

**PLANNING POLICY WORKING GROUP held at COUNCIL CHAMBER -  
COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on  
THURSDAY, 31 MAY 2018 at 6.00 pm**

Present: Councillor H Rolfe (Chairman)  
Councillors S Barker, P Davies, A Dean, P Lees, J Lodge,  
J Loughlin and E Oliver

Officers in attendance: A Bochel (Democratic Services Officer), P Bylo (Planning Policy Manager), D French (Chief Executive), R Harborough (Director - Public Services), S Miles (Planning Policy Team Leader) and S Nicholas (Senior Planning Officer)

Public speakers: Councillor J Redfern, W Brown, C Fuller, M Herbert, S Merifield, G Mott, T Orgee and F Wilkinson

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Harris and Mills.

Councillor Barker declared a personal interest as a County Councillor for Great Dunmow.

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

In response to a statement from Councillor Redfern, the Chairman said Highways England were looking at turning the M11 into a smart motorway. The timing of community facilities and additional access to the proposed North Uttlesford garden community were both issues the council was aware of. The question of a buffer zone was an ongoing discussion. It was important not to underestimate development plan documents. They would be a crucial means of engaging with the local community.

**ACTION POINTS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Chairman said officers had not had much time to address the action points but that they would be followed up.

Councillor Lodge asked about a Highways England study which proposed a limit to additional houses built to the east of Saffron Walden, and how this proposal fitted in with allocations in the plan and existing permissions. The Chairman said officers would clarify this point.

**REGULATION 19 PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT LOCAL PLAN**

Councillor Barker said officers were working to fix typographical and formatting errors in the plan.

The Planning Policy Team Leader gave a presentation regarding the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission draft Local Plan. He said an amendment to Policy SP11 had been circulated to members. Officers felt this new wording was clearer.

In response to a question from Councillor Lodge asking how Uttlesford District Council could take account of the ONS's reduced population forecast for the district, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the ONS would need to turn that population forecast into a household forecast. It would take four months to do this. Uttlesford District Council could only use the latest household projections to inform the plan.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said the government's standardised methodology to determine a household figure for Uttlesford District did not take into account an additional number of houses to act as a buffer figure.

Councillor Barker said it was common for plan inspectors to suggest modifications to Regulation 19 Local Plans. An inspector was likely to do the same for Uttlesford's plan.

Councillor Lodge asked whether it was appropriate to have wording in the main report referencing a potential east-west rapid transport scheme. The Director – Public Services said one of the main functions of the local plan was to provide a basis to seek external resources. Since funding for the scheme had not yet been found, reference to the scheme was suitable.

In response to points made by members throughout the discussion, the Chairman said work was ongoing to create a more consistent style to present equal weight to areas of allocations throughout the plan.

Members considered each chapter of the local plan individually.

The Chairman said the foreword to the plan would be rewritten.

The Chairman asked for a specific reference to installing a cycle link North Uttlesford Garden Community and Saffron Walden to the cycle path from Cambridge to Hinxton. The Planning Policy Team Leader said officers would look to be more specific on this wording.

Councillor Barker asked for reference to be included to the importance of mobile phone signal.

Councillor Lodge said there seemed to be a contradiction in retail policy between pages 63 and 146 of the agenda document, concerning the locations of facilities. The Planning Policy Team Leader said officers would look again at the wording. In response to a question from Councillor Dean, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the affordable housing plan document would look to provide further detail on housing within the district. Work had not yet commenced on this document.

Councillor Dean raised concerns on the subject of carbon emissions from aviation and the need for a clear policy on night flights at Stansted Airport. Officers agreed to take these issues up with Councillor Dean after the meeting.

Councillor Barker said reference should be made as to when Carver Barracks was intended to close so that it was clear it could be available for the next local plan.

In response to concerns raised by Councillor Loughlin, officers said they would relook at wording in Policy SP12 regarding whether 'acceptable' was a suitable term to be used to describe pollution or contamination.

In response to a question from the Chairman, officers said they would examine the potential to reference to drop-off points and drone deliveries in retail policy.

Councillor Barker said many suggestions made by Essex County Council for improvements to transport movement around Saffron Walden had not been carried out. The plan should state that Uttlesford District Council would continue to lobby Essex County Council for these improvements.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said the development plan documents could address parking standards if members wanted them to do so.

Councillor Lodge said he was unsure whether the Council could prove whether an additional 150 house site in Saffron Walden would have an 'acceptable' impact, as was stated in the plan. The Planning Policy Team Leader said he would discuss this with Councillor Lodge after the meeting.

The Chairman said the Council had a commitment to review whether use of the Community Infrastructure Levy was appropriate.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said officers would replace the word 'acceptable' with 'unacceptable' in the paragraph beginning 'where development proposals' in Policy EN16

Councillor Lodge said reference to 'significant adverse effects' in policy EN6 should be changed to 'adverse impacts'. The Director – Public Services said significance was assessed through the National Air Quality objectives which were about health-related risks to and effects on communities. If these objectives were breached, then this would qualify as a significant impact. The Chairman said officers would take the point away and respond to Councillor Lodge.

Councillor Lees said she did not understand why a site on School Lane in Henham was included in the plan, despite the fact an application to develop the site had been rejected by the Planning Committee. She also believed there were problems with sites at Elsenham and Newport. Councillor Barker said she was disappointed to see there were two sites at Great Dunmow that sat outside Great Dunmow's Neighbourhood Plan.

Members voted to remove the site at School Lane, Henham from the Local Plan, on the basis that it had already been previously rejected by the Planning Committee.

Councillor Barker said Chapter 16 stated there was to be no development in the metropolitan green belt, but did not say the same of the Countryside Protection Zone. The Planning Policy Team Leader said officers would add reference to the Countryside Protection Zone to this section.

RESOLVED to recommend to Cabinet that, being satisfied that the preparation of the Local Plan has complied with the relevant regulatory requirements, being of the view that the Regulation 19 Local Plan document is ready for submission to government for independent examination, and subject to a number of amendments being incorporated for Cabinet including the removal of the site allocation of School Lane, Henham, the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Local Plan be published in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

*Councillor J Redfern, W Brown, C Fuller, M Herbert, S Merifield, G Mott, T Orgee and F Wilkinson spoke on aspects of the Regulation 19 Pre-submission Local Plan.*

The meeting ended at 9pm.

## **ACTION POINTS**

PP19	Respond to Councillor Lodge's question about a limit to additional houses to the east of Saffron Walden.
PP20	Work to ensure a consistent approach to all areas of Uttlesford District within the Local Plan.
PP20	Rewrite the foreword to the Local Plan.
PP20	Include reference to linking Saffron Walden and North Uttlesford Garden Community to the Cambridge to Hinxton cycle path.
PP20	Include reference to the importance of better mobile phone signal for people in Uttlesford.
PP20	Relook at wording regarding the location of retail facilities in relation to the Garden Communities.
PP20	Discuss issues relating to carbon emissions from aviation and night flights at Stansted Airport with Councillor Dean.
PP20	Make reference to the planned closure of Carver Barracks in the Local Plan.
PP20	Investigate whether 'acceptable' should be used to describe levels of pollution or contamination in SP12.

PP20	Look into the need for retail policy to reference drop-off points and drones.
PP20	Look into making reference to working with Essex County Council on the implementation of suggested improvements to transport movements in Saffron Walden.
PP20	Discuss the Kier site in Saffron Walden following the meeting.
PP20	Replace the word 'acceptable' with 'unacceptable' in the paragraph beginning 'where development proposals' in Policy EN16.
PP20	Respond to Councillor Lodge's suggestion to remove the word 'significant' relating to adverse effects of air quality.
PP20	Remove the allocation to School Lane, Henham from the Regulation 19 Pre-submission Local Plan.
PP20	Ensure there is reference to not allowing development in the Countryside Protection Zone in objective 3a in Chapter 16.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PPWG Thursday May 31<sup>st</sup>**

**Stebbing Parish Council Comments**

SPC is greatly concerned of the emphasis in 3.20 on what appears to be the reliance of the future residents of WOB on all the local facilities and transport facilities in Braintree. We know we may be far away from the Nirvana of Saffron Walden but Stebbing is in Uttlesford and the majority of people go to Dunmow.

In SP1 SPC does not think that this is appropriate that when talking about WOB in eg 3.20 and 3.31 UDC still does not say how closely they will work with BDC/NEGC/NEDC. Will it be Uttlesford Development Corporation?

Stebbing Parish Council feels there are still too many questions, no answers only aspirations and still no developer overall.

SPC thinks that should this plan go through that so much is left to the DPD and whilst sounding an opportunity for local communities to have their input, we worry that this council and its officers will not have the experience and knowledge to carry out these immense tasks to create this Garden Community.

SP5 – How will this council intervene directly to ensure that Garden City Principles are met, within the delivery models and within the proposed timetables?

You state in 3.98 that you will jointly prepare a DPD with BDC, SPC still has no evidence of how you will do this.

It still states in 3.99 that there is a broad area of search, which is not at all satisfactory or equitable to the community of Stebbing and Stebbing Green especially. It is not always obvious whether this is the whole of WOB or just the Uttlesford part, given that the proposed area are distinct and separate sections of land. Yet again it appears we must wait for the DPD.

Concerning SP8 Yet again we have to wait for the Strategic Development Plan to be developed.

Can you assure us that there will be 40% affordable housing ; how will you go about ensuring it?

In SP8.5 it mentions the rapid transit system as a priority to Braintree and Dunmow it doesn't mention buses. Will there be no buses at all? Again this is aspirational.

SPC is very concerned there is no mention of schools, health centres, youth facilities – if I have missed them (too much to read)

Finally SPC is astounded that the map of Stebbing does not include all of Stebbing. This has been pointed out at least twice before and has been ignored. This is an insult to the villagers that live in Stebbing.

Cllr Sandi Merifield

This page is intentionally left blank

## Address to PPWG, 31 May 2018

Mr Chairman, I speak on behalf of Elsenham Parish Council.

Yes! Elsenham! **Not** one of the three new garden settlements.

Perhaps members are thinking, but surely: Elsenham is not in the Plan now.

But it is. The proposals include a site in Robin Hood Road scheduled for 40 (four zero) dwellings.

As we all know, Sir, a leading reason for the rejection of the previous local plan was the unsuitable road links to Elsenham, particularly the wholly unsatisfactory main route through Stansted Mountfitchet via Grove Hill, Lower Street and Chapel Hill; and the same conclusion was reached by a second Inspector, and confirmed by the Secretary of State in 2016, when rejecting the appeal by Fairfield against refusal of 800 homes between Elsenham and Henham.

Fairfield put in a recent application to build 350 houses on the same site, not part of this Plan; BUT some of the responses were surprising, for they reveal the extent to which local residents, weary of the intractable traffic problems through Stansted, already make use of wholly unsuitable alternative routes via narrow, twisting country lanes with width limits of 6 foot 6. In other words, access through Stansted is is now effectively beyond capacity; and there are about 230 houses approved but not yet occupied.

The total number of dwellings across the district in the Plan until 2033 is now 14,700, as against the 14,100 required. Using the 'Liverpool methodology' the 5-year housing supply stands at very nearly six years. Thus there is now spare capacity in the Plan. The smaller allocations should not just go through on the nod. The volume of new homes already committed in Elsenham will result in an increase in the village of about 60% since 2011 and these further 40 houses must be the leading candidates for total exclusion from the plan.

To conclude. When this plan goes before an inspector, one obvious question will be, what new housing is proposed for Elsenham. It would help greatly if the answer was 'none at all', rather than an allocation which is unsustainable because Elsenham has already been favoured with an excessively large amount of new housing. And, finally, new information from local residents shows that the village is even more unsuitable now on transport grounds than it was when the previous Local Plan Inspector concluded, in his words, that it cannot 'overcome the connectivity disadvantages of its location'. He certainly knew what he was talking about, Mr Chairman.

My thanks to you, Sir, and the members of the Working Group for your attention.

Dr Graham Mott  
Elsenham

[Not yet built: 30 DWH; 50 CN; 116 Bovis; 40 Nursery = 236

This page is intentionally left blank

I confirm that I am speaking in a personal capacity.

Paragraph 14 of the covering report states that: North Uttlesford Garden Community is close to rail stations on the existing lines to London and Cambridge.'

However, as we know, Great Chesterford station is less well served by trains than Whittlesford station, so for rail users access to Whittlesford station is important. For road traffic this means going via the A1301 and the A505 / A1301 McDonalds roundabout provided these are **not** congested.

On 10 January this year South Cambridgeshire District Council approved a planning application for the Sawston Trade Park (situated in Pampisford parish and just 400 yards north of the A505 / A1301 roundabout) - 1,500 jobs and 670 car parking spaces.

On 7 March this year South Cambridgeshire District Council considered an application for an Agritech Park on the A1301, south of the A505 – 4,000 jobs and 2,000 car parking spaces - this application was refused but could possibly go to an appeal.

The Wellcome Trust Genome Campus is currently talking about expansion on the A1301 with hundreds or more new jobs and 1,500 new dwellings. An application is expected within the next few months.

And then there is the North Uttlesford Garden Community proposal.

All these proposals seem to have a common feature - considerable reliance on improving capacity at the A505 / A1301 roundabout to address the impact of increased traffic.

I remain unconvinced by the traffic modelling and am very concerned that the likely impact of some or any of these proposals being implemented would be increased rat running through villages to avoid congestion in the A505 / A1301 roundabout area, resulting in a severe and adverse impact on villages such as Duxford, Hinxton and Ickleton.

Your response might well be: but there is going to be a study of the A505.

My response to this would be: in my view, it would be a mistake to assume that improvements to the A505 would necessarily be entirely on-line in the local area.

**In conclusion**, I do **not** support the inclusion of the North Uttlesford Garden Community site in this Local Plan,

**and finally**, I would urge you **not** to have an important Section 19 consultation where a significant portion of the consultation period is within the holiday period.

Thank you

**Tony Orgee**  
8 Bourn Bridge Road,  
Little Abington  
Cambridge  
CB21 6BJ

tonyorgee@gmail.com

Statement from Hinxton and other South Cambridgeshire Parish Councils to the Uttlesford District Council Planning Policy Working Group meeting, Thursday 31 May 2018

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed North Uttlesford Garden Community.

Although I speak for Hinxton, my comments are fully supported by the chairs of the parish councils of Ickleton, Duxford, Pampisford, Whittlesford, Little Abington, and Great Abington - that is, by all those parishes in South Cambridgeshire that are directly affected.

It is clear that Uttlesford is not proud of this proposed new town. You could not have pushed it further away. More than half of its edge is actually defined by the Essex-Cambridge county boundary. What a bizarre site for a town purporting to provide homes for people working in Uttlesford!

Whatever the short-term political convenience of this choice, it has profound long-term implications for our parishes. We abut on half the proposed new town boundary, but we shall have to bear far, far more than half of the infrastructural and amenity costs.

This is because the town would be high in our River Cam watershed, with all the flooding and pollution management implications bearing on our down-stream villages.

It is because the town would be on top of the main aquifers of our water supplier, Cambridge Water, but not of yours, Affinity Water.

It is because the traffic for the new town cannot possibly rely on the winding road to Saffron Walden. It will overwhelmingly be forced onto the already congested roads of South Cambridgeshire.

It is because, over the years while the new town grows, the costs of its health, education and other needs will unavoidably be borne by our nearby communities in South Cambridgeshire.

It is because the town, grotesquely sited on the hills that shape our Cam valley, will have a massive impact on rural South Cambridgeshire. It will not 'preserve or enhance' our shared landscape. It will wreck it, and its ancient heritage.

Not one of these implications is dealt with adequately in the documentation for your pre-submission.

Yet, despite most of the burden falling on South Cambridgeshire, Uttlesford has made minimal effort to consult it on these things. There is no commitment to share captured land value and or Section 106 money to meet the massive costs to be inflicted on our District and our County.

The looming tragedy of this new town is all the greater because it is unnecessary.

Uttlesford's housing needs are not in its north but in its south. South Cambridgeshire has shown publicly that it can meet its own housing needs. The new town would devastate our countryside to no purpose.

We urge you to remove it from your Local Plan.

We are confident that the Inspector will be persuaded that the new town is unnecessary; that it is contrary to national planning Regulations; that it is unsustainable; and that consultation with your neighbours has been grossly inadequate.

William Brown (Chair, Hinxton Parish Council)

This page is intentionally left blank

PPWG 31<sup>ST</sup> MAY 2018 AT 6PM

**GREAT DUNMOW TOWN COUNCIL OBJECTION TO NEW WORDING IN THE SPACIAL STRATEGY DOCUMENT SP1, CHAPTER 3**

**Caroline Fuller, Town Clerk**

(I would like to distribute two maps to illustrate the points raised in this objection statement.)

I have three points to raise in relation Chapter 3:

- 1) the explanation of the chosen hybrid strategy is not consistently supported by your evidence base
- 2) descriptions of Areas of Search are misleading
- 3) comparisons between Areas of Search are unclear and inconsistent.

If I take each point in turn:

- 1) All new settlement locations will pose challenges of urban sprawl and coalescence with existing neighbouring communities but NONE more so than the challenges facing our Town.

The combination of near-doubling the size of the town and a new town next to it, would compromise access to the town and pose serious transport problems, yet to be properly assessed, as raised in our comment to you at your last meeting.

3.8 explains that the hybrid strategy is intended to solve problems identified in the alternative strategies, however, in 3.9, you say

“Focussing significant new development in the villages or the two main towns would result in a scale of development which would have a detrimental impact on the character and historic assets of the town or village, the surrounding countryside and highway network.”

I refer you to our maps A, showing the extent of the planned growth including Regulation 18 sites and Map B showing the various issues we have identified with Easton Park.

Both maps show that the hybrid strategy cannot avoid substantial harm to the character, surrounding countryside and the highway network in relation to Great Dunmow. **Please provide evidence to support the hybrid strategy in relation to Great Dunmow.**

- 2) I refer to points 3.13 to 3.20 Areas of Search descriptions, which are then repeated throughout the document.

The Area of Search 7 is described as LAND SOUTH OF LITTLE EASTON. How can you NOT describe Easton Park as LAND WEST OF GREAT DUNMOW? West of Braintree is significantly removed from the town, in comparison. Is this an attempt to mask the inconvenient truth?

**Please amend the description to Land South of Little Easton and West of Great Dunmow, known as Easton Park.**

- 3) Similarly, for clarification, the misleading Area of Search 9 description **should be amended to Land North of Flitch Green and East of Little Dunmow**. Clearer presentation of the evidence is needed to explain that land is available to extend the Oakwood Park housing development, now known as Flitch Green, which has an established road and public transport network and local community amenities.
- Furthermore, 3.15 explains why Area of Search 9 was rejected but this raises more questions than it answers, including the question, “How is Stebbing better connected to the A120 than Flitch Green?”

**We ask that these matters are addressed so that your evidence is presented more clearly and consistently.**

78  
u  
c

I am here to speak again on behalf of the ward that I represent.

I brought to the PPWG committee's attention last week the concerns of capacity on the M11 and also the capacity problems of the B1383 raised in WYGs report. Still no improvements seem to have made it into Reg 19.

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, Wenden, and onwards to Stansted. Promises that this will be dealt with later are no good to this community. To ignore this problem is not acceptable to me or to the residents I represent.

In January GCPC gave a great deal of thought to SP7 and passed our version to UDC. I appreciate that some of our "red Lines" have been adapted and merged into Reg 19, and I thank officers for this. There are however some key things still not dealt with.

I have spent time with Stephen Miles and gone through many of my concerns, I hope that these will be dealt with in the final version of this draft. *Reg 19 document.*

We need clear protection of areas of the scheduled ancient monuments. We need it clearly stated what will be done about schools, especially secondary school as we already have children bussed past the County High on to Newport. Adding even a small number of extra secondary aged children without a new school will have a negative impact on both the new community and the existing villages.

Going back to roads, we asked for traffic mitigation measures prior to any occupation of new dwellings including a comprehensive strategy to minimise vehicular traffic into Chesterford station and into Saffron Walden Town. This is not included. We asked for further access routes out of the new town, not just Field Farm Drive, this is an absolute must, where else do you have a town with only one proper entrance and exit?

We asked for a clear buffer zone to protect the existing villages, in particular the triangle between Gt Chesterford and Stumps Cross, this is not in here. Why can the area of search not be redrawn to give this clear buffer and assurance to our residents?

Officers have GCPC red lines and I have highlighted some of the ones that most concern me here, and others with Mr Miles can I have agreement that these will be looked at again and the wording of this Reg 19 be strengthened where possible?

There were 11 points in our SP7 version, some have made it and some not but if not can we have a written explanation to the PC why not? Or how they have been altered so our residents can understand how we got to the draft SP7 of Reg 19?