

I think it's very helpful to have a reg 18 consultation and not, as we did before, go straight to reg 19. This does give councillors and residents an opportunity to make meaningful comments and raise any issues or bring forward further evidence.

I also appreciate there is a need for housing across our district, not least as member for housing here at Uttlesford, there is a clear need for genuinely affordable housing and, in my opinion, some form of social rented homes should form part of our Local Plan.

But as a member of Uttlesford DC, living in and representing Gt Chesterford I have to raise my concerns over the inclusion of Gt Chesterford Parish for the site of a new settlement. I do not come from a village of nimbys, we have already worked with UDC and developers to bring forward additional housing during this plan period. Infact we have built or have permission for new homes that give an increase of 27% to the existing village.

To me the proposal in this paper feels incomplete. I have seen no sustainability report, nothing to give me confidence that the roads around the villages will be improved other than at junction 10 of the M11 and the A505 Sawston roundabout. What about Gt Chesterford, Ickleton and Hinxton, as we become rat runs to the motorway and stations? Where is the mitigation for Saffron Walden as these new residents file down Bridge St?

I have also heard the Leader of South Cambs DC on the radio today saying that it is critical that the proposed massive development in this area should be properly thought out, in this he was not just including this new settlement but 2 new research institutes at Hinxton, Pampisford Business Park and a new service station at Duxford. He said that the transport infrastructure was not keeping up. This also gives me concern over our Duty to Cooperate, why is he not confident? The idea of being completely urban from Gt Chesterford to Cambridge fills us with horror.

Our own reports show that the landscape and historic environment is highly sensitive, how will this be dealt with? I would suggest, at the very least, a much greater green buffer should be included, between the existing village and the new proposed settlement site than the tiny 500m's that Bidwell's have suggested. We should also have a protected green space between the village and Stumps Cross, as this land is in the same ownership it is within their gift.

At the moment I see nothing from Bidwell's on how these problems can be overcome just another 'that's something we need to mitigate' I still need to see and understand how or even if this can be done. I'm sure we will be told all this can be dealt with later. But that seems like a gamble.

My final point is that I would also like reassurance for all the potential new settlements that they will be built on full garden principles, not a diluted developers version, and that the land value capture is secure, so that there is genuine community benefits wherever these new villages are built. That is what the residents of Uttlesford should expect and the council should deliver.