

Statement by Fiona Wilkinson

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this meeting. I represent Little Chesterford Parish Council.

I would like to draw the committee's attention to several items regarding the Reg18 responses.

Firstly, I would like to highlight the concerns raised by ECC in their responses regarding how UDC intends to effectively deliver the Garden Community principles. As they say, these should ensure "high levels of self-containment from the outset" to distinguish the communities from "large scale housing led development" or "dormitory communities". However they are concerned with UDC's ability to deliver employment within the communities and provide sustainable transport and infrastructure (including schools, healthcare). They also question the effectiveness of the delivery system and whether the simultaneous provision of three Garden Communities is viable, deliverable and cost effective. (Sections 4.5, 4.9, 4.10, 4.10 4.12, 4.16 and 4.28). We share their concerns.

Secondly, I would highlight the many different bodies who have all raised concerns about the transport infrastructure delivery to support the North Uttlesford settlement, in particular the capacity of A505, A1301, M11 and A1307. Concerns have been received from SCDC, Cambridge CC, South Suffolk CC, Essex CC as well as Highways England. Heidi Allen (the MP for South Cambs) has urged UDC to "revisit the transport studies informing the proposal" and "ensure the appropriate improvements to transport infrastructure are included in the plan." We share her concerns that without this, the North Uttlesford Settlement is unsustainable.

I would also like to refer councillors to paragraph 26 of the South Cambs submission where they have demonstrated that the plan can be made more viable by removing North Uttlesford Settlement and increasing the build rate in the other locations to better support sustainability and align to the evidence base

Thirdly, I would like to highlight the requirement from Historic England UDC to carry out full Historic Impact Assessments for all three settlement sites. I would also like to highlight that their concern that North Uttlesford (alone) raises fundamental "in principle issues" and their assertion it is unlikely that further work would realistically address these. We support their contention that the site is unviable on heritage considerations alone.

Lastly, I would like to point out what is missing from the pack. Many of my parishioners have taken the time to write, but there is no summary of the public responses. Also missing are the responses from many stakeholders such as the Wellcome Trust and Heidi Allen, and the Gt Chesterford Parish Council response is incomplete. The plan timetable does not appear to give an opportunity to consider further responses or indeed the missing evidence that has been called for by the statutory consultees. We agree with Essex CC that this timetable is ambitious in view of the ongoing engagement/dialogue needed to address some of the issues that have been identified. We believe failure to consider Regulation 18 responses in full will jeopardise the success of the local plan process.