

# UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

## GREAT & LITTLE CHESTERFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - DECISION STATEMENT PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM

### 1. Summary

1.1 Following an Independent Examination, Uttlesford District Council has recommended that the Great & Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan proceeds to Neighbourhood Planning Referendum subject to the modifications set out in Appendix 2 below. The outcome of the Examination was reported to Cabinet on 20 October 2022 where it was confirmed (see Appendix 1) that the Great & Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan, as revised according to the modifications set out below, complies with the legal requirements and Basic Conditions set out in the Localism Act 2011 and with the provision made by or under section 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Plan (Appendix 3) can therefore proceed to referendum.

This decision statement can be viewed online at:

<https://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/4960/Great-and-Little-Chesterford-Neighbourhood-Plan>

OR

<https://www.lovegreatechesterford.com/>

### 2. Background

2.1 On 15 September 2014 Great Chesterford Parish Council, as the qualifying body, applied to Uttlesford District Council for a designation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area for the purpose of preparing a neighbourhood plan for the whole Great & Little Chesterford Parish Council area. The Neighbourhood Area application was approved by Uttlesford District Council on 18 June 2015 in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012).

2.2 The Council in agreement with Great Chesterford Parish Council, appointed an independent examiner, Tony Burton on 6 September 2021, to review whether the Plan met the Basic Conditions required by legislation and should proceed to referendum.

2.3 Following the submission of the Draft Great & Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan to the Council, the Plan was publicised, and representations were invited. The six - week consultation period was from 14 April to 30 May 2022.

2.4 The Plan was submitted to the Examiner on 9 June 2022.

2.5 The Examiner's Report concludes that, subject to making the modifications proposed by the Examiner, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

### **3. Decision and Reasons**

3.1 The District Council received the Examiner's Report on 2 August 2022. Having considered the Examiner's report and recommendations the District Council decided on 20 October 2022 that for the reasons set out in Appendix 1 of the Decision Statement, that the Examiner's recommendations should be accepted and that the Great & Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan (as modified) should proceed to referendum.

3.2 Therefore, to meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 a referendum which poses the following question:

**“Do you want Uttlesford District Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Great & Little Chesterford to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?”**

will be held in the Parishes of Great and Little Chesterford.

3.3 The Referendum is scheduled for **Thursday 8 December 2022**.

## APPENDIX 1: Cabinet Resolution in respect of Great & Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan

Published on 21st October 2022

### RECORD OF DECISIONS - CABINET THURSDAY, 20 October 2022

RECORD OF DECISIONS - CABINET THURSDAY, 20 October 2022		
<b>Non-Key</b>	<p>12 - Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>I. That Cabinet accepts the Independent Examiner's recommended modifications to the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan in full as set out in the Schedule at Appendix 2 and notes the recommendation that the amended Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a Referendum of voters within the Parishes of Great and Little Chesterford to establish whether the plan should form part of the Development Plan for Uttlesford District Council.</p> <p>II. That the Cabinet approves the holding of a referendum relating to the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan and, that it will include all the registered electors in Great and Little Chesterford Parishes.</p>	<p><b>Reasons:</b></p> <p>The Great &amp; Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan has been successful at examination. The Examiner's Report (Appendix 1) received on 02 August 2022 recommends that the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan proceed to referendum subject to recommended modifications being made to the Plan.</p> <p><b>Other Options considered:</b> None.</p> <p><b>Any interest declared by any member of Cabinet:</b> None.</p> <p><b>In respect of any conflict of interest declared, whether dispensation is in existence for that interest:</b></p> <p>N/A.</p>

*A decision will come into force and may be implemented on the expiry of five working days after the date of publication unless either the Chairman or any three members of the Scrutiny Committee objects and calls it in. To check the call-in status of any of the above decisions, please refer to the Decisions page of the website, where you can use search options to find information regarding decisions taken.*

\* Date set for the Great & Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan Referendum is Thursday, 08 December 2022.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Great & Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan – Schedule of Examiner’s Recommendations**

<b>DOCUMENT PAGE/POLICY</b>	<b>EXAMINER’S RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>EXAMINER’S REASON/S</b>	<b>OFFICER RECOMMENDATION AND REASON</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: Introduction About the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan</b> <b>Page 11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OM1</b> – [Provide a link to where the neighbourhood area boundary can be viewed at a larger scale]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The boundary of the neighbourhood area can be discerned from Figure 1.1. This is not at a scale or clarity that allows the detailed boundary to be determined and no link is provided to where the boundary is available online.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>For clarity, the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area should be at a scale that will be clear enough to allow determination of the Neighbourhood Plan boundary.</p>
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS ON PLAN’S PRESENTATION</b>  <b>Chapter 4 – Vision and Objectives: pages 40 - 41</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M1- Clarify and be consistent in the drafting and use of the Plan’s objective, including by:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recognising the Plan has a single objective supported by contributing objectives and not multiple objectives</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Integrating the text used for the contributing objectives (currently</b></li> </ul>	<p>The Plan has a single Objective and identifies eight ways in which this can be achieved. These contributing objectives are used variously as the basis for some but not all of the Plan’s policies. The wording of each “<i>policy objective</i>” differs to varying degrees from that used in the overall objective and some policy objectives do not appear in the</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>The recommended modification eliminates potential confusion in the description and use of the objective and provides clarity and a consistent approach to the use of a single objective supported by multiple objectives.</p>

	<p><b>A-H) with that used for each policy objective so it is aligned as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>5.2 and (D)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>5.3 and (C)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>5.4 and (F)</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Add new contributing objectives to paragraph 4.2 aligned with the policy objectives for 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7</b></li> <li>• <b>Integrate contributing objectives (A) and (B) with policy objectives for 5.8 and 5.9 to provide separate contributing objectives for housing and employment</b></li> <li>• <b>Align the policy objectives for the overall spatial strategy with the Plan’s overall objective</b></li> <li>• <b>It is an option to retain contributing objectives (E), (G) and (H) recognising they are not addressed directly by either the policies or the community projects in the Plan</b></li> </ul>	<p>overall Plan objective (e.g., 5.5 to 5.9). Similarly, some parts of the overall objective do not appear as policy objectives and are not being achieved in other ways (e.g. (A) and (B)). Some parts of the plan reference the eight ways in which the objective can be achieved as separate objectives. There is also inconsistent use of numbering and lettering when referencing them. This is a source of potential confusion. There is also potential confusion in the description and use of the objective.</p>	
<p><b>OTHER ISSUES</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OM2 – [List all the evidence base documents used in the Plan in an Appendix and include a link to the Plan’s website where they can be uploaded, or links provided]</b></li> </ul>	<p>The Plan includes references to a number of documents which comprise the evidence base. These include the Landscape Character Assessment and the Historic Environment Assessment. It does not provide details or links to many of these documents and</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Agree</p> <p>All policies must be backed up by robust evidence and all evidence base documents referenced in the in the plan should be included in an Appendix or a link to the Plan’s website.</p>

		there is no indication of where the Plan’s evidence base is provided online. The majority of the evidence base documents are made available on the Plan’s website.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OM3</b> - [Use updated base maps throughout the Plan]</li> </ul>	The Plan uses base maps which are in some cases significantly out of date and do not show completed development.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>The most up to date maps should be used in the Plan to reflect the latest situation on the ground but in this case a mix of up to date and out of date maps were used because some of the base maps retained are the current mapping provided by OS and other up to date base maps available do not properly show features such as topography considered important for context. Since this is an optional modification up-to-date and outdated maps were used where considered appropriate. This issue does not affect the requirement to meet Basic conditions.</p>
<p><b>CHAPTER 5 – The Policies – pg.42</b></p> <p><b>Policy GLNCNP/1 - Overall Spatial Strategy including key strategic</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M2 – Amend Policy GLCNP/1 to:</b></li> <li>• <b>In Section 1 replace “Growth in the Neighbourhood Plan Area” with “New development proposals should”</b></li> </ul>	On the detail of the Policy drafting, it relates to “development” requiring express planning permission rather than	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>A policy should be clearly written and concise to ensure that a decision maker can apply the policy consistently and with</p>

<p>landscape and heritage sensitivities: page 46</p>		<p>“growth” which can be more general in nature.</p> <p>Section 1 of the Policy is also unduly restrictive in stating where development “will” take place.</p>	<p>confidence when determining planning applications.</p> <p>Modification provides flexibility to the policy.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In Section 1 replace “and in the housing site(s) allocated in Little Chesterford as part of this Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan” with “or land allocated in Policy GLCNP/9.1”</b></li> </ul>	<p>Only one site is allocated in Little Chesterford and it is unnecessary to reference either the Plan or Area in Section 1.</p>	<p>The modification introduces flexibility and clarity to the plan.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In Section 2 replace “Outside of the villages” with “Outside of the Great Chesterford development limits or Little Chesterford settlement boundary”</b></li> </ul>	<p>The Policy should also be clear as to what constitutes being “outside” the villages.</p>	<p>Modification provides clarity and precision in policy wording allowing for appropriate development in the countryside.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>After “enhanced” in Section 2 insert “and development proposals should relate to uses that:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>need to be in the countryside;</b></li> <li>▪ <b>are appropriate to exception sites; or</b></li> <li>▪ <b>are employment uses at sites identified in Figure 5.24 or Figure 5.25.”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The general approach to the location of development should be defined as part of the overall spatial strategy in Policy GLCNP/1, including allowing for exception sites.</p>	<p>The modification provides flexibility to the overall spatial strategy and allows for the location of development in the countryside, exception sites and identified employment sites.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In Section 2 delete “our” in the second paragraph</b></li> </ul>	Policy drafting should be impersonal.	Policies wording should be neutral.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In Section 2 delete “only” in subsections a)-c)</b></li> </ul>	As drafted the Policy takes a restrictive approach in stating what will “only” be supported.	Provides flexibility to the policy on development outside the settlements.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In Section 2c) delete “River”</b></li> </ul>	The Plan is inconsistent in reference to both “ <i>Cam Valley Area</i> ” and “ <i>Cam River Valley Area.</i> ”	The deletion of “River” introduces consistency to area referenced in the Plan.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M3 – Provide further detail in the supporting text on the rationale and evidence base used to define the Chalk Uplands, Roman Scheduled Monuments and Setting Zone and the Cam River Valley Area.</b></li> </ul>	<p>There is evidence supporting much of the definition of these areas in the Landscape Character Assessment and Historic Environment Assessment.</p> <p>I share some of the concern expressed by Strutt and Parker on behalf of The Hill Group about the evidence for the Cam River Valley Area and requested further information. I was informed of additional considerations for including some other land, including open farmland west of the B1383.</p>	Additional information should be provided in the supporting text to show that the rationale for the policy is based on robust and credible evidence base and considerations.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OM4 – [Provide access to a larger scale map enabling the detailed boundaries of the areas described by Figure 5.1 to be identified]</b></li> </ul>	It will be helpful to provide a larger scale map online enabling the detailed boundaries of the	A detailed Figure 5.1 clearly showing boundaries of areas will ensure that the principles for development impacting on the



		areas defined in Figure 5.1 to be identified.	Chalk Uplands, Roman Scheduled Monuments and Setting Zone and Cam Valley can be determined with confidence.
<b>5.2 Settlement pattern and separation – pg. 47</b> <b>Policy GLCNP/2 – Settlement Pattern and Separation: pg. 50</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M4 – Amend Policy GLCNP/2 to:</b></li> <li>• <b>Delete Section 1</b></li> </ul>	<p>There is significant overlap between Policy GLCNP/1 and the first part of Policy GLCNP/2 in determining the most appropriate location for new development and the role of the Great Chesterford development limits and Little Chesterton settlement boundary.</p> <p>Policy GLCNP/2 additionally identifies the appropriateness of types of development that need to be in the countryside (amplifying Local Plan Policy S7)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Section 1 is unnecessary because it duplicates part of Policy GLCNP/1 as well as reinforcing Local Plan Policy S7 (Countryside).</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Replace the first two lines of Section 2 with “Development proposals in the following Separation Zones (Figure 5.4) should either be appropriate to a location outside a settlement or otherwise avoid significant harm to the purpose of the Separation Zone in providing a rural buffer or visual break between settlements</b></li> </ul>	<p>The second part of the Policy defines four “Separation Zones” to be “kept open and free from development.” The location is provided in Figures 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 although confusingly the Figures and the Policy describe them differently as “Separation Zones” and “Areas of Separation.” It will be helpful to</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>This modification provides clarity and removes ambiguity and thereby ensures that a decision maker can apply the policy consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.</p>

	<p><b>and/or protecting the character and rural setting of settlements:”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>In Section 2 replace all references to “Area of Separation” with “Separation Zone”</b></li> </ul>	<p>provide a larger scale map online enabling the detailed boundaries of the areas defined in Figure 5.4 to be identified.</p> <p>The rationale for and boundaries of the Separation Zones are explained in the supporting text although this does not provide sufficient detail for each of the boundaries.</p> <p>I recommend this additional explanation is provided in the supporting text.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Delete Section 3</b></li> </ul>	<p>The Policy is contradictory in seeking to keep Separation Zones “free from development” whilst also supporting types of development that need to be located in the countryside.</p>	<p><b>Agree</b> Section 3 lacks clarity and should be deleted.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Delete Section 4</b></li> </ul>	<p>The fourth part of the Policy that new housing development in Springwell will not be supported is unduly restrictive. Any proposals will already be subject to stringent policies</p>	<p><b>Agree</b> Government policy requires neighbourhood plans to “plan positively” and unduly restrictive Section 4 is unduly restrictive and should be deleted.</p>

		covering development in rural areas.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In Section 5 delete “infill development”</b></li> </ul>	The fifth part of the Policy limits development within Great and Little Chesterford to infill despite the Great Chesterford development limits having been redrawn to include a non-infill site.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>The modification provides clarity.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In Section 6 replace “will not be supported as it would change the “with “should not result in significant detrimental harm to the linear”</b></li> </ul>	<p>It is also unduly restrictive in the final part of the Policy not to support any backland development in Little Chesterford even if it has no significant detrimental impact.</p> <p>I observed that a small amount of backland development already exists in Little Chesterford without damaging its linear character.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Provides flexibility to the policy.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M5 – Provide further detail in the supporting text on the rationale and evidence base used to define the Separation Zones</b></li> </ul>	<p>The rationale for and boundaries of the Separation Zones are explained in the supporting text although this does not provide sufficient detail for each of the boundaries.</p> <p>On request I was provided with additional information regarding their definition corresponding to relevant landscape character</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Providing additional information on the evidence and rationale supporting the Separation Zones provides a justification and purpose of the separation zones.</p>

		areas varied according to them fulfilling the purpose of a separation zone. I recommend this additional explanation is provided in the supporting text.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OM5</b> – [Provide access to a larger scale map enabling the detailed boundaries of the areas described by Figure 5.4 to be identified]</li> </ul>	The second part of the Policy defines four “Separation Zones” to be “kept open and free from development.” The location is provided in Figures 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 although confusingly the Figures and the Policy describe them differently as “Separation Zones” and “Areas of Separation”. It will be helpful to provide a larger scale map online enabling the detailed boundaries of the areas defined in Figure 5.4 to be identified.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Clearly defined and detailed boundaries of the Separation Zones on Figure 5 will ensure that application of the policy on this Zones is consistent as to the relevant Separation Zone boundaries.</p>
Getting Around – pg.51 Policy GLNPC/3 – pg. 54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M6 – Amend Policy GLCNP/3 to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In Section 1 replace <i>“In order to deliver sustainable development, all development proposals must”</i> with <i>“Development proposals should”</i></li> <li>▪ In Section 2 insert <i>“where appropriate”</i> before <i>“be capable”</i></li> <li>▪ In Section 3 insert <i>“as appropriate”</i> after <i>“development”</i></li> <li>▪ In Section 2 and 3 replace <i>“must”</i> with <i>“should”</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The Policy references specific measures to be supported by development but there is a lack of evidence as to their feasibility or priority. The measures also include road safety investment not covered by the Policy. I recommend that the measures are identified as examples rather than presented as a prescribed list.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>The recommended modifications make the policy flexible, concise, and ensure that requirements relate only to appropriate development.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In Section 4 replace <i>“to achieve the identified required”</i> with <i>“for”</i></li> <li>▪ In Section 4 insert <i>“and road safety measures, including”</i> after <i>“improvements”</i></li> </ul>	The detailed Policy drafting can be improved, including to avoid including the purpose of the Policy and to ensure it is not unduly restrictive and the requirements relate only to appropriate development.	
Landscape Character Policy GLCNP/4a – Landscape Character – page 57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M7 – Amend Policy GLCNP/4a to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delete <i>“only”</i></li> <li>▪ Replace all instances of <i>“preserves”</i> with <i>“conserves”</i></li> <li>▪ Insert <i>“and”</i> at the end of subsection d)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The Policy drafting is unduly restrictive in stating that development will <i>“only”</i> be supported if it meets the criteria. Its deletion still means support is conditional on the criteria being satisfied. It is national planning policy to <i>“conserve and enhance”</i> rather than <i>“preserve or enhance”</i> nature (Chapter 15, NPPF (National Policy Planning Framework)). The intention for all the criteria to apply is unclear.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Proposed modification by deletion of <i>“only”</i> provides flexibility and clarity to the policy.</p> <p><i>“Conserve and enhance”</i> is the national policy and not <i>preserve and enhance</i> as drafted in the original policy.</p> <p>Insertion of <i>“and”</i> after the penultimate criterion confirms that all criteria apply.</p>
	OM6 – [Include Uttlesford District Council’s Local Wildlife Site Review (2007) in the Evidence Base]	The significance, variety, and nature of the landscape in the neighbourhood area is partly evidenced through a detailed Landscape Character Assessment which informs the policy. Additional consideration has been given to the landscape setting of the three main settlements,	The Uttlesford Local Wildlife Review 2007 should be included to show that the Policy is supported by a robust Evidence Base.

		including village walks and work on local wildlife sites undertaken by Uttlesford District Council in 2007 (which is not cited in the supporting text).	
<p><b>Views: pg. 56</b>  <b><u>Policy GLNC/4b</u> – Views: pg. 64</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M8 – Retitle Policy GLCNP/4b as “Views” and make the following amendments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Delete “only”</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Insert “does” after “and” and “significantly” after “not” in subsection a)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Replace “especially” with “including” in subsection b)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Replace “plateaus and uplands” with “Chesterford Ridge and Chalk Upper Slopes (Figure 3.1)”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There is a lack of detail in the Plan about what distinguishes an “Important View” from a “Locally Important View.” This extends to the Policy title and the Plan sub-heading which both references only “Locally Important Views.”</p> <p>There is a need also to explain how the three categories of view described in paragraph 5.4.9 – Significant, Important and Community Designated – are differently categorised into Important and Locally Important for the purposes of the Policy. Table 5.1 also fails to distinguish between Important and Locally Important views and the supporting text incorrectly identifies Table 5.1 as only including “Locally Important</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>For clarity, the supporting text should explain the categorisation of the views for better understanding of the Policy.</p> <p>Amendment of the Policy title to Views will provide an unambiguous Title to what the policy seeks to protect.</p> <p>The deletion of “only” introduces flexibility to an otherwise restrictive policy.</p> <p>Recommended modifications to subsection a) provides clarity and ensures that the policy can be consistently applied with confidence.</p> <p>In subsection b) the modification provides flexibility to application of the policy.</p>

		Views.” I recommend text from the Important Views	Replacement of “plateaus and uplands” with Chesterford Ridge and Chalk Upper Slopes provides clarity and certainty when deciding on planning applications.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M9 – Make other clarifications to the supporting text:</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Delete “Locally Important” in the sub-heading on page 58 and the Contents on page 1</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Move paragraph 5.4.9 to before paragraph 5.4.8</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Distinguish “Important Views” from “Locally Important Views” in Table 5.1</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Replace “set out” with “included” in the last sentence of paragraph 5.4.8</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Insert “and Locally Important” before “Views” in the titles of Figures 5.13 and 5.14</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Insert “Important Views are those identified by reports in the evidence base, including the Conservation Area Appraisal and Historic Environment Assessment. Locally Important Views are those identified by the</b></li> </ul>	<p>There is a lack of detail in the Plan about what distinguishes an “Important View” from a “Locally Important View.” This extends to the Policy title and the Plan sub-heading which both reference only “Locally Important Views.”</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Deletion of “Locally important” in subheading and Contents page 1 reflects the amendments made in response to modification M8 and provides consistency to the plan.</p> <p>Movement of paragraphs provides a more logical presentation of the supporting text.</p> <p>For clarity Important Views and Locally important views should be clearly identifiable understood by anyone reading the Plan.</p> <p>Replacement with “included” provides flexibility to the text.</p> <p>Insertion of “Locally Important” provides clarity by making a clear distinction and identification between Locally Important and Important Views.</p>

	<p>community through surveys and village walks” before Table 5.1 and explain the categorisation of Significant, Important and Community Designated views into Important and Locally Important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Include additional supporting text explaining the evidence for the significance of the panoramic views</li> </ul>		<p>Recommended insertion serves to clarify and differentiate between Locally Important and Important Views.</p> <p>Additional supporting text will result in providing convincing rationale for assigning panoramic views as significant.</p>
<p>Historic Environment pg:65 Policy GLNCP/5 – Historic Environment – pages 69 -70</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M10 – Amend Policy GLCNP/5 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Replace opening two lines with “Development proposals should conserve and enhance the historic environment and take account of the following as appropriate:”</li> <li>▪ Delete Sections 1, 5, 7 and 9</li> <li>▪ Insert a new Section “The significance of any undesignated heritage asset, including any structure on the Local Heritage List”</li> <li>▪ In Sections 2, 4, 8 and 10 replace “must” with “should”</li> <li>▪ Replace Section 2 with “Open visibility between the Scheduled Monuments comprising the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>National planning policy is that “Plans should.....f) serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)” (paragraph 16, NPPF). Parts of Policy GLCNP/5 conflict with this approach, including Section 1 related to designated heritage assets, Section 5 related to Conservation Areas and Section 9 related to non-designated heritage assets. Section 7 is also inconsistent with national planning policy relating to undesignated heritage assets on a Local List.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>The recommended modification provides clarity of the policy and its consistency with national planning policy, including in relation to the setting of Scheduled Monuments.</p> <p>The modification introduces flexibility to the policy that was unduly restrictive in stating what “must” be addressed or happens and what “will not be supported.”</p>



	<p>Roman Town and Fort and the Romano-Celtic Temple and the open aspect of the Romano-Celtic Temple area should both be conserved.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Replace Section 3 with “Development along Newmarket Road should avoid any significant detrimental impact on views into the designated Scheduled Monuments “</li> <li>▪ In Section 4 insert “(Figure 5.17)” after “Monument”</li> <li>▪ Replace Section 6 with “In Little Chesterford, the Historic Core (Figure 5.17) comprising the open space and setting of the church and hall should be conserved.”</li> <li>▪ In Section 8 delete “and Brick”</li> <li>▪ Replace Section 10 with “The publication and dissemination of the results of archaeological investigations is encouraged where these are required to be undertaken”</li> <li>▪ Replace Section 11 with “The contribution of a high quality of design and materials”</li> <li>▪ Insert “; and” at the end of the penultimate Section</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>The revised Policy will read as follows:  “Development proposals should conserve and enhance the historic environment and take account of the following as appropriate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1.</b> The significance of any undesignated heritage asset, including any structure on the Local Heritage List;</li> <li><b>2.</b> Open visibility between the Scheduled Monuments comprising the Roman Town and Fort and the Romano-Celtic Temple and the open aspect of the Romano Celtic Temple area should both be conserved;</li> <li><b>3.</b> Development along Newmarket Road should avoid any significant detrimental impact on views into the designated Scheduled Monuments;</li> <li><b>4.</b> The setting of the Bordeaux Farm scheduled Monument (Figure 5.17) should be conserved;</li> <li><b>5.</b> In Little Chesterford, the Historic Core (Figure 5.17) comprising the open space and setting of the Church and Hall should be conserved;</li> <li><b>6.</b> The Local Historic Features (Flint Walls and Sunken Banks) in Little Chesterford</li> </ol>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>should be conserved or enhanced by any development proposals;</p> <p>7. The publication and dissemination of the results of archaeological investigations is encouraged where these are required to be undertaken; and</p> <p>8. The contribution of a high quality of design and materials.”</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M11– Provide a revised version or a link to a scale of map for Figure 5.17 which enables each of the Local Historic Features to be accurately located</b></li> </ul>	<p>Figure 5.17 is not at a sufficiently large scale to identify the precise location of these Local Historic Features. I recommend a larger map is provided at a scale whereby each feature can be accurately identified.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Maps should be at a sufficiently large scale to accurately identify the Local Historic Features in the relevant Plan.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M12 – In Figures 5.15 and 5.17 delete “Bordeaux Farm rural context area” and provide a description of the setting of Bordeaux Farm Scheduled Monument in the supporting text</b></li> </ul>	<p>The setting is shown in Figure 5.17 although it is identified here as the “Bordeaux Farm rural context area.” The different terminology is a potential cause of confusion.</p> <p>I share concerns expressed by Strutt and Parker on behalf of The Hill Group concerning the evidence supporting the boundary shown in Figure 5.17.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>The modification provides clarity and certainty by recommending a description of the setting of Bordeaux Farm Scheduled Monument in the supporting text.</p>

		This is not provided by the Historic Environment Assessment. On request I was provided with a brief description of the boundaries but the basis for this remains too unclear.	
<b>Valued Community Spaces and Facilities NP: pg. 71</b> <b>Policy GLCNP/6 – Valued Community Spaces and Facilities – pg. 76</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>M13 – Replace Policy GLCNP/6 with “Development proposals which result in the loss or significant reduction in the value of Valued Community Spaces and Facilities (Table 5.2) should demonstrate that either the space or facility is no longer required or that alternative appropriate provision of at least equivalent value exists or will be provided elsewhere in an appropriate location in the neighbourhood area.”</b> </li> </ul>	<p>Superfluous numbering of a single Section and a caveat relating to circumstances where “planning permission is required.” Planning policy is only relevant to development requiring express planning permission.</p> <p>The drafting is unclear in requiring the value to be simultaneously “improved or enhanced” and “not materially reduced.” It is also unclear how the Policy relates to instances where the space or facility is otherwise provided in the area or instances where the space or facility is no longer needed.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>It is both pointless and not necessary to number a single section and planning policy is required where development requires planning permission.</p> <p>The modification provides clarity and removes ambiguity so that as modified a decision maker can apply the policy consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>M14 – Clarify the locations of Chesterford Fisheries (4) and the route of the Riverside walk between Great and Little</b> </li> </ul>	<p>The locations of Chesterford Fisheries (4) and the route of the Riverside walk between</p>	<p>Clarity in Figures is crucial for the reader to identify exact locations of Chesterford Fisheries (4) and the route of the Riverside walk</p>

	<b>Chesterford (22) in the appropriate Figure(s)</b>	Great and Little Chesterford (22) are not clear from Figure 5.21.	between Great and Little Chesterford.
	<b>OM7</b> – [Add “and Facilities” after both instances of “Valued Community spaces” in the Contents]	The Contents does not reference “facilities.”	Addition of “Facilities” to Contents page provides consistency with Plan content.
<b>Local Green Spaces Policy GLCNP/7 – Local Green Spaces – pg. 79</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M15 – Amend Policy GLCNP/7 to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Delete Sections 2 and 3</b></li> </ul> </li>   <li>▪ <b>Delete “1” in Section 1 and replace “Figure 5.35” with “Table 5.3 and Figure 5.22”</b></li> </ul>	<p>To be afforded a level of protection consistent with them being Green Belt Local Green Spaces need only be designated by the Plan which means it is inappropriate to include any wording that sets out how development proposals should be managed.</p> <p>The Policy includes an incorrect reference to “Figure 5.35.”</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Sections 2 and 3 are unnecessary because designation as Local Green Spaces by the Plan affords the level of protection that is consistent with the Green Belt.</p> <p>Table 5.3 and Figure 5.22 are the correct references related to Policy GLCNP/7.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M16 – Delete LGS-13 from Table 5.3 and Figure 5.22</b></li> </ul>	There is insufficient evidence that it is demonstrably special to the local community. The land is protected from development under other development plan policies	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>LGS-13 does not meet NPPF Local Green Space designation criteria and should be removed from the policy as well as any references to LGS (Local Green Spaces) 13 in Table 5.3 and Figure 2.2.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M17 – Provide a revised version or a link to a scale of map for Figure 5.22 which enables the exact boundaries of each of the Local Green Spaces to be determined.</b></li> </ul>	Provide a revised version or a link to a scale of map for Figure 5.22 which enables the exact boundaries of each of the Local Green Spaces to be determined.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Site boundaries should be clearly provided to facilitate the exact location and extent of the sites under consideration.</p>
Gt & Lt Chesterford NP: pg. 78 Employment Policy GLCNP/8 – Employment - page 80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M18 – Amend Policy GLCNP/8 to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>At the end of Section 2 insert “where appropriate”</b></li> <li>▪ <b>In Section 3 insert “significant” before “detrimental”</b></li> <li>▪ <b>In Section 3 insert “identified in Figures 5.24 and 5.25” after “employment”</b></li> <li>▪ <b>In Section 3 replace “will not be supported other than where evidence can be produced” with “should demonstrate”</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Policy expects all development at Chesterford Research Park to be accompanied by a workplace travel plan. This may not be the case in all circumstances, such as where a planning application is for development with limited or no traffic implications.</p> <p>The protection of existing employment sites is negatively worded in stating what “will not be supported” and I recommend that proposals should instead demonstrate that they meet relevant considerations.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>The recommended modifications introduce flexibility and positive wording to the policy.</p> <p>Policies should be positively worded.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M19 – Delete Figure 5.23 and rename “Chesterford Research Park Development limit” as</b></li> </ul>		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>No evidence has been provided to justify the Development Limit and the proposed Development Limit</p>

	<b>“Chesterford Research Park” in Figure 5.4</b>		has not been publicly consulted on.  The Local Plan protects land around Chesterford Research Park, and it is an unnecessary to duplicate existing protection.
--	--	--	--

<p>Gt &amp; Lt Chesterford NP: pg.81 Housing Policy GLCNP/9 – Housing pg. 86</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M20 – Replace Policy GLCNP/9 with:</b></li> </ul> <p><b>“Residential development proposals will be supported which are located on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>site allocation Chest 12 and are in accordance with Policy GLCNP/9.1</b></li> <li>▪ <b>windfall sites of fewer than five units; or</b></li> <li>▪ <b>infill sites or previously developed land</b></li> </ul> <p><b>and which address the following considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>a scale of development which is proportionate to the size of the settlement in which it is located;</b></li> <li>▪ <b>provision of a mix of sizes and tenures of homes which reflects local needs;</b></li> <li>▪ <b>provision of specialist housing for older people where appropriate;</b></li> <li>▪ <b>provision of affordable homes which meet local housing needs as expressed in the local housing needs assessment; and</b></li> <li>▪ <b>securing contributions for the Early Years and Child Care education facility to the east of the Bowls Club in Great Chesterford where this relates</b></li> </ul>	<p>The three allocated sites are each subject to their own Policy. Two of the three sites are at such an advanced stage of development (Chest 9 and Chest 13) that their inclusion as site allocations within the Plan serves no planning purpose. Uttlesford District Council confirmed that construction began in March 2022 and April 2021, respectively. I recommend their deletion from the Plan and consequent amendments to the supporting text. The sites continue to contribute to the overall housing requirement for the Plan area.</p> <p>The Policy also supports residential development on windfall sites of less than five units or development of any size on infill/brownfield sites consistent with other Plan policies. Given the nature of the neighbourhood area it is unlikely that an infill site of larger than five dwellings will come forward as a windfall site, but this is recognised by the</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agree</b></p> <p>The recommended modifications provide flexibility, clarity and so that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.</p>
--	--	---	--



	<p><b>appropriately to the proposed development.”</b></p>	<p>parish councils as being possible. This confirms the need to redraft the Policy to provide support for residential development on all three types of sites.</p> <p>The Policy also supports residential development on windfall sites of less than five units or development of any size on infill/brownfield sites consistent with other Plan policies. Given the nature of the neighbourhood area it is unlikely that an infill site of larger than five dwellings will come forward as a windfall site, but this is recognised by the parish councils as being possible. This confirms the need to redraft the Policy to provide support for residential development on all three types of site.</p>	
--	---	--	--

		The Policy also repeats national policy on Net Gain and First Homes.	<b>Agree</b> Reference to national policy on Net Gain and First Homes should be deleted because the plan should not be duplicating existing policy but should be addressing gaps or provide further detail rather than duplicating existing policies.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>M21 – Delete Policy GLCNP/9.2 and Policy GLCNP/9.3 and make consequential changes to the supporting text to describe the recent history of planning consents and the contribution to meeting the indicative housing requirement.</b></li> </ul>	Two of the three sites are at such an advanced stage of development (Chest 9 and Chest 13) that their inclusion as site allocations within the Plan serves no planning purpose.	<b>Agree</b> There is no planning purpose served by allocating the two sites with extant planning permission and under construction.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>OM8 – [Provide information in the supporting text on the intention to monitor and review the Plan in relation to the future Local Plan review]</b></li> </ul>	The implications of any more recent evidence and information which will inform the forthcoming Local Plan review is most sensibly managed through a review of the neighbourhood plan.	<b>Agree</b> Any housing requirement may change as further work on the emerging Local Plan is undertaken.  The Plan states in paragraph 1.8 that reviews will be undertaken periodically to determine whether updates are required.
<b>Policy GLCNP/9.1 – Land opposite Rectory Barns (Chest 12)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Policy GLCNP/9.1</b></li> <li><b>M22 – Amend Policy GLCNP/9.1 to:</b></li> </ul>		<b>Agree</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Replace all instances of “<i>must</i>” and “<i>shall</i>” with should</b></li> <li>• <b>Delete “(for example, a children’s playground) in principle 5 and include it as an example in paragraph 5.9.14 of the supporting text</b></li> </ul>	<p>The Policy is overly restrictive in stating what “<i>must</i>” or “<i>shall</i>” be addressed.</p> <p>Examples should be provided in the supporting text.</p>	<p>The recommended modification provides flexibility to the policy.</p> <p>Policies should be clear and concise, and examples should be provided in the supporting text.</p>
<p><b>8.Examiner’s Recommendation and Referendum Area</b></p> <p><b>“I am satisfied the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other requirements subject to the modifications recommended in this report and that it can proceed to a referendum. I have received no information to suggest other than that I recommend the referendum area matches that of the Neighbourhood Area.”</b></p>			

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **Great & Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan – September 2022 Referendum Version**

<https://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/chesterfordsnp#referendum>