people and not simply provide jobs for people outside the district
- Conserve small/larger sustainable local employment centres/seed-beds
- Braintree town has at present a number of facilities enabling local residence to purchase virtually all their needs from clothing, food to DIY/new stores unlikely
- Encourage local shop owners and small businesses, especially in our town centres
- After transport encourage education vocational courses and apprenticeships
- Local services will follow the population growth without interference
- Good travel connectivity is essential but UDC mainly rural lacks a significant network of major roads. A120 runs east/west through district has advantage of serving Stansted Airport, Bishops Stortford and Great Dunmow/M11/ cities of Chelmsford & Colchester
- Great Dunmow and perhaps Takeley could provide more employment due to the excellent road links and the airport
- If a bypass was created in Saffron Walden more employment would be needed
- Houses in Uttlesford are expensive with limited well paid employment in the district
- aim should be local working/ reduction in the need to travel. Hardisty Jones optimistically concluded growth of Stansted Airport will create 41,700 jobs to 2033
- provide educational/training opportunities to encourage young people to look for local employment, rather than travel further afield or become unemployed
- If the Chesterford Research park is considered to offer employment opportunities then surely a site to the north of Uttlesford close to the Cambridgeshire border would reduce commute times. Whilst Stansted Airport is a considerable local employer,
- More jobs at the airport does not necessarily correlate into jobs for Uttlesford residents. many airport employees live outside of UDC Bishops Stortford, Harlow and Braintree
- the problem is not providing employment but finding applicants for jobs
- Focus on needs of commuters
- key routes viz: A1060, A1307, A11, A505 as well as A120 and M11
- Need proactive inward investment strategy that leverages UDC strengths
- Many able to get employment in London or Stansted Airport therefore the nearer the settlement is to London (or a fast train to London) or the Stansted area the better

- Accept UDC is just a commuter area
- Many employees at Chesterford Park travel long distances
- Potential for clusters of small scale craft/artisan workshops which support the rural character of the district and, in particular its small town.
- Shire hill needs a revamp/link road/facility to encourage start ups
- More examples like Chesterford Research Park should be encouraged.

## Question 8

### Natural Environment and Historic Environment

**What do you think are the main issues the Council should consider in relation to the natural environment and the historic environment?**

This question was responded to by 388 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>.

### STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

**Birchanger Wood Trust:** Historic and natural environments once gone will never be regained. Both are a resource which should be treasured and protected and a heritage for our children to enjoy in every sense. Flooding, however, has to be addressed. There are remedies which can enhance an area making it a pleasure to access and an asset to residents. Ignoring the issue will lead to a reduction to existing businesses and an economic failure.

**Environment Agency:** We need more coherent and resilient ecological networks. Design of development should aim to reflect and enhance the area's locally distinctive character. - Any development should seek to increase an area's biodiversity assets. - Protection of existing high quality habitats i.e. unimproved grassland and irreplaceable habitats i.e. ancient woodlands should be prioritised over creating new habitats. - Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats. - Create and extensive viable network of green and blue corridors and natural habitat throughout the development which connects larger or more expansive open spaces for both people and wildlife. The Areas of Search 9 (West of Braintree) and 12 (around Gt. Dunmow) within our Essex, Norfolk & Suffolk Area potentially include land adjacent to the Rivers Chelmer and Ter and the Stebbing Brook.

Waste water treatment and the quality of the water environment should be addressed to ensure there is infrastructure to support sustainable growth and ensure there is no deterioration of water quality.

River corridors are particularly effective wildlife corridors in an increasingly fragmented countryside hence it is important that rivers are protected and where possible enhanced. We would recommend a 20m buffer zone in which no development should be permitted.

The Local Plan includes numerous references to the terrestrial environment, especially in the search areas, but does not mention the aquatic environment once. The NPPF states in paragraph 165 that River Basin Management Plans should be used as evidence on which to base planning decisions. This promotes the use of up-to-date information about the natural environment which should be useful to inform the action needed to improve water quality in Local Plans. All public bodies, including local authorities are required to have regard to the River Basin Management Plan and any supplementary plans in exercising their functions. It is strongly recommended that these form part of the evidence base included within this

section as the planning system offers significant opportunities to improve water quality and achieve WFD objectives. We would encourage equal regard for the aquatic environment as there currently is for the terrestrial environment. Obtained data should also inform the subsequent Sustainability Appraisal of the preferred options stage of the Local Plan.

Some of the areas identified are in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and we would expect to see development steered away from the areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The plan should be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and develop policies to manage flood risk from all sources, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management bodies, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards. Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change.

No mention has been made with respect to geology and hydrogeology in the plan area, and this should be considered further. Principal aquifers are geological strata that exhibit high permeability and provide a high level of water storage. They may support water supply and/or river base flow on a strategic scale. Secondary aquifers are often capable of supporting water supplies at a local scale and normally provide an important source of flow to some rivers. The use of groundwater in the area makes it vulnerable to pollution and it is likely that a large proportion of drinking water derives from groundwater sources. A number of licensed abstractions are present across the plan area. Significantly, the majority of the area is also designated as groundwater source protection zones (SPZs) i.e. comprising potable groundwater sources requiring protection identified by the Environment Agency. Private potable groundwater supplies would not be identified by us, but should be considered as part of the pre-application/planning process and will require a 50m de minimis radius protection zone. New activities need to be deterred in certain areas based on their intrinsic hazard to groundwater.

We consider that an Environmental Quality policy should be included to give emphasis to the need for protection and improvement of the water environment where pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment should be minimized, in line with NPPF policies. The policy should be added to ensure that the water quality of receiving watercourses and aquifers is protected and improved to enhance the biodiversity and chemical status to meet the objectives of the WFD and River Basin Management Plans (RBMP). It should, also, ensure that land contamination, protection and enhancement of the water environment are appropriately dealt with via the planning regime. Proposals for new development or redevelopment should promote sustainable design, incorporate mitigation measures, account for climate change, and protect and enhance the water environment. Developers should be encouraged to develop on brownfield/contaminated sites and less on Greenfield sites and be able to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) in their design. Reference and gravity should be given to NPPF paragraphs 109,120 and 121.

Any development proposed on landfill will require a Preliminary Risk Assessment followed by intrusive site investigation, detailed quantitative risk assessment to assess whether remediation can be undertaken to ensure the protection of the water environment. Any Local Plan flood risk policy that includes surface water management, could also seek to address pollution prevention aspects of discharges to watercourses. Such aspects are pertinent in

the context of preventing deterioration of water quality under the WFD. Alternatively, the Environmental Quality policy discussed above could include wording on the requirement to address water quality for pollution prevention purposes where infiltration techniques are proposed. Because the use of deep bore and other deep soakaway systems are not appropriate in areas where groundwater constitutes a significant resource (that is where aquifer yield may support or already supports abstraction), we would expect an Environmental Quality policy to address such techniques.

**Essex Bridleways Association:** We request that the protection and enhancement of the local Rights of Way network are fully catered for within the new Plan which will benefit the local area for the reasons outlined in our response to question 7.

**Essex County Council:** Should consider the setting of the heritage assets. Some of the proposed locations for future development would break up areas of existing historic landscape intruding between historic parklands. In some instances the visibility between designed landscapes is important for maintaining their historic significance, or it may break the link between historic settlement cores and the wide countryside that forms their setting. A specific example of this is the area of 10g which lies within the area between Shortgrove Park and Audley End. ECC has prepared recommended biodiversity policies that may be considered for inclusions within the development management policies in local plans. The policies should assist UDC in meeting their obligations under Section 11 of the NPPF and achieve no net loss of biodiversity. The policies cover every aspect of ecology that must be considered in the development management process. The policies are outlined in their entirety in appendix 3 of this response.

**Essex Wildlife Trust:** Uttlesford's ecological evidence base is currently inadequate and out of date, rendering it unfit for purpose. The Local Wildlife Site review urgently needs updating. Targets for monitoring sustainability objectives should include biodiversity monitoring. The NPPF emphasises the importance of a robust evidence base to inform successful local plan policies on the natural environment. Evidence-gathering should include an assessment of existing and potential components of ecological networks. GI and biodiversity should be core considerations in the preparation of Local Plans. Over the last hundred years there has been an unprecedented change in the UK countryside, resulting in habitat loss and dramatic adverse impacts on the populations of many species. In securing sustainable development, the planning system aims to achieve a net gain for biodiversity, which means a sustained increase in abundance, quality and extent of all species and habitats that support healthy ecosystems. Any development should seek to increase an area's biodiversity assets while guarding against the loss of priority and irreplaceable habitats. It is good practice for a local plan to include specific measurable targets that can be monitored.

Comprehensive evidence-gathering will help to inform decisions on the type and location of green space required to complement existing GI, fill gaps, mitigate adverse impacts, and provide additional compensatory measures to ensure a net gain in biodiversity assets and GI. It is good practice to carry out context studies to establish where existing or potential GI exists. Local authorities should have access to baseline figures for biodiversity in their area. This information can then be broken down to a more local level to inform developers about site-specific biodiversity issues within a development. The Essex Wildlife Trust Biological Records Centre acts as a key source of evidence and the Council is urged to consider the benefits of a Service Level Agreement to enable access to ecological data and site records

(see below). Targets can be set to link fragmented habitats and landscape features to increase species viability, by restoring degraded sites and habitats and by providing new spaces for recreation to reduce human impact on sensitive sites. Recreational disturbance of vulnerable habitats can lead to a loss of vegetation, disturbance of ground-nesting birds (affecting their breeding and survival), and increased predation of birds and wild mammals by domestic cats. These sensitive areas should be protected from human disturbance. By providing additional “suitable accessible natural green space” (SANGS), local authorities can help to divert visitors away from sites that are sensitive to recreational disturbance. Natural England has produced useful guidance and a checklist for the creation of SANGS in the Thames Basin Heaths Planning Zone, and many of the principles will apply to the creation of SANGS elsewhere (although they may not be suitable for all locations and habitats).

Designated sites (including local wildlife sites) and areas of priority habitat, should be robustly protected from development in strict accordance with the mitigation hierarchy, as outlined in the NPPF, paragraph 118. Compliance with the requirements of the NERC Act can only be achieved if local authorities have access to up to date information from Biological Records Centres, and there is a system in place for monitoring and recording species and their habitats. In order to ensure compliance with the requirements of the NERC Act, local authorities should ideally sign up to a data exchange agreement with EWT Biological Records Centre. This will ensure ease of access to the most up to date species records and other biological data. The maintenance of a register of important wildlife sites with up to date information about them as a robust evidence base is a NPPF requirement. In order to maintain a robust evidence base into the future, an on-going Local Wildlife Site review programme is recommended, which engages the relevant land owners in managing their sites in an economically viable way that remains sensitive to the important wildlife they support. This review should periodically refresh the information held about LoWS and their nature conservation merits. It is recommended that local wildlife site reviews are conducted at least every 5 years. It should also be stressed that the role of a Local Authority should not be restricted to minimising or preventing environmental degradation through the planning process. The NPPF (para. 109) refers to the planning system providing net gains in biodiversity, thereby contributing to enhancement of the natural environment. This responsibility can be dispensed at the largest scale of strategic planning across an entire borough, by embracing Essex Wildlife Trust’s Living Landscapes ethos.

**Essex Wildlife Trust: Uttlesford Local Group:** Uttlesford may have once been blessed in the past with a rich natural environment, but available evidence shows that species have gone locally extinct, woodlands are in a very poor condition due to lack of management and the browsing pressure from the excessive population of wild deer, roadside verges and village greens have lost practically all of their wildflowers. Wildflower rich grassland is virtually non-existent in the District, rivers are in poor condition, habitats have been fragmented by new roads and development, and even the nature reserves owned and managed by Essex Wildlife Trust have suffered damage from excessive public use, as in many places they are the only public open space available to residents and are used as the local dogwalk, instead of being treasured for their wildlife. Local Wildlife Sites, though valuable in principle, in practice have no legal protection and are in badly degraded condition for wildlife. Green Infrastructure Networks MUST (not may) be provided as part of the design of development and MUST connect to the wider world. The Council MUST designate on

maps the land that will be the Green Infrastructure Network, as a land use allocation, and policies MUST promote the change of use of land within those corridors to ecologically rich and enhanced condition.

**Friends of The Flich Way:** The Council could issue a conservation order in regard to the protection of the natural environment represented by the preservation of the Flich Way, to enable all future planning decisions taken to consider the preservation of this unique and historic asset.

**Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Steering Group:** 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. This subject is covered extensively in the Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan.

**Hands Off Thaxted:** The prime consideration must be to protect the natural and built form of Uttlesford. Our landscape and our heritage are particularly important. All proposed developments must be carefully scrutinised to ensure there is no adverse impact on the natural landscape or on historic buildings. Any further developments around the towns of Dunmow and Saffron Walden should be resisted to avoid further damage to the fabric and character of these historic towns. In Thaxted the irreparable harm caused to the views of the Grade1 listed church by an ill-considered planning approval in Sampford Road should not be allowed to recur.

**Historic England:** The NPPF states that local plans should include a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, and that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157). In terms of the evidence base, Paragraph 169 requires local plans to have up to date evidence about the historic environment in their area. Advise an audit of existing evidence to identify potential gaps or out-of-date information.

We recommend that the Historic Settlement Character Assessments are reviewed and updated where needed to reflect recent developments. The existing Historic Environment Characterisation report should also be reviewed, along with conservation area appraisals. Specific heritage impact assessments may need to be produced to understand the potential impact of new development on heritage assets. The local plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the local plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Local Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the local plan should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the positive strategy required by the NPPF. In the withdrawn Local Plan, we broadly welcomed the inclusion of a strategic policy relating to the historic environment along with detailed policies on heritage asset types, although we required some amendments to specific wording. We would support the development of policies relating delivering high

quality design, and also advocate policies that set out the Council's approach to the overall management of the historic environment, in terms of both designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology).

Consideration should be given in the emerging Local Plan as to whether it is appropriate to propose any policies specific to addressing the matter of Heritage at Risk, either collectively or targeted at specific assets on the at risk register. We would also ask that a policy approach is included in the plan to afford an appropriate level of protection to non-designated heritage assets.

**The Hundred Parishes Society:** 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. The special character of Uttlesford is largely due to its exceptional depth of architectural heritage, yet owners of listed buildings are charged a fee for pre-application advice for listed building consent. Some local authorities offer this advice free. We encourage the Council to scrap this fee.

**The Ickleton Society:** It is important that new housing should blend into the landscape and not harm the natural and historic environment. Good quality agricultural land (Grade 1 and 2) should be preserved for agricultural use. As far as possible, development should be on brown field sites.

**National Trust:** Recognition that Hatfield Forest is an area of national significant historically and ecologically, has significant recreation value, and that it is currently being damaged by an unsustainable increase in visitors responsible in part to increase in local development. Consider that Areas of Search 5 and 6 are inappropriate locations for future development and are a threat to Hatfield Forest, the heritage and ecological value of which should be highly protected. Emphasise the importance of a Green Infrastructure Strategy, which should be addressed as a specific topic within the body of the draft plan.

**Natural England:** Refer to the requirements of i) the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended); ii) the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended); iii) Paragraph 118 of the NPPF; iv) Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Also refer to answers to questions 4, 7, 11, 13 & 14.

**Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group:** See comments of Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council.

**Stebbing Society:** Historic landscapes, woodlands, conservation areas and listed buildings should all be protected and not swallowed up and destroyed by new development. This would apply throughout the District and also to all sizes of historic sites. We agree with the CPRE stance that environmental appraisals of house building targets should be undertaken before finalising regional plans. This would surely provide a more appropriate and natural, instead of imposed, development blueprint and ensure that the Local Plan is more realistic, achievable and economically viable and capable of being integrated into the local communities with as little damage as possible to the environment and existing infrastructure. The East of England Plan, as stated in paragraph 3.21 of the London Arc East Report, has a specific Policy (LA1) in relation to this sub-area which emphasises a focus on Greenbelt

restraint. This is also the policy of CPRE not to release greenfield land for development and is also supported by ECC who recognise the importance of safeguarding greenbelt land.

**Sustainable Uttlesford:** Attach great importance to maintaining bio-diversity in the district. Greatly disappointed to have been ignored when a number of recent development proposals have been given approval. Any locations chosen for development should seek to maintain the district's biodiversity and protect special verges.

**Thaxted Society:** These two factors are the greatest contributors to well-being, quality of life and eventual sustainability. They both have a very large cumulative influence on the area. They should be a priority at all stages in order to aggressively maintain the appropriate balance, maintaining the area's critical uniqueness and "best place to live" status.

**Trustees of Gardens of Easton Lodge:** These are the only Grade 2 listed gardens in Uttlesford. They are of historical importance, having been designed by the renowned landscape architect, Harold Peto for the Countess of Warwick. Features of the original garden remain, including the sunken Italian Garden, which is a very fine example of Peto's work. The Gardens are in two ownerships, the owners of Warwick House and Land Securities. They are at present open to the public on nine Sundays a year and weekdays for group visits. 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 should remain open to the general public for informal leisure activities. The Gardens are of national importance and attract visitors from a wide area, not just from within Uttlesford. They should be accessible not only for their value for recreation and for their historical importance, but because they also attract visitors to Uttlesford.

## TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Arkesden Parish Council:** The natural and historic nature of the district must be protected. It is precisely the quality of the rural landscape and the historic assets within it that make Uttlesford such a popular place to live. Any development must be sensitive to these issues and in particular seek local opinion on protection of these assets. UDC has already carried out numerous Landscape Character Assessments as part of its background studies. The recommendations in these studies should be strictly adhered to during the planning process.

**Birchanger Parish Council:** Preservation of village envelopes and character.

**Clavering Parish Council:** As per NPPF. High regard should be placed on protecting the natural and historic environment.

**Elmdon and Wendens Lofts Parish Council:** Either Area of Search 1 or 2 would have significant impact on the natural environment, but particularly site 2 which in view of the contours of the land would be impossible to blend into the landscape. Both are on prime agricultural land that should be preserved for the production of food. AoS 2 includes, as far as one can tell, the Coploe Hill nature reserve.

**Elsenham Parish Council:** The technical studies have failed to map environmental constraints in the Area of Search 3 (NE Elsenham). Map 1C only extends to the settlement

of Elsenham in its north-east corner, whereas AoS 3 extends out to Henham. Is this deliberate or a mistake? Without that information it is impossible to comment on the impact of environmental constraints in AoS 3. Clearly the main issues are to weigh the protection of natural environment and the historic features against the need for growth and the general sustainability of new sites and areas.

**Felsted Parish Council:** Section 11 of the NPPF must be adhered to. Specifically Section 112, - local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. Area of Search 9, for example, includes a high proportion of Grade 2 agricultural land. This should be protected. The assessment process must maintain realism in reviewing routes residents will take to reach key transport hubs, to ensure that historic sites and villages do not become rat runs from any new housing area, as people seek to avoid rush hour congestion on recognised main routes. A requirement of any development must be the sympathetic incorporation of the very large number of listed buildings, archaeological sites, conservation areas, and undesignated historic assets. If this cannot be achieved then the site is not appropriate for use.

**Great Canfield Parish Council:** Uttlesford, including Great Canfield has a very high proportion of listed buildings, SSIs and conservation areas and these should be protected. This is a rural part of Essex and should be protected as such. Uttlesford is consistently named as one of the most desirable places to live in England. Consideration must be given to protect areas of historical interest to avoid destroying what is special about this area

**Great Chesterford Parish Council:** No comment.

**Great Dunmow Town Council:** This is a topic that is very much secondary to the amount of housing and its location. Sufficient work has already been done to enable the specific issues and features that need to be conserved and enhanced to be identified.

**Henham Parish Council:** See comments of Elsenham PC.

**Ickleton Parish Council:** New housing, especially on substantial sites, should conform to the existing pattern of development in the locality. For instance, where settlements have developed over time in river valleys and are well screened in the landscape, it would be inappropriate to develop on higher ground where the development would be highly visible for miles around, and the impact on the natural and historic environment of such intrusion on the existing landscape would be unacceptable. It would be good to see more emphasis on brown field sites in considering locations for development. Good quality agricultural land should remain in agricultural use.

**Little Chesterford Parish Council:** Where possible development should be restricted to sites that are brownfield. Class 1 and 2 agricultural land should not be utilised for building as it is a national resource that should be preserved for food production. If the Council is considering a new development that combines a mixture of housing with excellent design incorporating local wildlife sites, coppices and woods I suggest they look at the current Whiteley development in Hampshire, and the proposed associated North Whiteley development (Winchester District Council). This is certainly one of the best new stand-alone developments I have seen in recent years.

**Little Easton Parish Council:** The natural environment has better protection by the more specific wording in proposed policies and the technical studies to identify why they are important. The new policies are deficient when trying to protect wildlife sites, particularly because the wildlife corridors are not mentioned in the wording. Landscape areas should be specifically referred to, giving added protection to areas such as the Upper Chelmer Valley. New policy wording should be added so that local wildlife sites are protected and not isolated and degraded. Wildlife corridors are where wildlife actually migrate between sheltered areas such as woodland and can travel beyond the immediate vicinity of the new development. Developers cannot be allowed choose the location of wildlife corridors based on convenient gaps in or around their development and expect that the wildlife will use them. Wildlife corridors should be green, uninterrupted corridors and cannot be dissected by roads. Policy wording should protect specific styles and character of the historic environment by referring to historical or architectural studies to clearly state why they are important.

**Newport Parish Council:** The current standards should be maintained and consideration to building design styles that are consistent with the historical make up of Newport.

**Quendon Parish Council:** The natural and historic character of Uttlesford is its defining feature. This is a huge part of why Uttlesford has been voted one of the top places to live in the UK for the past few years and why people love living here. If this should ever be lost or diminished in any way through mass development of the area, it can NEVER be replaced. Development should not, under any circumstances, be at the expense of historic assets, SSSIs, local wildlife and the greenbelt. It should also not be done on prime agricultural land. Other options must be sought.

**Rayne Parish Council:** All existing facilities have to be maintained and where needed preserved or protected.

**Saffron Walden Town Council:** This is a topic that is very much secondary to the amount of housing and its location. Sufficient work has already been done to enable the specific issues and features that need to be conserved and enhanced to be identified. Having identified the issues however, the plan needs to provide properly for them, and the housing and other strategic plans need properly to take them into account. We do not believe that, for example, the previous spatial strategy took any proper account of the effect of proposed housing development on the historic environment of Saffron Walden.

**The Sampfords Parish Council:** Sufficiently covered in Section 2.8 of the consultation document.

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council:** Direct and indirect impacts on features of natural or heritage value would be an erosion of the rich environment valued by many people. The landscape/townscape character of Stansted Mountfitchet is unique within the district. It is centred on the boundary of the chalk hills and clay plateau which creates steeply sided valleys with views across the Bourne, Ugley and Stansted Brooks. No other town or village in Uttlesford has this character and we think the natural and historic elements which contribute to this uniqueness should be respected. Again a Blue and Green Infrastructure should be the backbone of residential development. We should ensure all sites of woodland are preserved and nature reserves safeguarded from being declassified. One example is that of Ailsa Wood which was declassified as an SSSI when the M11 was built but which still

holds the important habitat for the Cowslip. UDC should be supporting Elsenham and Stansted Mountfitchet's application for its reclassification to SSSI. Stansted Park is of historical importance and should be protected.

**Stebbing Parish Council:** Historic landscapes, woodlands, conservation areas, listed buildings and surroundings should be protected and not destroyed by new developments. This applies equally throughout the district and not to just one particular area. Small historic sites should be afforded the same protection as larger areas i.e. Audley End estate. There are interesting historic sites throughout the district. Overbuilding / development leads to loss of wildlife, flowers, birds etc.

**Strethall Parish Meeting:** Protect, improve, maintain and enhance. How will a new settlement in open countryside away from infrastructure sustain and achieve these criteria? Strethall is generally believed to be the smallest civil parish in England. Its boundaries have remained essentially unchanged since before Domesday. The Grade I Listed Saxon church celebrated its millenium in 2010AD. The even older Icknield Way traverses the heart of Area of Search 2. These are exactly the sort of historic assets that should and must be cherished and protected from development.

**Thaxted Parish Council:** The benefits of any development must outweigh the impact on the historic environment. In Thaxted, traffic generated by development is detrimental to the historic core of the town. The outcome of the offsetting pilot should be evaluated.

**Ugley Parish Council:** See comments of Elsenham PC

**Wendens Ambo Parish Council:** UDC should formulate a plan to preserve the rural nature of most of the district. It would be good to see an end to the creeping urbanisation, which results in too much signage. UDC should consider how it could better protect its roadside verges and hedges - the current arrangement with ECC is not at all satisfactory and in some instances is a waste of taxpayers' money. The historic worth of Saffron Walden has already been damaged by housing development of poor design - the architectural quality of new developments in the town is very poor indeed and should not be allowed to continue. Pollution and traffic: any Local Plan should include measures to reduce road congestion and the pollution in Saffron Walden.

**Widdington Parish Council:** See comments of Elsenham PC

## DEVELOPERS / AGENTS

- Recent development and the large number of planning consents that are yet to be implemented or fully built-out will impact the south of the district. It is considered important that the Council considers the impacts of such continued concentrations against their Local Plan Vision, in particular the objective to retain settlements as separate entities with green space between them.
- Concern at UDC relying on the Historic Settlement Character Assessment of 2007 in preparing the withdrawn plan. Up-to-date assessment has been provided for the call for Sites submission west of School Lane, Newport.
- Developing greenfield sites will open up countryside access opportunities.

- Both the natural and historic environment are a significant characteristic and asset of the district, and should be safeguarded.
- Sites within Stansted Mountfitchet can be developed without any visual impact.
- Promotes Andrewsfield Garden Village.
- Promotes Chelmer Mead.
- Promotes Takeley Green. The Council accepts the need to review the Countryside Protection Zone – not realistic to maintain its current extent in the next Plan period.
- Promotes land west of Braintree – long views are limited.
- Land west of Great Dunmow is less sensitive than the more exposed areas to the north (Chelmer Valley).
- The status of existing features should be taken into account and then the benefits arising from the proposal be weighed against any harm arising. Do not include policies that introduce a presumption against development unless the status of the land specifically warrants such an approach.
- The historic environment within existing towns and villages is important and further justifies the vision of a new settlement within the District providing the best solution for the long term housing and employment needs. In terms of natural environment, the green belt within the District is of key importance and should be protected.
- The natural environment of Uttlesford will be protected by delivering housing through a large number of generally smaller developments, within and adjoining the existing settlements. This scale of development will allow the new housing to be more easily related to the existing form of settlements and where necessary pay due regard to their historic or intrinsic character.
- The Council should view the Green Belt, as an opportunity to mould the future sustainable growth of the District, allowing growth to be located in the most sustainable locations whilst providing for the re-allocation of new Green Belt around the market towns to manage their future growth.
- Paragraphs 165-168 of the NPPF confirm the need to ensure that policies and decisions are based on up to date natural environment information, whilst ensuring that a sustainability appraisal should be an integral part of the development process.
- Paragraphs 169-170 of the NPPF reinforce the need for an up to date assessment in respect of the historic environment.
- Flood plains cannot be ignored.
- Need a robust, comprehensive evidence base to judge whether the need for new housing outweighs the adverse impacts of the loss of local environmental designations. Protection and enhancement policies should be established in the light of the NPPF, especially Paragraphs 109-125. Inspectors have queried whether green gap or similar policies are NPPF-compliant.

### 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.

- House building should not damage historic town cores by damaging views and increasing traffic.

- Essential to preserve the rural natural approaches to settlements. Market towns are set in irreplaceable rural locations.
- Every year, more of the natural and historic environment disappears. Need to preserve for our children and grandchildren. Uttlesford is a place people want to live because of the quality of life it affords them.
- Single settlement option should be considered, with these requirements planned in. A new settlement should be of its time and place. Needs to be near motorway and rail links.
- Any single settlement or major extension would have detrimental and irreversible effects.
- Avoid infilling. Avoid building new roads.
- Build ring roads and locate big buildings / warehouses there.
- Sensitively planned small scale additions to existing settlements across the district would lessen the impact. Developments need to be small, sustainable and contain sufficient affordable housing so that young people can remain in their communities.
- Careful low density housing, even in single development greenfield sites.
- Don't need a sea of soulless housing estates. Very little infrastructure has been provided with recent developments.
- Countryside must be protected. Uttlesford is scenically very important. We live in a beautiful unspoilt area with rolling hills and amazing wildlife. Noise and light pollution are low.
- Surrounding countryside is important to the settings of conservation areas.
- Designated sites cannot be considered in isolation from the environment of which they are part.
- Work with statutory bodies and parishes on long term enhancement plans. Surveys required.
- Frequency of recreational use should be taken into account when considering potential development sites. Public Rights of Way should be preserved. Protected lanes should be backed up with signs.
- Safeguard open space, historic woodlands, conservation areas, listed buildings, trees, hedges and agricultural land. Reference to Section 11 of the NPPF. Establish country parks. TPO groups of trees. All ancient woodlands should be mapped.
- Preserve the Green Belt.
- Protect country lanes for pedestrians and cyclists. Oppose industry and warehousing in the countryside.
- Green infrastructure is vital to sustainable development.
- Future development should be on brownfield sites, or using neglected town centre properties.
- Develop greenfield sites on the edge of towns.
- Future development must be sympathetic to its surroundings. Some of the town houses built in saffron Walden in the last 20 years are quite a good example.
- Reduce car use – houses should be centred on good public transport links. Historic streets are ruined by traffic. Rat-running on rural roads. Need 20mph speed limits.
- Improvements needed to Saffron Walden's road network. Current ECC plans will not cope with existing traffic. Need a ring road. Need a solution to school-run traffic.

- Change should be gradual – a few new houses can enhance a village, but building a thousand or so is not acceptable.
- Wildlife is being destroyed and /or fragmented. Need wildlife corridors and bat tiles etc. Preserve tree lines for connectivity purposes.
- Effect on landscape considerable.
- Risks of building on good agricultural land re population increase and food security.
- Historic buildings and sites should be protected at all costs. Uttlesford has the highest density of pre-1700 listed buildings outside cities than anywhere else.
- Give high priority to preservation of hedgerows.
- Pollution levels in some areas already too high.
- National policy already established a range of constraints.
- Use eco materials and mixed natural environments. Community hubs and play areas.
- Offsetting is a way of getting around legislation, and should not be allowed.
- Expand tree planting to absorb CO<sup>2</sup>, improve health and ameliorate noise. Plant fruit trees rather than evergreens.
- What sustainable energy methods are proposed? Not much wind or wave power in UDC + solar farms look ugly.
- Need to be more self-sufficient and produce more food.
- Views of elected parish councils and residents groups should be given more weight. Should be possible to veto large greenfield developments on inappropriate sites.
- Need to cater for archaeological investigation and publication.
- Make use of vacant spaces above shops.
- Concerned about the Nimbyism from the market towns and larger villages.
- Encourage community support for the countryside – rubbish clearing groups, school projects etc.
- Accessing information on historic sites in Essex seems to be difficult.
- Build houses with larger gardens and force planting of trees and shrubs. Hedges preferable to fence panels.
- Need to use up to date data.
- Eliminate excessive night lighting, reduce road sign clutter. Enforce noise restrictions.
- UDC should not charge for pre-application advice on listed buildings. UDC no longer offers listed building grants.
- Must allow listed buildings to use double glazing. No point preserving buildings that are subsequently too expensive to run.
- UDC has done a good job establishing and refreshing its conservation areas.
- Should ask whether new development proposals be viewed in a Century or so as meriting conservation? Use information boards and plaques to help raise understanding.
- Need a dark night sky.
- Need to ensure an adequate water supply.

*Some individual comments relate to specific places:*

- Retain Andrewsfield and Boxted Wood as sites of historical importance.
- Protect historic environments of Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and Thaxted. Recent development in Saffron Walden – filling in the gaps and edges – has contributed little. Need bold plans to determine what is best for the town. Views across Saffron Walden are stunning.
- Problem of “samey” development everywhere. Respect local distinctiveness.
- Some good new housing on Thaxted Road, Saffron Walden, taking in Georgian elements from Market Square.
- Turn Saffron Walden Market Square into a thriving space rather than a car park.
- Maintain the natural landscape around Audley End.
- Roman settlements around Great Chesterford area should not be disturbed. Effect of building huge settlements nearby.
- Area of Search 9 would also impact on many listed buildings in and around Stebbing. Also consider space, views and traffic.
- Effect on already occurring flooding in Radwinter Road, Saffron Walden.
- Land NE of Elsenham should be dropped from further consideration. Concern about the amount of development already approved in the area without infrastructure improvements.
- South of the district has large herds of deer and many badgers which are being forced into smaller habitats. Need to do more than preserve great crested newts.
- In Elmdon, the proposed development would destroy habitats, including those that are protected.
- Thaxted centre suffers from significant high speed traffic. Development at Bellrope Meadow negatively impacts on the approach.
- Traffic pollution in Saffron Walden – poor air quality, vibration and noise.
- Congestion in Saffron Walden is a fraction of what occurs elsewhere.
- Should confirm that upland views will be protected – area around Newport mentioned.
- Damage being done in Whiteditch Lane, Newport – flooding and verges.
- Protect the Gardens of Easton Lodge. Areas of Search 7, 8 and 9 border / are close by.
- Sealed-off developments such as Flich Green (or other dead-end developments) should be discouraged as an obstacle to the integration of new inhabitants into existing communities.
- Hatfield Forest under significant pressure from pollution associated with Stansted Airport, the M11 and other roads.
- Need to avoid building between Stansted Mountfitchet, Birchanger and Bishop’s Stortford. No more building around Stansted Mountfitchet.
- National Cycle Network Route 11 passes through Area of Search 2. Also the Icknield Way. Strethall Church is an Anglo Saxon rarity. Surrounding countryside is home to deer, badgers and bird breeding grounds.
- New housing in Great Chesterford looks like anywhere else. Infilling in Trumpington and Shelford are in keeping without copying the past.
- New cycle route to Audley End diverts traffic over an already weak bridge.
- Make better use of the Castle site in Saffron Walden.
- Walden and Dunmow are just dormitory towns.

## Question 8: Natural Environment and Historic Environment

- Welcomes UDC support for Thaxted Festival, Saffron Walden Museum etc.
- Recent degrading of natural environment around Great Dunmow – Highwood Quarry in particular. Noise from water pumps. Loss of brown hares and deer. Increased traffic and loss of green space.
- Dozens of trees felled at Alsa Leys, Elsenham to build 6 houses. 60 trees lost at Elsenham Nursery. Need to be aware of Policies S7 and ENV3 of the existing Local Plan.

## Question 11

### New Settlement Areas of Search

**What issues and evidence should the Council consider when assessing the potential for a new settlement at Areas of Search 1-9. Please reference any specific areas of search in your response.**

This question was responded to by 458 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>.

### STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

**Natural England** In assessing the potential for one or more new settlements (Areas of Search 1-9), the Council should include consideration of the potential increase in recreational pressure on the Hatfield Forest SSSI and NNR and also the potential impacts of traffic-derived air pollution upon nearby designated sites.

**Historic England** The historic environment and impact on heritage assets is relevant to every area of search, and there may be a need for specific heritage impact assessments depending on the location and its potential for affecting heritage assets.

**Environment Agency** The developers must work with the sewerage providers/water companies ahead of the preferred options so as to ensure there is a feasible and viable solution, including any necessary permit requirements for new works or upgrades, prior to any allocation under the Local Plan.

**Anglian Water Services Ltd** The need for new and improved infrastructure to serve a new settlement would be dependent upon its location and its proximity to existing foul sewerage network and the available capacity of the foul sewerage network and water recycling centres.

**Braintree District Council** Any proposal will be carefully assessed across a range of areas and must provide the necessary infrastructure both on site and off site if it is to be considered as an appropriate option through the Local Plan process.

**East Hertfordshire District Council** East Herts Council supports the principle of undertaking a high level options assessment. However neither the consultation document nor the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) provide information on how the options presented at this stage have been chosen over other locations.

**South Cambridgeshire District Council** Deliverability is a key consideration with respect to the relative merits of different new settlement options.

**Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways** Transportation ECC recommends that consideration be given to the transportation network when assessing the potential for a new settlement(s). Historic Environment ECC recommends that the cumulative impact of development on heritage assets, including historic landscapes, be considered as part of any decision. ECC recommends the preparation of an updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to cover the sites of the potential new

settlement(s). ECC recommends that UDC considers the availability of school places at existing primary and secondary schools in the New Settlement areas of search.

**Hertfordshire County Council** All areas adjacent to Bishop's Stortford need to provide sufficient primary and secondary school places to meet the needs arising from the developments.

**Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** Any area of new settlement should be very close to and easily accessible to good road and rail links.

**Essex Wildlife Trust** New settlement areas of search should reference the designated Living Landscapes in the district. Comprehensive evidence-gathering will help to inform decisions on the type and location of green space required to complement existing GI, fill gaps, mitigate adverse impacts, and provide additional compensatory measures to ensure a net gain in biodiversity assets and GI.

**Gt Saling Action Group** Search Area 9 The proposed urban sprawl concerns me greatly.

**Hands Off Thaxted** Liaison/co-operation with East Herts and South Cambridgeshire to identify their plans. Evaluate existing infrastructure provision.

**Herts and Essex School** I am interested, therefore, in whether 10 acres of the development area could be apportioned to secondary education, in return for which we could increase the number of students we could take in to the school.

**National Trust** The Trust would draw the Council's attention to Areas of Search 5 & 6. The direct impact on the Forest and its wealth of ecological and heritage assets would be severe.

**Stebbing Society** Areas of Search 7,8 and 9 are already heavily developed, with other developments under construction or approved. Consequently any further development here would simply overload this area and therefore be inappropriate and should therefore be removed from the Plan.

**Sustainable Uttlesford** The factors to consider are (1) Accessibility of location in relation to strategic transport network (2) The impact on the Green Belt. (3) The location vis a vis current employment centres (4) Potential to encourage modal shift away from private car (5) Past decisions by Planning Inspectorate about the viability of location for major development (6) Potential for cross border collaboration.

**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.

**The Ickleton Society** Area of Search 1 In our view this area is not a good location for a new settlement

**We Are Residents** UDC should consider all material issues and all material evidence.

**Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation** We strongly object to the inclusion of sites 11a and b in the areas of search.

TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Birchanger Parish Council** To maintain no coalescence principle between villages, towns and county boundaries.

**Broxted Parish Council** If a new settlement is required my Council feels it should be to the north of the District.

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

**Elmdon & Wendens Lofts Parish Council** Area of search 1. In our view this area is not a good location for a new settlement. Area of Search 2. In our view this area is entirely unsuitable for a new settlement.

**Elsenham Parish Council** AoS 3 Elsenham area. I have severe concerns about the justification for this proposal. Great Chesterford areas 1 and 2 well served by road system which gives good access to the surrounding area.

**Felsted Parish Council** Object to Area 9 on grounds of ribbon development and coalescence of settlements.

**Great Chesterford Parish Council** Object to Areas of Search 1 and 2 on various grounds.

**Great Canfield Parish Council** Area of Search Number 8 The Parish Council is opposed to this option and of the view that to put 20,000+ houses into this area would destroy a historical part of Uttlesford. The effect would be to increase the Urban sprawl that would join Takeley and Great Dunmow into one large town.

**Great Dunmow Town Council** None have been identified.

**Henham Parish Council** Refer to Inspector's concerns about Area of Search 3.

**High Easter Parish Council** Experience across the country has shown (e.g. Ebbsfleet, Cambourne) that new settlements require very significant funding to provide all the required infrastructure to develop an extensive greenfield site on this scale, and that such funding cannot always be met through development levys and section 106 contributions alone.

**Ickleton Parish Council** Area of Search 1 is not a suitable location for a new settlement. Impact on the landscape would be unacceptable, since the new development would not conform to the established pattern of development in the locality.

**Little Chesterford Parish Council** For both AOS1 and AOS2 , Little Chesterford Parish Council agrees with the points made in the sustainability appraisal that the location is not well related to large existing settlements, and that developments would give rise to a large amount of commuting outside the district.

**Little Dunmow Parish Council** The Area of Search 9 appears to be too widely drawn.

**Little Easton Parish Council** Areas of Search 1-9: 1&2. A new settlement should be promoted in either or both of these locations. Railway stations at Great Chesterford and Whittlesford are both under-utilised. Access to major road networks (M11, A11, A1301,

A14) and areas of good quality employment and growth are better than anywhere else in the district.

**Newport Parish Council** Current infrastructure and evidence of sustainability.

**Rayne Parish Council** These are complex issue and it is thought unreasonable to expect members of the public to have a formulated an effective response to such.

**Saffron Walden Town Council** None have been identified.

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council** On a general perspective any new settlement should be in keeping with the District's Vision statement to ensure there is green space between sites and therefore to avoid amalgamation. It must also be clear that access on to a main road network, whether new or established, is a necessary condition.

**Stebbing Parish Council** Areas 7, 8 and 9 are totally inappropriate for this already heavily developed or permissioned part of the district.

**Strethall Parish Meeting** Sustainability, social benefit and economic viability.

#### **Takeley Parish Council**

AoS 1&2 M11 Junction 9: - Believe to be sustainable - employment opportunities.

AoS 3 Elsenham: - No direct access to M11 - Poor road access.

AoS 4 M11 Jtn 8 North West: - This is within Green Belt!

AoS 5 M11 Jtn 8 south east: - Directly under Stansted Airport flight (landing corridor) - Proximity to Hatfield Forest SSS1.

AoS 6 West Takeley, south of A120 & north of Hatfield Forest: - TPC has serious concerns.

AoS 7 North of A120, west of Dunmow - Partially in CPZ.

AoS 8 South of A120: - Site is isolated.

AoS 9 west of Braintree: - Pressure on M11 Jtn 8 would be unsustainable.

**Thaxted Parish Council** Good quality architecture; Road layout; Power including opportunities to achieve energy efficiency; Traffic; Employment; Facilities; Relationship to neighbouring settlement; Public sector investment.

**The Sampfords Parish Council** New Town Areas 1 and 2 (Figure 1) adjacent to Great Chesterford appear to offer the best opportunity to establish a new and sustainable community. Locations 4, 5 and 6 suggest an undersirable suburb to Bishop's Stortford, and loctions 7, 8 and 9 similarly to great Dunmow.

**Ugley Parish Council** Refer to Inspectors concerns about Area of Search 3.

**Widdington Parish Council** Refer to Inspector's concerns about Area of Search 3.

#### DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

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.

The issues and evidence that the Council should consider when assessing the potential for one or more new settlements at Areas of Search 1-9 should include deliverability, achievability and availability of land to meet the required housing requirements. Social, economic and environmental impacts for potential sites should also be assessed vigorously.

The SA undertakes a very high level assessment of the AoS and identifies issues with each of the proposed AoS such as proximity to SSSI, moderate to high landscape sensitivity to change, poor road and rail access and flood risk. These are seemingly balanced against very generic possible benefits of each of the areas.

Conservation areas should be protected.

It is reasonable to assume that the potential scale of development should provide opportunities for the delivery of services and infrastructure to support the development (education, healthcare etc.) and alleviate any impacts associated with expansion of existing settlements i.e. pressure on services, impact of cultural heritage etc

Centred on a main line railway and station. Direct access to the M11 motorway. The prospect of high grade employment, which would enhance the perception of the county.

The Council should consider the role, function and location of the key sustainability drivers when considering locations for growth. Relative distance from strategic infrastructure and its accessibility; the need for significant new infrastructure; transport routing; access to main centres of employment; and access to social and community facilities and services.

Airport noise should be a consideration.

Any new settlement should preferably be built somewhere that has the space to accommodate 12,000 houses if required (and not right on top of existing villages impacting on their infrastructure)

### COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

General comments made by individuals relate to:-

- The importance of transport links; links to A120, M11, A11, rail line; potential for new transport methods such as guided buses or tramways.
- Infrastructure – provision of schools, doctors, shops, green space, sports pitches, planning for walking/cycling, broadband.
- Site needs good access to areas of employment
- New settlements being sustainable and self-contained
- Viability and timescale of supporting infrastructure
- The importance of retaining the character of existing villages
- Maintaining as much high grade agricultural land as possible
- New settlement should be net contributor to District and not a drain on its resources.
- In accordance with paragraph 52 of NPPF any new settlement should be designed and built in compliance with Garden City Principles.
- Await Secretary of State's decision on appeals by Fairfield and Land Securities in relation to land at Elsenham and West of Great Dunmow respectively.

Comments specific to Areas of Search are listed below:-

### **Area of Search 1 and 2**

- Supported as it will avoid the congestion by developing in Saffron Walden.
- Support as access to railway network
- Area has excellent road and rail connections. It is also within an area of high tech and other business developments around Cambridge and along the M11 corridor so has excellent job opportunities locally.
- A large settlement in the north will have a massive transport problem during rush hours when all the new traffic plus existing traffic moving north will join the A11/A1301 (Stumps Cross roundabouts) junction. This will be similar to the significant delays that occur daily at A505/A1301 roundabout and along to M11/A505 junction.
- Create environmental issues due to sitting traffic as well as Great/Little Chesterford/Ickleton all becoming rat runs as people go to work. This will create safety issues within the villages.
- AoS 2 - unsuitable for more than very limited development due to rural road network, limited employment, loss of agricultural land and no easy access to railway station.
- M11 junction 9 has only south facing slip roads.
- AoS 2 – M11 acts as barrier
- No fast train from Great Chesterford, no station carpark. Increase pressure on roads and villages to Audley End Station and on station carpark.
- Impact on woodlands and area of ecological value
- Impact on smaller villages to west. New settlement would be unrelated to existing pattern of settlements
- Impact on scheduled ancient monuments.
- on a slope and development would be highly visible.
- Loss of agricultural land.
- Impact on chalk aquifer and runoff would exacerbate flood risk at Great Chesterford.
- Increase traffic congestion in service centre of Saffron Walden. Existing facilities in Great Chesterford could not meet needs during site's development.
- Impact on Icknield Way and National Cycle route.
- Coalescence with Great Chesterford
- Would not meet local need as would attract people from outside the district who wish to work in Cambridge or London but cannot afford to live there. Would not serve District as whole.
- Planning Application for a crematorium
- Impact of planned expansion of Genome Campus and associated housing
- Little previous development in area – suited to development as separate development.
- Would broaden range of services and facilities available in the area.

### **Area of Search 3**

- Not suitable due to rural nature of roads
- Rejected by Local Plan Inspector
- Should be considered equally with all other options
- Capacity of J8 M11
- Coalescence of Henham and Elsenham
- Railway line acts as barrier between existing and proposed village

- Limited services and facilities
- Water stressed area and some areas subject to flooding

#### **Area of Search 4 and 5**

- Support as access to railway network
- Proximity to transportation links and connections to areas of major employment within the District and further afield.
- Areas around Bishops Stortford would be close to the Stansted Flight Path and would increase pressure on an already overburdened M11 junction.
- Area 5 too close to Hatfield Forest
- Area 5 too close to Stansted Airport
- Difficult to expand beyond 2033
- Impact on Bishop's Stortford
- Benefit of helping stop further expansion of the airport as aircraft noise would be intolerable.
- Least destructive site as close to M11, urban spread of Bishop's Stortford and Stansted.
- Area 4 – lies within the Green Belt;
- Area 4 - no long views of the site;
- Area 5 – intrudes into Public Safety Zone

#### **Area of Search 6**

- Proximity to transportation links and connections to areas of major employment within the District and further afield.
- The area along the A120 has already had considerable development particularly around Takeley
- Too close to Hatfield Forest
- Too close to Stansted Airport
- Difficult to expand beyond 2033
- Capacity of A120 and J8 M11

#### **Area of Search 7**

- Maintains adequate separation from nearby established settlements and does not engulf them.
- Not feasible due to size (far too big.) resulting in use of precious green land in the district and least favourable transport links or access to main employment areas.
- Proximity to transportation links and connections to areas of major employment within the District and further afield.
- The area along the A120 has already had considerable development particularly around Takeley
- Great Dunmow has already had its fair share of new development and is in danger of losing its identity.
- Lack of infrastructure and location of historical sites.
- Capacity of A120 and J8 M11
- Would create urban sprawl between Great Dunmow and Little Canfield/Takeley and Little Easton

- Access to A120 and M11;
- scope for self-containment; accommodate environmental assets and avoid significant impacts

### **Area of Search 8**

- Object as would blight rural area
- Maintains adequate separation from nearby established settlements and does not engulf them.
- Proximity to transportation links and connections to areas of major employment within the District and further afield.
- The area along the A120 has already had considerable development particularly around Takeley
- Great Dunmow has already had its fair share of new development and is in danger of losing its identity.
- Too close to Hatfield Forest.
- Capacity of A120 and J8 M11
- Would create urban sprawl between Great Dunmow and Little Canfield/Takeley

### **Area of Search 9**

- Maintains adequate separation from nearby established settlements and does not engulf them.
- Would need improved junction on to A120
- Proximity to transportation links and connections to areas of major employment within the District and further afield.
- Object to detrimental impact on countryside, increased traffic, air, noise and light pollution.
- Andrewsfield is in the middle of nowhere.
- Area is less well connected than other areas to London and Cambridge.
- Area will increase the already significant flood risk in Stebbing Green and in other areas upstream along the River Ter and its tributaries, especially because the whole area is flat and low lying.
- There is very little or no public transport (train or bus) and also no west-bound access to the nearby A120.
- Join up Great Dunmow and Braintree
- Close to Felsted which has a range of services which would be useful in early stages of development.
- Large enough to be self-contained; large enough to expand beyond 2033.
- Felsted, for instance benefits from an hourly bus service to Great Dunmow (16 minutes), Braintree (20 minutes), and Stansted Airport and at least four buses a day to both Chelmsford and Colchester. A rail connection is available from Braintree, which has a direct hourly service to Liverpool Street (one hour one minute, only five minutes more than Elsenham).
- Impact on Ancient Woodland of Bosted Wood
- Development would not serve local people but London commuters
- Detrimental impact on character of Stebbing, would lead to coalescence between Stebbing and Rayne

- Loss of historic World War 2 airfield.
- Could infrastructure provided to serve new settlement such as gas, sewerage, high speed broadband be extended to existing settlements, dwellings?
- Capacity of A120 and J8 M11
- No spare capacity at Braintree Railway Station.
- Potentially under a flight path
- The site has poor drainage and is susceptible to flooding and rising water table
- Proximity to gravel extraction site.

**Question 15****Villages**

**What issues and evidence should the Council consider when assessing the potential for development in the villages? Please reference any specific villages in your response.**

This question was responded to by 416 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** – they express concerns about development at Elsenham and the impact it may have on the rural road network. They recommend that consideration be given to the scale and quantum of growth than can be delivered within the village locations; it is more challenging to deliver alternative sustainable travel modes.

The gradual encircling of development within village locations may have detrimental impact of the historic cores. It may impact the setting or significance or force inappropriate development within the village cores. The scale and type of development should be controlled in villages with significant historic cores such as Thaxted, Newport and Gt Chesterford.

ECC recommends that the evidence base for surface water flood risk in the SA incorporates the most up to date source of information for surface water flood risk.

UDC should work with ECC to ensure the availability of school places is considered, whether schools are capable of expansion, whether schools are capable of expansion; whether the scale of development warrants the expansion of existing school or new school provisions and ensure the delivery of safe travel routes.

Early years child care provision needs to be considered.

**Historic England** – the Council should consider the possible impacts on the significance of heritage assets including impact on their setting. Updating the Historic Settlement Character Assessments should be carried out to help inform the process.

**Anglian Water Services Ltd** – the Council should consider the implication of additional development at the identified villages for water recycling centres and the foul sewerage network within Anglian Waters area of responsibility.

**Sustainable Uttlesford** supports incremental development in any village ie maximum 10%.

**Hands off Thaxted** – the Council should consider the effect on the historic setting and landscape views. Evidence should include the effect of new housing on the capacity of schools and health centres.

**The Hundred Parishes Society** – high priority should be given to working with, respecting and where possible, enhancing the historic environment.

**National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups** – the issue of whether traveller sites should be accommodated within or on the edge of settlements

**Stebbing Society** – oppose scenario A. any development should be matched with a corresponding improvement in associated infrastructure. Type A villages should have smaller groups of development to ensure community cohesion.

**Thaxted Society** – Thaxted's quality of life and sustainability is bound up in both its setting and history and these two important benchmarks are lost to creeping urbanisation.

**Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group** – if any settlement is not sustainably located then how can further development there be considered sustainable? Housing development for local needs as low cost housing may be acceptable but nothing else.

**The Ickleton Society** – there is no car park at Gt Chesterford rail station, no northbound access to or southbound exit from the M11.

**Birchanger Wood Trust** – add on housing is not a sensible or sustainable plan. It does no good to the existing residential population and does not provide the necessary infrastructure or integration for new comers.

#### TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council and Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Group** the scale of development in type A villages should take account of existing infrastructure strains. The road infrastructure in and around Stansted is suffering from wear and tear caused by heavy traffic. The hill top of Silver Street is barely wide enough for two lorries to pass. Cambridge Road has poor layout and suffers from on street parking. Grove Hill is a cause of congestion.

**Strethall Parish Meeting** villages with excellent facilities will inevitably take more new housing than those with less as the council must still apply sustainability, social benefit and economic viability to its decision when looking at development in the villages.

**Saffron Walden Town Council** – two policies should be drawn up, one should set out the criteria against which proposals to develop housing in or adjacent to villages would be assessed. The other would be an exceptions policy setting out the criteria that proposals for affordable housing would have to meet.

**Felsted Parish Council** It is important that the character of the villages be maintained. The village plan is very relevant and should be taken into account. A Neighbourhood Plan is being written and should be considered.

**Little Dunmow Parish Council** Flich Green has reached its limit and further expansion would risk coalescence with Little Dunmow or Felsted. The primary school is oversubscribed and roads are not suitable. Flich Green should not be considered a Type A village.

**Henham, Elsenham, Widdington and Ugley Parish Councils** there is limited capacity to accommodate any more than a small extra quantum of growth in the villages. The withdrawn plan made substantial allocations in Elsenham and Henham and these have been converted in permissions. These are significant figures given the size of the settlements and

constraints and will take some time to absorb them so no further allocations are needed or justified.

**Wendens Ambo Parish Council** some villages may have a primary school but there are not sustainable locations for expansion given their rural location and lack of infrastructure. UDC should ensure most effective use of UDC or ECC land.

**Newport Parish Council** in Newport the existing infrastructure has been totally disregarded despite bringing this to the attention of UDC officers. UDC should demonstrate listening and reacting to the comments and proposals of Newport PC.

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council** The road infrastructure around Stansted Mountfitchet is suffering from the wear and tear caused by heavy traffic flow. Cambridge Road is suffering from poor layout and on street parking. There is increased congestion on Lower Street.

**Birchanger Parish Council** – preserve the character of village highway issues. Can the nature of the roads cope with more traffic. Infilling only within village envelope.

**Little Easton Parish Council** Great Chesterford has the potential for further development without harm to its character. Elsenham has the potential for substantial development without harm to its character and is well located for employment and services. Care should be taken not to harm the character of Henham. Type A villages should consider extending their development boundaries to include additional development that will complement the existing village.

**Great Chesterford Parish Council** the location of SAM should be taken into account, Gt Chesterford is constrained by river tributaries which could lead to potential flood risk, low population size compared to other key villages, historic core and CA, sensitive landscape, development already accepted and the emerging NP should be considered.

**Little Chesterford Parish Council** – in relation to Little Chesterford the location of SAM and the historic cores of the village and hamlet should be taken into consideration as should the sensitive surrounding landscape and flood plains of the River Cam. The NP goes into more detail and should be taken into consideration.

**Great Canfield Parish Council** – Traveller policies do not appear to have been included within the issues and options for development of villages.

**Thaxted Parish Council** – the capacity of the village in terms of services and infrastructure, the character of the natural landscape, access to education, transport and health services all need to be considered. Thaxted is a tourist destination and its attraction is the historic buildings – this should be preserved.

**Quendon and Rickling Parish Council** the villages cannot offer the infrastructure that is required. New development changes the character and environment of the villages. Many have had an unfairly high percentage increase in the number of new houses with no new infrastructure provision. The Quendon and Rickling parish Plan has been left off the list of parish plans considered. NP are expensive and it is unrealistic for smaller Parishes to achieve.

**Great Dunmow Town Council** – given the scale of growth proposed, development in the villages will not be able to make any significant contribution towards its delivery without changing both their scale and character drastically. Two policies should be drawn up, one should set out the criteria against which proposals to develop housing in or adjacent to villages would be assessed. The other would be an exceptions policy setting out the criteria that proposals for affordable housing would have to meet

**Stebbing Parish Council** – development in type A villages should not be in estates but rather in small areas of 6-10 houses. This has been proven in Stebbing to contribute to community cohesion. Large estates tend to be inward looking and integrate less well into traditional village life. At present there are planning permissions for 36 houses in Stebbing.

**Great Easton and Tilty Parish Council** – there are already three large areas of search immediately around the Great Dunmow area. Currently there is an appeal in process for 700 houses at Little Easton and also a potential application from Land Securities. This development is in our neighbouring parish, but would without doubt have a direct effect on the parish of Great Easton

**Elmdon and Wendens Lofts Parish Council** – additional housing in Chrishall will create increased traffic through Elmdon and along the B1039. Increased traffic bound for the M11 is likely to go via Elmdon and Duxford as this option allows easier access into the A505.

**Clavering Parish Council** – sustainability of transport links to access rail links, health care and employment. Clavering lacks facilities for further expansion.

#### DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- The majority of the villages are remote from services and facilities.
- Stansted Mountfitchet is a good location for growth as it has a number of facilities
- land owner promoting site in Birchanger (Call for Sites reference number 01Bir15)
- UDC should apply the SA and SEA objectives to the key villages. Villages that have fewer adverse impacts when assessed against the objectives should be allocated a greater proportion of development.
- An assessment needs to be made regarding the scope of existing services to grow
- Land owner promoting site in Mole Hill Green. Promoting a proportionate approach to ensure villages have a level of organic growth
- Land owner promoting site at Great Chesterford (Call for Sites reference number
- The ongoing viability and vitality of villages should be considered.
- Increasing the number of sites across the District with allocations for residential development will increase the rate of housing completions
- Land owner promoting a site at Sion House (Call for Sites reference number 02Bir15)
- Development based on the existing hierarchy will distribute growth to all areas
- Development needs to be provided in the villages in order to meet the housing need in the early years of the plan.
- Land owner promoting a site at Pines Hill Stansted (Call for Sites reference number 02SSa15)
- Land owner promoting site west of School Lane Newport (Call for Sites reference 05New15)

- The hierarchy approach to villages requires further analysis on a village by village basis
- Landowner promoting land at Hatfield Heath (Call for Sites reference number 03HHea15)
- The sites put forward under the Call for Sites should be used as the starting point for allocating land
- 

### COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

Associated with the response from Henham/Elsenham/Ugley/Widdington Parish Councils

- Infrastructure at capacity – schools and health facilities at capacity
- Local roads cannot cope
- The Council needs to spell out a clear hierarchy when it selects sites
- Villages should only take developer proportionate to their size
- New settlement is more sustainable than village growth
- Villages natural and built environments should be protected
- Villages have had more than their share of growth
- Road access to villages needs to be considered
- Extra parking spaces would be required due to car dependency
- The Council should consider the views of residents
- Affordable homes in villages are needed
- Avoid coalescence with neighbouring villages and towns
- Type B villages should have minimal development in order to retain their contribution to the beauty of the area
- Villages have sensitive surrounding landscapes
- Development should be controlled to prevent speculative applications
- Local housing need should be established using housing need surveys
- Homes for older people should be provided
- Controlled increases in housing stock make for better community cohesion
- In fill development only
- Key villages are better equipped to take additional housing
- Development should be sensitive to its surroundings
- Existing planning permissions must be taken into consideration
- Some Type A villages are more constrained than others – each village should be considered in relation to its sensitivities
- Limited public transport in some villages
- The selection of villages in the hierarchy categories is poorly thought through.
- Consideration should be given to traffic flows on junction 8 M11
- Preservation of village character is important
- Train links are important
- Key villages should take some development so long as it is sensitive to its surroundings

## Question 16

### Development at 580 dwellings per year

What do you think the implications of development under scenarios A to D would be, at around 580 dwellings per year.

This question was responded to by 385 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>.

### STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

**Historic England** consider scenario;

- A. Positive and/or negative impacts depending on its location and how it alleviates pressure for growth in existing settlements.
- B. Implications for many of the district's historic villages, although the edge of Bishop's Stortford is less constrained in terms of heritage assets.
- C. Diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow plus impact on transport movements, although it would depend on site locations
- D. Mixture of the above effects

**Anglian Water Services** is sewerage undertaker for part of UDC including Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden and a number of the key villages/Type A villages. All development sites located within Anglian Water's area will require a connection to the foul sewerage network. The need for new and improved infrastructure will be dependent upon proposed connection point(s) to the network. The following comments are made on the first 4 scenarios

- A. The implications of this scenario would be dependent upon the location of any new settlement. Therefore we are unable to comment further at this stage.
- B. This would have a greater impact on Water Recycling Centres which serve villages within Anglian Water's area of responsibility than Scenarios A, C and D.
- C. This would have a greater impact on Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow Water Recycling Centres than Scenarios A, B and D.
- D. This would have a greater impact on Water Recycling Centres which serve villages within Anglian Water's area of responsibility than Scenarios A and C.

**Essex County Council** makes the following comments on the first 4 scenarios

- A. A new settlement is considered sustainable as it enables the infrastructure necessary to support a new community to be delivered effectively;
- B. ECC is concerned that this scenario would promote greater volumes of traffic growth on the district's rural road network; detailed considerations needs to be given to the availability of school places at the existing primary schools, whether the scale of development is sufficient to warrant a new school, whether the development would enable children to walk or cycle to school.
- C. In Saffron Walden this would generate sufficient demand for a new primary school. In relation to secondary schooling in Saffron Walden, in the long term this would lead

to fewer pupils from outside the school's priority admissions area but in the medium term is likely to lead to the displacement of some pupils from within the priority admission area. Any children displaced from SWCHS would need to be accommodated at The Joyce Frankland Academy.

In Great Dunmow this would generate sufficient demand for a new primary school. In relation to secondary schooling in Great Dunmow, if the existing school is relocated as previously proposed, work would need to be undertaken to ascertain if it could accommodate additional pupils or whether any adjustments to the school's paa could lead to another new school accommodating some of the additional pupils that would be generated by the additional housing.

- D. From a highways and transportation perspective this is the least sustainable option, as it would make the deliverability of sustainable transportation challenging, and also accommodating development within the more remote rural locations throughout UDC would require intervention. It is also the least sustainable for delivery of future education services and facilities as relatively small scale housing development is unlikely to fund anything other than the expansion of an existing school which can be difficult and/or expensive.

**South Cambridgeshire District Council** state that it is important that UDC plans to meet its full objectively assessed housing and employment needs, taking account of the need for a measure of flexibility. Close working under the duty to cooperate is necessary in regard to housing, employment and transport matters. The boundary between the two councils is also the boundary between two housing market areas and the relationship between the two should be considered.

**Hertfordshire County Council** comment that development on the edge of Bishop's Stortford included in scenarios B and D equate to a need for an additional 1FE of both primary and secondary school places which would be in addition to any additional school requirements arising out of development in East Hertfordshire.

The **Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** do not accept the figures fed into the Objective Housing Needs Assessment as they concentrate on national need rather than local need, so we reject all scenarios.

**Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** consider that Scenarios A and D seem more likely to be achievable without significant damage to the intrinsic character and appeal of Uttlesford's towns and villages. Scenarios B and C would probably inflict significant harm on the existing towns and villages.

**Essex Wildlife Trust** refers to their responses in earlier questions. **The Local Group of the Trust** refers to their answer to question 12 and consider that only a New Town based adjacent to Saffron Walden could ever be considered sustainable; all other options are just bolting-on housing in dribs and drabs, exacerbating existing infrastructure shortfalls.

**Sustainable Uttlesford's** first preference is for the allocation of housing in the plan period is to a single settlement but they are concerned about the deliverability and viability of the developing a new settlement within a single local plan period. They therefore consider that the council should develop a 30 year strategy to ensure the viability and deliverability of a new settlement.

**We Are Residents** believe that the effects of this level of development under any of scenarios B to D would be unsustainable and would drastically change the nature of the existing settlements. We do not see how 1,500 new homes can possibly be accommodated in Saffron Walden sustainably.

**The Stebbing Society** considers that the figure cannot be applied generally particularly where Type A villages are concerned and each location must be considered on its own merits. Under Scenario A there is a danger that this rate cannot be met anyway and hence the 5 year plan could not be met., The Society note the Parish's response and would have to be guided by them.

**The Ickleton Society** considers that for Areas of Search 1 and 2, this number of houses and rate of build would not justify the provision of a school, health centre and other facilities for several years and it is difficult to see that existing services in Great Chesterford could absorb the additional pressure on their resources in the meantime.

**The Thaxted Society** considers that figures set out for housebuilding nationally, either by government or by the planning inspector locally, are those against which we consider Thaxted's contribution. They are therefore broadly supportive of the inspector's figure of 580 houses per year.

**Birchanger Wood Trust** considers that this level of construction has never yet been achieved but consider it a challenge which could be met by defining a designated new village somewhere in the District.

**Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation** consider that all scenarios should have 500 dwellings on the edge of Bishop's Stortford removed from them with the number being reallocated to other settlements.

**Hands off Thaxted** make the following comments on the scenarios

- A. the most sustainable option if the new settlement is located near to the M11 and main line railway stations with the proviso that the settlement is well away from the A120 and Bishops Stortford .
- B. not sustainable in respect of the villages. Further congestion will be generated in Bishops Stortford which will be exacerbated by the planned major developments in Braintree which will feed more traffic going west onto the A120 into Bishops Stortford and the planned developments around Bishop's Stortford by East Herts.
- C. will cause further degradation of Dunmow and Saffron Walden
- D. A new settlement of 500 units is a large housing estate not a settlement. Appropriate infrastructure could not be funded from a development of this size and it would therefore need to be bolted onto an existing settlement

**Essex Bridleways Association** has no comment

#### TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Arkesden Parish Council** is concerned that the scenarios only consider a 15 year period and do not reflect the full plan period from 2011 to 2033.

**Birchanger Parish Council** considers this is too high a number and probably not achievable.

**Chrishall Parish Council** supports scenarios D and E. 750 dwelling spread across the district is NOT supported. The parish council suggest that the Local Plan inspector recommended at least one new settlement.

**Clavering Parish Council** considers that all future developments must be sustainable with complete infrastructure being provided.

**Elmdon & Wendens Lofts Parish Council** are concerned that scenario A in respect to Areas of Search 1 and 2 would impact the surrounding local communities with the need to increase infrastructure.

**The Parish Councils of Elsenham, Henham, Ugley and Widdington** object to the use of 750dpa for the scenarios and it does not reflect the SHMA. This would result in a smaller housing requirement which although still a substantial number could be accommodated by growth at Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow or a single new settlement.

**Felsted Parish Council** consider that scenario

- A. Raises objection in principle because it will cause the most negative impact on nearby towns and villages, and will require significant infrastructure modification. It removes the ability to respond to smaller local development needs in sensitive ways.
- B. Would have a too greater impact on villages
- C. would need substantial enhancement to the roads, utilities and facilities of the towns
- D. Is the most equitable solution as it gives maximum flexibility for villages of all sizes to respond to their own development needs to deliver sustainable growth, although the capacity of roads in and between the settlements and the strategic transport network would need to be extensively reviewed, together with the capacity of utilities and of bus services etc.

**Great Canfield Parish Council** makes the following comments on the Scenarios

- A. Would have the best outcome for employment, housing mix and leisure and open spaces.
- B. Concerned that the correct levels of infrastructure, employment, housing mix, leisure facilities and open space could be provided with this form of development.
- C. That there is no evidence to show that towns can grow sustainably to accommodate further homes, particularly on road and rail infrastructure.
- D. Concerned that the correct levels of infrastructure, employment, housing mix, leisure facilities and open space could be provided with this form of development.

**Great Chesterford Parish Council** considers that the housing requirement should reflect the SHMA and the existing supply include the windfall allowance. The following comments are made for each of the scenarios

- A. Not considered to be deliverable in the plan period
- B. Not a sustainable strategy as this does not provide development in the two main towns of Uttlesford with the best range of services and facilities, and does not provide any significant infrastructure improvements due to piecemeal development.

- C. Their Preferred Option. This is considered the most sustainable strategy as it concentrates development in the two main towns and can provide the necessary infrastructure required to mitigate any impact of development due to the proposed scale of proposals.
- D. Considered too piecemeal with no provision of significant infrastructure.

**Great Dunmow Town Council and Saffron Walden Town Council** consider the annual rate could well be higher and it is therefore appropriate to plan for a possible 'worst case scenario' so as to minimise the prospect of an eventual annual growth figure being higher than anticipated and resulting in the development strategy for the plan having to be revisited. Given the need to plan for beyond 580/yr, scenarios B and D are therefore not feasible. Scenario C is not feasible because of the detrimental impact on character and setting of the towns and they do not have the requisite infrastructure and delivery of the infrastructure in a cost-effective manner would result in the scope for much greater development the delivery of which would thus change their character even more. If it is accepted that it is appropriate and, indeed, prudent to not be limited to 580/yr then scenarios A and E emerge as the only feasible option. Given the long lead-in time for a new settlement, the issue then becomes how is it possible to ensure that sufficient new dwellings are delivered in the interim, which is considered in response to question 10.

**Little Chesterford Parish Council** considers that the numbers of homes that a village has already contributed needs to be taken into account. Although the numbers in Little Chesterford are small, they have a proportionally larger impact in such a small village. The emerging Neighbourhood plan needs to be a consideration for future development.

**Little Easton Parish Council** consider that suitable development in existing towns and key villages should be combined with new settlement villages in a balanced way.

**Newport Parish Council** have grave reservations about delivery of 580 dwellings per year without advance infrastructure improvements.

**Quendon and Rickling Parish Council** consider that Options A-D all fall significantly short of the 12500 homes target and options B&D place too much pressure on smaller communities that do not have the infrastructure to cope with this level of development.

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council** considers that scenarios A and D seem more likely to be achievable without significant damage to the intrinsic character and appeal of Uttlesford's towns and villages. Scenarios B and C would probably inflict significant harm on the existing towns and villages.

**Stebbing Parish Council** considers that these scenarios present an 'All or nothing' for Type A villages which is not acceptable. These scenarios are unjust and obviously biased towards a new settlement. The other scenarios appear to be designed to set the different areas against each other.

**Strethall Parish Meeting** consider that this is just achievable, but not in the form of one development 'dumped' in the middle of open countryside for all of the powerful reasons given i.e. unsustainable, socially negative and divisive and completely economically unviable.

**The Sampfords Parish Council** prefer Scenario A

**Thaxted Parish Council** makes the following comments on the scenarios;

- A. This has the least impact on the environment;
- B. This puts too much pressure on Bishop's Stortford;
- C. This would be impossible for Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow;
- D. Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden are less likely to be damaged. This would be better than developing the villages.

**Ickleton Parish Council** consider that as far as new settlements in either Areas of Search 1 and 2 are concerned, this rate of build would not release enough funding at early enough stages to secure the provision of educational, health and other facilities at the time necessary for these communities to function in a cohesive way, and existing services in Great Chesterford or other settlements nearby would not be able to cope with the demand from residents in the new settlements.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

A number of developers consider that the Council should plan for higher levels of growth to allow people to be properly housed; and to address affordability issues. Some developers also emphasised the need for flexible options that produce a 5 year land supply going forward.

The table below summarises the main points made in objection to or support of the 4 Scenarios A to D.

	Objection	Support
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slow delivery on new settlement site</li> <li>• Unable to show 5 year land supply</li> <li>• Vulnerable on deliverability/last resort</li> <li>• Deprives remainder of district from sustainable growth/settlement hierarchy conflict</li> <li>• Scale of infrastructure required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserves character of District's towns</li> <li>• Critical mass to support infrastructure delivery</li> <li>• Pattern of existing permissions</li> <li>• Sustainable social/environmental impact</li> </ul>
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would disperse growth thinly across a number of relatively unsustainable locations.</li> <li>• Includes less sustainable locations and excludes more sustainable locations such as the towns</li> <li>• Unlikely to support new infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater spread of options</li> <li>• Proportional growth of the villages</li> <li>• Sustain existing services and facilities</li> <li>• Makes good use of existing infrastructure</li> <li>• Less constraints e.g. green belt</li> <li>• Early delivery of sites/5 year supply</li> </ul>
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would cause serious detriment to the character and integrity of these market towns</li> <li>• Would not meet needs of rural areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Towns are sustainable locations</li> <li>• Makes good use of existing infrastructure, services, and facilities</li> <li>• Add Bishops Stortford</li> </ul>
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will not deliver the same critical mass as a large new settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater spread of options</li> <li>• Proportional growth of the villages</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May not deliver infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet different needs</li> <li>• Provide variety of development types</li> </ul>
--	--

### COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

A number of individuals consider the scale of growth (580dpa) too great and would have a detrimental impact on the character of the district and its infrastructure. The most frequent comment relates to infrastructure/lack of or the need for new infrastructure to support new housing.

	Objection	Support
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slow delivery</li> <li>• Impacts on nearby settlements/villages character and services especially if infrastructure not timely</li> <li>• More out commuting</li> <li>• Not compatible with character of district</li> <li>• Lack of choice in where to live</li> <li>• Out of keeping with rural character of the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability/best planned/optimize opportunities for public transport</li> <li>• Minimise urban sprawl</li> <li>• Avoids piecemeal development</li> <li>• Comprehensive delivery of infrastructure</li> <li>• Provision of new Secondary school</li> <li>• Less impact given constraints in towns and villages especially in Saffron Walden</li> <li>• Needs to be accompanied by offsetting allocations in early years</li> </ul>
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much for villages to absorb/huge scale of increase</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on villages/heritage</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure education/health</li> <li>• Pressure on Bishop's Stortford</li> <li>• Too general</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More finely grained settlement hierarchy for smaller villages might assist/towns take more</li> <li>• B and C logical to ensure enough growth to occur in next 5 years</li> </ul>
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limitations of towns for edge of town growth –impact on heritage/transport</li> <li>• Already significant commitments</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure - transport</li> <li>• Too general</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on towns/access to services, facilities and infrastructure</li> <li>• B and C logical to ensure enough growth occurs in next 5 years</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure in villages</li> <li>• Spread between the major towns along the M11 corridor</li> <li>• Add Bishops Stortford</li> <li>• If take account of poor road infrastructure in Saffron Walden</li> </ul>
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of new settlement too small</li> <li>• May not deliver infrastructure</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on villages</li> <li>• Too general/too much a compromise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spreads development around district fairest option</li> <li>• Fairest if takes account of recent completions</li> <li>• Potential for organic growth</li> <li>• May be a better option with say 2 smaller new settlements</li> </ul>

## Question 17

### Development at 750 dwellings per year

**What do you think the implications of development under scenarios E to G would be, at around 750 dwellings per year.**

This question was responded to by 361 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>.

### STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

**Greater London Authority** Testing a range of development scenarios including some that exceed the levels recommended by Inspector is considered appropriate. The use of population projections based on 10 year migration trends in the joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment is also welcome and over the future development of your local plan we would like to be kept informed on how the Council is seeking to reconcile housing supply and need in terms of NPPF requirements.

**Historic England** Note 750 dpa has implications for the historic environment/note the findings of the SA and makes the following comments on the scenarios

E) Could have positive and/or negative impacts depending on its location and how it alleviates pressure for growth in existing settlements. It would seem harder to locate two new settlements without some degree of harm to the historic environment, given the richness and geographical spread of heritage assets within the district.

F) Potential negative implications for the historic environment depending on location.

G) Mixture of the above effects, albeit with the potential for greater impacts than Scenario D as more housing would have to be delivered.

**Anglian Water Services** makes the following comments on the scenarios;

E) depends on location of any new settlements/unable to comment more this stage.

F) greater impact on Saffron Walden/Great Dunmow Water Recycling Centres and water recycling centres which serve villages within Anglian Waters area of responsibility than Scenarios E and G.

G) greater impact on Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow Water Recycling Centres and water recycling centres which serve villages within Anglian Waters area of responsibility than Scenarios E and G.

**Essex County Council** makes the following comments on the scenarios

E) Enables delivery of necessary infrastructure in planned way to support the new community. The larger settlement proposal would facilitate transport mitigation. Size important for secondary school/plans for growth beyond plan period.

F) Concern about growth being spread throughout UDC as may not facilitate appropriate highway mitigation. For education considers that F) is an amalgamation of Scenario B and C, therefore see the response to question 16.

G) Least sustainable in transportation terms making delivery of sustainable transportation challenging while rural road network in UDC may also be an issue requiring intervention. Also is likely to make the provision of additional school places more difficult to deliver and expensive/unlikely to fund anything other than the expansion of an existing school.

**Hertfordshire County Council** comment as per Q16 that development on the edge of Bishop's Stortford equate to a need for an additional 1FE of both primary and secondary school places which would be in addition to any additional school requirements arising out of development in East Hertfordshire. Regards E Herts identified a potential requirement for a new 2FE primary school and a new 6FE secondary school to meet the future need in the town the additional housing located on the edge of Bishop's Stortford within UDC has not been included within those identified requirements.

**Birchanger Wood Trust** Upon analysis of earlier years, this scenario is not possible to achieve.

**Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation** All scenarios should have 500 dwellings on the edge of Bishop's Stortford removed from them with the number being reallocated to other settlements.

**Essex Wildlife Trust** refers to their responses in earlier questions.

**Essex Wildlife Trust Local Group** only a New Town adjacent to Saffron Walden could ever be considered sustainable; all other options are just bolting-on housing in dribs, exacerbating infrastructure shortfalls. None of these scenarios is worthy of consideration.

**Hands Off Thaxted** Implication is further destruction of UDC landscape and its historic towns and villages. Others are increased road chaos with commuters heading for the M11 and main line railway stations via narrow country roads and lanes, lack of education places at primary schools in most villages and reduced service at health centres.

**Helena Romaine Secondary School** NPPF clear on significantly boosting supply of housing/option of providing 750 dwellings per annum should be favoured. If plan delivers 750 dpa this widens choice of high quality homes/opportunities for home ownership. It increases opportunities to create sustainable, provides inclusive and mixed communities, and better placesplan to account for changing circumstances. Also beneficial economic and social impacts, delivery of development at a scale within Great Dunmow capable of part-funding the replacement of HRS on the proposed site with a newer facility, which is imperative for the long term sustainability of Great Dunmow. Question SA/SEA for scenario suggest 750 dwellings would inevitably, result in significant impacts on a number of environmental sustainability objectives, including biodiversity as not clear how this

conclusion reached/would not inevitably encroach into areas that are protected for their ecological value, or result a negative impacts on such areas. Development has the potential for ecological enhancements/overall biodiversity gain. Also, question SA/SEA on intrinsic harm to landscape character. For a new settlement option recognise potential negative environmental, social and economic impacts for SA/SEA in response to Q 10.

**The Stebbing Society** No justification to go beyond the identified objective need for 580dpa. There is no justification to accommodate growth from neighbouring authorities. It is completely unsustainable that Uttlesford could deliver that amount of housing per year.

**G W Balaam & Son** Scenario G would be of the greatest benefit to the residents of Uttlesford since it would allow all the individual settlements to expand. This would provide unique settlements to provide for very differing needs and you will not tend to get the Taylor Wimpey (or any other large scale house building company) effect of homogenised homes that could be built anywhere in the country.

**Ridgeons** We do not have any specific observations other than a growth strategy that is heavily reliant on 2 new settlements only has deliverability question marks.

**Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** If this level of development proves to be necessary then Scenarios E and G appear to be the only tenable ones to us. Scenario F would, we believe, run the risk of destroying the intrinsic character of Uttlesfords towns and villages, which make it such a pleasant and desirable place to live.

**The Crown Estate:** Object to two New Settlements would compound the infrastructure and funding issues as discussed in response to Question 10. The Crown Estate considers the delivery of 300 dwellings per year could be optimistic and questions if UDC will be able to maintain a 5 year housing supply of land in the early years of the plan period with this scenario.

F)The Crown Estate supports this approach as given the rural nature of the district, it is necessary for housing development to be directed to Key Villages and Type A Villages to meet the housing need arising. The Crown Estate considers this to be best option for a steady supply of new housing, and land west of Station Road, Elsenham, and land north of Stansted, Elsenham, are available and suitable, and could deliver 80-100, and to 40 residential dwellings, respectively.

G) Support - provides a more even distribution of housing across the district to a variety of different sized settlements. This is a less risky approach to housing delivery, as it assumes housing will be delivered on a number of different sites providing a more effective buffer to maintain a five year supply of housing, should one site not come forward for housing.

**The Thaxted Society** We welcome the consideration of 750 dwelling per year as in our experience build out rates are normally significantly slower than housing trajectories indicate with the size and complexity of schemes and local market factors playing a big role in deliverability. As set out in Q10/Q16 examples of build out rates for larger schemes in the district have historically been less than 150 dwellings per annum. By increasing the number, variety and location of development sites, the build out rate can be maximised resulting in a more robust and realistic 5 year housing supply. The issues set out in Q16 above apply to the development of 750 dwellings. In any event an increase in the number of dwellings per

year will not result in a corresponding increase in deliverability of housing within a two new settlement scenario as this will always be restricted by its complexity, size and local market competition from other sites. It would therefore be necessary to consider increasing the proportion of new development on other sites around existing settlements to make up the shortfall. Likewise as outlined above the constraints associated with the smaller villages and Bishops Stortford make these in our view unviable options at the levels proposed. The only practical solution is to concentrate the majority of development on sites in existing key villages (including Hatfield Heath) and the market towns.

**We Are Residents** We believe the effects of this level of development under any of scenarios from B) would be unsustainable and would drastically change the nature of the existing settlements. We do not see how 1,500 new homes can possibly be accommodated in Saffron Walden sustainably. Again, without being told where the 5,000 committed new homes are to be located we cannot comment fully on the other scenarios, but they do not appear to us to be likely to be sustainable. Scenario E appears to be the only one which might be sustainable.

#### TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Birchanger Parish Council** Impossible. Must take into account nature of the area, which is rural. People from urban communities not keen to come here. Poor rail service for people now trains already overcrowded.

**Clavering Parish Council** two specific new settlements would accommodate better infrastructure and protect the countryside and also maintain character of existing historic market towns and villages in the long term.

**The Parish Councils of Elsenham, Henham, Widdington, Ugley** This level of housing is way above the carefully justified and calculated ORS report covering the whole HMA - 750 is 32% higher than the agreed figure of 568pa. (itself 32% higher than the last adopted development plan figure of 430pa) 750 pa is so unacceptable and unsupported.

**Felsted Parish Council** For reasons similar to those in response to Q16, Scenario G would be the least objectionable, but it still includes aspects already rejected above in scenarios A-C so do not support any of these scenarios. Should this option be further explored due to requests to take housing build from adjoining districts then this specific point should be independently reviewed/offered for referendum before agreement as impact so significant.

**Ickleton Parish Council** As far as new settlements in either Areas of Search 1 and 2 are concerned, this rate of build would not release enough funding at early enough stages to secure the provision of educational, health and other facilities at the time necessary for these communities to function in a cohesive way, and existing services in Great Chesterford or other settlements nearby would not be able to cope with the demand from residents in the new settlements. In consequence, the locations are not viable for new settlements.

**Great Chesterford Parish Council** The Examination Inspector was clear on his findings in relation to a higher housing provision "An increase in provision of about one third would bring provision to about 700 p.a., or an additional 3,500 dwellings - I find no convincing evidence to support an increase on that substantial scale" para 1.10. The Joint SHMA (July 2015) and agreed by Uttlesford in September 2015 provides robust evidence for an annual requirement

of 568 dwellings. The Parish Council considers it is unnecessary to provide an analysis of development at 750 dwellings per year.

**Great Dunmow Town Council and Saffron Walden Town Council** consider Q16 and Q17 to be linked. Consider the annual rate could be higher and it is appropriate to plan for a possible 'worst case scenario' so as to minimise the prospect of an undershoot resulting in the development strategy having to be revisited. Given the need to plan for beyond 580/yr, scenarios B and D are therefore not feasible. That means scenario F (focus on towns) is not feasible as it comprises scenarios B and C) nor is G (hybrid 2 - because it is similar to F plus a new settlement). Also (as per C) detrimental impact on character and setting of the towns and they do not have the requisite infrastructure and delivery of the infrastructure in a cost-effective manner would result in the scope for much greater development the delivery of which would thus change their character even more. Scenarios A and E emerge as the only feasible option if accepted go beyond 580/yr. There is a need to plan beyond the plan period for new settlements. Given the long lead-in time for a new settlement, the issue is how is to ensure sufficient new dwellings are delivered in the interim/see response to question 10.

**Little Chesterford Parish Council** is unable to see any compelling evidence that this increased provision is required.

**Little Easton Parish Council** are doubtful that there will be consumer demand to actually achieve the delivery 750 dwellings per year but, even if it could be achieved, it would totally destroy the character of the district.

**Newport Parish Council** has grave reservations about delivery of 580 dwellings per year without advance infrastructure improvements. To progress without these could lead to total traffic chaos, and overload of all services particularly sewerage.

**Quendon & Rickling Parish Council** preference is for Option E - we see it as the only way to provide long term development to achieve the required target of 12500 homes by 2033. It is also the only way to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided alongside the huge number of houses required.

**Rayne Parish Council**- Various suggestions were 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.

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council** If this level of development proves to be necessary then Scenarios E and G appear to be the only tenable ones. Scenario F would, we believe, run the risk of destroying the intrinsic character of UDCs towns and villages, which make it such a pleasant and desirable place to live.

**Stebbing Parish Council** There is no justification to go beyond the identified objective that answers the need for 580dpa. There is no justification to accommodate growth from neighbouring authorities. It is completely unsustainable that UDC could deliver that amount of housing per year.

**Strethall Parish Meeting** Realistically, our opinion is that it is impossible to achieve and also not necessary. But if attempted the only real chance is for the majority to be smaller homes spread over the district because of the greater density that can be achieved.

**Thaxted Parish Council** This increased number of dwellings arises from UDC considering taking on another authority's development shortfall and is completely unacceptable.UDC should not entertain accepting need from neighbouring authority areas. F & G would cause significant damage to the villages as the infrastructure is not in place to cope with these volumes. Arguably, Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow could cope better. A new settlement is favoured.

**The Sampfords Parish Council** prefers scenario A, with the New Settlement taking the addition development brought about by the increase in the construction ratio to 750dpa.

**Wicken Bonhunt Parish Meeting** support scenario E Two new settlements providing UDC manages the developments ensuring that the facilities, infrastructure and employment opportunities meet the needs of the residents.

DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

A number of developers consider that the Council should plan for higher levels of growth to allow for greater economic growth, make-up historic shortfall, enable people to be properly housed, and to address the affordability issues. Some developers also emphasised the need for flexible options that produce a 5 year land supply going forward.

The table below summarises the main points made objecting to or in support of the 3 Scenarios E to G.

	Objection	Support
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slow delivery on new settlement site</li> <li>• Unable to show 5year land supply</li> <li>• Vulnerable on deliverability</li> <li>• Deprives remainder of district from sustainable growth</li> <li>• Scale of infrastructure required/phasing needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserves character of District/historic towns and villages e.g. visual appearance</li> <li>• Critical mass to support infrastructure delivery</li> <li>• Provision of secondary school, primary schools, country park, GI, Biodiversity, shops, employment, public transport provision</li> <li>• Provides large scale growth in line with NPPF</li> <li>• Opportunities for well planned growth/ garden city design principles</li> </ul>
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would disperse growth thinly across a number of relatively unsustainable locations</li> <li>• Would cause serious detriment to the character and integrity of market towns</li> <li>• Includes less sustainable locations and excludes more sustainable locations such as the towns</li> <li>• Unlikely to support new infrastructure.</li> <li>• Would not meet needs of rural areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Towns/larger villages are sustainable locations for growth</li> <li>• Qualify above regards Saffron and Great Dunmow infrastructure</li> <li>• Could refine approach/ reduce dispersal</li> <li>• Less reliance/risk on just one or two sites that have potential to stall</li> <li>• Proportional growth of the villages</li> <li>• Sustain existing services and facilities</li> <li>• Makes good use of existing infrastructure.</li> <li>• Early delivery of sites/deliver 5 year supply</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would meet needs of rural areas</li> </ul>
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will not deliver the same critical mass for benefits as a large new settlement</li> <li>• May not deliver key infrastructure such as a secondary school</li> <li>• Unacceptable environmental impacts on market towns and villages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater spread of options</li> <li>• Proportional growth of the villages</li> <li>• Meet different needs</li> <li>• Provide variety of development types</li> </ul>

### COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

A number of individuals consider scale of growth (750dpa) is too great/relates poorly to evidence and impact on the district too detrimental. The most frequent comment relates to detrimental impacts on character especially heritage and impacts on infrastructure especially transport and schools.

	Objection	Support
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slow delivery</li> <li>• Not compatible with settlement pattern/in open countryside</li> <li>• Impact on neighbouring settlements e.g. traffic/schools/health</li> <li>• Lack of choice in where to live</li> <li>• Potentially more expensive than a single new settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Argument for new settlement more acute than for scenario A-D</li> <li>• Sustainable avoiding development in more damaging locations e.g. constrained towns and villages</li> <li>• Avoids piecemeal development</li> <li>• Comprehensive delivery of infrastructure</li> <li>• Provision of new Secondary school</li> </ul>
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much for towns/villages to absorb</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on traffic, schooling, health, other facilities</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure</li> <li>• Pressure on Bishop's Stortford</li> <li>• Limitations of towns for edge of town development</li> <li>• Already significant commitments</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All take a share of the growth/lessens impacts fairest solution</li> <li>• Comments made for B &amp; C that are applicable for F</li> </ul>
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of new settlement too small</li> <li>• May not deliver infrastructure</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on villages</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If dispersal strategy proves essential no need for new settlements</li> <li>• Comments made for D that are applicable for G</li> </ul>

## Question 18

### Other Scenarios

Are there any other potential scenarios not shown which should be assessed by the council?

This question was responded to by 242 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>.

### STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS

**Birchanger Wood Trust** Maybe, the District can join with others in Essex, or even Hertfordshire or South Cambs to look to providing a solution across borders?

**Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability, Highways** welcomes discussions with UDC on any alternative scenarios that are considered following this consultation.

**Essex Wildlife Trust Uttlesford Local Group** The Council should assess a classic New Town beside Saffron Walden based on Audley End railway station. See answer to Q12.

**Hands Off Thaxted** A scenario of say 400 dwellings per year on the basis that adjoining districts to the south, west and north could accommodate any shortfalls from Uttlesford. These would probably be more sustainable as there are better communication links with London and Cambridge where employment opportunities are far greater than those in UDC.

### TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Elsenham, Henham, Ugley, Widdington Parish Councils** A new settlement of only 3000 dwellings is the wrong number. If it is to have any chance of being self-contained, it would need to be twice that number even to have its own secondary school. There is no need to seriously consider Bishops Stortford (no indication that East Herts DC would agree to town extension); or to consider the villages. Therefore none of the scenarios are realistic there are really only two: a single new settlement of up to 7000 homes urban extensions to Saffron Walden (3850) and Gt Dunmow (3360) - some 50% of the option sites identified. This report finds either scenario is realistic and deliverable. However, of all the new settlement options (based on inspectors findings AoS 3 Elsenham is a non-starter), the land securities proposals for Easton Park (AoS7) stand out as suitable, sustainable and deliverable. For full response please see attached document.

**Felsted Parish Council** House building over the last 10 years has been close to the annual rate identified as required over the new plan period. A scenario should be developed that replicates this (or is identified from the existing scenarios). What has worked over the last 10 years is likely to offer a good option to learn from and build upon for future needs. Consider area west of Audley End. There are no radical new ideas being considered. Where, for example, is an idea to build based on an M11 spur, with an appropriate rail link delivering road and rail access designed for purpose?

**Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden Town Councils**

Other potential scenarios may emerge from combining elements of those existing if this proves necessary to ensure continuous delivery. All scenarios to be considered will, however, need to be the subject of rigorous and objective testing through a Sustainability Appraisal to ensure the prospect of sustainable development and be capable of satisfying the local plan Inspector accordingly.

**Little Easton Parish Council** Co-operation with Braintree and South Cambs Districts would provide the potential for new settlements that can have early-phase delivery of homes in Uttlesford, the required infrastructure to support the new settlements and carefully planned expansion of existing settlements in a balanced way.

**Newport Parish Council** The provision of better junctions and surfaces to all roads with particular attention to difficult junctions such as the junction at the bottom of Sparrows End Hill. Potential expansion of Stansted Airport should not be overlooked/widening of the M11.

**Stebbing Parish Council and Stebbing Society** Hybrid of B and C that considers proportionate size of towns and all types of villages (including those not at present) to spread the number of houses for each place.

**Strethall Parish Meeting** Come away from "one new settlement solves all" scenario and particularly the idea of 'dumping' it in an area of unspoilt countryside. Share the load throughout the district on the grounds we have previously outlined that is the fairest option for all residents who live in this lovely part of the world.

**Thaxted Parish Council** The inspector criticised UDC for not working with Braintree to increase development in this area. Braintree has a station/established commercial centre.

**The Sampfords Parish Council** None have been identified by the Parish Council.

**The Thaxted Society** We consider vision and imagination to be imperative in providing for a sustainable future. Whilst house building currently provides an income stream for local government it is very hard to disentangle this bonus from any vision and as a consequence the vision to 2033 is broadly marred.

#### DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- A number of developers argue for a higher housing need target e.g. uplift of 20% based on the household projections/housing market signals/lack of affordability
- More comprehensive scenario testing for the above including jobs based scenario
- Some developers considered that no further scenarios were needed or should not be radically different to those identified
- Optimum scenario to guide the future growth levels and locations should be based on an assessment of the existing key sustainable growth drivers
- Sustainable growth at Villages where such growth will support and enhance the role as service centres/ Great Chesterford
- Need hybrid scenario with most growth targeted at new settlements but allowing for sustainable growth at Towns/Villages to support their roles as service centres targeted at settlements with specific opportunities to enhance facilities
- Hybrid scenario with more emphasis on growth in the key villages/larger villages

- Hybrid scenario with a more emphasis on sites in the villages as most realistic option to achieve build out rates/deliverability - emphasis on the expansion of existing settlements;
- Based on Scenario G Hybrid 2, Stansted Mountfitchet should be identified as an area of growth in its own right for 1000 dwellings
- Focus growth widely throughout District/existing settlements in preference to new ones
- Focus on the southern half of Stansted Mountfitchet to deliver strategic housing
- None of the options consider an approach based on settlement hierarchy with towns and key villages absorbing most of the growth excluding new settlements
- recognise new settlement only yields a small number of new houses within the latter stages of the plan period/significant alternative provision to meet the shortfall
- Stansted Mountfitchet should be separated out from the Key Villages category and attributed a level of growth that is commensurate with its development potential

#### COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- A number reiterated support for new settlement e.g. twice the size of Saffron Walden
- New Settlement along with Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden and to a lesser extent the Key Villages on top of the Existing Planning Permissions
- Maximise the use of brownfield sites/always think about transport implications
- Sponsor growth over the border in Cambridgeshire, because that is the county where economic growth is occurring, and the county border irrelevant
- Developing new villages of say 500-1000 dwellings
- To build 1 or 2 new towns along the M11 corridor whilst widening
- Where is reference to Saffron Walden By Pass in coming years/its traffic pollution
- Not accept two new settlements/ huge detrimental impact on the district
- Stating that the District is full and that our shortfall should be passed to Harlow
- No new development where cars have to be parked in the roadway
- Avoid travel through the narrow streets of Saffron Walden
- Second runway/reinstate dunmow - stortford railway/new settlement
- One larger settlement which would provide the bulk of the housing
- Expanding existing towns and villages would be an option if road networks were improved e.g. ring road round Saffron Walden/south of town
- No settlement of say 10 or more houses should be considered 'off limits' for some modest expansion/consider Local Parish Plan
- There should be a mix of development - a new smaller scale development but also development in key villages. A hybrid to spread the development of B & C
- position of UDC in wider sub-regional focussing on travel-to-work patterns/role of towns outside UDC, increasing sustainability of districts settlements/discourage commuting
- focus on locations linked to Cambridge, Bishops Stortford, Chelmsford ,Haverhill and access to regional highways notably A414/A12, A11/A505, M11/A14 and A1307/A134
- Adopt CIL/ work with local communities to establish priorities for infrastructure provision
- No scenario for a lower housing need than 568 dpa forecast in the SHMA
- The elephant in the room is Stansted Airport
- Hybrid of Scenario D spreading 500 from the new settlement between Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow or 500 equally amongst all five locations

- A mix of small scale development in 7 key villages up to 50 houses (not all on one site) dependant on size/ infrastructure, 350 new homes, development in the 20 type A villages of up to 20 houses giving 400, some extension to the towns of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow - 600 houses in each and then 2 small new settlements of 550 houses,
- The LP should be flexible enough to take a distribution of housing around existing settlements with no new additional settlement
- Proximity to sources of employment when determining areas for development
- Two stage build strategy/ Phase 1 up to 2033 - distribution of development around existing settlements and no new settlement i.e. option D but remove the new settlement. Phase 2 2033 onwards to properly plan with the consultation of residents the district future housing / employment requirements maybe incorporating a new major settlement.
- Spread load across region/invigorate communities ease pain for people living here
- potential scenario no longer financial incentive from central government for new housing
- imbalance across the district/ bias to impose major development along the southerly border that lacks the infrastructure and with little development in north of district
- Any village can easily take 4-6 new homes
- A detailed option should be developed to illustrate continuation of existing build rate
- Negotiate with another LPA for them to take some of UDC requirements e.g. Braintree
- Need new green belt around any new settlement

**Question 19****Other Points**

**Are there any other points you wish to make which do not relate to the questions above.**

This question was responded to by 237 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>.

**STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHER GROUPS**

**Office of Rail Regulation** The Office of Rail and Road has no comment to make on this particular document.

**Oil Pipeline Agency Ltd** Please see attached plan of clients apparatus. We would ask that you contact us if any works are in the vicinity of the CLHPS pipeline.

**North Hertfordshire District Council** The intention stated in the document to meet your objectively assessed need is supported and whilst the wide ranging approach taken to identifying locations for development is understood, there doesn't appear to be any consideration of deliverability which therefore raises some questions of whether the options could accurately be described as 'reasonable alternatives'. However considering these options to rule them out on the basis of deliverability is a logical approach to site selection.

**Environment Agency** Waste does not appear to have been considered. Improved waste management can contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and can also provide a boost to economic growth in material recovery and recycling. However, care should be taken in the location of these operations and policies should steer higher risk waste disposal and treatment facilities away from sensitive receptors such as housing and communities.

**Essex County Council**

Need reference to cycling. Existing levels of bus services cannot be relied upon long-term/ include considerations for accessibility to services from the onset/accessibility should be addressed in the plan. Need to reference The Essex Minerals Local Plan e.g. Policy S8 / emerging plan, the Waste Local Plan and the work of ECC in Plan. Include the principle of Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas. Ensure mineral considerations to be factored into their proposed growth location assessments. Put Mineral Consultation Areas and Mineral Consultation Zones on the final Policy Maps at the district level. Waste Consultation Zones will continue to be a feature of the Waste Local Plan as it moves towards adoption. In a similar manner to Mineral Consultation Areas, this policy tool does not act to automatically preclude development, rather they act to ensure that the operation of waste management facilities are not compromised by non-waste development. Whilst there is not the expectation that these are included on a district level Policies Map, ECC intend to periodically send GIS layers to each Local Planning Authority which detail the spatial extent of these Waste Consultation Zones. Help deliver the Waste Hierarchy/integrate local waste management in new development considering likely impact of proposed, non-waste related

development on existing waste management sites and on sites allocated for waste management promoting sound management of waste from any proposed development.

Suitable previously-developed land, including industrial land, provides opportunities for new waste facilities and priority should be given to reuse of these sites. It is important for waste to be considered alongside other land uses when looking at development opportunities. Ensure non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development and, in less developed areas, with the local landscape. This includes providing adequate storage facilities at residential premises.

**Essex Wildlife Trust** Sites for development should be selected on the basis that there will be no adverse impacts on existing designated wildlife sites; this includes increased recreational pressure and severance of important wildlife corridors.eg The model of "Living Landscapes" should be fully integrated into strategic planning. Local authority planners should create "green infrastructure" masterplans which aim to enhance linkages between and habitat "buffers" around existing local wildlife sites. Such masterplans should be developed in advance of plans for the built development and their primary focus should be on protecting and enhancing biodiversity.

Select sites on the basis that there will be no adverse impacts on existing designated wildlife sites; this includes increased recreational pressure and severance of important wildlife corridors. Currently designated sites do not exist in isolation, and are dependent on viable and functional wildlife corridors that create a permeable landscape and allow the migration and movement of species between areas of high quality habitat. Fully integrate the model of Living Landscapes into plans. This will be achieved through the creation of "green infrastructure" masterplans which aim to enhance linkages between and habitat "buffers" around existing local wildlife sites. Such masterplans should be developed in advance of plans for the built development and their primary focus should be on protecting and enhancing biodiversity. An important consideration for these areas is that such Living Landscapes are also beneficial to local people and communities and foster a flourishing local economy.

**Chelmsford City Council** formally respond that the Council has no observations to make at this stage of your local plan process.

**Birchanger Wood Trust** Houses upon houses is a remedy for disaster, not a solution

**Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation** While not residents of Uttlesford our members could clearly be severely adversely affected by the possible development to be included in your local plan. I should therefore be obliged if you would ensure that I am included in any further rounds of consultation or decision making so that we may have the chance to make representations about matters which may affect us.

**Fritch Way Action Group** Great Dunmow Fritch Way Link Proposed Bridleway to Re-Connect the Fritch Way around Great Dunmow. The purpose of the proposed Bridleway is to form part of a viable and safe route for cycling, walking and horse riding to link the East and West sections of the Fritch Way and to provide access to these routes from the town. This link project is also the key component to create a multi user off road path to provide a continuous definitive bridleway from Rayne to Bishops Stortford. This link route will add to

the existing range of footpaths bridleways and byways. This link will bring benefits to health and quality of life. The Flitch Way represents one of the best and longest off-the-road cycle paths in the UK and has been nationally recognized as part of a long distance cycle route. For this reason it has more visitors per hectare than any other Essex country park. However, its value is diminished by being severed into two sections e.g. original A120 bypass (B1256) through the Dunmow Cutting/the new A120. The present route for cycling between the two is Sustrans National Cycle Network route 16; uses busy roads through the congested town centre. This is not viable or safe for novice cyclists or families with young children; these are the majority of cyclists using the Flitch Way and are also the category most encouraged to use it. The Great Dunmow NP Policy GA1 and GA2 clearly enable the project and it is integrated in the Core Footpath and Bridleway Network shown on page 114. A policy is needed to support this link/continuous bridleway from Rayne to Bishops Stortford/improve condition of Byway 57 that deters many from using the Flitch Way from Hoblongs Bridge.

**Forestry Commission** Impacts on Ancient Woodland using just one of the proposals impacted AoS Edge of Bishops Stortford, encompasses parts of Birchanger Wood/ancient semi natural woodland of high environmental historical/cultural value. It has had several English Woodland Grant Scheme contracts for public access works and continuing the coppice with standards management in the woodland and is a valuable asset to the community. Ancient woodlands are widely regarded as irreplaceable with great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed. Note SA did not consider the requirements for access to greenspace in its assessments, nor the deliverability although may be considered later in process. These comments are based on a desk study of the case, including the Ancient Woodland Inventory and our general knowledge of the area.

**G W Balaam & Son** All development must be sympathetic to the current local surroundings and must not harm, but enhance what is currently here.

**Pulse Flexible Packaging Ltd** The current Pulse site at Radwinter Road arguably represents a non-conforming use in a predominantly residential area. The business is constrained on its existing site and its processes and vehicle trip generation characteristics are not conducive to a residential neighbourhood. The character of Radwinter Road is changing with development of brownfield sites, high density residential close to eastern site boundary/further residential to the west/north opposite side of Radwinter Road. This brown field site offers potential for around 80 houses/density 40 per hectare. This would remove the non-conforming use, provide a significant number of homes, contribute to housing choice and mix and help meet housing targets/5 year housing supply.

**Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** Have full regard of the Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan and other emerging NPs in the district as they are being produced with the full co-operation and support of their communities and contain local and true evidence.

**Hands Off Thaxted** In view of the importance of this consultation all residents should have been given the opportunity to comment. Many residents do not have access to IT. A questionnaire should have been delivered to every address in Uttlesford. The windfall allowance of 50 units/year over the district seems low, has this figure been verified? Previous planning mistakes should be analysed and measures taken to ensure that

unsustainable and inappropriate developments such as Sampford Road, Thaxted never happen again.

**Helena Romaine Secondary School** would like to emphasise its commitment to providing an attractive and successful education environment for pupils in the future, which will be beneficial to the long term success of Great Dunmow. We would also emphasise the limitations of the existing school site to meet the projected demands in the longer term. HRS has undertaken a significant level of feasibility work and demonstrated that the proposed development and site allocations would be appropriate and a practical response to meeting the projected demands and improving the school environment. We sincerely trust that the previous representations will also be considered when determining the appropriate options for growth in UDC and Dunmow.

**National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups** refer to previous comments

**National Trust** Please see attached for full response on SA - Green Infrastructure. In addition to the above references to the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal, there is no mention of green infrastructure in the consideration of issues (Table 2) or among the 15 sustainability objectives (Table 3). As it is these overarching principles that underpin the development of the Local Plan, this omission is considered to be unacceptable. The benefits of Green Infrastructure are wide-ranging, spanning the environmental, social and economic spectrum of sustainable development, and will help to create a more sustainable environment for UDC residents and visitors.

**Stebbing Society** Since RSS stance and therefore our current responses have altered little regarding the Areas of Search along the A120 corridor, especially AOS 9. In addition, we are curious as to how Figure 1 has been conceived, bearing in mind the loading of Areas of Search which have been shown in the southern part of the District along the A120 corridor, as opposed to those AOS along the M11 corridor and further north in the District. We firmly believe that it unfairly favours the north of the District against the south and certainly isn't an equitable basis to start from. For the various reasons set out in our responses above, we are strongly opposed to this principle and feel that it creates an unfair bias in the Plan which is supposed to be neutral until all representations are received and fairly analysed. For these reasons we cannot reiterate strongly enough our arguments submitted in this response and which in general, support the views already submitted by the Stebbing Parish Council.

**The Hundred Parishes Society** The Hundred Parishes Society aims include advancing awareness of the character and history of The Hundred Parishes and promoting the conservation, protection and improvement of the areas physical and natural environment, especially its features of historic, architectural and wildlife interest. The Hundred Parishes area includes most of UDC. Ask plan reference the The Hundred Parishes/reasoning behind Society's initiative to highlight what is special and distinctive about The Hundred Parishes. It is an area that Oliver Rackham has called Ancient Countryside, with its winding lanes, village greens and ancient hedgerows and woods. It is also an area that is rich in listed buildings around half dating back to before 1700.

**The Ickleton Society** is a village society with an open subscription membership committed to good planning, protection of the environment and the village community. We are

responding to this consultation as some of the proposals could, we believe, have significant impacts on South Cambridgeshire and Ickleton, in particular.

**The Thaxted Society** The fundamental question has to be how much, of what makes rural Essex special, we need to maintain this uniqueness? How much of our rural community needs protection in order to deliver this uniqueness? People chose a UDC way of life for particular reasons. Those qualities need to be protected and saved to fulfill those expectations. The Thaxted Society has a breadth of historical background and knowledge as well as developed current thinking on the re modelling of a rural community for the future. We have a certain degree of success in impacting new building design and detail welcome the opportunity to work with UDC in developing a sustainable/vibrant future for rural UDC.

### TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

**Elsenham Parish Council** wishes to highlight the following issues.UDC Parking Standards for residential developments should be revised to provide a more practicable strategy to address residential parking within the District reflect the modern habits of households living in a largely rural area. It is suggested that UDC re-examines its parking strategy, as a part of its new Local Plan; and in particular e.g. a minimum of three spaces per dwelling. Regards provision of bungalows within housing mix increase the minimum requirement. Include Affordable Housing / Key Worker Housing in housing strategy/ key worker housing within housing allocations. Existing recreation and sports facilities offer little or no opportunity for expansion in the future but land on village boundaries are used for new housing developments or has developer/landowner options in place for possible future housing. Need land for a new cemetery to be found locally within the Parish of Elsenham.

**Great Dunmow Town Council** Important to have full and proper regard to the neighbourhood plans being produced across the district when preparing their local plan. While, as stated in Planning Practice Guidance.....the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested the converse may also apply. That is because the neighbourhood plans that have been through the process will have done so having gathered evidence by way of public opinion and incorporated it into policy. A new local plan offers the scope for UDC to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy. This presents a major opportunity for UDC to:- maximise the possible income associated with new development; provide monies to be directed to appropriate schemes across the district rather than it being limited to the needs generated by a particular proposal. This is particularly important if the plan is based on the strategy of a new settlement where the greater part of the development of the district would be concentrated in one area; and secure monies for local councils to be able to allocate to schemes to improve the local area for the benefit of existing and future residents. Do not understand why the consultation is in relation to 3000 new homes only/not an additional 4700. Also note no allocations of the 5,000 new homes permitted/not built without which not possible to give fully informed answers to the questions posed.

**High Easter Parish Council** Since it is likely that sites on the edge of the market towns and key villages will still come forward for major development in the future (approach delivered in the past), High Easter Parish Council would express a strong preference for either Scenario B (villages and edge of Bishops Stortford), Scenario C (towns), and to a lesser extent

Scenario D (hybrid) - depending on the location of any smaller new settlement, and object strongly to Scenario A (new settlement).

**Little Easton Parish Council** The wording and "corporate" approach to this consultation has meant that the general public have taken a minimal role in shaping their future built environment. The next consultation should be split into 2, with a detailed one aimed at councils and developers and a simplified version to encourage the involvement of the general public.

**Newport Parish Council** It is imperative that Planning Committee familiar with the local areas/expectancy familiar with all details appertaining to the application sites in Newport and these should not be restricted to the immediate area or the particular application. Water disposal infrastructure is beyond capacity at present, this was confirmed in the Hyder Report carried out in October 2009. This appears to have been totally overlooked.

**Rayne Parish Council** Hope commitment from UDC for transparency is seen through to fruition. One of the key aspects of demonstrating that commitment is to ensure that responses to this consultation exercise are fully and properly considered.

**Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council** Consideration should be paid to the sites already given planning consent but where building has not commenced. How will proposing new additional development on top of those not commenced be planned with due diligence? What if those already approved create unforeseen local issues? In the case of Stansted Mountfitchet, apart from the 212 houses due to be built within its boundary, it is due to have 2,600 houses built north of Bishops Stortford plus 500 in Elsenham. It would seem more prudent to support the building of homes elsewhere where the infrastructure is newer and more capable of coping with the extra traffic flows. However, it is understood that sustainable growth will have to be achieved but the emphasis must be placed on providing step up towards home ownership via the provision of affordable housing. If UDC serious about sponsoring improved employment prospects then attention should be made to having good road signage in and around the District e.g. only signs showing "Stansted" relate solely to the existence of Stansted Airport thus leaving businesses in and around Stansted Mountfitchet at a distinct disadvantage.

**Stebbing Parish Council** These proposed new settlements will no doubt be subject to long, expensive and demanding legal battles. This will lead to UDC in the interim period needing to give planning consents just to feed the quota rendering the need for any new settlements unnecessary. While we realise that this LDP is a government-imposed requirement we strongly feel that suggested AOSs for new settlements are not placed fairly or equitably around the district. As stated in Question 10 SPC question the validity of this consultation because of the way some villages have been presented i.e.(Stebbing) on the AoS maps in terms of their actual size and what UDC are presenting as the areas that are affected.

**Takeley Parish Council** In conclusion TPC believes that major development in the south of the district is unsustainable. The infrastructure for health and education is overstretched. M11 Jtn is at capacity. There is a lack of capacity on Liverpool Street main line & poor access to Bishop's Stortford station (via Jtn 8) & Stansted Airport rail service (see above). In addition, it is important to protect the existing countryside and recreational spaces for the current and planned homes/residents. We accept that some towns and villages want/need

small scale development to sustain schools, shops & existing facilities however tpc opposes further development in/around Takeley.

**Thaxted Parish Council** It will be important for UDC to have full and proper regard to the neighbourhood plans being produced across the District when preparing its local plan. That is because the neighbourhood plans that have been through the process will have done so having gathered evidence by way of public opinion and incorporated it into policy. A new local plan offers the scope for UDC to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy. This presents a major opportunity for UDC to:- -maximise the possible income associated with new development; -provide monies to be directed to appropriate schemes across the District rather than it being limited to the needs generated by a particular proposal. This would be particularly important if the Plan were to be based on the strategy of a new settlement where the greater part of the development of the District would be concentrated in one area; and - secure monies for local councils to be able to allocate to schemes to improve the local area for the benefit of existing and future residents.

**Sampfords Parish Council** in January 2012 commented on two potential sites in the village put forward for consideration by land owners/developers. GtSAM1 comprised Land between Sparepenny Lane North and Moor End/not favoured by the Parish Council because of access/visibility of the development on the approach to the village from Thaxted. GtSAM2 comprised Land adjoining Snowdop Cottage, Great Sampford/ not favour this site given its extension of development into open countryside, access, and poor standard of junction at Parsonage Farm Lane/Sparepenny Lane South/B1053.

**Wendens Ambo Parish Council** general comment about this questionnaire: It is hard to believe that much weight will be given to responses from the general public and local organisations. In particular, asking for comments on seven different scenarios, asking for comments to be referenced etc., is likely to put off many people. It is surprising to see that UDC continues to be wedded to the idea of large scale development in Elsenham - a very pretty rural area with very poor road transport - and in the face of the Inspector's comments on the previous failed plan.

#### DEVELOPERS, AGENTS AND LAND OWNERS

- Add reference to natural/built environment. New housing should be built in a form complementing/compatible existing settlements/houses, appropriate density, massing (height/storeys), design (materials etc.) and layout (with verges, greens, and open spaces) reflective of and similar to existing settlements
- There needs to be an understanding of how different form of development and the various options impact on carbon consumption/embodied energy for road and utility construction embodied energy for community buildings, shops, for heating/hot water
- Research to determine if people in different locations and differing population densities consume more or less energy to travel/ widely assumed people in towns use less
- seek to have discussion with landowners, land agents and developers to determine the deliverability of sites put forward at the Call for Sites stage
- Further, unmet need in London/HMA means OAN at least at the upper end of 750 dpa can be accessed off Park Road, Little Easton/opportunity for a direct access to Woodside Way, opposite the Woodlands Park development/Bovis Homes recent permissions Great Dunmow area, changing at a rapid place to the west of the Great

Dunmow western bypass development will be located in an area of Dunmow where key facilities exist within close walking distance, well screened by existing trees

- Undertake Green Belt study to identify areas of release e.g. Stansted Mountfitchet.
- Land south of Beldams Lane, Bishop's Stortford provides a sustainable location to deliver quickly 180 dwellings within walking distance of town centre/services/facilities
- Land southwest of Bentfield End, behind Bentfield Causeway and Bentfield Green Farmhouse 40ha west Stansted Mountfitchet, railway station within walking distance with regular rail access to Stansted Airport, Bishops Stortford, Cambridge and London
- Land at Bran End, Stebbing (STE10 plan) 5 dwellings permitted for Brick Kiln Lane frontage / 4 proposed but 50 as alternative to New Settlement/non-strategic growth, open space Stebbing Brook/village park, footpath/bridleway to village
- Land west of Station Road, Elsenham 3.9 ha on western edge, to south land has permission for 155 C3/Extra Care unit, capacity 80- 100 dwellings, open space, access off Stansted Road via new spine road as part of BDW development, in walking distance of Elsenham facilities good public transport links to larger settlements, available
- Land north of Stansted Road, Elsenham 3.1 ha north of Stansted Road permission for 40 dwellings adj Elsenham Nurseries, capacity up to 30, open space/allotments, potential employment, access from Stansted Road, logical small-scale infill, available
- Land to the rear of Hales Farm, Little Canfield, Dunmow west of Winfresh UK Ltd Ripening Centre, close to B1256/A120, employment units High Cross Lane East with capacity for 4 ha employment, logical expansion of existing employment, next to major centres of population from where future employees can be drawn
- Land off Brocks Mead, Great Easton 2.8 ha up to 40 dwellings, development at Brocks Mead, logical small scale expansion, careful master-planning for setting of listed buildings, access next to 8 Brocks Mead/pedestrian access/public rights of way, located in heart of village, close to Swan Public House/Church, hidden from view
- Land off B1256, Little Canfield, Dunmow 7.9 ha site suitable for potential employment uses, relatively flat, access either directly off the B1256 or Stortford Road, trees along site boundary help screen site rather than constrain it, potential for roadside services given close to A120
- Land at Wood Field, Woodside Way, Great Dunmow 5 ha/140 dwellings part previously proposed Great Dunmow Policy 1 opposite from Sectors II/ III of Woodlands Park, well located, mixed community including provision of a local centre community centre/sports hall, new primary school a range of open space uses
- Land north side of Braintree Road, Great Dunmow for inclusion within AoS 12c
- Land northern side of Brick Kiln Lane at Bran End, Stebbing 1.89 hectares access off wide Brick Kiln Lane frontage, 50 dwellings, western edge suitably landscaped, 2ha for community open space/natural extension to village playing field, dedicate 2.9 ha woodland/wetland as local nature reserve with managed public access
- Land on northern side of Stansted Mountfitchet, north of the Catholic Church on the west side of High Lane 1.2ha and on the east side of High Lane and Cambridge Road 3.4ha, permission west of Cambridge Road (B1383) extends village to the north/logical expansion, safe access/roundabout at Cambridge Road junction, landscaping and open space, avoid incursion into Green Belt, easy access to range of facilities/jobs, available
- Land at the rear of 238 Birchanger Lane, Birchanger? no history of flooding or contamination, openness not be unacceptably impacted, proximity to Stansted Airport an aging village population/ensure homes for downsize to free up larger houses.

COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

- Many reiterated support for new settlements as only way that the infrastructure needs of such met/market towns unable to without damage
- A number reiterated objection to new settlement preferring dispersal
- A number considered the plan was meeting a lot more than its fair share
- Realistic and acceptable plan? resubmission of earlier plan with little strategic thinking
- Once final plans are available, have full consultation in all places named in the plan
- Any development near Great Chesterford should be built around the railway station near the the M11 to make the station more central to the village.
- Cycles paths need to be more widespread because we have such few road and busy people are put off cycling on them as they are not safe
- target retired to downsize/known shortage of Flats/Apartments in Town Centre
- move Saffron Fire Station to Thaxted Rd near Aldi and build 6 or 8 story Apartments
- Like it or not we are going to get/need a lot more housing - properly plan for long term
- Take guidance from the responses to this consultation/avoid tick-box exercise
- Safety should be top of the list of any new development - twenty is plenty
- Make scenarios for 750 dwellings a year is to take any shortfall among its neighbours
- Especially in Search Area 2, there is the potential to totally destroy the unique quality of the villages and countryside surrounding them
- Maps not easy to read/spell checker needed
- Avoid a flood zone/an area of poor road links
- This generation caretakers for the next/must preserve beauty/character of surroundings
- Infrastructure led housing developments needed
- In Saffron Walden avoid removing trees and bushes
- In general I think this document is well considered in extremely difficult circumstances
- Need development but we must try to retain the uniqueness and beauty of the area
- Search area 2. beautiful countryside with rolling hills, hedgerows/wild life, unique villages many footpaths and walks and cycling opportunities down quiet country lanes
- New settlements will not achieve short term requirement so spread the development
- SHMA poorly evidenced
- Key worker housing should be a significant part of the plan
- Youth Services apart from provision of playing fields
- Clavering Parish Plan is now an adopted UDC planning document
- No further housing to the East of Saffron Walden
- AoS 3 is non-starter/Elsenham has already been allocated proportionally more houses than other key village and cannot be a candidate for more
- Need open mind and listen to the views of local people
- Enforce appropriate living space for health and safety reasons
- AoS 9 shows Stebbing much smaller omits conservation area/St Mary's Church
- Stumps cross has a little used motorway junction and a train station, avoid dispersal
- If there is real need for these housing numbers there must be a regional solution
- challenge the assumption that UDC requires this level of housing development
- more emphasis on legal contracts with developers to ensure timely delivery
- Saffron Walden needs a ring road with direct connection to M11
- preserve area by having small additions rather than one vast area

- defined sustainability has not formed part of these considerations
- opportunity for self-build and custom-build
- Andrewsfield airfield is busy and is a valuable asset to the community
- effect of your LP and expansion on the neighbouring areas, especially your traffic issues
- unfairly favours the north of the District against the south
- Agree with lower cost housing for local people the Catons Lane/Little Walden Road
- 50% Council Tax premium for empty properties to buildings that are listed and undergoing long-term renovation should be abolished
- UDC is recommending a greater provision of new housing than adjacent authorities
- representatives should take responsibility for the long term benefit of the area
- SA Summary Energy consumption - target renewable share for the plan period?
- The evidence is clear that developing on the basis of perceived potential of existing infrastructure is a trap. Cf. congestion on A120 at Galleys Corner
- Dunmow, area 9, Felstead, Stebbing, Great Saling, Rayne and Braintree will be 1!
- Braintree and Harlow Councils planning to grow their towns see Stansted Airport and its associated UDC hinterland as a major driver of their growth
- No questions about encouraging growth in employment
- Water is not mentioned new dwellings need to be highly water efficient
- Problems, traffic, school places, pedestrians safety, flooding are being ignored
- Expansion of the Genome centre the possible siting of an Agriculture development centre fronting the A505 near Pampisford will mean Urbanisation
- Uttlesford should not need provide expensive dormitory accommodation for London
- Refer to neighbourhood plans, village design statements and appeals
- Developers in Takeley changed plans to not provide benefit in agreed
- Need accurate 5 year supply position to stop development
- Minimum level of growth compelled to protect fields, woods, and hedgerows
- Growth needs to be a visual asset/of high quality with integrated renewable energy
- Stebbing falls into the category of being a Stansted flight path/unacceptable to build
- Overall effect of LPAs proposals on the whole infrastructure needs an overview
- ensure that ground levels of new developments are levelled to that of neighbouring properties to prevent future flooding
- Need strategies on transport and prioritise habitats/landscape
- new settlement really should not be on the edge of an existing settlement
- Encourage environmentally sustainable solutions, for energy, transport, water and waste management, as well as for innovative design and inclusive, friendly communities
- Reiterate the potential, as yet unacknowledged, of Saffron hall
- Build where sustainable wages so they can contribute to the country's economy
- Incorporate Bishop's Stortford into UDC/Essex as it is the central hub in the area
- Protect our communities form developments detrimental to well-being and heritage
- Plan period for the next 20 years/base on self-contained towns
- Keep green lung' between UDC and Braintree
- AOS for railway link from Stansted through Newport and Audley End, NE of Saffron Walden, SE of Great Chesterford, and east of Elsenham
- Have some development round the villages to help keep the local facilities alive
- Great Dunmow not seen concerted effort to develop business opportunities and established business/skilled jobs forced to relocate losing jobs for area – Boddingtons

- When we agreed a solution for a business park which would have supported the shortage of recreation land "Smiths Farm" ignored for speculative purposes
- Concerned at the settlement hierarchy/major growth for the smaller settlements