

CABINET held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on MONDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2023 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillor P Lees (Chair)
Councillors A Coote, J Evans, N Hargreaves, N Reeve and M Sutton

Officers in attendance: P Holt (Chief Executive), B Ferguson (Democratic Services Manager), N Katevu (Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services) and A Maxted (Interim Planning Policy Manager).

Also present: Councillor S Barker (Leader of the Conservative Group), Councillor N Gregory (Chair of the Scrutiny Committee), Councillor R Pavitt (Leader of the Uttlesford Independents' Group) and Councillor R Silcock (Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group).

Public Speakers: J Cheetham (Takeley Parish Council), B Critchley, A Evans, J Johnson, and M Marriage.

CAB19 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Five public speakers addressed Cabinet; their statements have been appended to these minutes.

- J Johnson
- A Evans
- B Critchley
- Councillor J Cheetham (Takeley Parish Council)
- M Marriage.

The Chair noted that four additional written statements were sent to Cabinet prior to the meeting, and these would also be appended to the minutes for the purpose of the public record.

- Mr & Mrs Evans
- K Woods
- D Ralph-Smith
- D Conway

CAB20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillor Sell as leader of the Liberal Democrat Group; Councillor Silcock substituted in his place

Councillor Evans noted for transparency purposes that two sites put forward in the call for sites abutted his land. The two sites had not been proposed for allocation and therefore were not included in the draft Local Plan before Cabinet.

CAB21 DRAFT UPDATED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

Councillor Evans presented the report regarding the updated Local Development Scheme(LDS). Cabinet noted the updated LDS and approved its contents for publication.

RESOLVED to note the contents of the LDS, including the updated timetable for preparing the new Uttlesford Local Plan and approve it for publication.

CAB22 5-YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY STATEMENT (5YHLS)

Councillor Evans presented the report regarding the 5-year housing land supply statement (5YHLS). He said it was important to note that the statement identified a land supply position of 5.14 years, using a base date of 1st April 2023. He asked Cabinet to note its contents and approve for publication.

Members of Cabinet welcomed the report. The Leader said this positive news demonstrated that the Planning department was improving.

RESOLVED to note the updated 5YHLS Statement and approve it for publication.

CAB23 DRAFT UTTLESFORD LOCAL PLAN 2021 - 2041 (REGULATION 18) CONSULTATION

Councillor Evans invited the Interim Planning Policy Manager to make a presentation to Cabinet on the draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation. The slides have been appended to these minutes.

The Chair invited members to ask questions on the presentation.

In response to a question from Councillor Reeve regarding whether multiple Regulation 18 consultations could be held, the Interim Planning Policy Manager said he was not aware of a limit to the number of Regulation 18 consultations that could be conducted during the Local Plan process. However, the real constraint would be time due to a June 2025 deadline to submit a Local Plan. He said it would be prudent to progress the plan in a time effective manner.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Interim Planning Policy Manager confirmed that live planning sites would be factored into the housing allocations as the Plan progressed.

In response to a question from Councillor Barker regarding how larger and smaller villages were defined in the draft Local Plan, the Portfolio Holder for Planning said the definition, and justification thereof, would be included in the

evidence base papers to be published with the Council agenda papers on 20 October 2023.

In response to a question from Councillor Pavitt regarding whether the Regulation 18 draft Plan held any weight in development management terms, the Interim Planning Policy Manager said that the draft Local Plan would hold little weight until it reached the stage of the Inspector's evaluation. He also confirmed that if the draft Local Plan was not approved at the Regulation 19 stage in the process, the draft Local Plan submitted at the Regulation 18 stage would hold no weight in planning terms. He said speculative development would continue until a Local Plan was adopted by the district.

Councillor Evans proposed recommending the draft Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation to Council for approval. He said opening up the Plan for public comment was necessary in order to accrue further evidence and to give the public their say on the draft proposals. There was much work to be done and the draft Local Plan needed to be progressed onto the next step in the process.

Councillor Gregory asked for confirmation that the evidence base for the draft Local Plan would be made available to members on 20 October. This was confirmed.

Councillor Reeve commended the report and said there were many positives in the draft Local Plan, such as 35% affordable housing, employment hubs and climate change measures. He said he did not like the proposals regarding the Countryside Protection Zone (CPZ) around Stansted Airport but it was right to send this out for consultation in order for the public to comment. He noted that both the Local Plan Leadership Group and Scrutiny Committee had recommended the draft Plan for approval.

Councillor Gregory said the Scrutiny Committee's resolution was subject to the evidence base being made available to all members on 20 October.

Councillor Coote thanked officers and members for their hard-work in producing the draft Local Plan. He said he did not believe in the concept of Local Plans, which he said were imposed on local authorities by central Government, due to the critical underfunding of local government, and the fact that central Government was not producing the necessary infrastructure projects to underpin large scale developments. He commended the draft Local Plan as a necessary and lawful step towards guarding the district against speculative development.

Councillor Hargreaves said that 48% of sites contained in the draft Local Plan had been subject to full or partial refusals on planning appeals, and there was no evidence to consider how suitable these sites were for development. He listed a number of sites to demonstrate his point.

Councillor Gregory said these claims were unevidenced and he was stunned that a live planning application had been cited during a Cabinet meeting. He would be making a complaint on the matter.

Councillor Hargreaves said he could also not see how larger and smaller villages had been defined for the purposes of housing allocations in the draft Local Plan, and questioned the lack of allocations in Elsenham, the Leader's ward. He said he presumed a second regulation 18 consultation would be held in future but would abstain from the current vote due to the lack of evidence available.

Councillor Gregory said the administration had committed itself to a Local Plan process that was evidence led. He believed that it had been but emphasised that if the evidence base was not made available on 20 October, he would be voting against the draft Local Plan at the Council meeting on 30 October.

Councillor Sutton said she had great concerns over the CPZ as the ward member for Takeley, but also appreciated that the district needed a Local Plan in order to prevent speculative development. She said she would be abstaining from the vote due to her concerns regarding the CPZ.

The Chair said that the administration did not have a whip in place, and that she accepted and appreciated her fellow members position in respect of the draft Local Plan. She said this demonstrated that there had been absolutely no political interference in the Plan, and it had been led by technical evidence. She said the evidence base would be published on 20 October 2023.

Councillor Pavitt said the Local Plan was a live and evolving process; if the Council did not move to Regulation 18 the public would have no formal say in the Local Plan. He said it was vital to put the draft Local Plan in the public domain in order for it to be shaped directly by residents, and he urged people to respond to both the Regulation 18 & 19 Consultations if they did go forward.

Councillor Evans said the "time was nigh" to put forward the draft Local Plan for the Regulation 18 Consultation and proposed approval of the recommendations set-out in the report.

Councillor Reeve seconded the proposal.

The Chair moved to a vote. The proposal was approved with 4 votes for, 0 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED to:

- I. Recommend to Council that the Draft Uttlesford Local Plan 2021 – 2041 (Regulation 18) document is published for six weeks consultation 3rd November 2023 to 15th December 2023.
- II. Provide delegated authority for the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Infrastructure and Stansted Airport to make any minor corrections prior to consultation, including for typographical and formatting purposes.
- III. Note the technical supporting evidence in preparation for publication alongside the Draft Uttlesford Local Plan 2021 – 2041 consultation.

The meeting was closed at 9.10pm.

Public Statements: Cabinet, 16 October 2023

J Johnson

The UDC local plan puts a line through the Countryside Protection Zone and wipes out most of the land between the A120 and the B1256 – land that borders Hatfield Forest. Land that keeps this Stansted - the airport of the Countryside. Your new proposal to remove large swathes of the CPZ means no buffer with the airport - just acres of warehousing and traffic.

Hatfield Forest – directly opposite this parcel of the CPZ - is recognised as sensitive. We can at least agree on that. What I cannot accept is 37 acres of open farmland within a CPZ being turned into a giant warehousing and logistics site with horrendous consequences for an already threatened SSSI and of course the amenity of local residents.

Your own CPZ study states that the parcel near Hatfield Forest that you intend to remove “Plays an essential role in preventing development between the airport and Takeley Street and Hatfield Forest. Any significant new development within the parcel would be likely to result in a perception of merging between Start Hill and Takeley Street”. It also suggests “Consider extending the boundary of the CPZ to Flitch Way to the south of Takeley Street”. But you have done the opposite. It goes on to say the damage would be “high”.

Hatfield Forest WILL suffer from removal of this land from the CPZ and mitigation will not help. The Developer – in one of their many previous attempts to develop this land – suggests there would be 1600 workers who will “benefit from the proximity to Hatfield Forest and the informal recreation offer that it provides”.

This land has been put forward by Developers many times with the usual glossy brochures and UDC have previously rejected it as unsuitable. I fail to understand why it is suddenly suitable. This land is not even needed for employment. I quote your own report “In aggregate the total developable land....is significantly more than the net additional land requirement for industrial sites”.

Let me further quote one of your objectives: to “Promote modal shift away from the private car and reduce the need to travel, whilst protecting residents and the natural environment from the impacts of congestion, air pollution and noise pollution. Preserve areas of rural tranquillity”.

This proposal is completely counterintuitive to that objective.

Then of course there is the water that will be generated by a 37acre Logistics site. Natural England says that “New discharges must not be in or within 500m of an SSSI. So – where will the water go? The flowing roadside ditch takes water across the road to Shermore Brook and on to the Lake at Hatfield Forest – a “unique site of National Importance”.

There is no mains drainage here, so pollutants and effluent will have no where else to go.

A Evans

I note that the sustainability appraisal document for consideration was dated October – so the LPLG could not have read it before recommending the draft plan to Cabinet. Maybe the LUC document would have been influential – but that

was not commissioned until August according to the website - so unlikely to have been available before the meeting.

The LPLG were concerned about justification of figures. Your Draft Plan says that Stansted is the second largest airport. Yet your sustainability document states it is the 3rd or 4th – Enlighten us to what it is, it cannot be all three

Sadly, this is just one example of the inaccuracies that undermines the credibility of the Draft Plan.

Your employment allocations is puzzling - You state that approx. 10ha of employment land overall is required by 2033 – yet you allocate 15ha in just one site alone, on the B1256, isolated away from the A120. A vast proposal with buildings that dwarf the diamond hanger – in old money this is 37 acres of land when 153 acres was recently approved at Stansted Northside, only a few 100 yards north and with direct links to major routes, and no impact to residential areas.

Access to this site would be via the B1256 adjacent to housing. In laymen's terms - massive warehousing and distribution operations in a residential area and within a mile of Junction 8 of the M11 – already over capacity, with the Northside not yet built, and an airport not yet running at full capacity.

You have gone on to say that manufacturing will decrease - and warehousing and distribution will grow. We know from the Developers that they have talked to at least 2 major distribution companies - identifying at least two major logistics operators – one recently having an application turned down by PINS on land adjacent to Jct 8, which we note is also raised in your report. Bearing in mind this was only a 5ha site with 3ha to be developed.

Para 5.5.9 of your sustainability document states with regard to - “the 15ha site at Takeley Street - it is recognised that this site is subject to significant constraint.”

One of those constraints in your own words is.... *“There is need for ongoing consideration of capacity issues at M11 J8”*. - Bearing in mind there is also no mains drainage, a poor water supply and no easy access to the A120. You cannot deliver the infrastructure in time.

It has been suggested that the B1256 can take the traffic flows - because it used to be the A120 – It CANNOT. It already has to accept all HGV's for the quarries and industrial sites in and around Elsenham - because of numerous weight restrictions on surrounding roads.

An FOI to Essex highways revealed in their words *“The B1256 approach to the M11 is a difficult balance between improving it and encouraging more traffic through the village and therefore they have kept upgrades to a minimum”*

It is hard to reconcile this area as a major distribution centre with the Net Zero targets UDC wish to achieve.

It is frustrating that the Uttlesford limehouse consult page is not in use with the plan as it was with previous plans. This makes it more than impossible for members of the public to find any information on the plan or comments made by third parties such as developers.

- The impact on Hatfield Forest and the village will be significant. Residents cannot run a bath or take a shower at peak times and affinity have no plans to upgrade the supply.
- A developer stated “The rate of unemployment in the District is lower than the national average (2.2% for the District compared with 5.1% for England).

Bill Critchley

Councillors, I have seen the blueprint for the new local plan. 15 hectares of warehousing, 1600 houses, a community hub and, schools all along the B1256 this is not sustainable. The sustainability appraisal is seriously flawed, containing many assumptions and errors.

Commenting on the appeal for 1200 homes at Little Easton, Mark Norman of National Highways confirmed that the road infrastructure would not cope, junction 8 of the m11 will require significant upgrade. UDCs own objections centred around traffic levels. Why are planners shortsighted and not supporting future rail R120, or the Haverhill link. NPPF 73 and 105 prescribe genuine choice of travel modes. This plan places transport exclusively on roads.

This blueprint proposes predatory development by Weston Homes with Essex Council looking to maximise land values.

Following the initial scoping report I would remind councillors of their commitment to support the CPZ. In their Preliminary Outline Strategy Report, September 2021, agenda ref CAB39 UDC cabinet endorsed the following statement “Development should avoid altering the Countryside Protection Zone (CPZ) boundaries, particularly where this would harm the purposes of the CPZ.” Unelected officials choose to ignore this policy. When viewed on a map the zones provide a buffer to the airport but cannot be considered as disproportionate or excessive.

At the recent local plan leadership group meeting much was made by officials of the limited time available, however unless the plan has the support of residents and outside agencies then it's likely to fall at any of the forthcoming hurdles, reg19 or even reg 22. Even at reg 22 residents can raise their objections. Reset the timeline now, rather than failing reg 19 and having to rescope sites which will create further delays with an additional consultation. Delay the consultation for a couple of months rescope the sites

in line with the scoping report and issue a revised plan that is more acceptable to residents and councillors. Or is the consultation just a tick box exercise?

I would remind councillors of their election pledges, including At any council there are many priorities, competing view points, and difficult decisions to be made, but we will always seek to put residents first. We will work to a deliver a new local plan to protect our communities from predatory development. In all conscientious can you support this seriously flawed plan.

M Marriage

I'm Mike Marriage and I'm speaking on behalf of the 591 members of STOP The Warish Hall Development group. Our group is not opposed to development generally, or development in Takeley specifically.

Instead the group was formed to protect the rural heart of Takeley, namely the area around the Ancient Woodland of Prior's Wood, the Protected Lane of Warish Hall Road and Smiths Green, which will hopefully soon become a conservation area.

Development on these sites was unanimously refused by UDC's Planning Committee in December 2021 and then dismissed at a subsequent appeal. A further application for a smaller parcel known as "Jacks" was refused by a second inspector when submitted under S62A.

We were therefore shocked to see these sites, which this council has just spent many thousands of pounds defending at appeal, now designated for development in the emerging Local Plan.

Tonight, our group has one simple request, that these areas of land be removed from the Takeley Framework.

In the recent Takeley Parish Plan Questionnaire, woodland was listed as THE most important landscape feature, prioritised by 95% of respondents.

Given that Prior's Wood is the only prominent woodland in the Parish, it can be reasonably assumed that it is one of, if not the, most valuable landscape asset to our community. The draft plan proposes built development tight in on three sides of this irreplaceable heritage asset.

To quote the NPPF:

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland...) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

The documents before you tonight provide zero evidence of "wholly exceptional reasons" for development in this location.

In fact, the Sustainability Appraisal actually says this of the allocations in Takeley:

... there is a not a clear strategic choice to the same extent as is the case for certain other settlements.

The inspector from the Warish Hall Development appeal said that these sites, I quote:

26. ... form part of the wider open countryside to the north of Takeley and Smiths Green, and are an integral part of the local landscape character. They share their affinity with the countryside. This gives this part of the appeal site a high susceptibility to change...

He went on:

"27. In my judgement, the development would introduce an urban form of development that would not be sympathetic to the local character and landscape setting..."

Please don't be fooled by the "Site Development Templates" document before you, which misleadingly promises a minimum 15m buffer around Priors Wood. A 15m buffer is physically impossible given the pinch point to the west of the wood. A new road would have to be built right next to the wood. It is unarguable that this development would be detrimental to the Ancient Woodland. No "wholly exceptional reasons" have been given.

These sites are relatively minor in scale and could be removed without compromising the Plan's progress. Please don't be fobbed off by excuses of "we can fix this later". This is clearly wrong and needs to be fixed before it progresses any further.



Good evening, I am Cllr Jackie Cheetham and I am speaking on behalf of Takeley Parish Council.

The Parish Council appreciates the amount of hard work taken to produce the new draft Local Plan, and we are aware that the timetable is time constrained.

We will be providing evidence in our consultation response regarding the allocations for Takeley, but wish to flag up now the totally inappropriate inclusion of the Warish Hall Bull Field/Jacks Field sites, which have been dismissed by the Inspectorate more than once in the last fifteen months. Your own Officers at the Scrutiny Committee have said that “the plan will change substantially between Reg 18 and Reg 19.” This area should not be in either Regulation as we know from bitter experience that once a site has been flagged up in a draft local plan document, Developers start to use it to try and persuade the Council or the Inspectorate to allow planning permission.

We are extremely concerned that proposing to change the boundary of the CPZ in the Reg 18 consultation risks speculative development in the CPZ from the moment the document goes out to consultation. Officers are already aware of a developer telling an inspector that their application has more weight because it’s in the draft Local Plan, and that’s even before the consultation has started. All Developers are ready to pounce on any weakness in the CPZ, and urban sprawl will be very difficult to resist without a strong and clear policy intention.

There is no relevant justification in the plan to explain the CPZ boundary change. We have already provided evidence to the Scrutiny Committee, to



TAKELEY PARISH COUNCIL

correct an error where the document states that a reason for the change is that Stansted Airport has become the second busiest airport in the country. There is also no reason to manipulate the Zone for convenience or ease to extend Priors Green because the boundary was not changed when Priors Green was itself allocated for airport-related housing. The original CPZ boundaries were drawn before the new A120 was built to protect the airport and the surrounding villages from coalescence and that reason has not gone away. If you take a large area out now you will find it very hard to stop the rest being eroded. This policy was put in place for a purpose and should remain untouched in fact your own consultants (LUC) recommended strengthening the policy. We therefore urge UDC to remove this small part of the draft document and retain the CPZ, as the LPLG has requested, and that includes keeping to the existing boundary lines.

We are concerned there is an inconsistency in the settlement hierarchy, where Priors Green, is listed as a small town and Flich Green, an almost identical settlement, is listed as a small village. Clearly there is an inequality in this approach but more importantly, taking this error into Reg 18 is unfair.

We understand that the evidence base is late and that responses to Reg 18 will be considered with a view to potentially significant changes for Reg 19. In these circumstances, therefore UDC should be open to more flexibility. Takeley has engaged consultants to work on its neighbourhood plan and other parishes will be in a similar position, able to contribute evidence on strategic sites.



TAKELEY PARISH COUNCIL

In returning to our main issue, we hope that UDC restores the CPZ and removes the greatest risk to the plan, and we hope that UDC will encourage joint working with the parishes to produce a sound plan as soon as possible.

Mr and Mrs Evans public statement: Cabinet 16/10/23

In the context of our most recent communication with the Planning Inspectorate with regard to the regenerated Weston Homes proposal (attached below) and having read through the Updated Local Development Scheme as it proposes to effect Takeley, we pose the following questions:

Who is running UDC's approach to the Local Development Scheme? Is it our elected representatives or, a wayward Planning Department with perhaps, a hidden agenda to undermine our elected representatives and make them appear incompetent, by creating illogical reasoning in documents?

For example, in respect of the proposals for Takeley, who is responsible for going against the findings of Mr McCoy last year and more recently, his fellow Planning Inspectors and placing into the Development Scheme recommendations, that have been ruled against, for very sound reasons, at the highest Planning level.

Are members of the Planning department too close to potential developers, including Essex County Council, who stand to benefit substantially from this Scheme?

With such obvious reasoning flaws in the plan, as it affects Takeley and no doubt elsewhere, are our council representatives at risk of being made to look foolish again, as happened with the Stansted enquiry?

When I attended Mr McCoy's enquiry last year, over and over again the Weston Homes legal team, denigrated UDC's planning competence (special measures), in the attempt to bulldoze their original scheme through.

In our long business experience, peculiar things can happen, when so much is at stake!

The land is accessed via: a Z-bend through Church End and over a narrow bridge; St Edmunds Way residential road which already struggles with being treated as a 'rat run'; a windy country road out to Stebbing. As can be clearly seen by anybody visiting the site, none of these access roads are suitable for the addition of anything between 800 and 1,600 more cars (as a very conservative estimate), as well as school traffic and buses. This development will cause appalling traffic problems, and no amount of 'improvement' to these roads will counteract this. Which leads to the next point.

Church End is supposed to be a conservation area. It used to be considered important to maintain some sense of the history and uniqueness of a town or village, to ensure that its identity was maintained for future generations to appreciate as we have, and to ensure our history wasn't swallowed up in the name of progress. The addition of this huge amount of housing and traffic will effectively ruin Church End and the views down to it.

This view down to Church End comes by the fact it is in the river valley, which leads to the next major issue: flood risk. Although work further up the river as alleviated some risk for the residents who live close to the river at present, the addition of huge swathes of hard surface on the sloping land above the river will undeniably increase the run off straight down to the river at times of high rain fall. This cannot be argued and it must be expected that any developer MUST provide proven measures to stop water run off to the river, and not be allowed to reduce these measures once building starts.

Finally, this area of land is full of deer and birds, which use the established tree and bush filled perimeters to move across the countryside. Is it too much to demand that developers are forced not to touch these borders at all? Too often they tidy and thin, or even remove completely, these established nature corridors. The developers then throw in some whips surrounded by plastic, stop watering them and consider the 'nature' side of things done. Or turf large areas as 'green space'. We all know this is entirely pointless for nature.

Thank you for your attention and I look forward to hearing further how I can keep fighting against this proposal.

I'm writing to outline my concern and objection to the 1600+ houses and enormous industrial site being considered in takeley/great hallingbury border.

I live at the old elm on the corner of B1256 and Tilekiln Road. My building is c15 and will be severely affected by additional lorries and cars passing ten feet of my house on B1256 accessing junction 8 of the M11.

Having lived at this property for over 25 years I see first hand the noise and vibrations heavy traffic causes, let alone the pollution of traffic, especially when it's at a standstill right outside my front door with the sheer weight of traffic. Not only will we suffer this at certain hours of the day but it will be ALL day and ALL through the night too if the proposed industrial site is to be 24/7 which is what is proposed as I understand.

I'm also very concerned that the sites will be on CPZ land which was put in place to protect small villages such as ours from industrial building and dense housing.

In spite of the ongoing work to try and improve the area around junction 8, which has been a nightmare in itself for the last year or so, and still we have no date to finish it, there is no way this part of the motorway will cope - and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to work that out!

As the M11 is being used more and more, the amount of weekly accidents that close this motorway will only make this area around start hill a bottleneck and cars and lorries will take the shortcut past our house down tilekiln green road to access the M11 at junction 7a. It happens now so will only get hundreds of times worse!

Please take it from me, a resident of great hallingbury who lives in the corner of B1256/Tilekiln road...I see and hear it all! It will make living here almost impossible (it's unbearable now)! My 500 year old house will be shaken to the bone and our lives will be blighted by even more fumes and noise.

Please see sense and not even consider putting this development here.

16th October 2023.

ATTN : Local Planning Committee.

Re: Local plan

I wish to raise great concern I have for the Uttlesford local plan. I have lived in the area all my life and have seen great changes in the area.

The suggestion of removal of CPZ land in the proposed local plan, is incredibly horrifying. The Countryside Protection Zone policy was put in place in the 80s. To protect the local area and environment with the expansion of London Stansted. Whilst there is an airport in the area then the CPZ is still current and we should not dismiss its importance.

For all the home owners who purchased the property, like myself, in an area of legal protection. Removing such a strong policy will have a huge detrimental affect. Removing Sites from the CPZ which will affect residential properties should be heavily compensated. After all decisions to purchase's property was reliant on the CPZ policy.

It is a particular concern with the mention in the plan document on page 28, ("finally, there is a site available adjacent to the M11 junction, but an application was recently refused by the planning inspector. It is recognised that there is a clear case for focusing employment land adjacent to the M11 junction 8, although there is also merit in employment close to Takeley").

This site was a protected site, it contained ancient woodland and protected habitats. This was allowed to be destroyed with local authorities backing. If it wasn't for local residents who stood up to the developers to stop a 24/7 logistic development being built, and the government inspector recognising that it was a very unsuitable site as its position too close to junction 8 and residential properties.

In this above case is the local plan really recognising the feelings of the local residents? I think not the over development of Takeley and Canfield is catastrophic. This needs to stop and other areas connected to the M11 need to be considered for industrial development especially.

Look at schools, road infrastructure, medical centres and local amenities for the people who already live here. Before proceeding with any other huge development. Base the local plan on what's needed here and not profiteering developers under the guise of a housing shortage.

Please consider how we can relieve the housing crisis without losing green space! People move here to reap the benefits. Then what I consider our greatest benefit is then built on so more people can move in that have no clue what a fox, deer or a badger is.

As for a need for industrial land in Takeley, there is a huge industrial site planned at the airport site. This is close to Takeley. Restrictions stop industrial vehicles using the airport road. Which means large vehicles can't access the A120, without going through the villages on the B1256. How stupid is this?

In my teens my school bus would drive out of the road Bury lodge lane, (Kearsley Airways), turn left to Takeley, and STOP. Yes in the 1980s traffic would queue all the way down to the four ashes. It was a great idea to build the new A120 and yes it changed Takeley for the better. BUT now the heavy traffic which drives down the B1256, past many historic buildings, and home is getting heavier and heavier.

A plot of land suggested for a huge industrial area between Takeley Street and Stane Street which is at the moment within the CPZ. This site would bring more heavy traffic through Takeley and add to the heavy congestion at Junction 8 of the M11. Junction 8 is running at full capacity and the surrounding villages are increasingly taking the strain with no other alternative routes.

The site runs parallel to Hatfield forest and the environment and ecological impact this will have to the forest and surrounding woodland to the south of the plot. Surely this goes against government environmental policy and Uttlesfords own environmental policy?

I feel the overall the local plan proposal is reliant too heavily on the Takeley, Great Hallingbury and Canfield area and feel that Uttlesford has not been completely represented as a whole area. As a area I think we are done.

I am unable to attend the meeting at Saffron Walden on the 16th October 2023. Please take my views into account and include this as my statement.
Please please listen to local people enough is enough.

Yours sincerely

Diane Conway
Resident



Cabinet – October 16th 2023

Overview



1. Introduction
2. Draft Uttlesford Local Plan 2021 – 2041 Consultation
3. Next steps.
4. Any further questions and discussion?



1. Introduction

- The existing Uttlesford Local Plan is **out-of-date**.
- There have been two plans rejected by the Planning Inspectorate (**in 2014 and 2019**).
- The Council need a new Local Plan that is ‘demonstrably’ **sound**.
- This will ensure the Council can **gain control** of planning to support sustainable and quality development that is supported by appropriate infrastructure.
- We need to move away from unplanned, speculative development, that does not adequately plan for infrastructure – with no Plan, this form of development is likely to continue.



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

Key Issues we are seeking to address:

- We need to be demonstrably following the advice from the previous Planning Inspectors to identify a range of sites of different size, type and geography. This is important to ensure a rolling land supply, to provide choice and support early delivery – and to ensure the plan is **SOUND**.
- We need to develop a strategy in the context of what this Plan needs to do – if we need c. 5,000 homes on strategic sites across the district, it wouldn't be reasonable to plan for 5,000 to 10,000 homes on a single site (in this Plan).
- We need to support **sustainable** development, by maximising opportunities for walking, cycling, public transport, and proximity to services/ employment etc – this also supports our employers/ retailers/ service providers.
- We need to ensure that any proposed allocations are providing for a range of new services, facilities and **infrastructure** that benefit our main existing (most sustainable) communities as well as any new residents – we know there is a deficit affecting many of our communities.
- It is important the Plan can be found **SOUND** – it needs to be consistent with Government Policy, Guidance and Legislation.



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

- We are producing a **Draft Local Plan** for consultation. This is the Regulation 18 stage of plan making.
- This is an important stage in the process because the Council '**can**' (**and is likely to**) make changes to the document after the consultation, before the next stage.
- The next stage will be to produce the version of the Plan the Council intend to submit to the Secretary of State, that is the **Publication Plan** (Regulation 19), that is intended for publication in Summer 2024.
- The Council '**Cannot**' make any significant changes to the Publication Plan. Any consultation responses at that stage are forwarded to the Planning Inspector (s) and become business for the Examination.
- So, it is very important the Draft Plan is as detailed as possible, as that maximises the value of the Consultation. The more people can see what is proposed, the more than can respond. This is invaluable to ensure we have **meaningful and genuine consultation**.



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

How do we process the Consultation Responses?

- We will consider every response we receive to the consultation.
- We will produce a comprehensive report setting out all of the comments and who has made them. They will be organised by topic, so it will be easy to see what has been said about each and every part of the Plan.
- For all the substantive points raised (i.e., each different issue) – we will provide a response for how the Plan will be changed, or why it isn't being changed if that is the case.

Page 23

It will be easy to see:

- What has been said in relation to each issue raised.
 - Who has said what.
 - And, how the Council intends to respond.
- The report will be published alongside the updated Plan at the next stage around June/ July 2024



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

Planning for Housing

- Our updated Housing Need is for **13,680** homes.
- We need to plan for some headroom, so we build flexibility and contingency into the Plan.
- We already have:
 - **980** homes completed (completions) since April 2021
 - **5,800** homes that have planning consent (commitments) up to April 2023*
 - A Windfall allowance for the Plan period of **1,500** homes
- This is **8,280** to contribute towards the total.
- We are proposing **5,076** homes on Strategic Allocations
- And **1,000** homes on non-strategic sites.
- This means we are currently planning for **14,356** homes in total.

*please note that we can anticipate the commitments figure increasing since April 2023, which may provide flexibility for 'adjusting' the extent of proposed allocations at the next stage of the process



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

The Emerging Strategy

- We are proposing Ten Strategic Sites at our most sustainable settlements.
- We have developed indicative master-plans for each proposal so we can start to demonstrate how the sites ‘could’ come forward. This helps to demonstrate the sites will include:
 - **Environmental** – large areas of open space with appropriate and sensitive consideration for landscape/ heritage/ biodiversity and opportunities for enhancing many of these features.
 - **Infrastructure** – including new schools, local centres, leisure and community facilities, including for health care, along with provision for utilities, etc.
 - **Transport** – maximising opportunities for supporting walking, cycling, public transport and improving accessibility. At Saffron Walden a new link road is proposed between Thaxted Road and Radwinter Road that is shown to have positive effects on traffic in the town centre, along with providing for a wide range of other benefits.
- These are proposals to help ensure the consultation is meaningful. There is scope to continue to refine them for the next stage of the Plan.



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

The Emerging Strategy

Page 26

Settlement	Completions	Commitments	Proposed Allocations	Total
Key Settlements				
Great Dunmow	416	2,361	869	3,646
Saffron Walden	189	1,020	1,280	2,489
Stansted Mountfitchet	18	37	390	445
Local Rural Centres				
Elsenham	17	1,017	0	1,034
Great Chesterford	36	193	0	229
Hatfield Heath	1	41	0	42
Newport	42	113	412	567
Takeley	273	489	1,636	2,398
Thaxted	6	78	489	573

Please note these are provisional figures

This equates to around 43% of the proposed growth at our Key Settlements and 31% at our Local Rural Centres. The proposed non-strategic growth at our Larger Villages is around 6%.



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

Why are there no proposals at Elsenham, Great Chesterford or Hatfield Heath?

Elsenham:

There are a number of suitable sites for development at Elsenham, but these already have planning permission and there are already over 1,000 homes committed at this settlement.

Great Chesterford:

Again, there are sites at Great Chesterford that could support sustainable development, but in one instance it would rely on access from neighbouring South Cambridgeshire. This may be possible and could be considered in the future, but given there is substantial uncertainty concerning the delivery of a Local Plan for Greater Cambridgeshire, there would be uncertainty surrounding the delivery of the site at the current time.

Hatfield Heath:

This settlement is located entirely within the Green Belt. As there are numerous opportunities to bring forward development elsewhere in the district and outside of the Green Belt there are not thought to be any 'exceptional circumstances' to justify development at Hatfield Heath.



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

What about Appeal Sites?

- Some of the proposed allocations include areas that have previously been subject to planning applications that were refused at Appeal.
- Any refusals at Appeal were for technical reasons, such as a particular constraint not being adequately mitigated or addressed in the design for the development.
- This does not rule out the potential for development in any circumstances, it just means that the reason for refusal needs to have been adequately addressed.
- It may be that a proposed allocation is for a larger area and would support a more comprehensive development proposal that could more successfully and adequately address any constraints.



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

What about the relationship between Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan?

- There is a great deal of very helpful policy and guidance set out in the NPPF and PPG to assist us. These are clear what the role is for Local Plans and Neighbourhoods Plans and what is expected for each.
- The PPG provides some helpful guidance about the role of Neighbourhood Plans. For example:
 - “A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the local plan”.
 - “Only a draft Neighbourhood Plan or Order that meets each of a set of basic conditions can be put to a referendum and be made” – this includes: “is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area”.
 - “Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies”.
 - “Neighbourhood planning groups should also give particular consideration to the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites (of a size consistent with Paragraph 69 – i.e., no larger than one hectare) suitable for housing in their area”.
- The Council will continue to positively support communities who wish to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to help to make them as effective as possible.



2. Draft Local Plan 2021 - 2041

Employment

- The updated evidence identified a residual need for around 4.5 hectares for office uses and around 25 to 30 hectares for industrial uses - split between:
 - up to 5 hectares at Saffron Walden
 - 5 to 10 hectares at Great Dunmow, and
 - around 15 hectares in the Stansted area.
- There are four additional sites proposed:
 - **Gaunts End:** Office uses of up to 4.5 hectares.
 - **Saffron Walden (Land North of Thaxted Road/ Rear of Knights Road):** Industrial uses up to 3 hectares.
 - **Great Dunmow/ Takeley (Land between A120 & Stortford Road)** – Industrial uses of up to 15 hectares.
 - **Takeley (North of Takeley Street)** - Industrial uses of up to 15 hectares.



3. Next Steps

- **Local Plan Leadership Group:** Wednesday 4th October
- **Scrutiny Meeting:** Wednesday 11th October
- **Cabinet Meeting:** Monday 16th October
- **Full Council:** Monday 30th October

- **Consultation Start:** Friday 3rd November
- **Six weeks consultation to 15th December**

- We then consider all of the consultation responses and update the plan ready for the Publication Stage next year (June/ July 2024)



3. Next Steps

Consultation

- Press Releases in local newspapers, E-newsletters and Social Media – at the beginning of consultation – W/C 30th October
- Community Engagement Events, 3 events will be taking place around the district, Gt. Chesterford, Gt. Dunmow and Manuden (tbc). These sessions will be an opportunity for members of public to look at the draft plan and meet officers to discuss aspects of the plan that are important to them – W/C 13th November
- District wide information booklet drop, informing every household about the LP consultation, what it is, why it's important and how people can comment – W/C 20th November
- Continued E-news and social media will provide further short facts about the plan and provide a countdown to the end of consultation and outline how people can comment. 20th November – 15th December.



4. Questions and Discussion





Round Up & Summary