

**PLANNING POLICY WORKING GROUP held at COUNCIL CHAMBER -
COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on
WEDNESDAY, 23 MAY 2018 at 6.00 pm**

- Present: Councillor H Rolfe (Chairman)
Councillors S Barker, P Davies, A Dean, P Lees, J Lodge,
J Loughlin, A Mills and E Oliver
- Officers in attendance: A Bochel (Democratic Services Officer), P Bylo (Planning Policy
Manager), A Gilham (Principal Planning Officer), D McDonald
(Planning Policy Officer), S Miles (Planning Policy Team
Leader), S Nicholas and A Ross (Planning Policy Officer)
- Also present: C Berry (Troy Planning and Design), J Herbert (Troy Planning
and Design).
- Public speakers: Councillor J Redfern, J Deane, J Evans, D Hall, J Kingdom, K
McDonald, S Merifield, M Young

PP1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Harris.

Councillor Dean declared a non-pecuniary interest because his wife was a
volunteer at, and a member of the trustees of, the Gardens of Easton Lodge.

PP2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting on 17 April 2018 were agreed as a correct record
and signed by the Chairman.

Councillor Barker said she would like an answer on a question she had raised at
the last meeting about how employment figures in the paperwork had been split.
The Planning Policy Team Leader said he would respond to Councillor Barker
about this.

PP3 PUBLIC SPEAKING AT LOCAL PLAN MEETINGS

The Chairman said the following meeting of the working group would take place
at 6pm on 31 May. There would be 60 minutes available for public speaking.

Additionally, at the Cabinet meeting to consider the Local Plan on 12 June, there
would be 60 minutes available for public speaking. At the Council meeting to
consider the Local Plan on 19 June, there would 90 minutes available for public
speaking.

PP4

LOCAL PLAN EVIDENCE BASE

In response to statements made by members of the public, the Chairman made the following points:

The Council had engaged Dentons, a law firm with specialist experience in the field. Dentons had advised that development plan documents have the same legal status as the Regulation 19 Local Plan. Advantages of these documents were that they would provide the depth of detail about the planned communities that public speakers were asking for, they would have the same period of consultation and would also be examined by an inspector.

The government had announced it would create its own methodology for calculating figures for housing need. The government's methodology would calculate Uttlesford's housing need figure as 16200 houses, as opposed to Uttlesford District Council's (UDC) current figure which was 14000. It was important not to slip from the Council's timetable for approving the Local Plan because otherwise the government would impose the higher figure of housing need on UDC.

The Council was not including any additional land in the West of Braintree site. The site might be developed through a development corporation and if so, UDC would work with Braintree District Council on that. It was possible the other two sites could be developed through development corporations too.

Access to all proposed garden communities was fundamental, both on arterial routes and more rural roads. There was a possibility to create a rapid transport system running from Stansted Airport to Easton Park. This could also be expanded further.

Highways England were considering the possibility of creating a smart motorway at Junction 8 North on the M11.

The potential for use of the Community Infrastructure Levy was being considered by UDC.

The Planning Policy Team Leader introduced the report. He said a lot of the detail regarding the proposed communities would be included in the development plan documents.

In response to questions from public speakers, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) took the latest government household projections, translated those households into dwellings and then applied an adjustment to take into account market signals in order to achieve a figure for housing need. The calculations for these adjustments could be found on page 9 of the 2016 SHMA and page 5 of the 2017 SHMA.

PP5

PAPER ON GARDEN COMMUNITIES TRAJECTORY

The Planning Policy Team Leader introduced the paper.

Councillor Lodge said he believed it was necessary to specify in the Regulation 19 Local Plan that a development corporation would be the preferred delivery method for the proposed new towns.

In response to Councillor Lodge, the Chairman said development corporation legislation had not yet been enacted by central government. He said the Local Plan would state that garden communities would be delivered if necessary through development corporations. Both Dentons and an inspector had advised the Council do this.

In response to a question by Councillor Davis, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the Council's proposed delivery rates had been informed by responses to the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation and the documents these responses had referred to. Officers believed the delivery rate trajectory was realistic and had built in a buffer in case problems arose.

PP6 PAPER ON STEPPING THE HOUSING TRAJECTORY

The Planning Policy Team Leader introduced the paper.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said the Council's five year land supply figures would be calculated using the Liverpool method, whereby backlog from previous years would be spread out over the whole plan period. This method would be specified in the Local Plan, but could not be used in development decisions until the Local Plan was adopted.

PP7 WATER CYCLE STUDY

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the paper.

In response to a question from Councillor Lodge, the Principal Planning Officer said limiting water use per person per day to lower than the statutory requirement was a policy set by Affinity Water with the Environment Agency. The Chairman said this was a general issue and was not particular to the garden communities. Officers would respond to Councillor Lodge about this.

In response to a question from Councillor Lodge, the Principal Planning Officer said Affinity Water had satisfied the Environment Agency that it would be capable of supplying the necessary amount of water to the district. The water cycle strategy was based on the existing parameters of Stansted Airport. The Chairman said officers would respond to Councillor Lodge about what measures would be required if the airport was expanded.

Councillor Barker said one issue in her ward was that water pressure was low. The Council needed to ensure this was addressed.

PP8 TRANSPORT STUDY

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the paper.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said one of the advantages of the garden communities was that concentrating development in certain areas allowed for the delivery of significant elements of infrastructure. The Local Plan was seeking to avoid rat-running which could be caused by the development of the proposed North Uttlesford garden community, but detailed decisions about mitigation would be included in the development plan documents. He would respond to the question by D Hall in his public statement about the park and ride service in writing.

The Chairman said Cambridgeshire County Council had secured funding for a detailed study of the A505, and this was now on the Mayor's infrastructure plan.

Councillor Dean said the development plan documents should not focus so much on the proposed garden communities that they ignore other parts of the district. The congestion on the B1383 and the likely increase in traffic in for northwest Hertfordshire were examples of issues that should be addressed.

In response to a question from Councillor Davis, the Principal Planning Officer said the Council used Essex County Council's (ECC) guidance on car parking but this was not prescriptive on setting maximum standards. The Local Plan would also contain a policy on electric car charging points in new developments. The Chairman said officers should note that the Council should be protecting new communities in terms of where cars would go. Councillor Davis said he would be happy to provide input on the National Grid's capacity to supply electric charging points.

In response to questions from Councillor Lodge, the Principal Planning Officer said all highway links within Uttlesford currently operated within capacity but not all junctions did. There would be a policy in the Local Plan requiring detailed transport assessments on planning applications. ECC review strategy on air quality as required but had not considered it necessary to review strategy for the proposed new developments.

In response to the statement made by J Deane, the Principal Planning Officer said the transport study had adhered to national guidance and standards. Additionally a sensitivity test had been introduced in the study, using peak methodology to calculate its figures.

PP9

BRIEF ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the paper.

In response to a question from Councillor Dean, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the Local Plan could be used to inform the master planning in the development plan documents.

PP10 UTTLESFORD HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Planning Policy Team Leader introduced the paper.

In response to a question from Councillor Dean, the Principal Planning Officer said officers would look again at whether more specific wording was needed to reference the registered gardens of Easton Lodge on page 516, but that the list of mitigation measures on pages 500-501 was intended to address the registered park.

PP11 RETAIL STUDY

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the paper.

Councillor Mills said it was important that all the necessary detail came forward in the development plan documents.

PP12 INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

J Herbert of Troy Planning and Design introduced the report.

Councillor Dean said he was concerned the Local Plan was not looking far enough ahead in terms of the expansion of Stansted Airport, if this expansion was to go ahead.

J Herbert said work could only be carried out in relation to the known scale of growth.

In response to a question by Councillor Loughlin about mitigation measures for Saffron Walden, J Herbert said Troy Planning had drawn on input from service providers such as Essex County Council, and from the transport study which identified improvements to particular junctions to help improve the flow of traffic. A wider package of sustainable travel measures was referred to in the mode shift in the transport study. The Principal Planning Officer said the results of a study about a link road had been published last year and were available on the UDC website.

J Herbert said the next road investment strategy would run between 2020 and 2025. Highways England were working on long term solutions for Junction 8 on the M11 and there should be an announcement about this in 2019. He would liaise with the transport consultants about transport infrastructure for Saffron Walden.

PP13 WHOLE PLAN VIABILITY STUDY

C Berry of Troy Planning and Design gave a verbal update on the study. So far the results of the study strongly indicated positive viability across different case

studies. Work was still ongoing to test out the case studies and would be fed back in further detail at the next meeting.

PP14 HATFIELD FOREST WORK

The Planning Policy Officer gave a verbal update on the work.

In response to a question from Councillor Barker, the Planning Policy Officer said he would look into issues with parking occurring at Hatfield Forest.

PP15 EPPING FOREST WORK

The Planning Policy Officer gave a verbal update on the work. He said it left space for further discussion in the future.

PP16 UPDATE ON THE SPORT AND PLAYING PITCHES STUDY

The Senior Planning Officer gave a verbal update on the study.

Cllr J Redfern, J Deane, J Evans, D Hall, J Kingdom, K McDonald, S Merifield and M Young spoke on aspects of the Local Plan Evidence Base.

PP17 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting was 31 May 2018. The starting time would be 6pm.

The meeting finished at 8.50.

ACTION POINTS

1)	Respond to Councillor Barker's question as to how the employment split figures had been calculated.
2)	Respond in writing to questions submitted by public speakers which were not answered at the meeting.
3)	Respond in writing to Councillor Lodge about issues raised regarding the water cycle study.
4)	Note the importance of protecting new communities in terms of where cars would travel.
5)	Liaise with Councillor Davis about the capacity of the National Grid in relation to electric charging points.
6)	Respond in writing to Councillor Dean about concerns raised regarding the gardens of Easton Lodge.

7)	Troy Planning to liaise with White Young Green about transport infrastructure within Saffron Walden over the Local Plan period.
8)	Respond to Councillor Barker and S Merifield in writing with regards to parking issues at Hatfield Forest.

This page is intentionally left blank

I am here to speak on behalf of the ward I represent and to ask just some of the questions I have on these papers.

On page 140 of the WYG Conclusions point 7.2.2, the roads that exceed their capacity without additional housing in the local plan, M11 Junctions 7-9 is listed. And on page 371, point 5.6, options to improve this are suggested.

None of these seem to have made it into our own report – why not? Again, on page 140, the B1383 is noted as being at capacity and no improvements have made it into our report.

My ward is impacted by both of these roads. The M11 is just two lanes from Junction 8 north to Junction 9 and there is no access north at Junction 9. At one end, we have Stansted Airport with its potential to dramatically increase passenger numbers, and, at the other, NUGC. Both will have a huge impact on this motorway, and as we all know, this regularly falls over now and is shut. This, being one of the longest stretches of motorway without an exit in the country, then pushes all this traffic onto the B1383 down through Great Chesterford, Little Chesterford, Littlebury, Wendon, and onwards to Stansted. To ignore this problem is not acceptable to me or to the residents I represent.

In Grosvenor's Transport report, there are also a series of alterations they feel need to be made to Great Chesterford to enable this development. Peter Bretts mention in their document that they have engaged with Great Chesterford Parish Council on this. This is simply not true. If they had, they would understand that much of what they suggest is not feasible or acceptable to Great Chesterford. Why should Great Chesterford pick up the pieces to make NUGC sustainable when it has a negative impact on this historic village?

The heritage impact assessment recognises that there are a number of areas of potential harm and the site is

constrained. It says no development between the temple and Roman town but the current plan supplied by Grosvenor shows new ground modelling and balancing lake in that very location. If the balancing lake, cannot be at the bottom of the hill, where can it be? The report states that more work on heritage is required. Surely this should be done before the allocation of such a sensitive site?

Great Chesterford Parish Council provided Grosvenor and UDC with a considered version of SP7 some time ago. Grosvenor responded passing much of it back to UDC but we have heard nothing on this to date, except in the last few days that our red lines will be addressed in Regulation 19. We have seen nothing of the new SP7 that is to go into Reg.19 and whilst UDC is confident that details will be dealt with by a DPD, I am led to believe leaving important detail to DPD's is dangerous. South Cambs backed away from this idea and included all detail in the initial policies, as have Chelmsford City. The concern is that the scheme cannot deliver the numbers needed in a sympathetic way, for example, clear landscape separation buffer between new houses and Great Chesterford, which is not currently proposed on the master plan; and the balancing lake issue. These conflicts need to be sorted out now so that a proper assessment can be carried out. Leaving it to DPDs could result in Uttlesford delivering a sub-standard development and not providing the housing numbers needed.

So for Great Chesterford Parish, it is clear we need our red lines in regulation 19 to have any confidence that these will be delivered. The road network improvements are essential and the buffer zone as a protection to the historic environment should be stated in policy so that they can be picked up and delivered by the DPD. The red lines are key to my ward and, as such, key to me as their member. I am extremely uncomfortable with jam tomorrow.

Comments, David Hall - PPWG 23 May, 2018

Great Chesterford Parish Council (“GCPC”) challenged UDC’s Regulation 18 Local Plan proposals because of incomplete or inadequate evidence relating in particular to transport, archaeology and heritage, and overall lack of deliverability.

GCPC, whilst reserving its position regarding any eventual inclusion of NUGC, has provided UDC with no less than 27 additions to the proposed Policy SP7 as constituting the minimum red lines necessary to protect Great Chesterford in the event NUGC proceeds.

As regards Agenda Item 3, today’s comments are limited to GCPC’s principal objections. Taking these in turn, the Agenda Item inadequately sets out the attached evidence base, and all PPWG members should carefully study the Appendices in order to understand the full impact for Great Chesterford of what is proposed. So

TRANSPORT

Paragraph 34: refers only to the desired modal shift and the “ambitions for a step change to non-car mode”. But look at Appendix 4, attached to the papers at page 131, paragraph 6.6.6 - “Achieving the mode share targets above will...require new development to deliver a step change in the use of sustainable modes”. Regarding the A120 at paragraph 6.7.11, page 135, there are “current unknowns regarding deliverable modal shift”, and exactly the same concerns apply to all the Garden Community sites. For the measures required to achieve the potential modal shift, look at page 244, which in relation to Great Chesterford, refers to the requirement to make the rail station “more accessible” by means of “improved routes”, which inevitably means rat runs for pedestrians, cyclists and private vehicles through the centre of the Conservation area of the Village in order to reach what WYG refers to as Great Chesterford’s “transport hub”. The UDC proposal (Agenda Item 3, paragraph 79) that “improved access” to the rail station must be provided merely confirms that the already narrow and cluttered roads

within Great Chesterford are to be turned over to become rat runs in order to achieve UDC's requirement; how does this then square with the action point PP15 at paragraph 112 of Agenda Item 3?

Paragraph 41: the claim in the Agenda Item that "Great Chesterford has good access to walking and cycling facilities and is close to a rail station" ignores the fact that UDC's own consultants identify the need (bundle, page 1071) to "extend Park and Ride services [within NUGC] towards walking/cycling distance of Great Chesterford", emphasising at the same time that links to the station (at which identified constraints exist) will be particularly important (bundle, pages 1060 and 1069). Faith in the Consultants is in any event shaken by the assertion (bundle, page 1069) that "there is an existing cycle route south to Saffron Walden along the B184" - there is no such thing unless this refers to the road itself beyond Little Chesterford.

Paragraph 47: again, as regards access to the strategic and local network, Troy is completely wrong to claim that "it is not thought there are any major access constraints" associated with NUGC (bundle, page 1048). GCPC's redlines reflect the absolute priority to avoid the very rat-runs advocated by WSG and Troy needed in order to achieve UDC's desired "modal shift". Further, by insisting, as per Grosvenor's recently disclosed proposals, that the primary first highways access is to be at the Park Road/B184 junction, and the discovery that capacity enhancements at Stump Cross (as yet not agreed with the highways authorities, let alone funded) have to precede establishment of what is to be the principal access to NUGC at Field Farm, and that access North to the proposed Cambridge Park and Ride on the A1307 (bundle, page 1071) is but a yet-to-be-agreed, unfunded, gleam in the eye, then it is obvious that there are indeed major access constraints which are wholly unresolved.

ARCHAEOLOGY

Paragraph 51; as to details of the "number of areas of potential harm" at the NUGC site, see pages 448 onwards, in particular pages 465-466.

Paragraph 7.5.11 (page 466) opens: “It is considered that development on the site would cause harm to the heritage assets”; the suggested HIA at any stage, therefore, cannot possibly mitigate against these serious adverse impacts, and it is wholly unrealistic to suppose that it could.

HERITAGE ASSETS

Paragraphs 59, 61-62: The same comment applies. Please take account of the full implications of paragraph 3.18, Appendix 6 (bundle, page 415) about this “highly sensitive landscape”. How can it be, the Roman Temple and the surrounding area having lain undisturbed for centuries, that UDC can sensibly imagine that any work on the proposed Development Plan Documents can possibly ameliorate the irreversible damage to the site that will be caused?

In conclusion, for these reasons alone the NUGC site is unsustainable, and should be omitted from any future Local Plan that UDC proposes.

This page is intentionally left blank



STEBBING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

STEERING GROUP

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN JOHN C. EVANS

TO UDC PPWG

23 MAY 2018

Mr Chairman and Councillors

I am speaking as the Chairman of the Stebbing Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, which has been working for the past two years preparing of a draft Neighbourhood Plan for our Parish. We hope to conclude our drafting in the Autumn of 2018.

We wish to make some brief observations concerning the UDC Heritage Evidence Base to the extent that it impacts potentially upon Stebbing and our own emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

We have every wish to cooperate with Officers in the drafting of our Neighbourhood Plan and, just two weeks ago, were able to hold our first (but long delayed) meeting with them to discuss the impact of potential development in the area east of Stebbing Green and Stebbing Village, namely the so called West of Braintree Garden Community, both upon the landscape characteristics and qualities of our Parish, and also to discuss the awaited UDC commissioned Heritage Impact Assessment. However, that Assessment was not available by the time of the meeting (although it had been postponed from March to await it) but it has finally been included in draft form in your papers tonight. As will be appreciated, there has been limited time for us to consider it, let alone discuss it with Officers.

We invited our consultant Mr Simon Neesam of The Landscape Partnership to attend the Officers' meeting in order to discuss his recommendations for the placing and extent of a Green Wedge or buffer between any new development at Andrewsfield/Boxted Wood and Stebbing Green/the main Village, being one of the recommendations included in his report dated March 2017.

I addressed you about that report in June 2017, when I was told that it would be taken into account. At our recent meeting with officers, that remained the stated position. Nothing seen by us however so far indicates that positive consideration has been given to those recommendations concerning a Green Wedge or buffer.

We are also now further concerned about heritage matters. The very lengthy report before you tonight remains in draft form. It has not taken into account the Stebbing Heritage Assessment commissioned by the Steering Group from Grover Lewis dated August 2017.

We requested that the Grover Lewis report be included within the instructions given to Douglas Insall, the authors of the UDC commissioned Heritage report, but it was not. In the

circumstances, we sent it to them directly requesting that they take it into account, which they have not.

The issue which the Stebbing Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group now wishes to raise before you is the absence of active engagement and consultation with us regarding the landscape and heritage evidence and assessments obtained by us for the purposes of our Neighbourhood Plan and their potential interrelationship with the equivalent evidence base and assessments obtained by the Council.

We very much appreciate the pressure and timetable that Officers are working to, but in order to achieve the best results for our Neighbourhood Plan, we respectfully ask that direct engagement and meaningful consultation be afforded to us and our highly regarded consultants in the future, and on an ongoing basis.

For the Residents of Stebbing to come to believe that UDC genuinely has ears open to listen to their opinions regarding their two most important concerns surrounding potential development in the Parish, namely adverse landscape and heritage impact, we as a Steering Group do request feedback from and interaction with Officers on our consultants' reports and advice, which has hitherto not been substantive.

Thank you for allowing us to address you.

Uttlesford District Council PPWG Meeting 23 May 2018

Question from Stebbing Parish Council: Archaeological Case West of Braintree GC site

The 'Brief Archaeological Impact Assessment: Proposed Uttlesford Garden Communities' by Pace Services, January 2018 summarises known Heritage assets within the WoB Garden Community located within Uttlesford: (Not listed buildings)

1. **Andrews Field WWII airfield of the 8th Air Force (USAF), station 485, known officially as Andrews Field. Surviving beneath** HER No: 14090
2. **South of Boxted Wood Traditional site of building, alleged locally to be the site of a former church.** HER No: 1240
3. **Stebbing Green Roman Mill Roman villa identified in 1958. Tessellated pavement first reported by owner-farmer in 1938** HER No: 1239
4. **Stane Street Roman Road from Braughing to Colchester** HER No: 1226
5. **Boxted Wood Ancient Woodland**

Table 12: List of heritage assets within the boundary of the proposed Land West of Braintree Garden Community

But does not refer to sites within Braintree District Council's area and we suggest the total number of sites needing archaeological investigation is much higher.

We have sought the services of an Archaeologist and are advised, following his referral to *Planning Policy Statement 5, Planning for the Historic Environment*, that assessing the likelihood of currently unidentified heritage assets is an essential part of the planning process.

We feel the Council has not given the impact of archaeology anything like its due weight.

I refer to the impact of past investigations during two recent development programmes: a) the Stansted Airport expansion programme (Havis & Brooks 2004) and b) the upgrade of A120 in 2000 – 2003. These works give a detailed idea of the kind of archaeology which will be encountered during a project on this site.

For Stansted Airport; c 600 Ha was fieldwalked while for the A120 landscape transect, an area of c 115 Ha was investigated. The latter project produced some 24 archaeological sites; one per 4 Ha, of which most were sampled or excavated.

We are advised, the dissected boulder clay plateau on which WoB would be built, is a strong indicator that the archaeology at Stansted Airport and the A120 will be similar.

So, on the assumption that the projected land-take for the Garden Community would be approximately 500 Ha, we can assume that the archaeological site density will be approximate to that encountered at the earlier two sites and a fieldwalking programme may identify as many as 125 sites which merit investigation.

Basing costs on the closest project; A120: Costings from Oxford Archaeology re A120 project: Evaluation @ £65,000 Field Work @ £445,000, Post Excavation @ £326,000 for 115 Ha. Therefore, on the basis for 115 Ha, an archaeology cost of £7,700 per hectare.

It is not unrealistic to take that figure for the 500 Ha; which means the Developers need to find £3,500,000 (2003- 2005 prices) for the archaeology. In today's prices approximately £4million.

Can the Council assure us that a full and thorough archaeological investigation will be carried out?

Page 17
23/5/18
Jackie Kingdon
Stebbing PC

This page is intentionally left blank

Uttlesford Planning Policy Working Group meeting 23 May 2018
Statement and Questions by Ken McDonald, FCA, of Stansted Mountfitchet

I have been speaking to this group for two and a half years. Based on my previous experience, I have no doubt that I shall be ignored again today. But I have to try.

In December 2015, I questioned the SHMA and this group declined to adopt it. In April this year, Mike Young spoke about the Hardisty Jones employment report and this group “noted” the report although several of your questions remained unanswered.

I have come, yet again, to complain that this Local Plan is based on unsound foundations and little but hearsay.

Where is the evidence, the calculations and the audit trail that arrive at Uttlesford’s highly exceptional housebuilding target? Can any of you demonstrate how the number was arrived at?

Similarly, will you come clean and tell us how you arrived at the jobs forecast? Specifically, how do you square this forecast against retaining the airport planning limit of 35mppa and against more recent job forecasts by Stansted Airport?

Will you tell us what testing you did of these figures, especially in the face of challenges to the housing need figures from two or three chartered accountants and the airport’s recent forecast of 13,200 jobs in 2028 to service 35mppa¹. I think you have assumed around 19,000, but it is not clear.

These fundamental building blocks, these foundations for the local plan, are far from robust yet you have chosen not to satisfy yourselves on these questions or to demonstrate why you think your base numbers are sound. You have simply ignored the challenges and moved on. For the last two years, the frailties of the foundations have been ignored while you have continued to build upon this ill-considered base.

It’s as if the main issue has been the colour of the tiles in the bathroom. I wonder where you councillors will be when the tiler shows up. I can just imagine him saying “I’m not keen to tile over that crack – has this house got any foundations?” Nor, sadly, do I expect to see many of you when the planning inspector is about and officers are being hung out to dry.

Houses and jobs are the two most fundamental elements for a local plan, yet in Uttlesford both are unclear and shrouded in mystery, with no joined-up supporting evidence. So, not for the first time, I ask you two basic questions that go to the heart of your plan:

Firstly, will you reveal how the so-called “housing need” for Uttlesford has been calculated? I do mean calculated, with an audit trail that any reasonable person may be able to follow, not vague assumptions based on hearsay arguments and pleas not to derail the process.

Secondly, will you reveal - clearly - what you have assumed regarding Stansted Airport’s passenger throughput, its total employment numbers, and the number of jobs there that will provide employment for Uttlesford residents? As a point of information, may I say that in its latest employment survey the airport found that only 18% of employees lived in Uttlesford. At the last PPWG meeting various, higher percentages were banded about.

¹ Application UTT/18/0460/FUL, Environmental Statement 1, Table 11.10

This page is intentionally left blank

PPWG 23 May 2018

I wish to talk on two separate subjects.

The first concerns the Housing trajectory and five-year land supply - Appendix 2.

There are two ways of calculating the 5-year land supply, known as "Liverpool" and "Sedgefield". The council has always used the harsher Sedgefield method and this was not a problem when it comfortably met the 5-year target.

Last year problems emerged and I suggested that it changed to the Liverpool method. This method had been accepted by the government and the Courts, especially where a district, like Uttlesford, had a good record on delivery. And it would have meant that Uttlesford would meet or have been reasonably close to its target.

The planning department did not agree with me and continued with the Sedgefield system.

Now it's proposed to change to Liverpool. This sudden change of heart is very welcome. It's a shame it didn't come earlier.

My second point concerns the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Appendix 8. I was very pleased to see the report which is an update of a Plan produced a year ago. That earlier Plan was not presented to the Group, who were merely shown a short summary of it.

The Plan does concentrate on the infrastructure needed for possible garden settlements, but it includes details of infrastructure requirements in other areas. So, I was surprised with the comment that for other locations it didn't expect that growth would "result in the need for additional strategic infrastructure" (paragraph 2.1.1). Since the district is anticipating an extra 10,000 homes outside of these garden settlements during the Plan period this seemed unduly optimistic.

But the report does include some costings. Should the council decide to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy (a CIL) then these could be a very useful starting point.

Five years ago I wrote suggesting that a CIL be introduced and since that time the council's position has gone from opposition to lukewarm support.

I do appreciate that there are arguments about whether a CIL is most appropriate for large developments but there will still be a considerable amount of building in other parts of the district. I believe that the benefits of a CIL far outweigh any disadvantages. Having now completed the basic work on infrastructure needs then the council is surely in a good position to start work on a CIL almost immediately.

Michael Young
May 2018

Yet again SPC finds itself with more questions than answers.

- 1. Why are Andrewsfield and Boxted Wood, two separate applications from landowners now to be known as one namely Andrewsfield – given they are two very obvious separate sections of land and not joined or connected?**
- 2. How do you intend to join / connect these two very separate sections of land (if you do). If so, has this been included in the ‘ Call for Sites’?**
- 3. Why have you withdrawn your ‘Call for Sites’ information tables etc. from the website?** We can only assume that you are hiding something before your meeting of the 31st. SPC already has seen that there have been sites in Stebbing that the PC has not been asked to comment on as they were at the original ‘Call for Sites’ and last August / September. This is not transparent or fair and starts to look as though this council have something to hide. Therefore SPC and the community of Stebbing want to know and have the right to comment on any other proposed sites
- 4. Does this council and its’ officers have intentions to discuss or include any other land not yet disclosed within the West Of Braintree Garden Community?**

You have stated that you will reconsider the trajectory for WOB after BDC’s Inspector examination is reported on. You seem more concerned about BDC than your own residents. You have made no comments about the WOB Issues and Options Consultation nor can it be found on UDC website.

- 5. Will UDC ensure that they will enable access on their website to all the comments made re the WOB Issues and Options Consultation?**
- 6. How will UDC ensure that it will not find itself in the same position as BDC? Given that their LDP is delayed because of either their ineptitude or their deliberate exclusion of ‘Monkswood’**

So far there is no developer (Galliard homes I believe is not of the same size and resources as Land Securites and Grosvener) for West of Braintree. NEGC intend to form NE Development Corporation therefore does.

- 7. Does UDC intend to form its own Development Corporation, will this be shown within Section 19?**

Part 2

SPC has noted that there are elements in the Troy Infrastructure Development Plan, that whilst included for Easton Park have been omitted for West of Braintree.

The omissions are as follows from page 31 of the IDP :

- ❖ M11 junction 8
- ❖ Local level highway infrastructure enhancements will be required

- ❖ Essex Regiment Way contributions for sustainable transport mitigation i.e expansion Chelmer Valley P&R
- ❖ A120 Braintree junctions; A120/B1018 Galleys Corner; A120/B1256 Marks Farm Roundabout

The above elements of infrastructure plus what is at present aspirational at best would seem to cost somewhere between £87m and £117m without adding any of the above.

SPC requests that this error is noted and corrected.