

CHAPTER 2 – Spatial Portrait, Vision and Objectives

General Comments - No paragraphs

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 15 people/organisations.

	TOTAL
Support	4
Object	10
Comment	1

Overarching Summary

- Representations note that the vision should mention travel and transport, as this is a key concern of residents.
- Concern is expressed over the lack of green space and sport facilities that are to be provided.
- Concern that the objectives and vision will not be realised due to a lack of proposals which ensure that infrastructure will be delivered.
- Concerns are expressed over the evidence base used to inform the plan.

Statutory consultees and other bodies

Stebbing Parish Council - Surprised that the District Council District Council has set out a Spatial Strategy when it is yet apparently to produce a composite Strategic Land Availability Assessment, which is usually the starting point for determining an overall development strategy. Stebbing Parish Council is concerned that the precise scale and distribution of the proposed growth is covered by Policy SP3 in the draft Local Plan which indicates that 4,670 new dwellings (79%) of the 5,929 dwellings required between now and 2033 is to be accommodated in three new settlements to the north, east and west of the District.

Braintree District Council (BDC) - BDC welcomes the reference to the West of Braintree garden community within the Spatial Vision, but notes that there is no mention of travel and transport. As this is a key concern of local residents and as a key part of the strategy forming the garden communities, it may be worth referencing here.

Manchester Airports Groups (MAG) - The importance afforded to the airport in the spatial vision is supported. However, the vision does not address the direct social and economic benefits that the airport does, and will continue, to bring to the District. Instead, the vision focusses narrowly on managing the airport's environmental impacts. In order to more adequately reflect national planning policy objectives, the spatial vision should be amended to reflect the three dimensions to sustainable development in paragraph 7 of the NPPF.

Objective 2a: is welcomed; in particular the reference to employment opportunities related to the airport. Objective 2c, second bullet: this is supported but the theme would be more

effective if there was an explicit aim / commitment to partnership working to deliver transport infrastructure. It would be appropriate to amend the aim to read: Ensuring through partnership working with Highways England, Essex County Council and public transport operators that the cumulative effect of airport and all other planned development within the District is considered so that appropriate surface access infrastructure and service capacity will be provided without impacting on capacity to meet the demands of other network users.

WeAreResidents.org - In relation to Section 2 we note as follows. We have commented previously a number of times on the removal of the paragraph in the 2014 draft Plan which noted Uttlesford's carbon footprint and quite how unsustainable Uttlesford currently is. We would wish that paragraph to be reinstated. In the description of Uttlesford, there is no mention of the lack of green space of any description, other than agricultural land. In terms of the NPPF, this is an extremely important issue. We note also that the draft Spatial Vision makes no reference to the need to increase green space and that it should be amended specifically to refer to achieving this as part of the vision. The Spatial Vision does not appear to be followed by the detailed policies as it refers to making existing settlements clean and safe places to live, but it fails to take any action to assist Saffron Walden's unlawful air pollution levels. The vision refers to there being sustainable alternatives to car use, but the Plan fails to provide for any. There is a need to compare the detailed policies against the Spatial Vision and amend the detailed policies to reflect the Spatial Vision and objectives.

We have difficulty understanding whether the figures set out in Section 17 are actually intended: according to Appendix 2, in the period 2016-2033, the Plan is intended to deliver only 2 ha of allotments, 8 sports pitches and 11ha of natural space and according to Policy SP3, the target for 2011-2033 is 14,100 new homes, of which 2,468 will have been built by 2016, leaving 11,632 new homes to be built in the period 2016-2033. 11,632 homes at 2.2 people per home, which is about the average, equate to some 25,000 new residents in this period, who will be sharing 8 new sports pitches between them! By comparison, South Cambs requires 1.6ha of new sports pitches per 1,000 new people, so they would require 40ha of sports pitches. In the period 2016-2033, UDC should be requiring the delivery of approximately 100 new sports pitches to meet national standards, as required by South Cambs.

Similarly, for natural and semi-natural space, the UDC Open Spaces strategy says there should be provision of about 6ha / 1,000 new residents, so the Plan should be providing for about 150ha rather than the Objective 1d proposal of 11ha.

The requirements in Objective 1d do not even correspond to Policy INF2, which requires 2ha of allotments per 10,000 people; over the Plan period 2016-2033, 5ha of allotments should therefore be being provided.

There is an absence of proposals to ensure that Objectives 1c, 1d and 2b will be achieved and provided.

Developers/landowners/site promoters

- The Spatial Vision is commendable, but won't achieve any of the objectives, as the introduction of three new settlements will completely change the character of the district. New settlements will not comfortably integrate and will be resented by the existing residents, particularly as they will through increased population and

associated traffic, detract from not only the most rural areas but more seriously from the quality of life for the residents of Stansted, Newport, Quendon, Littlebury, Great Chesterford, Dunmow and especially Saffron Walden.

- It is surprising that the UDC has set out a Spatial Strategy when it is yet to produce a composite Strategic Land Availability Assessment, which is usually the starting point for determining an overall development strategy.
- Support for the Spatial Objectives. The land at Thremhall Priory Farm is suitable for employment uses given its proximity to Stansted Airport and strategic road networks. The site is approximately 1.6ha. Thremhall Priory Farm lies between the B1256 (Dunmow Road) and the duelled A120. It is no longer a working farm, as the land has been bought by Stansted Airport for their expansion. The existing dwelling is unoccupied and in a deteriorating state of repair. The site is extremely well contained, with strongly defined boundaries on all sides. Between the northern site boundary and the A120 lies a strip of land which is understood to be within the ownership of Stansted Airport and is used by airport patrol vehicles. There are no public footpaths through the site. Adjoining the eastern boundary are two existing commercial sites. Thremhall Priory Farm is extremely well located, being only 2 minutes from Junction 8 of the M11 and within only 1.5km of the airport. The site is also accessible via public transport where bus services exist along Dunmow Road, providing half hourly services connecting Bishop's Stortford, Takeley, Dunmow and Stansted Airport. It is our client's view that the site represents suitable land in a sustainable location to meet the anticipated needs of new and existing businesses and that Thremhall Priory Farm should be allocated for B1, B2 or B8 uses.
- Supporting the Spatial Vision that focussing new development in the three new garden communities. ANSC supports the ongoing co-operation and joint working between Uttlesford and Braintree Councils to ensure the appropriate strategic and site specific planning for the WBGC.
- There is limited growth in the villages, with most not being allocated with new housing... Concerns with the overall strategy for two key reasons: concerns over the ability of large strategic allocations to deliver, as new settlements and large strategic allocations take time to deliver. We would suggest that the Garden Communities element of the housing trajectory to 2033 is pushed back at least two years, with first delivery of 125 dwellings in 2023-24. This would mean that the 500 dwellings in each of years 2031-32 and 2032-33 will need to be re-provided elsewhere. Secondly the lack of housing allocations in the villages is concerning, because it ignores the future needs of the rural areas. They may need new facilities e.g. play equipment, shop, etc., which may be cross funded i.e. via section 106 agreements relating to new housing developments in those areas. Villages might also need affordable housing which could be delivered via market led housing schemes. Uttlesford has a shortage of affordable housing. Little new provision is being made for some sustainable growth of the villages which national planning policy supports. The strategy for the rural areas is primarily focussed on their protection not their sustainable housing growth. The Plan has not taken an appropriately balanced approach to the proposed strategy, rendering it not fully compliant with national policy. Government has recently recognised that smaller housebuilders can play an important part in housing delivery, yet there are few new allocations that would be suitable for this sector of the housebuilding community.

Individuals

- Local residents have voted by over 95% in the neighbourhood plan opposing the garden community development. Uttlesford should not take into account the views of the landowners in a public consultation as they are biased and will not give a balanced opinion.
- This is the wrong location as support facilities and infrastructure basics are not in place to support a development of this size. Little thought and therefore the implications to the local community are not considered. Funding is not available for key upgrade projects needed to support this development. The consultation is very short for a development of this size with its potential implications over the local area and heritage. The Town and Country Planning Association's guidance states A Garden City's design must enable at least 50% of trips originating in the Garden City to be made by non-car means, with a goal to increase this over time to at least 60% and Garden Cities should be located only where there are existing rapid public transport links to major cities, or where plans are already in place for their provision. These conditions cannot be met. Your proposal talks about Quality of life for residents and maintaining character of the area. Character will be obliterated if this development goes ahead. The proposed development is about twice the size of Saffron Walden, and will dwarf Great Chesterford and will impact on the surrounding villages. A settlement in this location right at the northern edge of the District will therefore do little to service employment in the district, it will only encourage commuting to Cambridge and London. Concern that there is a conflict of interest, as UDC has holdings at Chesterford Research Park.
- Inadequate attention to these matters in the south of the district.
- I object to the plan because it fails to meet its own aim of 'ensure Uttlesford remains a great place to live, to work and to visit. Concerned that the evidence base is wrong and does not support the plan. The proposal for three new garden communities, is not, does not, shape our district in a positive way. In the case of the proposed NUGV there is no reason to select this location other than it was offered by local landowners willing to exchange their heritage for cash. Concerned over the recent loss of a hospital, an ambulance station, the courthouse and the police station, an independent secondary school. The crime rate in Uttlesford in the year ending March 2017 is up by nearly 40% in the period March 2014 to March 2017 and is more than 25% higher than similar areas of South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire
- Spatial Vision/ Transport: The District Council should encourage the extension of the guided busway from Cambridge to Stansted Airport, via Saffron Walden.

Introduction

Paragraphs 2.1- 2.3

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 1 person /organisation.

	TOTAL
Support	0
Object	1
Comment	0

Overarching Summary

- Biased, unsustainable objectives.

Statutory Consultees and other bodies

No comments received.

Individuals

- Biased, unsustainable objectives.

About Uttlesford

Paragraphs 2.4-2.17

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 101 people/organisations.

	TOTAL
Support	5
Object	49
Comment	47

Overarching Summary

- There are a number of representations that ask for UDC to reference the population figure.

- A number of representations are concerned with the inaccuracies in the retail patterns of residents. The inaccuracies are outlined in the representations.
- A number of representations are concerned over the sustainability of the loss of agricultural land for development.
- Concerns that the garden communities will not be sustainable as they will rely on car usage which will increase already high pollution levels.
- Representations are concerned that many of the new residents of the garden communities will commute to work and add to the overcrowded trains.
- A number of representations question the notion that transport links are 'good'.
- Representations question whether employment opportunities are available for the residents of the new garden communities.

Statutory consultees and other bodies

Education and Skills Funding Agency - Welcomes reference within the plan to Objective (1d) Infrastructure.

Great Chesterford Parish Council - The shopping needs of NUGC will be met by Saffron Walden. Concern over traffic congestion on the B184. A settlement which is stand-alone and not on a railway line will inevitably make this worse, not better. NUGC does not go anywhere near achieving this, as it does not maximise the use of sustainable development. To reduce the need to travel, shorten travel distances and make sustainable travel a priority by: Locating development so that the use of sustainable travel modes such as public transport, cycling and walking can be maximised whilst recognising the continuing role that the car has in meeting transport and accessibility needs in the rural area. NUGC does not conserve and enhance the natural environment.

Takeley Parish Council - Grade 2 and Grade 3 Agricultural Land must be preserved. Agricultural land should not be considered for housing for sake of sustainability. As Carbon Dioxide Transmissions levels are high, the likelihood of housing needing cars to access services and facilities must remain a planning consideration. High density housing in single, inaccessible areas with current poor transport links and infrastructure will further exacerbate the problem. Too few roads being an issue that can further impact the current problems. Expansion of the airport must not be so great that air quality is impaired or road networks so congested that emissions build up to even greater levels.

Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Quotes a population of 85,100. I believe this figure is estimated, but based on the 2011 census (beginning of plan period of 75,900 people, occupying 31,300 residences averaging 2.425 persons per household.
- The statement "Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow provide nearly all of the districts food shopping needs" is a gross exaggeration because people in the NW of the area shop in Royston which has a large Tesco Extra and other retail. The south west and mid-west of the area shop in Bishop's Stortford. The extreme east and north east are likely to use Braintree and Haverhill. There are regular (several times a day) food deliveries to all parts of the district by Tesco, Ocado and Sainsbury which is extensively used and growing exponentially. Saffron Walden is a most beautiful

market town but is generally avoided for everyday shopping due to severe congestion at times and a poor choice of retail, particularly clothing and white goods. For these Cambridge and Freeport at Braintree are the most likely choice where you can also do a weekly/monthly main shop.

- Due to the rural nature and history of Uttlesford there are relatively few previously developed and brownfield sites within the District. This is misleading and technically incorrect. The rural economy is thriving; almost all of the 56 parishes have some form of employment sites. These are mostly converted farm buildings but none the less are previously developed brownfield sites.
- Rural jobs no longer exist and people travel to work. Stansted Airport and Chesterford Research Park are the major employment sites. Many people work at home. Many small rural businesses are based permanently from home or home offices.
- 68.4% commute beyond the district boundaries. This figure destroys the myth that new settlements will result in shorter travel distances. Concern that commuting will result in the area just being a dormitory.
- Average house prices in Uttlesford are generally in line with its distance and commuting times from both London and Cambridge. They will remain high unless supply meets demand. Technical advances will change work patterns considerably during the DLP period. Low-cost housing rents are related to open market costs and charged at 80% of open market rents- this is not affordable. The council should control properties at genuinely affordable rents.
- Despite the relatively affluent position of many in the District there are pockets of deprivation as a result of rural isolation and lack of access to services and facilities, particularly for the elderly.
- Concerns over traffic congestion contributing to high carbon dioxide emissions in the District. The M11 J8 interchange is a key junction in the District providing access to London Stansted Airport and the M11 and A120 transport corridors. The B184 forms an important north/ south spine for the District connecting its two largest settlements. In the rest of the District the highway network and transport connections in general are very limited. Consequently, accessibility to services and facilities is an issue. There is no mention of the B1383, which is a vital local link between Bishop's Stortford and the M11. Its importance should not be overlooked and upgrading will be essential if the area is to accommodate the increased population. Houses should be built in proximity of readily accessible railway stations, of which two of the three proposed new settlements are not.
- Concerns over pollution at the major junctions in Saffron Walden. Central Saffron Walden is an AQMA. Within the period of the plan we will have self-driving vehicles running on renewable energy, however there are limited policies to encourage faster take up of and production of renewable energies. All new houses should have charging ports and all have solar panels or solar tiles.
- (Para. 2.17)- O- There is a need to focus new development in locations where there are opportunities to reduce travel between homes, jobs and services and facilities and where there are alternatives to using the car. The new developments do not achieve this objective.
- The Market Town of Bishop's Stortford adjoins the Uttlesford District boundary rather than 'lie close' to it. Paragraph 2.6 should be reworded as follows to ensure the

accuracy of the Plan: "Beyond the District the nearest towns are Bishop's Stortford and Braintree which both lie adjacent to or close to the District's southern boundaries, whilst Cambridge and Chelmsford are also accessible and provide a greater range of services. Further afield is London with good transport links to the District by both road and rail. The south west of the District includes the outer edge of the Metropolitan Green Belt around Bishop's Stortford. London Stansted Airport is located in the south of the District surrounded by a designated Countryside Protection Zone."

- It is important for the local planning authorities to maintain dialogue with neighbouring areas outside the HMA under the Duty to Cooperate. The district will also need to maintain dialogue with the Mayor of London through the Greater London Authority. However, the SHMA 2015 undertakes an assessment of OAN without modelling the needs of the wider area and in particular ignores the implications of known under provision in London and as such is unsound. A review of the OAN methodology accompanies this submission and concludes that the requirement is higher than quoted at 654 dwellings per annum rather than the 641 dwellings per annum currently quoted and as such the total number of dwellings required is 14,388 rather than the 14,100 currently quoted. The local plan should be amended to reflect the current housing need and realistic delivery rates and include additional allocations in order to be considered sound.
- The recognition that "...there is a need to focus new development in locations where there are opportunities to reduce travel between homes, jobs and services and facilities and where there are alternatives to using the car" is welcomed as it will ensure the Plan is effective and in line with national policy regarding reducing the reliance on single occupancy car trips. Greater consideration should be given to the role that Bishop's Stortford, its railway station, shops and services can play in delivering sustainable growth in the district.
- The 2011 Census reveals that the Parish of Widdington has 188 households and a population of 504. The village has small but reasonable range of facilities. The village lies in close proximity to Newport, Saffron Walden and Bishops Stortford which provide good facilities. Bus services serve Widdington, which has previously been under threat. Additional patronage brought by occupiers of new housing development along its route would be helpful to maintaining the bus service in to the future. In nearby Newport and Wendens Ambo the railway services provide destinations to Cambridge and London Liverpool Street. The nearest station (Newport) is within easy cycling distance and bicycles can be parked here. Buses also serve Stansted and Bishop's Stortford for train services there. At paragraph 2.15 the Plan states: 'the District the highway network and transport connections in general are very limited and accessibility to services and facilities is an issue across the District as a whole'. However, Widdington fares well in respect of paragraph 2.15: it is an accessible village with good public transport facilities and is in close proximity to nearby employment and retail centres. As a Category B village, no housing is being proposed for Widdington. We suggest an allowance for a small amount of housing in Widdington should be made to cover the period to 2033. We would suggest that approximately 15 to 20 houses be allocated for Widdington in the Local Plan. This would represent an increase of circa 8% to 10% in the number of village households,

based on those recorded in 2011. Broadly, this suggested allocation would provide an average increase of one dwelling per annum in the village to 2033.

- Felsted is an accessible village by the road network, and by public transport. Felsted is also close to the City of Chelmsford and Broomfield Hospital, major employment areas which can be easily reached from Felsted by regular public transport. The Plan makes no reference to the importance of Broomfield Hospital of Chelmsford as destinations for employment. Stansted airport is also accessible by regular public transport from Felsted. Equally, Chelmsford is accessible for employment, but the does not refer to its importance as an employment pull. Given the accessibility by bus, Felsted is a strong contender for a reasonable amount of new housing development to take account of its sustainable location. Our Suggestion If the LPA is intent on retaining a village settlement hierarchy, our suggestion is that Felsted should be included as a Key Village as it clearly meets the relevant criteria. It should therefore be allocated with new housing to reflect its suggested status as a Key Village. Felsted should be allocated with new housing to take account of its available facilities and services.
- Support paragraph 2.17. Significant housing growth needs to be accommodated within the District. However, the 3 new settlements are going to be slow to deliver and are going to be reliant on significant infrastructure installations that reduce the need to travel. If sustainable growth is to be delivered across the district, the efficient use of sites within the settlement boundaries of the existing Market Towns need to be maximised. Land at Ashdon Road is currently zoned for employment use however there is no reasonable prospect of this employment land coming forward for employment use. The land is brownfield land and is well connected to the already consented residential development at site SAF2. The site is to be directly served by a bus service and enjoys pedestrian and cycle links into the town centre and the facilities and services provided within it (including active and occupied employment sites). This land is entirely suitable for residential use and should be brought forward for new housing. The development will be highly sustainable and, given the land is available now, will help address the Council's housing land supply shortfall which, as confirmed in the recent Little Walden Road appeal decision (APP/C1570/W/17/3168869) is substantial (a shortfall of 1.9 years or 1,216 dwellings has been identified when applying a 20% buffer).

Individuals

- The population figure needs to be referenced. The population growth per annum needs to be shown also to give context for how the local plan is expecting to manage homes, infrastructure etc. within the years the plan references. With no population reference, trend or expectations then the plan cannot possibly have a sustainable objectives and delivery goals.
- Agree this is a rural area, necessary to produce food and openness for society
- There is a need to say when the population was 85,100.
- Other centres besides Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow provide schools and health services, and these towns do not provide for "nearly all" the District's food shopping needs. Residents of Elsenham and Stansted Mountfitchet shop either in Stansted Mountfitchet or in Bishop's Stortford.

- Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow will be swamped by this amount of new housing. There is no population reference, trend or expectations. This plan does not have sustainable objectives and delivery goals. Concern over congested roads.
- Concerned that there are not the employment opportunities to support development in Dunmow and West of Braintree. The M11 corridor is a more suitable location for development. Stansted cannot employ the inhabitants of the 10,000-20,000 proposed new homes. Concern over congestion on the A120.
- UDC is seriously overstating the number of houses required. The latest statistics show that immigration has reduced substantially since the expansion of Stansted. UDC Have not taken in to account significant house building at Bishops Stortford, Harlow North and Braintree.
- Rail links from London to Stansted airport are adequate for the moment, but with no real effective public transport links from Great Dunmow to Stansted. The car parking provisions both at Stansted and the other stations in the area are very expensive. It is not reasonable to say that the rail transport links to London from Dunmow are "good" relying as they do on car usage for it to be a 2-hour commute to London. X2
- Not everyone would agree with good transport links by both road and rail.
- The transport links into London and Cambridge by rail are terrible - frequent delays, cancellations, late running trains with above inflation ticket price rises. Concern that this will worsen with more people from the housing developments. Great Dunmow does not have a rail station so you still have potentially thousands more people driving to get to the nearest train station. Concern that the bus service is poor. For example, buses for the elderly are hardly used and have seen cut backs in service by 40% in the past year. The roads around Uttlesford are in disrepair and there has been no new road infrastructure built to take account of this massive increase in traffic. X2
- Transport links are poor in the Great Dunmow area. It is expensive to park at rail stations
- Objection to good transport links. Trains from Braintree to London run every hour, and parking is severely limited and expensive. Concern that the plan does not concern the existing community, but rather the commuters. Concern over infrequent buses with poor links, especially to local train stations and larger towns from the villages. Any new development in the Dunmow area (particularly the proposed West of Braintree development) will be heavily car dependent.
- Transport links from the Andrewsfield, West of Braintree area cannot be described as "good". Travel by train involves getting to Braintree, Chelmsford or Bishop's Stortford. Parking is expensive, busy, and causes traffic congestion. Concerned that bus services in the area are not adequate for commuting.
- Transport links are dreadful! Concern that the WoBGC will not cycle. The A120 is at capacity & will only get worse once it is duelled all the way to Marks Tey. Concern that the country roads are dangerous. Concern that increased traffic congestion will destroy agricultural land, decrease air quality and create grid lock.
- Is there a policy to meet the expected rise in older people in the District?
- The rail links are not good, particularly as Braintree has such a limited timetable. Also with recent local developments the B1256 has an increased amount of traffic making it difficult to exit the villages during peak periods.

- The infrastructure does not exist to support the plan. Transport links are inadequate. Braintree Rail Station is on a one-train-per-hour branch line requiring users to change at Witham to continue any journey. Concern that the B1256 and the A120 will not be able to accommodate substantial increases in traffic volume. Concern that infrastructure such as schools and hospitals are too few and too far away to support development.
- Haverhill should be added to nearby towns, as there are good parking facilities, public transport connections and shopping facilities.
- If UDC really did value its historic sites, ancient woodland, listed buildings and everything else listed, then they would listen to their residents & not build such large developments but smaller infill sites which residents would accept.
- It seems that the plan is endangering the 'distinct rural character of the District'. Concerned that historic villages and market towns will be swamped by the new homes. Concerned that tourists will no longer see the area as 'attractive and historic'.
- I agree with your comment. Why are you therefore going to ruin it all?
- If there are few, how many have been developed by a specific date or in certain years? 'Few' does not quantify how many brownfield sites are expected to be available.
- Please list them and show how many houses they can support and then subtract them from the need for further housing. Brownfield sites should be used first before any further development allowed and all developers should be pointed towards these first.
- The first sentence is a bit wonky - the second half needs a verb.
- You forget to mention the Science Park at Harlow and the College to be built at Stansted. There is NO cluster economics for development at West of Braintree.
- It is inappropriate to refer to the "London Stansted Cambridge Corridor" in an official document such as this. The London Stansted Cambridge Corridor (LSCC) is an unofficial term that represents a group with narrow economic interests and an agenda that is opposed by many in the local community.
- If the District is central to the London Stansted Cambridge corridor why is the majority of the development away from this area and not in the north of the district with easy access to both Cambridge and the M11 to London avoiding Junction 8.
- All the employment opportunities are a car's commute away reinforcing the concerns about lack of transport infrastructure.
- Debden Airfield, to be decommissioned by the army, is a large brownfield site, large town size, reasonably close to the M11, and totally ignored.
- Building houses will not bring employment into the district. The challenge is surely more about facilitating older people to remain economically active into old age- the policy should be about keeping older people fit & healthy & able to contribute to work. Post Brexit, there will be fewer employment opportunities. Stansted will lose out to Europe's air ports. A high percentage of the local population commute to places of employment.
- You forget to mention the Science Park at Harlow and the College to be built at Stansted. There is NO cluster economics for development at West of Braintree.
- Why is attracting investment into the area assumed to be desirable? It is only desirable if it enhances and doesn't destroy the advantages that Uttlesford currently enjoys

- Government policy has been steered towards building on brownfield sites as a priority over and above greenfield sites. The plan needs to align with this.
- The transport infrastructure is inadequate to cope with additional commuter traffic, if residents of the proposed settlement are to commute to Stansted. Concern that new residents will commute to London or Cambridge. Great Chesterford and Audley End stations are already at capacity. Concern that the road infrastructure cannot support commuters.
- Questioning why there is a need for housing in Uttlesford since Cambridgeshire is already planning further housing developments to meet the need for employment in the biotech research industry.
- A significant number of residents commute out of the district and so rail infrastructure investment and improvement routes should be a very high priority.
- How is the 'social good' of using land to keep the district an attractive area in which to live and for wildlife to live taken into account?
- The paragraph first implies that Stansted Airport is a major employer in the district, however 68.4% of people are commuters. A geographical analysis of where Stansted's workers come from is needed.
- Concern that development is located at Stebbing Green, where there are no employment opportunities.
- This paragraph reinforces the lack of transport infrastructure in the Andrewsfield, West of Braintree area and the lack of employment opportunities in the area itself.
- Concerns that employment opportunities do not support the increased population.
- There is an assumption that the new towns will provide employment opportunities, however this is unlikely. The jobs created at WOB will be in Braintree district. UDC is losing employment sites as the increase in land value for residential is causing companies to move. People need to commute to afford housing. The employment offered by Stansted Airport means that no home is "affordable" and shift work means a car is essential.
- Concern that the new houses will result in more commuting which the road and rail infrastructure cannot support. It is suggested that more local jobs should be created.
- These statistics mean almost nothing unless put into context by reference to adjacent districts, Essex, Herts, London. Average house prices mean little Uttlesford, as there is a high proportion of listed buildings and larger farms. Average values would be more meaningful if given for detached and semi-detached houses and flats. Delete "higher than" from lines 4 / 5 for this to say what it means.
- Concerned that there is no mention of the commuters who travel to nearby Cambridge, both by rail and road. This needs to be reflected here to ensure sustainable housing is also built to support these growing jobs growth areas.
- It cannot be guaranteed that new residents will work at the research park. The majority will be seeking to commute to London or Cambridge. Concern that Great Chesterford and Audley End stations are already at capacity. Concern that the route to the train station goes directly through the village of Great Chesterford.
- If the average house price in Uttlesford is £355,000 why are new builds starting at nearly £400,000? We need more two and three bed houses at affordable prices.
- First time buyers cannot afford the average house price in Uttlesford. The Plan needs to provide more affordable housing to attract younger people.

- Instead of decreasing house prices through market forces, social housing should be built for people on the waiting lists and some for key workers. Cambridgeshire have the bio cluster expansion covered (or should do). Airport expansion has not been agreed.
- Questioning why Harlow is not taking a larger share of housing, because of its proximity to London.
- Uttlesford is a rubbish place to live & grow up as a young person, due to terrible commuting links to employment centres. Suggestion that policy should aim to improve opportunities for businesses to start, develop & thrive.
- Concern that sustainable developments cannot be built if socially deprived communities don't have access to reasonable jobs close by. Build business, jobs, infrastructure and houses to make sustainable communities.
- Concerned that additional development will increase already high carbon dioxide levels.
- The bus services are poor. Work centres are outside of the range of cycling. Rework to reflect this.
- Transport infrastructure is poor, especially in the West of Braintree area, and the development will make it worse. There are no proposals on how to create more local employment.
- Many skilled people will move away from the area, if its quality is destroyed by unsustainable planning policies.
- We would like to use bus services and cycling more in the district, as they reduce congestion and pollution. However, the focus is on profit and not service for buses and the cycle network is fragmented and in areas is dangerous.
- There are pockets of deprivation not related to living in a rural area, or to age. Specifically, Castle ward in Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow South ward. These were the two prominent wards where people sought the help of the Uttlesford Foodbank.
- The area is unsuitable for mass scale housing development, due to the points raised in this paragraph. Significant infrastructure construction to support house building will change the environment.
- Concerned over traffic congestion as a result of the developments. The Stansted Express is never on time.
- Concerned that NUGV will not reduce pollution and congestion in Saffron Walden, because the nearest facilities are located here. The best station for London commuters will be Audley End due to traffic congestion.
- The B184 is carrying a significantly increased volume of traffic since additional housing was built on the way into Saffron Walden and the ALDI supermarket was opened. Heavy goods traffic now uses the road as a cut through between the M11, the A11, the A505 and the A120. Concern that more dwellings would exacerbate this.
- Concern over traffic congestion as a result of the new developments.
- Concerned that there is no plan for tackling the air quality issues in Saffron Walden. Past proposals have lacked measurable objectives and there is no target date for the lifting of the AQMA. UDC has been specifically instructed by DEFRA to take cumulative air quality effects of new developments into account in planning decisions but this has not been done. Consequently, the two most recent Air Quality Status Reports (2016/17) show continued deterioration in pollution levels across the town.

The new Local Plan must introduce tougher and more enforceable controls on developments that will harm public health. Sites which would lead to further traffic pollution should be removed from the plan.

- The solution would seem to be a number of houses to facilitate a bypass around the town to protect the historic centre it cannot remain set in aspic.
- Concern that the new development will result in more traffic congestion. Infrastructure is needed to support the developments and should be part of this consultation
- Saffron Walden is very urgently in need of some form of simple bypass, possibly located on the Audley End estate. Health centres and school need to be provided before the construction of housing
- Whilst I have no problem with this as a statement I cannot find the link between it and the proposal for NUGV, which fails most of the criteria.
- The AQMA problem related to Saffron Walden supports the need to develop new communities away from the existing main settlements.
- What are the expectations and expected calculations for the overall AQMA in terms of it expanding or contracting, and by how much in percentage terms over the term of the plan? Are there expected to be new by-road schemes to take traffic around the town rather than through it to reduce the AQMA longer term?
- Objection to WoBGC because it will destroy the local environment and arable land and rely on car usage. There are better alternative sites within UDC, e.g. Easton Park and Great Chesterford which would meet the housing needs in Uttlesford, and are more suitable as far as public transport and employment is concerned. Stansted Airport cannot be relied on for employment.
- We agree it makes sense to build only where there is local employment and there are local services so traffic is reduced. West of Braintree has neither.
- The observation about ancient street patterns and congestion in Saffron Walden is valid but there is no proposal to solve the problem. A ring-road is an obvious solution, which could enable concepts such as Park and Ride and revival of the town centre.
- Aspirational statements without any evidence that they can be achieved.
- Proposals for non-car travel do not include specific measures to encourage or facilitate walking.
- The plan will not achieve this, as it will increase travel by car.

The Spatial Vision

Paragraphs 2.18

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 39 people/organisations.

	TOTAL
Support	5
Object	20
Comment	14

Overarching Summary

- Concerns are expressed over whether creating the garden communities supports the vision and the objective to conserve the natural environment.
- A number of representations question how sustainable transport will be provided for given the location of the garden communities, and lack of existing infrastructure.
- Representations support the aspirations for high quality design, however question how this will be ensured.
- Representations express the need for infrastructure (road, rail, broadband, water, sewage, hospitals and schools) to support existing and new communities.

Statutory consultees and other bodies

Great Chesterford Parish Council - North Uttlesford Garden community is part of the vision. The Sustainability Appraisal impacts of Spatial Vision not adequately assessed and not properly evidenced. There is no consideration of alternative approaches. GCPC want removal of reference to NUGC in Spatial Vision.

Historic Environment - Support for this approach, however creating housing estates separate to existing settlements does not achieve this, as it lacks the infrastructure required to support it.

Natural England - Natural England is pleased to see the safeguarding of the natural environment included in the Spatial Vision, however the plan should seek to achieve enhancement in line with your aspiration for the historic environment.

Historic England - Historic England welcomes the specific reference to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment within The Spatial Vision. There is also a helpful reference to maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of towns and villages in the district. Paragraph 2.8 of the supporting text usefully outlines the distinctive and historic nature of the District's towns and villages. It is recommended that this paragraph also recognises the irreplaceable nature of the historic environment. The provision within theme 3 of the Spatial Objectives to conserve and enhance the District's heritage assets and their settings is a clear overarching theme which is welcomed. It is noted that The Spatial Vision is not itself labelled as a policy.

The Thaxted Society - We are aware of the need for both planning, i.e. a Local Plan and housing i.e. a Local Plan. Without an LP, not only Thaxted, but the entire district is prey to speculative development and 'catch up' planning. Thaxted Society supports the Spatial Vision if infrastructure goes hand in hand with housebuilding in Uttlesford.

The LP makes the expected presumption in favour of sustainable development in response to the NPF. However recent case-law has shown the primacy of an LP as a statutory consideration as opposed to the NPPF which is merely Government policy. Care should therefore be taken in developing 'sustainability' as an original and localised vision for UD and not simply a broad and generalised reaction to government policy.

Essex County Council - ECC considers that there is a need to reinforce reference to sustainable travel within the spatial vision. It is recommended that paragraph 4 of the vision includes the following sentence 'The new communities will be designed to support sustainable travel within and outside the community to the wider area'. ECC notes that UDC recognise they have a lack of passenger transport links and identify that new development should be located in areas where there are opportunities to reduce travel and where there are alternatives to the car. It is recognised that the Spatial Vision highlights convenient, comfortable, safe and affordable environmentally sustainable alternatives to the use of the car. ECC recommends that the new Local Plan provide a clear explanation as to what sustainable transportation provision will be provided throughout UDC and in particular the Garden Communities. This information should be clearly linked and supported by the transportation modelling, providing stakeholders and the local community with a clear consensus of the transportation mitigation measures and a vision for sustainable travel.

The Hundred Parishes Society - The plan should recognise that Uttlesford and adjoining districts have a shared responsibility to preserve the special character of the wider area known as The Hundred Parishes. The draft Plan claims that, over the period of the Plan, it is necessary to add thousands more homes, in addition to what has already been built or approved. Given the lack of clear evidence, the choice of an exceptional period of growth as a base, the failure to consider alternative forecasting options and the absence of audit trails demonstrating how the "need" has been calculated, we are not convinced that further houses are needed before 2032 in addition to those already approved. The garden communities do not minimise the need to travel. High priority should be given to working with and enhancing the historic environment, especially historic settlements, conservation areas and areas of ancient countryside. We urge the Council to oppose any further expansion beyond the existing authorised limits at Stansted Airport. We encourage the Council to promote alternative employment opportunities throughout the district. Any new development should respect and enhance such amenities and the provision of information, encouraging residents and visitors to use public transport, to cycle and to walk.

Clare College Cambridge - The scale of housing delivery proposed at North Uttlesford Garden Community (NUGC) will increase traffic on already busy roads and junctions without the necessary infrastructure in place to support increased traffic movements. There is no reason to expect that a modal shift away from car use can be delivered in NUGC.

Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Emphasis should be placed on how development will be located in areas to help reduce single occupancy car trips with development focussed around existing rail connections, in accordance with the aims of paragraph 2.17 to ensure that the Plan is effective in delivering sustainable development without the over reliance on the private motor car.
- Support for the Council's stated Spatial Vision Strategy, particularly the desire to see the District thrive as a successful balanced local economy. Emphasis should be on balance, and we are concerned about elements relating to the provision of adequate employment opportunities alongside significant housing development.
- We consider that Uttlesford's proposed vision for the District is not aspirational, realistic or clear enough to achieve the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development advocated by the NPPF. The ability of three new garden communities to meet the District's needs over the plan period is considered unrealistic as a result of the delivery constraints associated with new settlements.
- Object to the proposal to adopt a plan for the period 2011- 33. When adopted in 2019, the plan will provide a planning strategy for only 14 years. Paragraph 157 of the NPPF indicates that Local Plans should relate to an appropriate time scale with a preferable time horizon of 15 years. Stansted Airport wants to increase, which would alter anticipated jobs growth forecasts in Uttlesford and housing need accordingly. In this context and given the dynamic nature of housing need in Uttlesford, it is critical that the Local Plan time horizon is extended, or the plan commits to an early review to ensure that a credible long-term strategy for growth in the District can be secured that takes account of these specific circumstances.

Individuals

- The NUGV will not meet the criteria set out in this vision, as it would be dependent on the car for access to employment. Walking and cycling are not viable all year round for such a decoupled community and the probability of achieving a public transport system which meets residents wishes on timing and destinations is unrealistic.
- New houses continue to be built around the town of Saffron Walden. Concerned that there are no employment opportunities that can be reached on foot or by public transport.
- How will you ensure that Housing will be of high quality?
- Objection to the 2 2 garden communities in the south-east corner of Uttlesford, as the transport infrastructure, water supply, or employment opportunities are insufficient. Concerned over urban sprawl.
- UDC LP does not comply with NPPF 155, as the WoBGC is not supported. The road infrastructure is not adequate and there is no proper rail support.
- The West of Braintree and Easton Park developments will not enhance the unique character of this part of the district, as it will dwarf all the local villages. This will change not enhance the area so they are not in keeping with the 'Vision'.
- Concerned that Uttlesford will not continue to be one of the most desirable places to live and work in the UK due to the scale of new development.
- Convenient or affordable alternatives to the use of the car do not exist at present. How will this be implemented in the future?

- The inappropriate scale of housing growth, focused into three large settlements is out of character for this rural area.
- The Spatial Vision takes no account the negative consultation response to the West of Braintree development with regards to health/schools/roads/water infrastructure. Concern over the loss of historic villages, ancient woodland and Grade II agricultural land. There is no detail as to how the infrastructure will change, or who will pay for it.
- Concern that the planned housing will attract more commuters from London and Cambridge which will overwhelm the transport infrastructure. Concern that local employment opportunities where people can easily walk or cycle to work are not planned for.
- The proposals ignore access to a railway station and the m11 motorway.
- Garden communities are not nationally endorsed and therefore there are no guarantees that the proposed settlements can be delivered to these standards. Concerned that the houses will be small, with small gardens and no parking.
- Concerned that West of Braintree is not close transport links.
- The quality of life in Saffron Walden will not be safeguarded by more housing within the town (especially Keir) or a massive new garden community at Stumps Cross.
- Easton Park will put considerable pressure on Bishop's Stortford. Saffron Walden is at risk of being destroyed as a town due to too much unsustainable development being approved.
- The proposals for the North Uttlesford Garden Village do not conform to the requirement to safeguard the quality of the countryside or natural environment nor to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
- There is no section devoted to the way that this Local Plan will be implemented with local people and communities at the centre of the planning, consultation and decision-making processes. Requests confirmation about what affordable housing is. Social housing should be referred to throughout this document, which would enable local people who cannot afford to buy a home to continue living locally.
- The linking of the Flich Way across Dunmow as a multi-purpose path would give good access for all, and should be included in the plan. Any new developments need to have rights of way that link into the current network of paths. There is not enough green space or recreational parks. Provision for this should be included for the Little Canfield/Dunmow area.
- This vision is not true given the amount of the countryside and natural environment which will need to be sacrificed to build the garden communities.
- The plans for West of Braintree do not support this vision, as they create a dormitory town without its own employment or services.
- Pride of Place requires good quality distinctive design of housing and sympathy to topography. Access to green spaces will require public land in the new towns. How will broadband be provided to existing homes?
- Crucial to the delivery of this will be infrastructural and service (specifically health care and education) provision. This has to be in place first, to allow services to develop.
- Saffron Walden does not have a community that is healthy and safe, due to the poor air quality and difficulty contacting the police force. The existing road surfaces break up routinely and the road drains are usually blocked. Despite allotments being recognised as providing measurable health benefits, there have been no additional

plots provided in Saffron Walden. What is meant by "Affordable housing"? The secondary school is already over capacity.

- The spatial vision is an appropriate vision for future development in the garden settlements, however it doesn't fully address the needs of the present settlements in the area. These will continue to have the majority of the population and the infrastructure in place cannot support further development.
- The support of employment opportunities should not be to the detriment of the community, as an expansion of Stansted would generate housing, traffic and pollution problems. Building designs should be site specific.

Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects

At the broad strategic level, the Vision is aligned with the positive aspirations of a range of sustainability objectives in line with its general focus. The Vision is particularly strongly aligned to those sustainability objectives related to housing and economic growth, accessibility and sustainable travel. It is also aligned to aspirations regarding the natural and historic environment, landscape, and infrastructure. Impacts can be expected to be more significant in accumulation with other Local Plan policies that expand on sustainable development in a local context and regarding the distinct characteristics of the District. The Vision does not appear to be directly aligned with those sustainability objectives and aspirations related to water quality, soil quality, climate change and pollution and also flood risk, which can all be expected to experience some implications from growth in the Plan area to 2033. It should be noted however that any impacts on these sustainability objectives will be minimised through Plan policies and such themes are and should not be the principle focus of a Local Plan.

Related to this however, those sustainability objectives corresponding to health and education could be elaborated on within the Vision, as areas of social infrastructure that will be put under pressure from growth.

Alternatives Considered

No alternative approaches can be considered reasonable as the Vision largely reiterates the thread of sustainable development as espoused in the NPPF. Any alternative that deviates from this approach would be contrary to NPPF and therefore an unsound approach.

Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations

It is recommended that the Vision be expanded to focus more directly on ensuring that social infrastructure provision is ensured throughout the Plan period, particularly regarding health (where relevant and within the scope of the Plan) and education

Spatial Objectives

Paragraphs 2.19

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 31 people/organisations.

	TOTAL
Support	6
Object	11
Comment	14

Overarching Summary

- A number of comments on objective 2 question whether providing opportunities for employment at Stansted is a contradiction of UDC's position on objecting the second runway at Stansted.
- Concerns are expressed over whether creating the garden communities supports the vision and the objective to conserve the natural environment.

Statutory consultees and other bodies

Thaxted Parish Council

- Objective 1e: Change 'resisting' to 'refusing'
- Objective 2: Possible conflict with Corporate Plan which states that UDC will oppose 2nd runway but this paragraph wishes to provide employment growth opportunities. UDC to clarify this point.

(Natural England - Objective 1d - Infrastructure. Natural England is encouraged to see Green Infrastructure (GI) included as an infrastructure requirement under Objective 1d.

Essex County Council - Objective 1d - Infrastructure Although the bullet point under this objective does refer to new infrastructure, this is within the context of protecting existing services. ECC recommends that objective 1d entitled Infrastructure be amended to read "To protect and enhance existing and future local services by: ..." Objective 1e - High Quality Design ECC recommends that the high-quality design overarching objective includes reference to Sustainable Urban Drainage. The objective should include a further bullet that states "Delivering Sustainable Urban Drainage within new residential and non-residential developments".

Theatres Trust - The Theatres Trust supports the intent of Objective 1D, however, there is no clear policy in the plan that reflects and implements the Objective in relation to cultural facilities. Policy C4 only has limited application and Policy INF1 isn't worded in a way that would promote or protect cultural venues. Culture and the creative industries play a key role in developing vibrant town centres which are at the economic and social heart of sustainable

communities. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides clear directions about the importance of safeguarding and promoting culture activities and venues in their areas. Policies should therefore protect, support and enhance cultural facilities and activities, particularly those which might otherwise be traded in for more commercially lucrative developments. To be found sound and reflect guidance in the NPPF, the Trust recommends inclusion of a specific policy with wording along the lines of: Cultural and Community Facilities- Development of new cultural and community facilities will be supported and should enhance the well-being of the local community, and the vitality and viability of centres. The loss or change of use of existing cultural and community facilities will be resisted unless: replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the need of the local population, or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision; or it has been demonstrated that there is no longer a community need for the facility or demand for another community use on site. The temporary and meanwhile use of vacant buildings and sites by creative, cultural and community organisations will also be supported, particularly where they help activate and revitalise town centre locations and the public realm. For clarity, and so that guidelines are clear and consistent, the accompanying text and the Glossary should contain an explanation for the term cultural and community facilities. We recommend this succinct all-inclusive description which would obviate the need to provide examples: cultural and community facilities provide for the health and well-being, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.

Environment Agency - We support the thrust of the Vision, in particular that the natural environment will be safeguarded and challenges presented by climate change will be embraced and development located and designed to minimize resource and energy use and risk of flooding reduced. Objective 1d - infrastructure We support the thrust of this objective, in particular that new and enhanced infrastructure is provided in a timely and sustainable manner. This is important given the level of growth and proposals for the three garden communities. Objective 3b Climate Change and Use of Resources We endorse this objective.

South East Education and Skills Funding Agency - Welcomes reference within the plan to Objective (1d) Infrastructure.

Saffron Walden Town Council:

- Objective 1 High Quality Design Comment- Proposed Change: change words to “ensuring high quality design” and delete “resisting poor”, as this is too negative.
- Objective 2b - Notes that the Local Plan will support Market Towns. How will this objective be met? Hierarchy given within Retail policy to SW? Need to clarify.
- Objective 2c London Stansted: Possible conflict with Corporate Plan which states that UDC will oppose 2nd runway, but this paragraph wishes to provide employment growth opportunities at Stansted. UDC to clarify this point

Sport England - Support is offered for including a strategic objective (1d) ensure sports facilities are provided to meet the needs of people and business. Support is offered for including a strategic objective (1e) that seeks to achieve high quality design that provides a healthy place for residents, visitors and businesses.

Developers/landowners/site promoters

Objective 2c: Strong opposition to any further expansion of Stansted Airport, due to the environmental consequences.

Individuals

- I'd like you to demonstrate how you have complied with the consultation principles of the NPPF. The expansion in the Bishops Stortford / Dunmow area is causing chaos on the roads, utilities, schools, NHS etc. The needs of the community are being ignored.
- NUGV fails to meet 1c as it will create a community highly dependent on the car and delivery vehicles from elsewhere. The main job opportunities cited are Stansted Airport and Chesterford Research Park, which would require a substantial journey on current and proposed links. Concern that this will create further traffic congestion and damage existing communities.
- Objective 1a: How will you ensure they're attractive? Objective 1e: High Quality Design Resisting poor quality design. How will you do this? Concern that UDC has not done this in the past. Objective 2c: Why should Utilising the permitted capacity of the existing runway be part of the District plan?
- The proposal for so called 'Garden Communities' is completely at odds with Objective 3a, as it destroys a rural area and its distinctive character.
- The Council's spatial vision is flawed with an over reliance on the 3 large garden communities to deliver the District's Objectively Assessed Needs. This is not a sustainable approach to development, as it will not deliver community benefits. Concern that they will not deliver the 5 year land supply. The Council's spatial strategy should be a more dispersed across the towns and villages.
- Roads and rail improvements, in addition to schools, need to be included within the plan. Concerned that there is no mention of Social Care and Welfare needs such as mental health, jobs assistance programmes where government programmes are being developed to provide.
- Concerned that NUGV does not meet exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt.
- Concern that UDC are not listening to people's comments, as the vision does not represent what people think. Questioning how many affordable houses will be built for local families. The roads are in a state of disrepair. Concern that there are very few bus routes
- Has the increased need for services such as broadband, water and sewage been considered? More affordable housing is needed. Concern that new houses will increase congestion on roads, cause higher pollution levels, create busier trains and stretch public services.
- The size of Uttlesford District has been emphasised, as people commute. Jobs and services are not well connected. Concern that the road system is not well maintained.

- Objective 1b is not supporting or protecting the rural community of village and the community of Stebbing. Loss of employment opportunities in relation to agriculture, due to loss of agricultural land.
Objective 1c: Concerned that there is no clarification about who will fund this.
Objective 3a: WOB does not conserve and enhance Stebbing. Concern over urban sprawl, which does not conserve the natural environment and landscape character. It will not enhance Boxted Wood.
- The infrastructure item is key, due to the high level of commuters. This means significant investment in new roads and improved rail services. Infrastructure fails to include broadband provision.
- 1c an unrealistic and unrealisable aspiration until the full infrastructure for the North Uttlesford Garden village (NUGV) is in place. 1d, 3a and 3b: NUGV does not meet these aspirations. Policy SP1: there is no evidence that the NUGV would be sustainable.
- The vision makes sense, but the West Of Braintree proposal is contrary to the vision, as it creates a dormitory town without its own employment or services.
- The vision seems to be broad and acceptable if a little idealistic. Delivery will be key.

Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects

The Plan's Spatial Objectives can be seen to have broadly significant positive impacts on the majority of the sustainability objectives and aspirations through their direct alignment. Despite this, the Plan's Spatial Objectives do not directly cover those aspirations related to water quality or the conservation of high grade soils.

Alternatives Considered

No alternative approaches can be considered reasonable as the policy reiterates the thread of sustainable development as espoused in the NPPF. Any alternative that deviates from this approach would be contrary to NPPF and therefore an unsound approach.

Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations

It is recommended that the Spatial Objectives are expanded to reference positive outcomes and aspirations related to water quality and the conservation of high grade soils.

Paragraph 2.20

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 11 people/organisations.

	TOTAL
Support	1
Object	7
Comment	3

Overarching Summary

- Concerns that the delivery of timely and sufficient housing and affordable housing within the plan period via the proposed new strategic new settlement given the high infrastructure cost involved and the complexity of development.
- Concerns are expressed over the mechanism to deliver sustainable travel through different transportation options including vehicles, railway, cycling and bus.
- A number of representation expressed concerns over the provision of affordable housing for local people.

Developers, Agents and Land Owners

The proposed spatial strategy approach needs to be based on the principles of sustainable development, as set out in the NPPF particularly Paragraph 7, 17, 30, 34 and 55. The plan aims to deliver 14,100 dwellings (641 dwellings per annum) during the plan period. However, too much emphasis is being placed on new settlements and villages which require significant new infrastructure (Easton Park, West of Braintree and North Uttlesford Garden Communities) and on strategic extensions to existing large scale allocations where development has not yet started, or delivery is delayed, and lower than anticipated levels of affordable housing will be delivered (e.g. East of Saffron Walden and west of Great Dunmow). It is inevitable that there will be delays to the delivery of development at the new settlements and village sites because they are complex, as shown historically with Northstowe and Cambourne in South Cambridgeshire. Also, these developments will require a significant amount of new infrastructure, and we are concerned that the associated costs of providing that infrastructure will reduce the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered from these sites. We have undertaken a preliminary review of housing delivery at some of the strategic allocations, and conclude that some of the assumptions about housing delivery are optimistic, and as a result less housing will be delivered from the allocated strategic sites and the proposed housing target will not be met during the plan period. In addition, any delays to the delivery of housing at the existing and potential strategic sites will have an adverse impact on the delivery and supply of affordable housing. As such, we conclude that Objective 1a will not be met.

Individuals

- Objectives seem balanced and acceptable. Further growth at Stansted should be considered.
- The plan ignores and insults most of the objectives.
- Destroys living environment of the south of the district.
- The development will destroy the rural and historic nature of the existing town countryside.
- The whole route of Flitch Way should be made accessible for the complete route from Braintree and beyond Takeley - including the old Railway line from Braintree to Great Dunmow for families/ cyclists and those with impaired/ limited mobility. Endangered species of birds/ mammals should be protected.
- Need to ensure new development promotes the use of sustainable travel
- Current roads/ rail and buses struggle with the current road users. Extra pressure from construction traffic and the subsequent road use will create more bottlenecks.

- Need to facilitate the provision of sustainable smart travel solutions, and concerned how to deliver extra bus routes, better roads, expansion of the rail network.
- Need to meet local housing needs in terms of type and tenure including affordable housing and housing for people with specific accommodation needs. Affordable housing should be provided for local residents who are born and bred in the area and want to stay in the area.
- Need more police on the streets and more police stations.
- The council should impose fines on companies 'fly tipping' their advertising banners on fences adjacent to roundabouts.
- Safety and risk assessments are needed to ensure risk management.
- Need to define whose "best practice" is.
- There is no reference to building infrastructure to support the needs to London or Cambridge commuters, either by Rail or Road.
- Objective 1c ignores the fact that the car is also required by many people within the urban areas of the District.
- Objective 1b should include reference to the provision of new homes, particularly affordable housing, as a means of 'protecting and supporting' rural communities.
- Need evidence of the people already living in North Uttlesford that need a new home to justify "To deliver housing for Uttlesford".
- Will the purchasers/occupants have recourse to UDC funds to rectify the failings if housing provided failed to reach the expected level?