

## CHAPTER 9 DESIGN

### Introduction

#### Paragraphs 9.1- 9.4

This supporting text was responded to by 5 people/organisations.

Support	3
Object	1
Comment	1

#### Overarching Summary

- Importance of design in adequate parking
- Wording of policies considered not 'woolly' and not assertive
- Policy wording considered 'unrealistic' as evidenced by West of Braintree Village plans
- No support for parking courts

#### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Saffron Walden Town Council and Thaxted Parish Council support the UDC** supported for adopting The Design Companion for Planning and Placemaking, TfL (Urban Design London) 2017

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments received.

#### Individuals

- Design in adequate parking is important
- Provision of adequate parking close to properties
- No parking courts
- Wording of policies described as woolly and not imperative
- Ineffective wording of policies resulted in "unrealistic" West of Braintree Garden Village plans

### Design and Local Distinctiveness

#### Paragraphs 9.7 and Policy D1: High Quality Design

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 21 people/organisations.

Support	7
Object	4
Comment	10

## Overarching Summary

- The policy should refer to Secured by Design (SBD) and criteria for accreditation
- Silver Accreditation should be requisite minimum standard for street lighting
- The 'historic environment' should be used and not heritage assets as in text
- Developments should be designed to encourage healthy and active lifestyles
- Policy should reference Sport England's and Public Health England's 'Active Design' guidance
- Policy to specify garden sizes e.g. 50sq m. for 2 bed and 100sq m. for 3-bedhouses
- Nationally described space standards to apply to all new development
- Evidence is required to support implementation and adoption of internal space standards
- Considerations when imposing internal space standards:
  - Need – evidence on size and type of dwellings being built in UDC and consideration of impact on starter homes;
  - Viability – impact adopting standards to be part of viability assessment taking into account potential impact of larger buildings on land supply as well as affordability of larger homes
  - Time – transitional period required to allow developers to factor in new policy on space standards
- Space standards requirement should be deleted as it is not evidenced
- "Good Design" criteria is highly subjective so it needs to be codified
- Policy D1 fails to make provision for the following criteria in Saved Policy GEN 2

## Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Essex Police** consider that the policy should include more reference to "secured by design" (SBD). Criteria to achieve Silver SBD and Gold SBD accreditation should also be included in the policy. Silver SBD accreditation should be the requisite minimum for street lighting.

**Historic England** welcomes the principle that all new development should respond positively to the local character and create high quality spaces. Use of the term "historic environment" rather than heritage assets is recommended.

**Sport England** consider that the policy should be amended to include an additional design principle along the lines that developments should ensure that they promote healthy and active lifestyles through providing the opportunity for encouraging physical activity in the design of developments. The supporting text to the policy should refer to Sport England's and Public Health England's 'Active Design' guidance <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/> which provides Government endorsed guidance on how the design and layout of new developments can be planned to make communities more active and healthier e.g. principles relating to walkable communities, co-location of facilities, multi-functional open space, active buildings etc.

Sport England is working with Essex County Council, Essex districts/boroughs (including UDC) on the review of the Essex Design Guide. The Active Design principles will be embedded into the EDG review which will provide advice on how the principles can be practically applied in a range of residential environments. In this context, it is considered important that policy D1 addresses how design can encourage activity as this will assist with

alignment with the EDG review as well as helping to deliver the wider activity and healthy lifestyle outcomes through the design of new development in Uttlesford district.

**Saffron Walden Town Council and Thaxted Parish Council** broadly support the policy especially inclusion of DCLG standards

**Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** consider that the requirement to meet nationally described space standards should apply to all new development. Also neighbourhood centre provision to be included when designing major development sites and provision of neighbourhood centres should be added to the policy. Policy to specify garden sizes e.g. 50sq m. for 2-bedhouses and 100sq m. for 3-bedhouses.

**The Thaxted Society** considers building design in the visual environment as paramount. At Thaxted responses to the vernacular and narrative are important as they are influenced by history. The Thaxted Building Design Guide clarifies the Society's preferences.

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Attempt at delivery of high quality and design is supported
- Limited definition of "high quality"
- Policy should reference suitable standards/SPD documents and national policy relied on when considering proposals
- Evidence is required to support implementation and adoption of standards
- Considerations when imposing internal space standards:
  - i. Need – evidence on size and type of dwellings being built in UDC and consideration of impact on starter homes;
  - ii. Viability – impact adopting standards to be part of viability assessment taking into account potential impact of larger buildings on land supply as well as affordability of larger homes
  - iii. Time – transitional period required to allow developers to factor in new policy on space standards
- Impact assessment of space standards not carried out as no evidence supporting size and buildings being built in UDC
- Reference to space standards should be deleted from policy since evidence not sufficient to warrant inclusion of assessment of impact on delivery
- Developer to work closely with UDC, local stakeholders and community to develop initial ideas for Garden Community

#### Individuals

- High housing density due to basing calculations on gross area
- No allowance for open space, SUDs allocation etc.
- "Good Design" criteria is highly subjective

- Good Design should be codified to include for e.g. minimising heating requirement by optimisation of solar gain and /or inclusion of mechanical ventilation with heat recovery (MHVR) systems in new builds
- Developers to be firmly encouraged to adopt RIBA and other professional organisation recommendations or Planning Consent would be withheld.
- Policy D1 fails to makes provision for the following criteria in Saved Policy GEN 2 GEN2: Development will not be permitted unless its design meets all the following criteria and has regard to adopted Supplementary Design Guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents.
  - d) it helps to reduce the potential for crime;
  - e) it helps to minimise water and energy consumption;
  - g) It helps to reduce waste production and encourages recycling and reuse;
  - h) It minimises the environmental impact on neighbouring properties by appropriate mitigating measures;
  - i) It would not have a materially adverse effect on the reasonable occupation and enjoyment of a residential or other sensitive property, as a result of loss of privacy, loss of daylight, overbearing impact or overshadowing.
- How will high quality be defined? There should be a provision whereby applications will not be considered from developers who have been found to be inadequate in the past. In practice, developers seek to build a collection of their standard designs. Specific guidelines are needed, e.g.:
  - No false chimneys;
  - No false bricked-up windows;
  - Façades to be varied, even where the basic design is the same;
  - Variations in basic design in order to give variety to roof outlines;
  - No terraces;
  - No more than four houses in a straight line;
  - Storey heights to be restricted to 2.5 in rural areas, where the top storey is genuinely and completely in the roof space, and not used as a device to build three-storey blocks of flats;
  - Minimum pavement widths.
  - Little evidence of contemporary design in Uttlesford
- A step change is required and plan to move forward in this respect
- Contemporary buildings need to be distinctive and of current age
- Not a pastiche of historic style or some supposed “rural ideal”
- New development should be compatible with existing development and not too distinctive as to stand out

Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

### **Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

The Policy can be seen as likely to have significant positive impacts on townscapes, through a design-led approach underpinned by good design principles and reflecting a thorough site appraisal. The Policy will also have minor positive impacts on the natural environment, through required consideration within applications, as well the historic environment / assets, sustainable transport through high quality pedestrian access and also access.

### **Alternatives Considered**

The District has a notable amount of historic settlements and the Policy seeks to ensure protection of these through the design requirements of new development. In light of this, it is considered that any alternative approach could not be considered reasonable or otherwise distinctly different from the policy approach to warrant assessment within this SA.

## Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

## Car Parking Design

### Paragraph 9.8 and Policy D2

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 12 people/organisations.

Support	2
Object	2
Comment	8

### Overarching Summary

- Policy should include provision for cycle parking in residential developments
- Paragraph 9.8, second sentence to read to be amended to read, 'If it is provided in the right place **or of sufficient quantity**, it is unlikely to be used properly'
- Omission of parking provision for bikes, motorbikes, buses or visitors, carer and delivery vehicles
- On-street parking only a design option where street widths are more than adequate
- Parking courts should be avoided
- Further discussion recommended by Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways to ensure consistency with the SUDs/Flood Risk Strategy with regards to permeable car parking courts
- Electric charging points should be provided within property curtilages

### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Saffron Walden Town Council** suggests the second sentence should be amended with an addition to read as follows 'If it is provided in the right place **or of sufficient quantity**, it is unlikely to be used properly.'

**Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** supports the policy for avoiding parking courts. However, the policy does not mention bikes, motorbikes, buses or visitors, carer and delivery vehicles. It is suggested to outlaw parking courts for houses as they do not meet Secured by Design standards. Motorbikes and cycles should be given priority and on-street parking with parking laybys and open aspect should be encouraged. On-street parking a design option where road widths are more than adequate.

**Thaxted Parish Council** believes that the policy should include that rear courtyards are to be avoided.

**Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** states the policy is supported for avoiding parking courts. However, the policy does not mention bikes, motorbikes, buses or visitors, carer and delivery vehicles. It is suggested to outlaw parking courts for houses as

they do not meet Secured by Design standards. Motorbikes and cycles should be given priority and on-street parking with parking laybys and open aspect should be encouraged. On-street parking a design option where road widths are more than adequate.

**Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways** recommends further discussions to determine the extent to which permeable external car parking may be delivered in future to ensure consistency with the SUDs/Flood Risk Strategy.

**Takeley Parish Council suggests** that the policy should include ensuring off-road parking thereby promoting amenity for road users. Parking provision should be provided above the minimum parking standards to allow for extra requirements. Parking bays, not owner owned should be incorporated into new road pavements to ensure extra visitor parking. Residential parking should be off-road. Safe electric charging points for cars should be within property curtilages.

**THE THAXTED SOCIETY** believes that parking design should avoid use of the phrase informal parking as this wrongly suggests police flexibility. Informal parking should be referred to as anti-social parking.

**Saffron Walden Town Council** suggest that the policy should include that rear parking courts should be avoided.

**Sport England** advises that incorporation of cycle parking design in residential environments should be included in the policy. The policy should refer to the importance of adequate cycle provision in prominent locations on new house frontages in secure and covered storage facilities.

The review of the Essex Design Guide is considering cycle parking design and it will be appropriate to refer to this in the supporting text.

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments received.

#### Individuals

- No reference to motorbikes, bikes, buses or visitors' vehicles e.g. carer, doctor, grocery delivery
- Parking courts should be avoided as not always used
- Vehicles in parking courts not within sight of the house and this is against Secured by Design Standards
- Electric charging points should be included in all communal car parks i.e. existing public car parks and those in affordable housing
- Retro fitting charging points would be costly they should be incorporated into new builds
- Will new houses have electric charging points?
- More houses to be provided with garages to avoid clogging streets with on-street parking
- How many "street trees" are planned?
- Provide reasonable space in front of houses

- Pay more attention to public green space in front of houses

Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

**Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

The Policy is not directly relevant to any specific sustainability objectives, however there can be seen to be minor positive impacts associated with social inclusion and well-being through car parking that is fit for purpose and overlooked to ensure natural surveillance and ‘designing out crime.’

**Alternatives Considered**

It is considered that any alternative approach could not be considered reasonable or otherwise distinctly different from the policy approach to warrant assessment within this SA.

**Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

Officer Response

Proposed changes to plan

**Small Scale Development/Householder Extensions**

**Policy D3**

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 6 people/organisations.

Support	5
Object	1
Comment	0

Overarching Summary

- Policy should be amended to read *“Proposals for small scale development, including extensions to existing buildings, must be of a high standard of design, responding to or improving the site and surrounding area and not have a detrimental impact on flood risk”.*
- Requirement for a specific consideration of the historic environment within design policies
- Policy supported

Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways** recommend that policy D3 includes wording that seeks to ensure that any development should not have a detrimental impact on flood risk. ECC recommends that the first policy provision be amended

to read - *“Proposals for small scale development, including extensions to existing buildings, must be of a high standard of design, responding to or improving the site and surrounding area and not have a detrimental impact on flood risk”.*

**Historic England** commends the need for development to be responsive and relate to surrounding areas and existing buildings is supported. However, Historic England seeks a specific requirement for the consideration of historic environment within Local Plan design policies which seek to draw on opportunities offered by the historic environment and reflect local character and distinctiveness. Contemporary development should not be stymied but should require an appreciation of the significance and character of the historic environment in producing a high design standard.

**Saffron Walden Town Council, Thaxted Parish Council, Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and THE THAXTED SOCIETY** support the policy.

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments received.

#### Individuals

No comments received.

#### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

##### **Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

For many households an extension to their property ensures accommodation to meet changing needs. However, it is important where an extension is permitted that it is compatible with the design and setting of the existing building and does not adversely impact the surrounding area or nearby neighbours. This is also true of small scale development. The policy will have positive impacts on the historic environment through ensuring that home extensions retain the character of the area and are designed to respect the existing building. There will be positive contributions to meeting specific housing needs regarding type and size, and also in addressing social inclusion and health by enabling the adaptation of homes to meet the changing requirements of residents whilst also preventing development that would adversely affect neighbours in terms of overlooking and restricted light.

##### **Alternatives Considered**

It is considered that any deviation from the Policy approach could be considered unsustainable in line with the Policy’s criteria or otherwise not distinctly different to warrant assessment within this SA.

##### **Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed at this stage.

#### Officer Response



## Proposed changes to plan

### **Development Frameworks and Codes**

#### **Paragraphs 9.10 – 9.16 and Policy D4**

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 37 people/organisations.

Support	8
Object	12
Comment	17

#### Overarching Summary

- Major developments required at minimum to provide a sports facility plan/strategy as part of green infrastructure plans
- Query on what constitutes 'large development' and 'strategic development'
- Town and parish councils should be involved in strategic and major developments  
Suggestion to amend paragraph 9.14 to read 'Particular regard and consideration must be afforded to the delivery of local community or shopping centres and school provision. Early delivery of these facilities will ensure provisions for the 1st / 2nd cohort of residents'
- The policy should stipulate a trigger point for provision of facilities
- Building for Life 12 Assessments should apply to all developments of 50+houses not just new settlements
- An adopted Masterplan for Easton Park should be annexed to SP6 at the Regulation 19 consultation stage
- 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point in Policy D4 be amended to – "*A green infrastructure plan setting out the network and typology of green spaces, links, flood mitigation areas and areas of ecological importance*" (page 115).
- Wording of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph in Policy D4 is amended to read – "*Development frameworks should be informed by best practice landscape and urban design principles. Applications.....*"
- The fifth bullet point (Policy text) should be amended to read '*A green infrastructure plan setting out the network and typology of green spaces, links and areas of ecological importance and opportunities for the creation of sustainable drainage schemes including attenuation ponds/ infiltration basins and swales.*'
- Policy should include reference to the historic environment
- The West of Braintree Garden Community development approach merits a separate section in the policy which can be built on in a site specific DPD
- Detailed code should be specified
- Policy is supported on condition that enforcement will be proactive and effective
- Equestrians should be mentioned and included in Policy D4
- Definition of "strategic" needs clarification to ensure that Plan is effective

- Requirement of Development Frameworks is regarded as an additional phase in the planning decision making process and is unjustified, not effective and not supported by national policy
- The policy considered overly onerous and does not specify when the policy will be applied
- Not clear whether the policy refers specifically to Garden Communities and strategic sites allocated through the Local Plan
- Area Design Codes are considered more appropriate for a 10,000 unit Garden Community at Easton Park to be built over 20 years
- Clarification is required on whether Policy D4 expects outline or reserved matters submissions to be accompanied by the Building for Life Assessment
- Unclear whether framework is to be adopted as SPD or approved by the Council as guidance. SPD adoption will add to delivery timetable and cause delay
- Proposed rewording of Paragraph 9.10, "*Proposals for strategic development sites (500+ dwellings or 50,000 sq. m) large scale development, including the new garden communities, major and strategic development sites, should be informed by a masterplan that comprises part of a development framework for the site. This should place the site in its wider context and avoid narrowly looking at landownership boundaries.*"
- UDC should develop its own Design Code, consult on it and ensure rigorous compliance once adopted
- Design codes can provide greater certainty and control over design quality in long term
- Design code to cover, building heights, depths and widths, street typologies, landscape treatments as well as façade treatments
- New large settlements (estates) are not appropriate for the district
- Large settlements are artificial and ignore historic structure of area

#### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Natural England** welcomes the policy requirement to prepare a Green Infrastructure plan for strategic sites.

**Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways** recommends that the wording of the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point in Policy D4 be amended to – “A green infrastructure plan setting out the network and typology of green spaces, links, flood mitigation areas and areas of ecological importance” (page 115). Also recommended is the amendment of the wording of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph in Policy D4 to read –“Development frameworks should be informed by best practice landscape and urban design principles. Applications.....”

**Environment Agency** welcomes the requirement for Green Infrastructure plan is welcome. Such a plan provides an opportunity to link with the design of surface water management for a development especially where SuDS in the form of attenuation ponds/infiltration basins and other methods such as swales are recommended as principal form of water drainage.

Environment Agency recommend that the fifth bullet point is amended to read as follows: ‘A green infrastructure plan setting out the network and typology of green spaces, links and areas of ecological importance and opportunities for the creation of sustainable drainage schemes including attenuation ponds/ infiltration basins and swales.’

**Historic England** advises that the policy should include reference to historic environment and how this is a key consideration in good place making.

**Braintree District Council** notes that the approach to be taken forward for West of Braintree will be different from other sites since this is driven by Local Authorities and as such a separate section in the policy may be appropriate which can be built on within the site specific DPD.

**Sport England** welcomes the principle of development frameworks for major developments. It is recommended that major developments (Garden Communities) should be required at minimum to provide a sports facility plan/strategy as part of the green infrastructure plans. The sports facility plan/strategy would consider the strategic provision of indoor and outdoor facilities. Experience suggests that provision of sports facility plan/facility is helpful to all stakeholders in masterplanning process.

**Thaxted Parish Council and Saffron Walden Town Council and Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** query what constitutes “large scale development”

**Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** believe that town and parish councils need to be involved in proposals for large scale developments including garden communities, major and strategic development sites. Landscape treatment schemes should comprise local species and low maintenance. The developer has to maintain landscape scheme until adoption by the local Council.

**Saffron Walden Town Council and Thaxted Parish Council** propose an addition to paragraph 9.14 to read ‘Particular regard and consideration must be afforded to the delivery of local community or shopping centres and school provision. Early delivery of these facilities will ensure provisions for the 1st / 2nd cohort of residents’

**Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** note that phasing needs to be more specific to ensure early provision of convenience stores, schools and community facilities. The policy should stipulate a trigger point for provision of facilities e.g. by the time 30% of the development is completed.

**Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** believes that Building for Life 12 Assessments should apply to all developments of 50+houses not just new settlements. All new developments should be designed to offer shortest well-lit pedestrian routes through a development. Current Essex Design Guide on road widths is too narrow and this should be stipulated to 6.5 metres to allow lorries to pass. The provision and phasing of supporting facilities (schools etc.) should be mandatory.

**Saffron Walden Town Council** suggests addition of “and community facilities” to the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point and the last bullet point should be phrased to ensure community provision is supplied to the first cohort of residents. The provision and phasing of supporting facilities (schools etc.) should be mandatory. Building for Life 12 assessment should apply to all new developments. All new developments should be designed to allow the shortest routes for

pedestrians to key destinations. Current advice from Essex Highways results in roads that are too narrow and dangerous.

**Dunmow Town Council** requires the adoption of a Masterplan to guide the Garden City development during the plan period. The Masterplan has to address broad areas of growth, new road access, buffering areas, heritage identification, landscape and ancient woodland mitigation measures. The Masterplan has to be annexed to the Local Plan Policy 6 in the Regulation 19 consultation.

**Thaxted Parish Council suggests addition of “and community facilities”** on 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point. On the last bullet point, phasing of works should ensure that provision of community facilities is supplied to the first cohort of residents.

**THE THAXTED SOCIETY** notes that conditions that add positive and often mitigating detail to development remain moribund and redundant without robust enforcement. The Plan relies on both condition and requirement and this is pointless without enforcement. This policy is supported on the presumption that there will be renewed and invigorated enforcement.

**Elsenham Parish Council** notes that the Local Plan is a policy document and should not have provisional statements as to what can be used or should be considered. A detailed design code should be specified.

**Essex Bridleways Association and British Horse Society want equestrians** to be mentioned and included in Policy D4. They also state that the green infrastructure plan should set out the aspiration for informal recreation accessible for all users. Uttlesford should follow neighbouring authorities in aspiration to enhance equestrian access via green infrastructure of their proposed garden cities.

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Objection to the requirement for the preparation and approval of Development Frameworks prior to planning application submission
- The requirement of Development Frameworks is regarded as an additional phase in the planning decision making process and is unjustified, not effective and not supported by national policy
- What constitutes “strategic development?”
- Policy D4 should be amended to allow Development Frameworks and Outline Planning Applications to be submitted in parallel.
- Development Frameworks for strategic sites should not to be approved prior to submission of planning applications.
- The wording “prior to submission” should be amended to read “prior to approval”.
- Area Design Codes are considered more appropriate for a 10,000 unit Garden Community at Easton Park to be built over 20 years. Policy to be amended to require approval of Design Code/Area Code prior to approval of any reserved matters application.
- Clarification is required on whether Policy D4 expects outline or reserved matters submissions to be accompanied by the Building for Life Assessment
- The policy is overly onerous and does not specify when the policy will be applied

- It is not clear whether the policy refers specifically to Garden Communities and strategic sites allocated through the Local Plan
- If requirement is applicable to all potential development of a strategic scale then definition of strategic scale should be included in the policy
- Policy may prevent non-allocated sustainable sites coming forward because the Council might not agree to the Development Framework
- The requirement for the preparation of Development Framework documents and Design Codes adds an additional layer to the planning process
- The requirement also entails additional time, cost, and expenditure of resources for both the applicant and the Council.
- What constitutes “strategic” development is not defined and there is a danger of inappropriate application to small-medium size allocation.
- A properly drafted Design & Access statement achieves a similar outcome to a Development Framework or Design Code.
- Wording of the Policy should be revised to:
  - exclude small – medium sized developments or
  - identify individual sites such as Garden Communities and larger urban extensions or
  - set a threshold beyond which Development Frameworks will be required e.g. 1,000 units
- Policy is unclear on whether design code is required over and above a development framework or it can be included in the framework
- Unclear whether framework is to be adopted as SPD or approved by the Council as guidance. SPD adoption will add to delivery timetable and cause delay
- No definition of “strategic sites” in glossary of terms
- Council to outline development framework programme for strategic sites as the requirement to have and “Adopted” Strategic Masterplan could delay matters
- Definition of “strategic” needs clarification to ensure that Plan is effective
- Definition of Strategic Development Sites could be defined as those sites comprising 500+ dwellings or 50,000+sq. m. of commercial floorspace
- First sentence of D4 should be reworded to read: *“Development frameworks shall be prepared for all strategic development sites (500+ dwellings or 50,000+ sq. of commercial floor space) to be approved by the Council prior to submission of any planning application.”*
- Current range of developments of 10+ dwellings or 1,000 sq. m. requiring preparation of a masterplan prior to approval is considered too wide.
- This wide range (10+ dwellings or 1,000 sq. m.) has potential to frustrate delivery and adds unnecessary work to the planning system and an undue burden on council officers and developers.
- Proposed rewording of Paragraph 9.10, *“Proposals for strategic development sites (500+ dwellings or 50,000 sq. m) large scale development, including the new garden communities, major and strategic development sites, should be informed by a masterplan that comprises part of a development framework for the site. This should place the site in its wider context and avoid narrowly looking at landownership boundaries.”* The advantage of the above would be to ensure a comprehensive delivery of significant developments (500+ dwellings or 50,000 sq. m) as well as facilitate delivery of smaller sites.

- ANSC as principal landowners have prepared a development vision and masterplan alongside the proposed development by Galliard Homes of land at Bosted Wood
- A copy of the development vision and masterplan was submitted towards Regulation 19 Braintree Local Plan

### Individuals

- Developers need to be given tangible deadlines for the provision of infrastructure e.g. community facilities to be provided when 30% of the site is completed
- Development Frameworks and Codes should include necessary improvements to highway and transport infrastructure required to take place at outset of development or prior to occupation
- Highway and transport infrastructure should be triggered at agreed capacity to ensure improvements are in place before they become necessary
- Need for equestrian access not fully considered
- UDC should develop its own Design Code, consult on it and ensure rigorous compliance once adopted
- Design codes can provide greater certainty and control over design quality in long term
- Design code to cover, building heights, depths and widths, street typologies, landscape treatments as well as façade treatments
- New large settlements (estates) are not appropriate for the district
- Large settlements are artificial and ignore historic structure of area

### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

#### **Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

The inclusion of this Policy within the Plan is integral to the development of sustainable development emerging from the principle of Garden Communities at this stage. The Policy will have significant positive impacts associated with sustainable travel, accessibility, health and social inclusion, and education and skills. These themes are required to be integrated within self-sustainable new communities in the form of supporting infrastructure, and the process of development frameworks for all strategic development ensures that forthcoming applications factor in sustainable themes through their initial identification at the plan-level.

#### **Alternatives Considered**

The Policy, in introducing development frameworks for strategic development proposals maximises the potential for sustainable outcomes to be realised through a plan-led approach. It is considered that any deviation from the Policy approach could be considered unsustainable in line with the Policy's criteria or otherwise not distinctly different to warrant assessment within this SA.

#### **Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

### Officer Response

### Proposed changes to plan

## Design Review

### Paragraph 9.19 and Policy D5

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 18 people/organisations.

Support	2
Object	8
Comment	8

### Overarching Summary

- The size and complexity of West of Braintree development requires a site specific solution and policy may be too restrictive
- All major development should be subject to a Design Review
- All major schemes should not be subject to a Design Review
- Design should be in accordance with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan requirements as well as complementing the area
- Local Town and Parish Councils should be consulted and included in discussions on design
- Where a Neighbourhood Plan adopts a design guide as part of its Heritage and Character Assessment, this should be used.
- Application of the Essex Design Guide to new settlements regarded as inappropriate as development should reflect the age they being are planned
- All projects should be subject to design review regardless of size or being “in important and/or sensitive” locations
- Clarification required on whether “emerging schemes” refers to emerging reserved matters submissions
- Referral of all strategic and major developments is not proportionate
- Requirement for a design review assessment is too onerous, restrictive and the Policy encourage and not require
- Policy D5 needs to clarify a development threshold to trigger the Design Review process
- Policy D5 has the potential to frustrate delivery by using a Design Review Panel operated by Shape East
- Suggested rewording of Policy “*Where necessary the Council will require emerging schemes for the new garden communities, strategic and major development sites to be assessed through design review. Equally, smaller sites in important and or sensitive locations will also be subject to design review. The Council may seek to refer schemes to the East of England Design Review Panel operated by Shape East an independent review panel where it may be helpful in reaching an appropriate design solution. The Council encourages design review to take place early in the process to allow scope for input into the emerging design. The final scheme submitted to the Council should include a report on the design review process and how the scheme has responded to this.*

### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Braintree District Council** opines that the policy maybe too restrictive as it is too early to specify a specific process and company to undertake the design review. The size and complexity of the scheme will require a site specific solution to achieve the best results and may not accord with the policy

**Saffron Walden Town Council** and **Thaxted Parish Council** recommend that paragraph 9.19 should be amended to clarify that all major development will be subject to a design review.

**Saffron Walden Town Council** recommends an addition to the Policy should stating that Design will be in accordance with any specific requirements of Neighbourhood Plan and will complement the area as identified within the Heritage and Character Assessment. It is also recommended to delete “it is envisaged” (paragraph 9.19) to make the statement more positive.

**Thaxted Parish Council** considers that design should be in accordance with any specific requirement laid out in the adopted Neighbourhood Plan and should complement the area as identified in the Heritage and Character Assessment.

**Littlebury Parish Council** believes that the application of the Essex Design Guide to new settlements is inappropriate because developments should reflect the age in which they are being planned and developed which currently gives greater scope to incorporate energy generation and management discretely.

**Elsenham Parish Council** believes that all projects should be subject to design review regardless of size or being “in important and/or sensitive” locations.

**Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** consider that Local Town and Parish Councils should have a say on design and be included in discussions. Where a Neighbourhood Plan adopts a design guide as part of its Heritage and Character Assessment, this should be used.

**THE THAXTED SOCIETY** supports the policy.

### Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Policy 5 should clarify whether “emerging schemes” refers to emerging reserved matters submissions
- Policy 5 should make it clear that the Design Review will need to have regard to the Design Code/Area Design Code approved in accordance with Policy 4
- Referral to Shape East is not considered a mandatory requirement enshrined in the development plan
- It is suggested that the Policy 5 should be amended as follows: *Where necessary the Council will require emerging schemes for the new garden communities, strategic and major development sites to be assessed through design review. Equally, smaller sites in important and or sensitive locations will also be subject to design review. The Council may seek to refer schemes to the East of England Design Review Panel operated by Shape East an independent review panel where it may be helpful in reaching an appropriate design solution. The Council encourages design review to*



*take place early in the process to allow scope for input into the emerging design. The final scheme submitted to the Council should include a report on the design review process and how the scheme has responded to this.*

- Design Review required for new Garden Communities but not for all strategic and major development sites
- Design Council's Design Review Principles and Practice (2013) guidance state that referral of schemes for design review to be proportionate and referring all strategic and major developments is not proportionate
- Referral of all strategic and major development schemes is not justified and will introduce delays in the planning process
- The requirement for design review assessment is too onerous, restrictive and the Policy should be reworded to say that the Council encourages assessment through a design review
- A design review should not be obligatory on all large schemes
- No definition is provided for what constitutes "strategic" or "major" development
- Design Review is considered unnecessary and should be removed from the Policy
- Policy D5 should be amended to encouraging design review rather than requiring it
- Object to Policy wording
- It is not clear at what point the Design Review Panel will participate in the preparation of the Strategic Masterplan and Design Codes or comment on detailed design arising
- UDC is seeking to front load the design process (Masterplans and Design Coding) therefore there is no need for the involvement of a Design Review
- What is the difference between "major developments" and strategic allocations?
- Policy D5 needs to clarify a development threshold to trigger the Design Review process
- Policy D5 has the potential to frustrate delivery by using a Design Review Panel operated by Shape East
- Use of a Design Review Panel should be optional for developments less than 500 or more dwellings or 50,000 sq. m commercial floor space
- Policy needs rewording to clarify when use of Design Review is appropriate
- For clarity deletion of the following is suggested:
  - "and major" (1<sup>st</sup> sentence);
  - "Equally, smaller sites in important and or sensitive locations will also be subject to design review." (second sentence); and
  - Addition of, "suggest the referral of" and deletion of "refer."

#### Individuals

No comments received.

#### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

##### **Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

The scale of growth outlined within the plan over the plan period is such that meeting OAN for housing is a significant challenge on comparison to past housing requirements. The Policy will have significant positive impacts on landscapes / townscapes through the requirements of design review. The requirements of the policy can be seen to emanate from the fabric of the District and local characteristics related to the historic environment and landscapes. With this in mind, secondary positive impacts are realised on the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment and cultural heritage.

### **Alternatives Considered**

The Policy, in introducing design review for strategic development proposals maximises the potential for sustainable outcomes to be realised at the outset of the development management process. It is considered that any deviation from the Policy approach could be considered unsustainable in line with the Policy's criteria or otherwise not distinctly different to warrant assessment within this SA.

### **Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

#### Officer Response

#### Proposed changes to plan

## **Innovation and Variety**

### **Policy D6**

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 7 people/organisations.

Support	6
Object	1
Comment	0

#### Overarching Summary

- Avoidance off-the –shelf house designs is supported
- Delete last sentence as considered unenforceable and unmanageable
- Query on how and who will judge the design competitions
- New houses should complement the local area

#### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Elsenham Parish Council** recommends a specific ban is recommended for 'off-the-shelf' housing types. In Elsenham there has been talk about respecting the local vernacular but in practice developers have offered a mix of their standard designs.

**Thaxted Parish Council** recommends deletion of last sentence since it is considered unenforceable and unmanageable.

**Saffron Walden Town Council** supports policy.

**Stansted Neighbourhood Steering Group and Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Steering Group** query how the completion will be judged and by whom?

**THE THAXTED SOCIETY** supports the principle of avoidance of all off the shelf design. New homes and buildings in Thaxted should look like they belong in Thaxted or Uttlesford. New design is strongly supported. Good design may incalculate local detail and respond to it whilst maintaining its modernity and sustainability.

Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments received.

Individuals

No comments received.

Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

**Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

The scale of growth outlined within the plan over the plan period is such that meeting OAN for housing is a significant challenge on comparison to past housing requirements. The Policy will have significant positive impacts on landscapes / townscapes through the encouragement of development proposals that establish bespoke design solutions and residential typologies. The requirements of the policy can be seen to emanate from the fabric of the District and local characteristics related to the historic environment and landscapes. With this in mind, secondary positive impacts are realised on the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment and cultural heritage.

**Alternatives Considered**

The Policy, in encouraging bespoke design solutions and residential typologies for development proposals maximises the potential for sustainable outcomes to be realised at the outset of the development management process. It is considered that any deviation from the Policy approach could be considered unsustainable in line with the Policy's criteria or otherwise not distinctly different to warrant assessment within this SA.

**Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

Officer Response

Proposed changes to plan

**Self and Custom-build Housing**

**Paragraph 9.21-9.23 and Policy D7**

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 10 people/organisations.

Support	5
Object	1
Comment	4

Overarching Summary

- Larger sites to provide 5% of self-build land
- Suggested that all sites of 150 or more homes should provide 5% self-build land
- Designs should be in accordance with specific requirements in Neighbourhood Plans
- Queries on how self-build will be identified, how those registered will be notified, and how appropriateness of design will be determined

- Plot passports should include all matters and not leave it to plot owner to decide
- Flexibility should be adopted to allow self-build beyond development limits
- Small plots of land outside villages and conservation areas should be available for development
- Hamlets should be allowed to expand rather than barn conversions that are not in keeping with surrounding housing style

#### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Saffron Walden Town Council** suggests that larger sites should provide 5% self-build land.

**Thaxted Parish Council** considers that the last sentence of paragraph 9.23 should include the following wording, “however, the plot owner must consider that the design will be in accordance with any specific requirements laid out in the adopted Neighbourhood Plan, and will complement the area as identified within the Heritage and character assessment.”

**Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** queries how self-build land will be identified; how those on the register will be notified and how appropriateness of design will be determined? It is also suggested that all sites of 150 or more homes should provide 5% self-build land. Neighbourhood Plans and Design Statements have to be taken into account

**THE THAXTED SOCIETY** believe that plot passports should include all matters and not leave matters for plot owner to decide because owners’ decisions might not respond to historic vernacular and narrative as well as the owner’s taste not always proving acceptable.

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Requirement of adoption of a flexible approach to self-build homes beyond Development Limits to address objectively assessed need
- D7 is unnecessary because scale, mass, layout, landscape and appearance can be controlled through outline and full planning applications
- Individual plot passports add further layer of work and do not improve design
- Policy D7 should be deleted from the Plan

#### Individuals

- Small plots of land outside villages and conservation areas should be available for development
- Hamlets should be allowed to expand rather than barn conversions that are not in keeping with surrounding housing style

#### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

##### **Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

The Policy’s requirement for the preparation and submission of site masterplan and individual plot passports for self / custom build homes will ensure minor positive impacts on townscape.

### **Alternatives Considered**

The National Planning Policy Framework requires Councils to plan for a mix of new housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and different groups within the community, including self-build homes. With this at the forefront of the Policy's approach, and in line with the evidence outlined in the SHMA, there can be considered no reasonable alternatives that exist for exploration.

### **Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

Through iterative working, a draft SA of the Plan recommended that the Plan also include the Council's approach to any self-build home applications that might come forward in the plan period. This has been factored into the Plan through this Policy. As such, no mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

### Officer Response

### Proposed changes to plan

## **Sustainable Design and Construction**

### **Paragraph 9.24 and Policy D8**

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 20 people/organisations.

Support	4
Object	8
Comment	9

### Overarching Summary

- Wording of the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph of Policy D8 be amended to read, *“Waste, recycling and storage areas should be provided. Equally, a system that reduces water consumption and allow for the reuse of grey water is encouraged. Development should not increase flood risk on or off site.”* (page 118).
- Policy wording seen as unambitious and too loose
- Policy should be amended to include waste access
- Green roofs should be encouraged
- Policy needs to be more specific on provision of waste areas for flats.
- Policy needs clarification as it might be misinterpreted as applying to all developments of all scales
- The policy makes no specific reference to the historic environment or to visual impact and setting
- Policy D8 is not in line with PPG and Ministerial Statement of July 2015 stating that improvements in technical build standards are to be delivered through Building Regulations
- Use of BREEAM Standards and Home Quality Mark is an unnecessary financial burden on developers

- Both BREEAM standards and Home Quality Mark have not undergone a formal public consultation and UDC should not allow the Building Research Establishment Ltd. to dominate assessment of Sustainable Design and Construction
- New builds should exceed BREEAM standards and current Building Regulations

#### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** notes that the policy wording is unambitious and too loose. Developments offering innovative recycling and waste disposal systems are welcome. All housing should include solar panel installation or equivalent if required by owner/occupier.

**Saffron Walden Town Council** recommends an addition to read, 'Houses with roof solar panels and water recycling schemes will be encouraged'. We would also like to see a policy on green roofs as suggested. Amend policy to include waste access (...be provided) out of sight of the frontages of properties but with easy access to the road to allow for rubbish collections. 'Developments that offer innovative recycling and waste disposal systems will be particularly welcomed'? (Already the case in many countries)

'The use of green roofs in new builds will be encouraged, especially for flat or shallow-pitch structures. Green roofs reduce water run-off, enhance sound and thermal insulation, and support local biodiversity.'

**Thaxted Parish Council** suggests an amendment to policy to include accessible waste areas by both residents and refuse lorries. Policy needs to be more specific on provision of waste areas for flats.

**Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** considers the policy wording as unambitious and too loose. Water recycling schemes should also be encouraged. Proposed addition to first sentence, "(..... be provided) out of sight of the frontages of properties but with easy access to the road to allow for rubbish collections". Is it worth adding 'developments that offer innovative recycling and waste disposal systems will be particularly welcomed'? All housing should include solar panel installation or equivalent if required by owner/occupier.

**Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways** recommend that the wording of the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph of Policy D8 be amended to read, "*Waste, recycling and storage areas should be provided. Equally, a system that reduces water consumption and allow for the reuse of grey water is encouraged. Development should not increase flood risk on or off site.*" (page 118). ECC notes that this amendment is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 102 and 103.

**Environment Agency** supports the thrust of this policy especially the third paragraph which requires proposals for new development demonstrating how resource efficiencies and climate change adaptation measures will be incorporated. Policy D8: Sustainable Design and Construction includes systems that reduce water consumption and allow for the reuse of grey water is encouraged. Again we are in favour of this approach.

**Historic England** is of the opinion that as currently drafted the policy makes no specific reference to the historic environment or to visual impact and setting. This policy is likely to refer to new build developments only, but that is not clear and could be interpreted as applying to all developments of all scales. Modern construction techniques on a listed

building may detrimentally affect existing historic fabric and risk damage to the heritage asset. It is recommended that the policy is clarified as at this stage as it's remit is unclear to prospective applicants and decision makers.

**THE THAXTED SOCIETY** supports the policy.

**Dunmow and District Chamber of Trade and Commerce** considers that investment in highest levels of energy efficiency new homes is an extremely costly way of saving carbon but investing in improvement of existing homes is dramatically more cost effective

**Sustainable Uttlesford** believes that the LPA should aim for PASSIV house standard for social and rented stock. All housing stock should include SMART and green technologies especially the provision of superfast (or subsequent generations) broadband.

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Sustainable design and construction of new development is addressed at national level including outside planning e.g. Building Regulations. Arbitrary requirement beyond this is not justified.
- Policy D8 is not in line with PPG and Ministerial Statement of July 2015 stating that improvements in technical build standards are to be delivered through Building Regulations
- No need to show how a proposal is in line with Building Regulations or provide Energy Assessments as this is dealt with through Building Regulations
- Ministerial Statement (July 2015) and PPG paras 56-001 to 56-023 show that Government's intention is to deliver the vast majority of improvements in technical building standards through Building Regulations.
- Part L of the Building Regulations deals with energy demands and carbon dioxide emissions therefore there is no need to require evidence on these matters when applying for planning permission.
- Ministerial Statement (July 2015) and PPG paras 56-001 to 56-023 show that the vast majority of improvements in technical building standards are to be achieved through Building Regulations
- Part L of Building Regulations require details on energy demands and carbon dioxide emissions and inappropriate to require evidence on these matters when applying for planning permission.
- Both BREEAM standards and Home Quality Mark have not undergone a formal public consultation and UDC should not allow the Building Research Establishment Ltd. to dominate assessment of Sustainable Design and Construction
- BREEAM provides no rural weighting in its assessment to take into account challenges of rural districts
- Use of BREEAM Standards and Home Quality Mark is an unnecessary financial burden on developers without delivering Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy D8 should be reworded as follows to make the Plan effective for the reasons stated above:

*"Proposals for new development are required to embed sustainable design and construction techniques from the outset.*

*Applications for development will need to demonstrate accordance with the appropriate Building Regulations and or BREEAM standards in force at the time of submission. Housebuilders are encouraged to register for assessment under the Home Quality Mark.*

*This should show how resource efficiencies and climate change adaptation measures will be incorporated through aspects such as the layout of the proposed development, orientation, massing, landscaping and building materials.*

*Waste, recycling and storage areas should be provided. Equally, systems that reduce water consumption and allow for the reuse of grey water are encouraged. The impact on flood risk from development should be minimised.*

*Development should maximise the opportunities for using of on-site renewable forms of energy."*

### Individuals

- All new builds should incorporate intrinsic photovoltaic panels in design and not extrinsic (added on by contractor as an afterthought)
- New builds should exceed BREEAM standards and current Building Regulations
- Planning consent should be refused where it is clear that only lip-service is being paid to the BREEAM recommendations
- Policy is full of weak phrases: '*Housebuilders are encouraged to register for assessment under the Home Quality Mark*'. What does 'encouragement' mean? Clearly not a requirement.
- '*Development should maximise the opportunities for using of on-site renewable forms of energy.*' Slightly better, but 'should' is far weaker than 'must'. It doesn't seem to be a planning requirement either.

### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

#### **Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

The Policy will ensure positive outcomes for a range of sustainability objectives, this includes significant impacts associated with townscape, and minor positive impacts on water related criteria, and cultural heritage and climate change through climate change adaptation measures. These impacts on a plan level are maximised through Policy D9 below.

#### **Alternatives Considered**

The Policy, in requiring sustainable design and construction techniques, as well as climate change adaptation measures, maximises the potential for sustainable outcomes to be realised at the outset of the development management process. It is considered that any deviation from the Policy approach could be considered unsustainable in line with the Policy's criteria or otherwise not distinctly different to warrant assessment within this SA.

#### **Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

### Officer Response

### Proposed changes to plan



## Paragraph 9.26

This paragraph was responded to by 2 people/organisations.

Support	0
Object	1
Comment	1

### Overarching Summary

- Phrases such as “allow latitude” and “subject to viability” perceived as weak and undermining UDC’s stance on climate change
- Query on location of Planning Practice Guidance

### Statutory consultees and other bodies

No comments received.

### Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments received.

### Individuals

- Where is the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance?
- Phrases such as “allow latitude” and “subject to viability” undermine Council’s statement on climate change in para 9.25
- Real threat of viability on life on planet for current and next generations not being calculated
- Paragraph 9.26 shows that UDC is not serious about climate change

### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

No policies to appraise.

### Officer Response

### Proposed changes to plan

## Energy Hierarchy

## Paragraph 9.27

This paragraph was responded to by 1 person/organisation.

Support	0
Object	1
Comment	0

### Overarching Summary

- The paragraph is considered a lack of massive support for energy reduction measures

### Statutory consultees and other bodies

No comments received.

### Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments to receive.

### Individuals

- This is a massive statement of lack of support for energy reduction measures, "*Some of these can be relatively expensive and..... viability of the project and may therefore not be enacted.*"
- This is a policy statement which says that we will put aside all requirements for a low carbon strategy, just as long as the houses get built.
- Politicians need to take the lead for the responsible sustainable way and create an environment in which developers have to operate.

### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

No policies to appraise.

### Officer Response

### Proposed changes to plan

## Design Optimisation

### Paragraph 9.29

This paragraph was responded to by 2 people/organisations.

Support	2
Object	0

Comment	0
---------	---

### Overarching Summary

- Paragraph is supported.

### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Saffron Walden Town Council and Thaxted Parish Council** support the paragraph.

### Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments received.

### Individuals

No comments received.

### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

No policies to appraise.

### Officer Response

### Proposed changes to plan

## **Fabric Improvement**

### **Paragraph 9.30**

This paragraph was responded to by 2 people/organisations.

Support	2
Object	0
Comment	0

### Overarching Summary

- 

#### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Saffron Walden Town Council and Thaxted Parish Council** support the paragraph text.

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments received.

#### Individuals

No comments received.

#### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

No policies to appraise.

### Officer Response

#### Proposed changes to plan

## **Renewable Energy Sources**

### **Paragraph 9.31**

This paragraph was responded to by 3 people/organisations.

Support	0
Object	2
Comment	1

### Overarching Summary

- Policy wording is considered not strong and assertive enough

#### Statutory consultees and other bodies

None

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

No comments received.

#### Individuals

- Local Plan needs revision to strengthen phrases such as “consideration should be given to the following.....LP Section 9.31 and “.....encouraging the supply and use of appropriate renewable energy and low carbon technologies.....” The local plan must be revised to strengthen these objectives by replacing ‘encourage’ with ‘mandate’ and ‘should’ with ‘shall’.
- "Consideration" of renewable energy is not enough; please take a lead on this and insist on, at the very least, solar panels on all houses. (This can be done aesthetically if it is incorporated into the design)
- Another weak phrase: ‘*Consideration should be given to the following technologies:*
- Consider, but feel free not to implement...

#### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

No policies to appraise.

#### Officer Response

#### Proposed changes to plan

### **Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions**

#### **Policy D9**

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 19 people/organisations.

Support	5
Object	8
Comment	6

#### Overarching Summary

- No specific reference to historic environment or visual impact and setting
- Historic England invites a specific policy relating to inclusion of renewable technologies in Conservation Areas with regard to historic buildings and wider historic landscape
- Proposed 30% improvements on Building Regulations is too high
- Policy D9’s Energy Requirement places rigid expectation on all development and may make schemes unviable
- Policy sets requirement beyond scope of national technical standards for energy efficiency
- Policy D9 is not consistent with National Policy and guidance and should be deleted
- Policy D9 first sentence should be amended to read, “*Development proposals for both commercial and residential buildings should demonstrate that they have applied the Energy Hierarchy, as set out in the Local Plan and, in doing so, have achieved a*

*Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) which is 30% 10% lower than the Target Emission Rate (TER) required by Building Regulations Part L 2013 Edition."*

- 30% lower than TER considered a very a very weak target. A wealthy, well-resourced district like Uttlesford should be taking a far stronger lead!
- The get out clauses here: 'as far as practical,' 'where it is feasible', and worse of all, 'economic' mean: let's get it cheap now – let future generations pay.... These phrases should be removed.
- PASSIV houses should be given priority

#### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Historic England** - Policy does not make a specific reference to historic environment or to visual impact and setting. Historic England invites a specific policy relating to the inclusion of renewable technologies within Conservation Areas and with regard to historic buildings and wider historic landscape. A sustainable approach should secure a balance between benefits that such development delivers and environmental costs it incurs. The policy should seek to limit and mitigate any such cost to the historic environment.

Reference for developing policy in this area is <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/>

**Saffron Walden Town Council** and **THE THAXTED SOCIETY** support the policy.

**Thaxted Parish Council** suggests the inclusion: 'Houses with roof solar panels and water recycling schemes will be encouraged.' Policy is supported.

**Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Stansted Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** believe that the cheapest way to install solar panels is by the developer. If solar panels considered standard then this should apply to market housing. Energy saving initiatives should be availed to market housing.

#### Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Policy D9's Energy Requirement places rigid expectation on all development and may make schemes unviable and this may be recognised by inclusion of clauses such as (1) applicable only where financially to do so and (2) that its imposition or element of it may not be possible with specialised housing schemes.
- Policy not in line with PPG and Ministerial Statement (July 2015) indicating that improvements in technical build standards should be through the Building Regulation regime and therefore no need for planning applications to provide Energy Assessments as these are dealt with via the Building Regulation regime.
- Policy sets requirement beyond scope of national technical standards for energy efficiency
- In 2015 the Government made it clear that such matters had to be addressed through Building Regulations rather than through planning policy (PPG ID 56-001-20150327)
- As drafted the policy conflicts with this requirement
- Policy D9 is not consistent with National Policy and guidance and should be deleted

- Ministerial Statement (July 2015) and PPG paras 56-001 – 56-023 clarify extent to which planning system has in delivery of additional technical building standards
- No need to demonstrate how Building Regulations will be met
- Energy demands and carbon dioxide emissions are required to accord with Part L of the Building Regulations
- Ministerial Statement (July 2015) and PPG paras 56-001 – 56-023 clarify extent to which planning system has in delivery of additional technical building standards
- No need to demonstrate how Building Regulations will be met
- Energy demands and carbon dioxide emissions are required to accord with Part L of the Building Regulations
- Proposed 30% improvements on Building Regulations is too high
- 10% improvement is more achievable without affecting viability too much
- Policy D9 first sentence should be amended to read, "*Development proposals for both commercial and residential buildings should demonstrate that they have applied the Energy Hierarchy, as set out in the Local Plan and, in doing so, have achieved a Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) which is 30% 10% lower than the Target Emission Rate (TER) required by Building Regulations Part L 2013 Edition.*"

#### Individuals

- PASSIV houses should be given priority although this may mean reduced profit for builders but it's in the interest of current and future residents in the District
- Expressions like "where practicable", "wherever feasible" are weak and obvious get-out clauses for developers
- Need to apply metrics to which conformity is required to gain consent for a new build
- "as far as practicable ", and "where feasible and economic" should not be in the text: minimising energy loss and incorporating renewable energy sources should be the guiding principles in designing and building, not add-ons which can be marginalised for 'economic' reasons...
- This does not go far enough. If the Council is serious about reducing carbon emissions, there should be binding requirement that all homes built in the proposed new garden villages are built to zero emission standards.
- Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) should be 30% lower than the Target for Emission Rate (TER) set out in Building Regs 2013.
- 30% lower than TER is a very weak target. A wealthy, well-resourced district like Uttlesford should be taking a far stronger lead!
- Other weak policies follow: '*Evidence that, as far as practicable, the development's fabric performance has been improved to minimise energy loss (Fabric Improvement).*'
- '*Evidence that renewable energy sources have been considered and incorporated into the development where it is feasible and economic to do so.*'
- The get out clauses here: 'as far as practical,' 'where it is feasible', and worse of all, 'economic' mean: let's get it cheap now – let future generations pay.... These phrases should be removed.

Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

#### **Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

Ensuring that carbon emissions are minimised and that new development is as energy efficient as possible, is a key tenet of sustainability and sustainable development. The Policy will have significant positive impacts in this regard.

### **Alternatives Considered**

It is considered that any deviation from the Policy approach could be considered unsustainable in line with the Policy's criteria or otherwise not distinctly different to warrant assessment within this SA.

### **Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

### Officer Response

### Proposed changes to plan

## **Highly Energy Efficient Buildings**

### **Policy D10**

This policy and supporting text was responded to by 10 people/organisations.

Support	7
Object	1
Comment	2

### Overarching Summary

- Extent to which planning system has in delivery of additional technical building standards is clarified in Ministerial Statement (July 2015) and PPG paras 56-001 – 56-023
- Energy demands and carbon dioxide emissions are required to accord with Part L of the Building Regulations
- Standards for energy efficient buildings considered low
- All new housing should be built with solar panels
- PASSIV housing standard should apply to all social housing delivered by the Local Plan
- All new housing stock should include SMART and green technologies especially superfast or subsequent generations broad band

### Statutory consultees and other bodies

**Saffron Walden Town Council and Thaxted Parish Council** support the policy.

**Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Steering Group and Stansted Neighbourhood Steering Group** support the policy but consider that the policy should cross reference to other policies.



### Developers/landowners/site promoters

- Ministerial Statement (July 2015) and PPG paras 56-001 – 56-023 clarify extent to which planning system has in delivery of additional technical building standards
- No need to demonstrate how Building Regulations will be met
- Energy demands and carbon dioxide emissions are required to accord with Part L of the Building Regulations

### Individuals

- As I read it council will condescend to look favourably on truly sustainable development, but really aren't promoting, requiring or insisting on it
- Why not set the bar of really energy efficient housing in Uttlesford? Show some leadership?
- If all new housing were to be built with solar panels, it is said we could solve our energy shortage
- The LPA should aim for PASSIV house standard for the social rented housing stock delivered by the plan.
- All housing stock should include SMART and green technologies especially the provision of superfast (or subsequent generations of) broadband

### Sustainability Appraisal June 2017

#### **Significant, Temporal and Secondary Effects**

Ensuring that carbon emissions are minimised and that new development is as energy efficient as possible, is a key tenet of sustainability and sustainable development. The Policy will have significant positive impacts in this regard.

#### **Alternatives Considered**

It is considered that any deviation from the Policy approach could be considered unsustainable in line with the Policy's criteria or otherwise not distinctly different to warrant assessment within this SA.

#### **Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations**

No mitigation measures or recommendations are proposed.

### Officer Response

### Proposed changes to plan