

Public Speakers:

Councillor Tina Knight spoke about the amount of houses that the local plan intended to be built in Debden. There had already been houses approved and built in the village. The planned amount was disproportionate for Debden's size. Flooding, parking and rat running were already big problems for the village, and the planned houses were intended to be built on prime agricultural land.

Jane Collins spoke about concerns about the development planned for Debden. Traffic gridlock and safety were currently major problems and further development would make it worse.

Ian Carter said he was in favour of proportionate development that fitted in with the local area. However, the planned development in Debden was disproportionate to the size of the village, was not in keeping with the rural location, would harm the open spaces and character of the village and was inappropriate due to the poor roads and gridlock in the area. There was flooding in the village and a proper hydrological study should be undertaken.

Brian Ross spoke on behalf of Stop Stansted Expansion. He said new policy proposed in the plan watered down or removed safeguards which protected the community from the unfettered expansion of Stansted Airport. Policy in the Regulation 18 local plan was not controversial, but had nevertheless been revised, almost exactly to mirror changes suggested by the airport's owners. He asked for the previous wording to be reinstated.

Ken McDonald spoke on the lack of an audit trail to demonstrate how the housing need figure had been calculated and that the total number of assumed jobs at Stansted Airport needed to be revised on the basis that the airport had revised its recent jobs forecast downwards. Only 18% of the airport's employees actually lived in Uttlesford, which would likely affect the employment need figure.

Isobel Grant spoke on behalf of Wendens Ambo Parish Council. She said the parish council were concerned that important aspects of policies GEN2, GEN4 and GEN5, included in the 2005 plan, had been left out of the Regulation 19 local plan.

Jackie Cheetham spoke on behalf of Takeley Parish Council. She said the parish council were concerned that the protection that residents around the airport had in policy SP11 had not been included in the Regulation 19 local plan. The new policy did not safeguard the local residents and countryside in the same way. The parish council were also concerned about the potential for an increase in noise generated by the airport and the proposal for off-street parking.

Sandi Merifield spoke on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council. There was a frustration about the lack of infrastructure included in the plan. The possible development did not reference Stebbing in its name, referring to it as West of Braintree. The plan would result in coalescence with Braintree District. There was concern that Uttlesford

District Council would be the junior partner in drawing up the development plan document for the West of Braintree site. The site was not viable, deliverable or sustainable.

Graham Mott spoke on behalf of Elsenham Parish Council. He said there was surplus capacity for houses in the plan and the five year land supply currently stood at almost 6 years. A proposed 40 dwellings in Elsenham were therefore not needed. Infrastructure in Elsenham was inadequate such as road and healthcare access, and Elsenham had already taken a disproportionate amount of houses. He proposed the Elsenham site be removed from the plan.

Alexander Armstrong spoke on behalf of Great Dunmow Town Council. He urged removal of three sites from the local plan; two of these were outside of the Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan and another had already been turned down by the Planning Committee. It was unjustified to include these in the plan.

Councillor Neil Hargreaves suggested removing two sites from the plan and instead adding an alternative site. The Bricketts site could be removed as it was a greenfield site, ribbon development, would be far from the village and would have issues with noise. Instead, a redundant quarry could be included, as it was achievable. This was a proposal which was important to Newport and Debden.