

# Appendix 4: Regulation 18 Comment Summaries and Responses

## Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy July 2024

Table 1 Core Policy 1: Addressing Climate Change .....2

Table 2 Core Policy 2: Meeting Our Housing Needs..... 10

Table 3 Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy.....34

Table 4 Core Policy 4: Meeting Business and Employment Needs .....48

Table 5 Core Policy 5: Providing Support Infrastructure and Services .....63

**Table 1 Core Policy 1: Addressing Climate Change**

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2086	Councillor Fiddy				Adaptation	Respondent states that neither the Climate Change Evidence nor the IDP mention adaptation to climate change. References the need to counter overheating and the potential use of public buildings as 'cooling centres'. Water stressed areas and water supply at times of low rainfall should be addressed (under adaptation) too.	These matters are addressed elsewhere in the draft plan. The overarching Core Policy 1 requires development proposals to demonstrate mitigation including in relation to point v - implementing the cooling hierarchy and the overheating policy CP24; viii in CP1 covers promoting the efficient use of natural resources and CP 35 addresses Water Supply; the required Climate Change Sustainability Statement (Table 4.1 and para 4.15) which sets out topics to be included in development proposals requires overall consideration 'adaptation'. Despite these references, the review of the policy will consider in more detail how these aspects have been covered.
NDLP2193	Robin Grayson				Agricultural land	Opposes use of the best agricultural land for development, and the implications for food security and domestic food production.	Most of the agricultural land in the District is of high quality and the plan seeks to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land in accordance with national policy. However, this needs to be balanced against a wide range of others factors, including the importance of the plan supporting sustainable development, such as ensuring development is located where it can maximise the use of sustainable modes of travel.
NDLP2200	Mrs Isobel Grayson						
NDLP2495	Miss Kathryn Woods						
NDLP2764	Mrs Isobel Grayson						
NDLP1275	Mr Robert Jones				Airport	Difficult to take the climate change policies as a means to help meet net zero targets in the context of the airport and its polluting operations and permitted expansion. Air travel contributes significantly to carbon emissions and hence expansion of Stansted activity is of great concern but is not sufficiently addressed in the Local Plan.	It is important the Local Plan seeks to minimise emissions associated with development influenced by the Local Plan, such as planning for new development and these are designed and implemented. Other mechanisms will help to address emissions from other sectors including from air travel, including the development of low carbon fuels and technologies.
NDLP1889	Karen Quinn						
NDLP600	Stephanie Gill				Biodiversity	Biodiversity is being eroded by building into countryside so any policy must be strong. Wildlife corridors, green spaces, planting of trees and biodiverse habitats are essential. Support for the Chalk streams policy.	Noted. CP1 will be reviewed in order to include a general reference to biodiversity but CP40 covers protection and enhancement of Biodiversity in detail, CP38 on the Natural Environment and CP39 on Green and Blue Infrastructure. These biodiversity protection policies focus on the need to put the environment at the fore in development proposals, avoiding the loss of irreplaceable habitats like ancient woodlands and protecting trees and hedgerows whilst requiring an enhanced biodiversity net gain over what is statutorily required, potentially at 20%. Chalk streams protection policy 35 will be refined to ensure it is effective and enforceable
NDLP2586	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP3201	J Damany-Hosman						
NDLP3419	Bloor Homes (Eastern)				Climate Change and Sustainability Statement	Supports the principle of CP1 but recommends clarification of the CCSS to make its requirements proportionate to the scale of development beyond the two categories identified for below and above ten units; this needs to be explained that it refers to 'minor' and major' development. Suggests additional categories so the requirement for the small and medium developers are not unnecessarily onerous.	The CCSS will be reviewed to ensure its requirements for different types and sizes of development are clear and consideration will be given to a template or guidance note.
NDLP3436	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3453	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP324	Mrs Jane Sharp				Environment	Welcomes focus on protection of the natural environment and role in carbon capture but urges inclusion of another policy that focuses on Nature Recovery. Policy wording should be strengthened to include 'enhancement' as well as 'protection' to capture the biodiversity duty under the Environment Act 2021. Plan should recognise role of green infrastructure in aiding climate change adaptation such as natural flood management, reducing air pollution, tree planting. Policies should set out appropriate nature-based solutions for climate mitigation and adaptation such as woodland/wetland creation. Natural England references their	Consideration can be given to adding to an appropriate policy such as CP 40 (Biodiversity) to address nature recovery and enhancement. Policy CP39 on green infrastructure (GI) will be reviewed in the Regulation 19 draft Plan to integrate the role of GI in climate change adaptation and nature-based solutions. CCSS requires demonstration of how these requirements are addressed and (x) in CP1. There are several policy and statutory tools to retain trees including TPO, the site development guidance, the Design Code etc. It is acknowledged that unprotected trees may be removed before
NDLP744	Mr Neil Reeve						
NDLP950	Kim Crow						
NDLP2143	Mr David Kent						
NDLP3563							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1513	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  Natural England					'Climate Change Adaptation Manual, Carbon Storage and Sequestration by Habitat and National biodiversity climate change vulnerability model' . Removal of trees for new development means the loss of the carbon store which is impossible to replace except over a very long time period with new planting. Need to find a mechanism to prevent tree loss in the build-up to planning consents and in new development. Para 4.13 applies to Ashdon, protection of environment, enhancement to biodiversity and access to the countryside. There is general support for the policy and encouragement of wildlife corridors and connectivity including the Big Green Internet project for hedging between Epping Forest and Maldon linking Hatfield Forest and Easton Park. Further commentary that eco homes and the adoption of SUDs should be compulsory to avoid private maintenance charges.	the site comes to the attention of the Planning Authority. The new Biodiversity Net Gain requirement ignores the loss of trees removed in this way from its calculations and this should act as a disincentive because of the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain across the site under the Environment Act 2021. The Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy encourages the creation of wildlife corridors and achieving biodiverse and relevant areas of habitat, especially woodland. It shows the proposed link to Thaxted from Hatfield Forest and the emerging revised proposals for the Takeley site embrace this. All the strategic sites encourage a green infrastructure-led approach. The eco home standard is essentially encompassed in the climate change policies in chapter 9 requiring high standards of energy efficiency. The design of SUDs is expected to be to adoptable standard but there are some locations and instances where this is not always possible. Policy encourages working with the Council at an early stage in the design process through Design Codes and the strategic site guidance principles so that the design of all green infrastructure conforms to the highest standards. Policy also requires consideration of (community) stewardship principles.
NDLP642 NDLP1023 NDLP1404 NDLP1684 NDLP1909	John Howett  Mark Bulling  Kathryn Chatto  Essex Police  Louise Johnson	Planning Advisor Essex Police			Housing	The changes in sustainable design and the construction of zero carbon housing needs to be done from the publication of the plan and not phased in over the 20 years to 2041. Supports the aim for well-designed, sustainable, high design quality homes that are properly insulated and low in carbon footprint. They should be built to the highest possible low carbon standards that will last longer and in doing so have a reduced carbon footprint. Safe and secure homes will prolong their lifespan and future proofing. This must include a high proportion of affordable homes in any development. Agrees with importance of providing a range of housing to suit different needs in different locations including access to good transport links for commuting and provision of adequate parking for domestic and self-employed/working-from-home vehicles, helping to create a sustainable community.	Policies on energy and sustainable construction will apply from the adoption of the plan by the Council. The overall climate change policy CP1 together with individual policies on energy and overheating, and the Design Code, aim for the highest standards that are achievable. They require high standards of insulation to reduce the carbon footprint and the need for a high level of expenditure on heating and energy use. Housing policy CP56 requires a high proportion of affordable homes, and these must be built to similar standards. The Housing policy seeks to fine tune the housing requirements to the range of needs identified in the Housing study. The Design Code applies to the layout of sites including parking spaces to achieve convenient and usable housing areas.
NDLP1031	Mark Bulling				Noise	Noise derives from additional housing as well as planes.	Housing will not be located in the vicinity of the airport where the noise levels are considered excessive noise within the airport safety zone or Countryside Protection Zone around the airport. Any unsociable or nuisance noise associated with housing residents is separate from planning but may fall within the remit of Environmental Health.
NDLP721 NDLP1221 NDLP3222 NDLP1218	Kim Crow  Mr Richard Walford  Weston Homes Plc  Mr Richard Walford				Corrections	Suggests that there is an additional Core Policy which aims to cover "Maintaining and enhancing the quality of the local environment, both built and natural." Some policy reference numbers are incorrect. There is a general suggestion for use of terms 'must' rather than 'should' in order to provide tighter policy control. There are several suggestions to supplement the initiatives and requirements relating to renewable energy and environmental amenity: key measures to achieve net zero should include buses as well as small vehicles (para 4.8 , bullet point 4) and suggests adding : 'Consider replacement of car use by mass transit for end-to-end travel e.g. ropeways (or bubble lifts)'; potentially piping hydrogen to new development , possibly in the community-based initiatives mentioned in para 4.12; in para 4.14, add: "Provision of shops, schools, cafes and other facilities within, or within easy reach of, new developments in excess of [30] units will reduce the need for people to travel, and will create a greater	The Spatial Strategy sets out five core policies on climate change, housing, the settlement hierarchy, business and employment and supporting infrastructure. These lead on from the eleven overall strategic objectives in the Plan set out in Table 3.1. This includes Objectives SO2 to protect quality landscape; SO3 to protect the natural environment ; SO6 to protect heritage and the historic environment. It is considered that the proposed new objective is covered by these existing strategic objectives though the precise wording will be reviewed as part of the Regulation 19 draft Plan. Text will be checked and references to the correct numbers. The various suggestions will be considered in the review of the plan for the Regulation 19 draft. Some may not yet be practical with current infrastructure such as the increased use of hydrogen. In general, the word 'should' is considered more appropriate than

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						sense of community in these new localities.” In para 4.15 and Table 4.1 add references to light pollution and to post development/construction waste disposal.	'must' although the policy wording will be reviewed to inform the Reg 19 Plan.
NDLP230	Mr Roy Warren	Planning Manager Sport England			Physical activity	Sport England supports the aim of the core climate change policy and its Active Travel and green open space elements. Requests that the policy include the Sport England ten Principles of Physical Activity as a requirement to address in new developments, and hence comply with the Government's aim for the planning system to contribute to health and well being as well as climate change. Supports the Climate Change and Sustainability Statements.	Local Plan Policy can be reviewed to reference the Sport England principles although this may be more appropriately included in the policies related to sports and leisure facilities.
NDLP244 NDLP1749	Tim Wilkinson Tony Crosby				Planning Conditions	Requests clarification over the road map to net zero in operation - how to work towards this in the design and heating/powering of new buildings using better insulation, air source heat pumps, solar panels and batteries, controlled through planning condition. There must be an implementation back-up system of checks to ensure that new houses are built only using renewable energy sources for example - and this should be a planning condition and enforced.	The policy and explanatory text has detail on the techniques and expectation of different aspects of building design and energy usage to work towards the net zero target and which are designed to apply to new build. This can be reviewed to clarify further these implementation and design aspects including reference to the Climate and Planning Unit support at the County. The use of planning conditions will apply to certain aspects of building design and will underline the requirements set out in the applicant's Energy Statement also. The Plan has robust policies that cover most areas relating to heat loss/gain/energy generation etc. Accompany any planning application must be the Climate Change Sustainability Checklist and for larger schemes, the Energy Statement. This gives several areas of control for the design and over what is built - the performance gap. The wording of relevant policies will be reviewed to ensure they are robust and cover follow-up on implementation.
NDLP3108 NDLP3109	Higgins Group Higgins Group				Policy implementation	Agrees that the requirement for the Climate Change and Sustainability Statement is a good and efficient way for the Council to determine whether a development is policy compliant but queries how this would work in practice. As a requirement for validation, a template or guidance note ( that cannot contain any additional policy) would be useful and clarify the level of information that is proportionate to each type of development with assurance over who would be assessing it. Support for strategy and overarching themes of CP1 to ensure that homes built will meet Government targets. Concern over operating the policy in practice such as how adjoining developers would work together over connectivity and cumulative impact emphasising that a master plan is needed to set out proposals from the start, to coordinate infrastructure and/or whether developments come forward at the same time. Statement on the cooling hierarchy should be clarified regarding building cooling requirements. (NB conflict between the policy and table 4.1).	The CCSS will be reviewed to ensure its requirements for different types of development are clear and consideration will be given to a template or guidance note. For all the strategic sites, concept master plans have been prepared and are being reviewed following commentary and further evidence precisely to co-ordinate design, implementation and infrastructure needs. For other sites, allocated or coming forward, there will be a master site plan and it is expected that promoters would liaise with adjoining land owners as part of the normal development process, facilitated by DM and urban design officers as appropriate. The cooling and overheating of buildings is covered in CP24 and will be reviewed to ensure clarity over cooling.
NDLP445 NDLP302 NDLP1999 NDLP3220	Kim Rickards Sally Taylor Home Builders Federation Weston Homes Plc	Planning Director Durkan Homes Councillor Birchanger Parish Council			Policy Wording	Respondent asserts that there is no mention of solar panels, nor heat pumps as an expectation for new builds, nor disabled access and a contradiction between two paragraphs 4.10 and 4.15 regarding net zero requirements for re-using existing buildings. Agrees with the intention to reach net zero and apply high standards in new build, but it is not clear what evidence is required for different scales of development. This should be clarified and relates to table 4.1 . Developer is committed to tackling climate change and has a business target to reach net zero carbon by 2040. Supports the promotion of low carbon ways of living including the principle of electric vehicle charging. Concerned that the existing electricity grid capacity and costs associated with upgrading, reinforcement and implementing need to be	The forms of energy generation that would work towards net zero, such as solar panels, are covered in the climate change policies in chapter 5; disability access is covered in the housing policies in chapter 11. It is noted that there may be a contradiction in the wording of the text and the standards for new and re-used buildings but the clear intent is that the new build has to meet the standards in the energy policies and that, wherever possible, buildings should be re-used. It is often not possible to achieve the required high standard in a converted building and especially in a heritage building where the policy seeks 'best endeavours' and will be assessed in the Climate Change Sustainability Statement. It is important for policy to be clear what evidence is required in the planning submission

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3897	Saffron Walden Town Council					considered, recognising changing technologies for which the policy should allow flexibility across the plan period and development viability considerations. Suggests that the wording of the first paragraph be amended to: 'Development proposals must demonstrate how they seek to mitigate the impacts of climate change and support an overall reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, including the following measures wherever feasible:' Regarding all the climate policies considers that there is no need for policies with technical standards because this is covered by Government through the Future Homes Standard and building regulations to which strict adherence will attain the overall reduction in emissions. In the light of SUDs legislation, suggests that the policy is reworded so that new developments MUST provide recycling and waste disposal infrastructure, including food waste (ix), and that an additional comment be added that local rewilding and/or re-meadow lng initiatives would be encouraged (x). Suggests that for "Applications of 1+ dwellings" change " is expected to..." to "must" complete a climate change and sustainability statement.	for the Climate Change Sustainability Statement for different scales of development. Amendments are supported regarding waste, rewilding and recycling. It is a requirement that proposals will submit a CCSS that will demonstrate (i) -(x) compliance. The Council has an obligation to contribute to the national targets to the achievement of net zero by 2050 across a host of criteria; the planning process operates with regard to new build and it is fitting that strict new build policies around resource efficiencies are included in the Local Plan. The Plan will be subject to further viability testing which will include a cost for net zero technologies. In terms of the capacity of the grid, this is part of a national issue that is being addressed at a scale beyond the local plan but in the meantime the policy will not permit fossil fuel use in new building; the wording of the policy will be reviewed at the Regulation 19 stage to ensure it is flexible and can cater for these different circumstances regarding demand and supply, and to consider the proposed addition of the phrase "wherever feasible" at the end of the first paragraph of CP1.
NDLP1457	Pink Fairy				Refutation of Climate Emergency	Concerned that the climate change urgency is more fabrication and means of control than actuality. Objects to new housing in Great Dunmow and feels people should have access to cars as they see fit to do so.	The Local Plan responds to the national Government requirement to address the need to reduce carbon emissions as it is required to do so. Furthermore the Local Plan is one of the tools for the council as Local planning authority to use to help address the objectives and the Climate Emergency plan, currently undergoing revision. The policies in the Plan are intended to assist the council in meeting its overall aims for net zero carbon over the lifetime of the Local Plan.
NDLP2959	Mike Tayler				Retrofitting	Stresses importance of 'environmentally proofing' existing homes in rural areas and protecting heritage assets using viable means, and points out conflict with heritage protection policy especially for listed properties. Requests policy change to permit adaptations in heritage settings.	The potential conflict between climate sustainability and carbon reduction measures and impact on design or setting of heritage and listed buildings is acknowledged. A review of policy CP1 and CP62 where this impacts will be undertaken for Regulation 19 draft plan.
NDLP3564	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering				Settlement hierarchy	Agrees with the need to reduce transport by private car and to support public transport and walking and cycling routes but questions the categorisation of Ashdon as large village accordingly.	This matter is addressed in relation to CP3: Settlement Hierarchy, however, in the case of Ashton, following an update to the hierarchy assessing services and facilities by settlement rather than parish, Ashdon is moved to the Smaller Village category for the Reg 19 Plan.
NDLP3223	Weston Homes Plc	Director Luxus Homes Stoney Common Limited	Peter Biggs		Site allocation	States that a key way to address climate change is to select sustainable housing development sites which are well served with employment, facilities and infrastructure. The larger and greenfield sites offer more scope to deliver this and to provide for biodiversity, green infrastructure and amenity. Commentary queries how the plan can deliver climate change objectives when sites are proposed that create traffic, harm a conservation area, are in locations where there is pressure on water supply and it is alleged that there is no green energy mandated in new building. Support for the settlement hierarchy using the most sustainable settlements to locate growth and for the core climate change policy to underpin growth especially its requirement to reduce traffic movement through the location and design of new development. Disputes how development allocations at Ashdon can help to address climate change from a transport, settlement hierarchy and service perspective because the village has very limited services. The respondent suggests that with this in mind the southern side of Stansted Mountfitchet is the more sustainable and cites Pines Hill (003 RES) submitted site as a non-strategic allocation. It was described by the planning inspector as a sustainable location	The Local Plan proposes the majority of development sites at the Key Settlements or Local Rural Centres, which are the most sustainable locations in the district, provide good access to a range of services and facilities and employment and maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel, by public transport or walking and cycling. There are no developments proposed at Ashdon. The Southern side of Stansted Mountfitchet is Green Belt - the Council considers that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify development in the Green Belt especially given the wide range of potential development sites available located outside the Green Belt.
NDLP3549	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP750	Christopher Muir						
NDLP1064	Luxus Homes Stoney Common Limited						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						though the application was otherwise refused. On balance the respondent urges that this site is sustainable, meets climate change objectives, and should be included as a non-strategic allocation.	
NDLP2725	Paula Griffiths				Solar energy	The policy wording implies that solar panels will be expected in all new homes and this needs to be made explicit.	The objective of the policy overall is to reduce the use of energy so that it is effectively net zero. Policy CP22 expands on how this can be achieved by reducing the demand for space and energy heating and usage to specified standards. In order to achieve this, and to comply with the policy, however, it will in most domestic cases require the use of a renewable energy source and solar panels or pv cells are the most convenient and effective. The wording in this overall climate change policy can be clarified.
NDLP1088 NDLP754 NDLP1055 NDLP912 NDLP226 NDLP323 NDLP462 NDLP1028 NDLP1610 NDLP1441 NDLP1448 NDLP1826 NDLP1782 NDLP2277 NDLP2527 NDLP2585	David Learmonth Roderick Jones Richard Hughes Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings) Mr Richard Gilyead Dr Peter Stuart Withington Mrs Margaret Hudson Joan Boulton Anglian Water Savills - Audley End Estate Savills - Audley End Estate Essex County Council Littlebury Parish Council Mulberry House Farms LLP Gillian Mulley	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings		Support	A number of comments provided support to CP1. Some of the main points included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the overall climate change objectives and measures expressing the boldness of the policies and the strength of the Council's commitment.</li> <li>• Strong support for working towards net zero in particular for the setting of high standards for building design to improve energy efficiency, reduce embodied carbon, and manage excess heat, water consumption, green and blue infrastructure, open spaces, landscape character and public rights of way.</li> <li>• Support to require developers to meet high standards of insulation and air tightness to ensure that the dwellings are really efficient because current Building regulations parts L and F are not sufficient.</li> <li>• The Local Plan ambitions accord with those of Anglian Water and their ambition to be a net zero business by 2030 for operational emissions and achieving a 70% reduction in capital (embodied) carbon. However, the Plan should reference more climate change adaptation measures. Suggests that utilising existing water infrastructure capacity is the most carbon-efficient within the sustainability hierarchy. Where investment in infrastructure is required to support delivery, the level of growth in a location should then be of a quantum that would support carbon efficiencies of scale for both operational and embodied carbon.</li> <li>• Respondent feels that the level of information required should be tailored to the type of application ( outline or detailed) and the stage of development of the project when the application is made.</li> </ul>	Support noted. Policies on energy, embodied carbon, overheating and sustainable construction are designed to ensure the plan can deliver against the climate change objective and address the carbon aspects of climate change. All the infrastructure requirements from utilities to community infrastructure are being assessed as part of the local plan process and once the preferred sites have been agreed, a detailed analysis through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, working with providers, will identify gaps in provision and the need for enhancement in order for development to proceed. Policy CP5 (infrastructure), CP33(waste), CP34 (water supply) and CP43 (air quality) require that all these infrastructures are in place in a timely way in response to the implementation and occupation of the development scheme.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2587	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP2662	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP2723	Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield						
NDLP2792	Paula Griffiths						
NDLP2827	Nick Dukes						
NDLP2933	Mr and Mrs Roberts						
NDLP3055	Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield						
NDLP3077	Mrs Christina Cant						
NDLP3565	Mrs Christina Cant						
NDLP3566	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP4120	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP1020	Tim and Alexandra Bradshaw						
NDLP3206	Louise Pepper						
NDLP3357	J Damany-Hosman						
NDLP3612	Gladman						
NDLP1602	Hill Residential Ltd						
	Anglian Water						
NDLP3175	Phoenix Life Limited and Mulberry S				Sustainable Construction	Notes that policies overall promotes new developments to embed sustainable design with careful consideration given to renewable energy systems. Comments on (iv) of CP1 which promotes sustainable design and construction, and the re-use of materials and reduction in waste, and suggest that in recognition of the	The policy requires the applicant to demonstrate how they would promote sustainable construction. If there are any special circumstances this can be included in their Climate Change and Sustainability Statement which itself will be an evolving document as technologies addressing the re-use
NDLP3221	Weston Homes Plc						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1166	Mr David Mayle					limitations on recycling of construction material the phrase " as far as possible" is added.	aspects of the development process are developed and improved.
NDLP1866	Paul Plowman				Sustainable Transport	Supports the statement : "development proposals must demonstrate how they mitigate the impacts of climate change and support an overall reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, ..."and urges the imposition of a spatial strategy which minimises the need for travel via car and where residents can access employment opportunities within easy reach of their homes. "Notes that the Plan relies on sustainable transport to help reduce carbon emissions which the respondent fully supports, along with future proofing homes and reducing waste as essential components of sustainability. Questions how realistic it is to expect people to walk and cycle in different weather and times of day and year. In the policies on active and sustainable transport, there is a need for connectivity of routes not just to the town centre but also to where major facilities like schools, jobs and supermarkets actually are. Otherwise, partly complete routes from origin to general destinations will not provide sufficient pressure or opportunity to achieve behaviour change. Department of Transport Active Travel Design Guidelines and the 5 PROW cycle route design principles should be applied, and should allow for mixed use with cycle, walking and wheelchair use. One respondent advocates a development site south of Dunmow Road which they believe has good sustainable travel possibilities. Considers that the three subpoints in CP1 relating to travel, connectivity and locating new development to reduce the need to travel are not met in the proposed Great Dunmow site allocation.	The Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between locating development in services centres with easy access to facilities including by non-car means but it also has to recognize the role of the car in the district's rural and dispersed settlement pattern. The focus on transport as the major source of emissions is useful at the local level when planning the layout and mix of uses so that as many journeys as possible can be local and walkable. The relevant transport policy and site guidelines will be reviewed to reflect the principal point about connectivity to key 'destinations'. The DoT guidelines will be applied wherever possible. The Sustainable and Active Travel policies are designed to encourage use of non-car modes of travel wherever possible. The design of layouts will have convenient walking routes to facilities in the area around the home or workplace. It is acknowledged that use of the car will continue but the plan aims to increase and to provide for a greater element of travel choice. The allocated sites were subject to scrutiny across a range of criteria including all aspects of transport.
NDLP1568	David Perry						
NDLP2371	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP145	Graham Statter						
NDLP3019	Mr Graham Jolliffe						
NDLP3882	Grosvenor Property UK						
NDLP3610	Hill Residential Ltd				Takeley	States that Hill have been awarded the contract from Essex County Council to develop land at Warren and Parker's Farm, Takeley/Little Canfield.	Noted.
NDLP2324	Mr Edward Gildea				Targets and Standards	The Energy policy aligns to the overall national five year carbon budgets to reach net zero by 2050 whereas the Council ambition is to aim for 2030. Urges the Council to retain the earlier target date. Developer acknowledges the important role the development industry has in the national move to a low carbon society and supports the construction of energy efficient homes but considers that the building regulations are the appropriate means to impose a consistent and national standard. Respondents feel that it is difficult for the authority to require standards that differ from Building Regulations in order to achieve net zero. Considers that there should be a similar attack on embodied carbon within the local plan. The Council's own Climate Action Plan needs to be monitored and evaluated to chart progress. Queries how Biodiversity Net Gain is to be measured and whether it includes soils. Assumes transport infrastructure will relate to the site development requirements rather than be district-wide. The role that footpaths and cycle routes have in providing sustainable access to local services is important. Climate change ambition is achieved by focusing housing development on key locations that are close to A-roads, motorways, railways and centres with major job opportunities and business, and supported by the Local Plan to build a strong and competitive economy.	The Local Plan's lifetime is to 2041 and policies need to endure or to retain flexibility until that time. Nevertheless the energy policies are more strict than required by Government through Building Regulations or the proposed Future Homes Standard which means that the Plan will help to deliver more comfortable and cheaper-to-run homes and non-residential property that achieve net zero energy from when the Local Plan is adopted in early 2026. The policies on Net Zero emissions, renewable energy, overheating and embodied carbon align to the most ambitious local plans in preparation or adopted elsewhere.
NDLP3325	The North West Essex Constituency						
NDLP3712	La Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP1990	Mr. Charles Pick				Technology	Observes that the technology to achieve net zero now may be obsolete by the end of the Plan period and hence it would be advisable not to specify a particular type of equipment such as air source heat pumps. In turn, the phasing out of gas boilers has been extended to 2035.	The local plan does not require any particular technology but seeks the achievement of certain standards and these are the standards considered necessary at this point to mitigate climate warming. The review of the plan could add text that



Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							covers flexibility regarding technological advance in future years.
NDLP154	Graham Statter				Transport	Further comments relating to Transport include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most effective way of addressing climate change is to consider the transport implications of spatial planning because significant carbon emissions from vehicles which amount to around 34% though higher in Uttlesford because of the reliance on the car@ 53%.</li> <li>• There is a non-alignment with green policies of proposing growth along the B1256 at Takeley in addition to the new homes approved west of Great Dunmow because of impact on traffic flow.</li> <li>• The Plan should provide for related vehicle requirements such as bus garage, servicing, commercial parking.</li> <li>• Plan encourages use of Stansted Airport to grow as a transport hub but rail fares from here are more costly than from Stansted Mountfitchet.</li> <li>• Respondent encourages wider deployment of the on-call digibus service to cover the north of the district and to establish more transport hubs especially at Stansted Airport.</li> <li>• Limiting the provision of parking spaces in new residential developments especially for larger houses in order to try to reduce dependence on the car does not work because residents park on streets instead .</li> <li>• Comment on need to enhance traffic flow and capacity to reduce air pollution from static and slow moving traffic. Query that the plan seems to design more for car than for cycling and walking.</li> </ul>	The Local Plan focuses the majority of growth at the Key Settlements and Local Rural Centres which maximises opportunities for sustainable modes use, including for public transport, cycling and walking and to ensure that enhancements in these sustainable modes also have the maximum benefit. Matters relating to Transport are addressed in more detail in Chapter 9 and the suite of policies covering transport. The plan supports a wide range of policies, proposals and interventions in this regard.
NDLP144	Graham Statter						
NDLP152	Graham Statter						
NDLP599	Stephanie Gill						
NDLP744A	Mr Neil Reeve						
NDLP1021	Mark Bulling						
NDLP1102	Theresa Trotzer Wilson						
NDLP890	Simon Carpenter						
NDLP1030	Mark Bulling						
NDLP462	Mrs Margaret Hudson						
NDLP1352	Sarah Eley						
NDLP2216	N/A	Clerk Hatfield Broad Oak Parish Council					
NDLP2219	N/A	Clerk Hatfield Broad Oak Parish Council					
NDLP2220	N/A	Clerk Hatfield Broad Oak Parish Council					
NDLP3713	Douglas and Ruth Burton	Clerk Hatfield Broad Oak Parish Council					
NDLP855	Mr Neil Hargreaves				Urban Design	Focus development where there are more facilities and respond to the needs of communities rather than development opportunities. Create village 'centres' rather than linear development where this is the historical form, and protect the character of villages like Clavering. Suggestion for a policy to prevent use of artificial grass.	Local Plan policy on design guidance, the design code and site guidance all focus on creating a sense of identity and community, often called 'placemaking'. There is a strong preference to locate growth where there are supporting facilities and hence to make the settlement itself more sustainable and with a more cohesive morphology. With regard to materials, the Design Code will resist the use of inappropriate materials in different places but it is difficult to impose strict standards in all areas of landscape design. However, the use of non-permeable material in external front garden landscaping is not permitted. The use of appropriate landscaping surfaces will be covered in the final version of the Design Code.
NDLP1047	Mr John Britten						
NDLP2295	Stuart Hastie				Viability	A local plan should not be pushing up the capital cost of building houses, nor pushing up the running costs of new builds as this plan does by insisting on net zero. Reliance on electricity alone is not appropriate and development the use of hydrogen as a fuel should	The Council has an obligation to contribute to the national targets to the achievement of net zero by 2050 across a host of criteria; the planning process operates with regard to new build and it is fitting that strict new build policies around resource
NDLP2296	Stuart Hastie						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						be addressed in the local plan. The capacity of the electricity grid may not be sufficient with the growth in demand e.g. electric vehicle charging.	efficiencies are included in the Local Plan. The Plan will be subject to viability testing which will include a cost for net zero applications. In terms of the capacity of the grid, this is part of a national issue that is being addressed at a scale above the local plan but in the meantime the policy will not permit fossil fuel use in new building; the wording of the policy will be reviewed at the Regulation 19 stage to ensure it is flexible and can cater for these different circumstances regarding demand and supply.
NDLP2503	Mr John Cox				Water	Stresses that new development is putting pressure on water utilities in a dry area of water stress and low rainfall. Climate change has brought sudden and unexpected conditions that food local road infrastructure and covering arable land with built development will exacerbate this.	All sites will be subject to water supply and control measures in accordance with the Water Cycle Study and the water and infrastructure policies (CP4, CP36). The management of drainage for development sites will need to be agreed with the Local Food Authority at the County (CP37) and will be based on a sustainable urban drainage system.
NDLP1912	Louise Johnson				Wind energy	States that the building of wind turbines is essential to combat the climate crisis and the Council should support this with climate change at the heart of the Local Plan .	The strategic objectives of the Local Plan reflects the importance placed on climate change adaptation and mitigation by the Council and as expressed in draft CP1. The use of wind turbines is supported, subject to various environmental and amenity considerations, in CP25.

**Table 2 Core Policy 2: Meeting Our Housing Needs**

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3992	Hawridge Strategic Land	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited			Alternative sites	<p>Various comments refer to potential alternative sites, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is suggested that exceptional circumstances exist to justify development at Little Hallingbury, which should be classified as a Larger Village – details for a potential development site in this location are also proposed. It is suggested that there are a range of issues with other sites proposed by the Council and that the Local Plan does not make provision for sufficient development. An additional site at Flitch Green is proposed for consideration for allocation.</li> <li>• The promoter of Land at Stortford Road and Land at Grinstead Lane, offers supporting evidence for the promotion of these two sites as sustainable development that would meet the aims of the draft local plan.</li> <li>• The site promotor notes that the HELAA is supportive of the Clavering 014 RES as a housing site. The next iteration of the plan should allocated all housing sites, including non-strategic sites.</li> <li>• A proposed Employment Site at Saffron Walden (North of Thaxted Road – Rear of Knight Park) is proposed for residential development and omitted as an employment site.</li> <li>• Details of a site at High Easter is submitted for which the respondent considers is suitable.</li> <li>• It is suggested that a wider range of sites are needed including smaller sites and details for a site South of Dunmow Road Takeley is proposed</li> </ul>	<p>The Council doesn't consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify development in the Green Belt. It is envisaged that the Local Plan will make provision for c. 10% oversupply buffer, but that in any case, there are a wide range of other non-Green Belt omission sites that could be re-considered should the need to plan for more housing was established. The methodology for the site selection process is set out in an accompanying Topic Paper including the reasons potential development sites are either supported or not. This will be updated to accompany the Reg 19 Plan. The Sites Selection process has ensured all appropriate sites have been assessed consistently and overall, the Council is satisfied the Spatial Strategy and selection of sites is appropriate.</p>
NDLP3402	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3823	N/A						
NDLP3709	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP3710	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP129	Mrs Susan Barker						
NDLP161	Robert Lodge						
NDLP3501	Kier						
NDLP2320	Paul Cronk						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3105	Higgins Group					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An alternative site at Newport is proposed for development. Details of the site are set out including its proximity to the railway station.</li> <li>• An additional site at Flitch Green is proposed for consideration for allocation. It is suggested that there is too much reliance on the proposed strategic allocations and that additional and smaller allocations will be required.</li> <li>• Some commentary is provided for how the plan is seeking to address housing need. An example of a Neighbourhood Plan is provided that was designated in July 2020, but as yet has not produced a Neighbourhood Plan. Detail is provided for an alternative site at Dunmow, which is suggested should be added to the Reg 19 plan as an allocation.</li> </ul>	
NDLP2274	Mulberry House Farms LLP						
NDLP3475	Richstone Procurement Ltd						
NDLP3862	Lands Improvement Holdings	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings		Housing Delivery	<p>Support for scale of growth identified using Standard Method. Consideration that the over-supply buffer should be increased to at least 10 % (one comments suggests 20 %) rather than just 5 %. Reference is made to the recent lack of a 5-year land supply and the need to build greater flexibility to deal with unforeseen circumstances. The HBF supports a minimum of 10% buffer in order to ensure that any unexpected changes in the delivery of sites allocated in the plan do not lead to the Council not meeting its housing needs. It is suggested that the Local Plan takes no account of the long lead in times for larger sites, which is likely to be at least four years post plan adoption, and that this needs to be taken into account. It is also suggested that more flexibility (additional sites) are needed to provide for more flexibility.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council is satisfied that lead in times have been adequately considered in development the housing trajectory that accompanies the Local Plan. Support noted. It is envisaged that the Reg 19 Plan will provide for c. 10 % over-supply buffer for the reasons indicated. This will ensure the plan is more robust and resilient.</p>
NDLP3284	Legal and General Property						
NDLP3766	Harlow Agricultural Merchants Ltd						
NDLP2001	Home Builders Federation						
NDLP913	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)						
NDLP3359	Gladman						
NDLP3981	Hawridge Strategic Land						
NDLP1450	Savills - Audley End Estate						
NDLP3361	Gladman	Pelham Structures Ltd			Housing Growth	<p>General comments raising concern over why we need to plan for housing, the perceived link to immigration and the harm to the countryside that will 'ruin perfectly beautiful countryside'. It is suggested that if the Standard Method figure was calculated in 2024 rather than 2023 the need would drop to 13,500 rather 13,680. A detailed description/ explanation is provided for how the Standard Method figure is calculated, although no issues are identified. Some general objections also received including that the additional housing is totally unnecessary and that many developers are delivering large houses which doesn't match the need. A question is raised as to what would happen if the Council resisted the need to plan for housing. It is stated that more housing is needed in the north of the country, but not the south (i.e. in Uttlesford). It is also stated that not enough jobs are being planned for to justify the housing figures and that there are large numbers of empty properties that should be utilised first.</p>	<p>The Council has a legal duty to produce and maintain an up to date Local Plan that is consistent with Government national planning policy, guidance and legislation. The Standard Methodology and NPPF sets out how the Council should plan for housing. The evidence will be updated to inform the Reg 19 plan to ensure the proposals remain current. The Secretary of State has written to the Council indicating the Government will step in if the Council do not progress a plan in a timely and effective way. The Council is content that the calculation of housing need takes account of all relevant factors. The Council will prepare the Reg 19 plan on the basis of updated completions and commitments as at April 2024. One option for how the recent permission west of Great Dunmow is considered is to reduce the additional housing to be planned for, providing the</p>
NDLP3020	Mr Graham Jolliffe						
NDLP3909	Pelham Structures Limited						
NDLP2000	Home Builders Federation						
NDLP371	Lewis Coomber						
NDLP561	Mr Michael Young						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1094	James Balaam	G W Balaam & Son	Matthew Thomas			There is said to be an error in Table 4.2 where the lapsed rate of 51 is double counted. It is suggested that Government are about to announce a new planning system that will give Councils more freedom to set lower housing targets and that targets can be lowered where there is evidence any development would harm the local character or require greenbelt development. It is suggested that it is not justified to include completions which occurred before the 'current year' and therefor the plan period should be changed to commence in 2023. The Uttlesford population growth has grown at a faster rate than seen elsewhere and is roughly double the rate of Essex. Furthermore, there is also significant affordability pressures in Uttlesford which also need to be addressed. The impact for the Council not meeting its identified housing need are listed and include: struggling town centres; emissions and congestion from growing in-commuting; low affordable housing delivery and growing homelessness; more young people living with parents or renting; low supply of family housing; the need to intensify development on brownfield sites; growing old age dependency ratio; loss of contributions towards infrastructure and community facilities. By contrast, the benefits of meeting (or exceeding the need) are stated as including: addressing affordability; growing labour force facilitating business investment; more sustainable local finances; funding for the delivery of strategic infrastructure and community facilities; delivery of a mix of housing types (family housing as well as flatted schemes). It is argued that the housing need should be increased. The standard method figure if applied without a cap would be 15,380 and this is considered a more appropriate figure to plan for. It is suggested that the housing figures do not have full regard to the economic potential of Stansted Airport (now expanding to 43 million passengers per year) and Great Chesterford Research Park which is also set to expand. Furthermore, it is considered to be unclear if the Council have had discussions with neighbouring councils and ascertained if they will be seeking assistance to delivery unmet need from elsewhere. A response suggests that the recent granting of permission for c. 1,200 homes west of Great Dunmow should be taken into account in the Local Plan by either increasing the housing need, extending the Plan period, or increasing the housing over supply buffer. It is suggested that this would provide for more flexibility overall. Other responses suggest that the Plan could update to take account of this permission by removing the proposed allocation to the East of Great Dunmow and to amend the Settlement Boundary to reflect the recent permission. The HBF support the use of the Standard Method and of the identified need figure, but suggest that the housing need is described as a minimum. The HBF also support the conclusion that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify considering an alternative method. However, it is suggested that Uttlesford should consider housing levels above those identified by the Standard Method, especially in relation to planning for Greater Cambridge.	identified housing need overall is met and that there is an appropriate over supply buffer to provide sufficient flexibility and resilience. The Settlement Boundaries will be updated to reflect any updated permissions. Given the lack of up to date plan in Uttlesford for nearly 20 years, it is considered prudent to secure an up to date adopted plan that does at least plan for Uttlesford's need in the first instance. The Council has made it clear that the next plan will be progressed quickly for adoption in c. 2030/31. It is also the case that there is considerable uncertainty over planning for Cambridge at the present time and so the next plan is likely to align more closely with planning for Cambridge. At the present time, Cambridge are unable to confirm their own housing need, or how much housing they can accommodate themselves. Furthermore, planning for larger scale growth in proximity to Cambridge will need more work to understand the impact and infrastructure needed, which will also need more time to plan for (as discussed separately under the New Settlement headings).
NDLP88	Maria Clelland						
NDLP77	Lauren Johnson						
NDLP837	Malcolm Green						
NDLP1346	Timothy Armstrong						
NDLP1432	Debbie Blair						
NDLP1946	Mr Loftus Buhagiar						
NDLP1556	Paul Chinnock						
NDLP1621	Chelsteen Developments Limited						
NDLP1973	Gill Gibson						
NDLP2121	Michael and Patricia Fairchild						
NDLP2267	Mr Kemp and Ms Shutes						
NDLP2121	Michael and Patricia Fairchild						
NDLP2517	Michael and Patricia Fairchild						
NDLP2778	Peter Simmons						
NDLP2275	Mulberry House Farms LLP						
NDLP2364	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP3501	Kier						
NDLP3339	Welbeck Strategic Land						
NDLP3225							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3226	Weston Homes Plc						
NDLP3339	Weston Homes Plc						
NDLP3420	Welbeck Strategic Land						
NDLP3437	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3454	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3496	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3709	Mr and Mrs R A French						
NDLP3759	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP3798	The Hargrove Family						
NDLP3860	Belinda Challenger						
NDLP3502	Grosvenor Property UK						
NDLP4114	Kier						
NDLP1993	Siemens Benefits Scheme Limited						
NDLP1529	Mr Charles Pick						
NDLP4232	P J Thompson						
	City and Country Residential Ltd						
NDLP1997	Home Builders Federation				Housing Growth - General and Surrounding Districts	The HBF support the use of the Standard Method and of the identified need figure but suggest that the housing need is described as a minimum. The HBF also support the conclusion that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify considering an alternative method. However, it is suggested that Uttlesford should consider housing levels above those identified by the Standard Method, especially in relation to planning for Greater Cambridge and London.	Noted. See above.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2267	Mr Kemp and Ms Shutes	Pelham Structures Ltd			Housing Need	<p>A number of comments related to housing need, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•UDC should consider unmet need within the SA, and pursue further discussions with neighbouring authorities. It is suggested that housing requirement figures for parishes should only be provided where Neighbourhood Plan updates are in progress, but that the Local Plan allocates any non-strategic sites to provide certainty. Or, if Neighbourhood Plans are to bring forward some housing, the Local Plan should identify reserve sites to provide contingency should any of the Neighbourhood Plans not come forward. It is suggested that there may be uncertainty as to whether Neighbourhood Plans will actually come forward.</li> <li>• The question of unmet housing need is raised, in particular relating to Harlow and Greater Cambridge. It is suggested that no unmet need being identified at the current time may be a product of the different position in preparing local plans in neighbouring authorities, but the importance of planning for any wider needs are set out in the submission.</li> <li>• Uttlesford is projected to grow faster than the region or nation and the area has significant economic potential. On that basis, it is suggested that housing supply to accommodate this potential is required and should be planned through the Local Plan to avoid housing growth acting as a constraint. The total population of the district is expected to grow by 16% from 2021 to 2041, compared to 7.6% for the East of England and 7.7 % for England overall. This will generate continued demand for housing growth and further increases to the already high affordability ratio if not addressed through the allocation.</li> <li>• UDC should wait for changes to national policy which will allow for restrictions on housebuilding on green belt and the countryside.</li> <li>• The plan relies on houses that have already been built or have planning permission and therefore the plan does not confirm with the NPPF, which requires local plans to provide a vision for the local area and look forward at least 30 years. The UDC local plan should be ambitious and focus development on areas that already have strong infrastructure.</li> <li>• Larger and smaller villages should be allocated a housing requirement figure, in line with the potential impacts on existing infrastructure. The plan should reconsider housing requirements, particularly at Thaxted, Flitch Green and Felsted.</li> </ul>	<p>NPPF Paragraph 67 makes clear that housing requirements should be set for any designated neighbourhood area, this is irrespective of whether a Neighbourhood Plan update is currently being prepared. As some parishes may decide to prepare neighbourhood Plans at different times, it is considered prudent to provide figures for all relevant parishes to assist decision making at a parish level. This will assist parishes decide whether to prepare or update a Neighbourhood Plan and will provide clarity on what housing may be required to contribute to the strategic objectives of the Local Plan. As the Council is also required to review and update where necessary its Local Plan every five years and as the non-strategic sites will not be included within the five-year land supply calculation, it is considered that no further contingency is required. The Local Plan Review will provide sufficient mechanism to address any shortfall, should there be one in the future. The Council has and will continue to engage with its neighbouring authorities through the Duty to Cooperate. The Council has not been formally asked to make any contribution to unmet housing needs. It is also noted that at the current time, Greater Cambridge is unable to confirm its own housing need, how much housing it can provide for, and on that basis, it is impossible for any unmet need to be identified for Greater Cambridge. That said, it is recognised that the next plan, to be adopted c. 2030, will align more closely with consideration for planning for Greater Cambridge.</p>
NDLP3227	Weston Homes Plc						
NDLP3992	Hawridge Strategic Land						
NDLP2259	Landsec						
NDLP3420	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3437	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3454	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP490	Mr Ken McDonald						
NDLP1883	Vic Ranger						
NDLP2716	Paula Griffiths						
NDLP2726	Paula Griffiths						
NDLP3208	Ceres Property						
NDLP2379	National Highways						
NDLP3390	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3593	Pegasi Limited						
NDLP2716	Paula Griffiths						
NDLP2726	Paula Griffiths						
NDLP2445	Anchor						
NDLP1543	Martine Dann						
NDLP555	Stephen High						
NDLP1995	Home Builders Federation						
NDLP3387	Gladman						
NDLP4096	S Payne						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3933	Pelham Structures Limited						
NDLP555	Stephen High						
NDLP1024	Louise Howles						
NDLP913	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings		Housing Supply	It is suggested that the Plan is not accompanied by a full housing trajectory and as such respondents cannot comment on whether the housing requirement can be met in full. It is suggested that when a full trajectory is provided, a total supply figure should be provided for each monitoring year. Confirmation is also sought about the Council's ability to demonstrate a 5-Year Housing Land Supply at the current time. Recently approved development at Little Easton is not mentioned in the Plan, nor how infrastructure will be planned for this recent permission. It is suggested that this permission should replace any proposed allocations at Great Dunmow as both sites coming forward would lead to damage to the environment. It is suggested that the existing commitments should be shown on maps as part of the LP evidence base.	The Plan and supporting documents make clear that the Reg 19 Plan will be updated to reflect commitments as at April 2024. A full housing trajectory will be provided to accompany the Reg 19 plan in summer 2024. The Council will provide an update on its 5-Year Housing Land Supply at the time the Reg 19 version of the Plan is considered through the formal governance (Cabinet/ Council) process in July 2024.
NDLP3605	Knight Frank						
NDLP1342	Sarah Eley				Housing Type and Housing Mix	Support is given for the recognition that Uttlesford requires a range of small and medium sized houses. Concern is raised as to whether this type of development will be viable in Uttlesford. There is a lack of consideration and provision for C2(extra care) dwellings.	Noted. The LP's housing policies ensure an appropriate mix of housing types and sizes are supported, in accordance with the supporting evidence and this has been tested by the updated viability assessment. The Housing Policies are considered in more detail in the context of Chapter 11.
NDLP3040	Susanne Chumbley						
NDLP3765	Harlow Agricultural Merchants Ltd						
NDLP3768	Harlow Agricultural Merchants Ltd						
NDLP3767	Harlow Agricultural Merchants Ltd						
NDLP913	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings		Need for 2nd Reg 18 Consultation	It is suggested that a second Reg 18 consultation is needed to ensure the full spatial strategy and options for growth are fully considered and commented upon.	The Reg 18 has gone somewhat beyond any legislative requirements by setting out a nearly complete draft plan - this detail helps to ensure a full and meaningful consultation to inform the Reg 19 Plan. It is noted that some Councils Reg 18 consultations only include vague options, sometimes not even identifying which options are preferred. On this basis, it is not considered necessary to undertake any further Reg 18 consultation.
NDLP3502	Kier				Plan Period	It is suggested that the Plan period should be extended to account for the length of Examination which is said to take over two years and thus if the Plan were submitted in January 2025 the Plan could not be adopted until at least July 2026, but could be later. On this basis, it is suggested that the Plan period should be extended.	Noted. Published research indicates the average length of an Examination is 18 months based on 300 Local Plan Examinations. The Council's timetable indicates Plan adoption would be in the second quarter of 2026 which is consistent with this finding. It is envisaged the Plan will be submitted in December 2024 and hence, no changes are considered appropriate to the Plan period.
NDLP1442	Savills - Audley End Estate				Policy Wording	General support is provided for CP2, although it is suggested that the housing requirement is described as minimum and that the over supply buffer should be increased above 5%. It is suggested that reference to a comprehensive and master-planned approach	Noted. Support welcome. As explained elsewhere, it is anticipated the over supply buffer included in the Reg 19 plan will be c. 10 %. The Council is content that the policy provides sufficient clarity in relation to
NDLP1449							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3229	Savills - Audley End Estate Weston Homes Plc					needs to be clarified and also included in an updated Statement of Community Involvement. The area of confusion seems to relate primarily to the proposed allocation at Saffron Walden that includes area that benefits from outline planning consent. However, it is suggested that any issues can be resolved through amendment ahead of the Reg 19 plan. Clarification is also sought on whether the proposed allocation figures are minimum or maximum figures. It is also suggested that the non-strategic allocations should not be limited to Larger Villages, but could come forward elsewhere. It is suggested that the allocation figures should be referred to as 'up to' figures. It is suggested that the lapsed permission is set out twice and is confusing and should be removed.	a master-planned approach, especially when read in combination with the Area Strategy policies and policy detail set out in the Site Development Templates. The proposed allocation figures will be clarified and the lapsed permissions issue also corrected.
NDLP3420	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3437	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3454	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP3898	Saffron Walden Town Council						
NDLP1168	Louise Howles				Proposed Allocations - Takeley Education	Concern is raised over the proposed location of a secondary school at Takeley in proximity to the A120 for health reasons.	The proposed location of the school will be reviewed as part of the ongoing masterplanning work, however it is noted that a suitable buffer is proposed along the northern part of the site and that the A120 at this location is set in a cutting, thus any impact would be negligible and mitigated by the buffer. However, this will be investigated further.
NDLP1025	Catherine Loveday				Proposed allocations - general	The respondent objects to the selection of several of the strategic sites on the grounds of sustainable access to rail stations though considers some of the sites suitable in Newport because of proximity to services and facilities. Views the access to the railway station as an important consideration.	The sites were selected according to a range of criteria including access to local facilities and transport links. Whilst access to railway stations may be important, a wide range of other factors should be considered and it would not be appropriate for development in Uttlesford to, only be located in proximity to stations, as that would fail to plan for the district effectively - the Local Plan is after- all seeking to meet the identified needs of Uttlesford.
NDLP1025	Catherine Loveday	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings		Proposed Allocations - Great Chesterford	A number of comments suggest that Great Chesterford should be a location for some strategic growth. It is described as a sustainable location, with access to a railway station and proximity to employment. Reference is made to the Plan supporting expansion of Great Chesterford Research Park yet there is no housing within the Uttlesford Plan in this area. Reference is also made to a planning application for development at Great Chesterford that has been deferred. Specific reference is made for Little Chesterford 005 which has planning permission for up to 76 dwellings and is currently being built. This permission was granted in 2020 and falls before the Plan period that commences in April 2021. Consideration is needed for how this site has been considered in the HELAA and Site Selection Process.	Potential development sites have been considered at Great Chesterford. Some sites were identified as having potential, but some of these are either not available, have issues (such as access being required through a neighbouring district and thus not being deliverable at the current time) and/ or being at an advanced stage of a planning application process where significant objections were raised by statutory consultees. The potential for large standalone Garden Communities are addressed separately. It should be added however that the Council need to prepare and update their plan every five years and given the gap since Uttlesford last updated their plan, it is proposed that the next plan should be adopted in 2030/31 - thus there will be early opportunity to review potential development opportunities at Great Chesterford, at which time planning for neighbouring Greater Cambridge may be clearer. The HELAA and Site Selection Process will be reviewed and updated to inform the Reg 19 Plan.
NDLP907	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)						
NDLP1281	Les Thain						
NDLP674	Robert Fairhead	Vaughan Bryan					
NDLP1098	Alison Farrell	Alison Farrell					
NDLP913	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)	Stacey Rawlings					
NDLP222	Mr Richard Johnson						
NDLP250	Ian Vance						
NDLP378							



Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Mr Bill Critchley						
NDLP2484 NDLP2486 NDLP1569 NDLP2639	Alan Wenman Alan Wenman David Perry Chris Loon				Proposed Allocations - Great Dunmow	It is suggested that Great Dunmow and Takeley are becoming a single ribbon conurbation and will no longer be separate settlements. Reference is made to the plan referring to Stansted and Great Dunmow as historic settlements, but it is suggested that the plan does not protect their identity, in particular with development proposed at Great Dunmow that is said to be likely to have significant detrimental impacts. Another respondent suggests that Great Dunmow is not a sustainable location with services and facilities not keeping up with the level of growth and the nearest station at Stansted Airport, which is not suitable for commuters.	The proposed allocations are being subject to detailed and careful masterplanning to inform the policy wording to ensure any proposals are delivered to a high standard and sensitive to their setting and any historic features. More detailed Heritage Impact Assessments are being undertaken for selected sites including for Great Dunmow. Great Dunmow is located on the A120 corridor that is close to a wide range of employment opportunities that are accessible by sustainable modes and where there are opportunities to enhance these links. It is however recognised that services and facilities need to be improved to ensure they are fit for purpose and appropriate for the level of development coming forward.
NDLP1621	Chelsteen Developments Limited				Proposed Allocations - High Roding	Details for a site at High Roding is provided that is described as suitable to meeting any future housing needs for this settlement.	Noted.
NDLP967 NDLP221 NDLP325 NDLP1025	Mary Powe Mr Richard Johnson Mrs Jane Sharp Catherine Loveday	Director Richstone Procurement Limited	Mary Power		Proposed Allocations - Newport	Concern is raised over the proximity of the M11 to proposed development at Newport, even though the settlement is described as having good road and railway links and is a good sustainable location. It is questioned why the smaller site proposed for development in Newport is included as it is below the 100 homes threshold (which is the definition for strategic development as set out in the Plan).	The suitability for development at Newport which is described as a sustainable location is noted. There will be no strategic allocations included in the Reg 19 Plan for Newport, but instead a lower housing requirement figure is identified to be planned for by the neighbourhood plan.
NDLP913 NDLP1025 NDLP303 NDLP325 NDLP2325 NDLP302	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings) Catherine Loveday Sally Taylor Mrs Jane Sharp Mr Edward Gildea Sally Taylor	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd Councillor Birchanger Parish Council Councillor Birchanger Parish Council	Stacey Rawlings		Proposed Allocations - Saffron Walden	Saffron Walden is described as having capacity to accommodate development and that the proposed allocations will complement the existing settlement. Another comment raises concerns over the suitability of the proposed sites at Saffron Walden, with impacts on traffic congestion, air quality, landscape and heritage. The proposed allocations are not within easy walking distance of the town and there are no good pedestrian/ cycle links. It is suggested that the development will change the landscape setting drastically. A range of shortcomings for the proposed allocation is stated, including the lack of viability evidence, multiple ownership and development to the north that does not safeguard a route for a link road. It is suggested that any proposed allocations should be separated into small components and not linked as a single proposed allocation.	The suitability for development at Saffron Walden is noted. The sites identified to the east of the town are the least constrained and most suitable/ deliverable sites available at the settlement. Other locations at Saffron Walden are not available or suitable. The proposed allocation will deliver a range of benefits including improvements to traffic flows in the town centre and enhanced pedestrian/ cycling linkages. There has been a protracted period of speculative and unplanned development in Uttlesford where an infrastructure deficit has developed. The provision of local plan allocations along with improved provision for infrastructure is the only mechanism available to the Council to deliver improvements to the benefit of the existing and new communities. Allocations are not identified on the basis of ownership – it should be the purpose of the Local Plan to make provision for coherent, comprehensive and high quality development that appropriately provides for the needs of the existing and new communities.
NDLP1098	Alison Farrell				Proposed Allocations - Stansted	It is suggested that even though Stansted is a large employer, it employs people from outside of Uttlesford and that placing all Uttlesford development, including additional employment development in proximity to Stansted, will increase congestion and lead to significant additional issues. Natural England requires further consultation, particularly in relation to Stansted 023+13 due	The Council is satisfied the proposed spatial strategy provides balance between supporting development in sustainable locations across the district, that have good access to sustainable modes of travel and across different parts of the district. It is the case that Stansted is a significant employment area within

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						to the impacts on Sawbridgeworth Marsh SSSI, Thorley Flood Pound SSSI and Little Hallingbury SSSI.	Uttlesford and the majority of the identified employment need arises in this area. Supporting development in this area provides opportunities to support sustainable development, to maximise use of sustainable modes and to ensure that new infrastructure has the maximum benefit. However, development is also supported at the majority of the top tier settlements and appropriate larger villages as explained/ stated elsewhere. Further work will be undertaken and further engagement with Natural England will also be carried out.
NDLP1025	Catherine Loveday				Proposed Allocations - Takeley	It is suggested that the development proposed at Takeley is disproportionate and too high and that development at Takeley should be reduced. It is stated that development at Takeley is the largest in the district. The Parish Council object as there are no safe cycling/ walking routes to the airport and no reason to think they could be delivered; there is no need for development around the Smiths Green Conservation Area; that Takeley does not need to be bounded by the A120 and that there would be impact on the CPZ. It is also suggested that more sustainable locations are available elsewhere that would not have any impact on the CPZ. The National Trust notes the housing requirement of 13,680 home for the Uttlesford District to be delivered in the plan period between 2021 and 2042. The Trust supports a plan led approach to new development. However, they raise concern about the scale of development proposed in South Uttlesford, particularly at Takeley, in proximity to Hatfield Forest.	The Council must consider what is the most appropriate strategy for the district as a whole having considered the potential reasonable alternatives (potential alternative development options) - and, that help to achieve sustainable development overall. The level of growth at Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow, when commitments are considered, is actually much higher than at Takeley. Overall, Takeley is considered to provide an excellent opportunity to deliver sustainable development. The Reg 19 Plan will provide more detail for what infrastructure is envisaged and how it will be delivered, but there are considered to be very good prospects for improving access to the airport, which is very close-by and is by far the largest area of employment within the district. The area of the CPZ will be re-considered to inform the Reg 19 plan, but it is considered that the proposed development, as amended for inclusion in the Reg 19 plan, does not affect the original purpose of the CPZ.
NDLP913	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd					
NDLP1068	Jackie Deane	Parish Clerk Takeley					
NDLP303	Sally Taylor	Councillor Birchanger Parish Council					
NDLP305	Sally Taylor	Councillor Birchanger Parish Council					
NDLP378	Mr Bill Critchley						
NDLP1168	Louise Howles						
NDLP2680	National Trust						
NDLP302	Sally Taylor	Councillor Birchanger Parish Council			Proposed Allocations - Takeley - Education	It is proposed that instead of planning for two new secondary schools across Great Dunmow and Takeley, as larger single school could be provided to include more post16 options. Whilst there would be more travelling within the area to access secondary provision, there could be a reduction in travel for students currently travelling out of the district for post 16 courses.	The Council as Planning Authority works closely with the County Council as Education Authority to consider what is appropriate for planning for education. The County Council provided written advice to the Council in August 2023 making it clear their preference for a second secondary school in the Great Dunow and Takeley catchment and their in principle support for a new secondary school at Takeley. This approach was confirmed in the ECC response to the Reg 18 consultation and the emerging LP is consistent with this view.
NDLP305	Sally Taylor	Councillor Birchanger Parish Council					
NDLP305	Sally Taylor	Councillor Birchanger Parish Council			Proposed Allocations - Takeley - Transport	Concern is raised over the impact of development at and around Takeley, both for housing and for employment. Questions are raised over the extend existing improvements to the M11 J8 will accommodate this growth, or the existing proposed expansion of the airport. It is not clear how nearby employment development will benefit from public transport connectivity, nor the likelihood that anyone would walk or cycle to the airport.	The Council is undertaking detailed transport assessment work to inform the emerging plan. This will be updated to inform the Reg 19 stage of the plan and includes consideration of existing mitigation, the proposed development, the need for any new mitigation as well as opportunities for improving sustainable modes (cycling/ walking etc). The role of the public transport interchange at the airport needs
NDLP302	Sally Taylor	Councillor Birchanger Parish Council					

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							to be carefully considered given our collective responsibilities for contributing to the climate change agenda in addition to maximising a range of sustainable travel opportunities in the A120 corridor ensuring the housing and employment are successfully integrated.
NDLP1783	Littlebury Parish Council				Proposed Allocations - Thaxted	One comment suggests that allocating housing to Thaxted is inconsistent with Core Policy 2, as there is no allocation for employment. Travel to expanding or existing employment sites will rely on a rural and congested road network.	Any proposals for strategic development at Thaxted are removed from the Reg 19 Plan.
NDLP4314	Vistry Group			Bidwells		One comment states that the allocation of land at Thaxted meets the aims of Core Policy 2 by delivering new housing and education infrastructure and is therefore supported.	
NDLP885	Charlie Hamilton				Proposed Allocations - Infrastructure	A general comment is made about the need to plan for infrastructure, for schools, healthcare including dentist and that no new dwellings should be built without infrastructure needs being met.	Noted. The plan makes provision for infrastructure, partly through CP 5 and partly through the policy requirements for the proposed allocations, as informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The Local Plan allocations provide a more robust and effective way to plan for infrastructure than for speculative development that has been coming forward in the absence of a plan.
NDLP130	Mrs Susan Barker				Proposed site at High Easter	Details of a site at High Easter is submitted for which the respondent considers is suitable.	Noted. Consideration of potential non-strategic sites will be undertaken following the consultation to inform the Reg 19 plan in consultation with relevant parishes.
NDLP2002	Home Builders Federation	Director Silverley Properties Ltd	Sophie Pain		Sites under one Heactare	The Council have not clarified how the LP address the NPPF requirement for 10% of sites to be less than one hectare. This is described as a minimum figure and the Council is encouraged to go further. Data is presented to demonstrate why smaller sites support SME house builders. It is stated that this 10% cannot come from sites that have been delivered or from windfall. It is suggested that this requirement could be met within the UDC plan on the non-strategic sites that are to be added to the Reg 19 version of the plan.	Noted. This matter will be clarified in the Reg 19 version of the Plan.
NDLP999	Daniel Jones						
NDLP1057	Jackie Deane	Parish Clerk Takeley	Mary Power		Spatial Strategy	A number of comments relate to the Settlement Hierarchy, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It is suggested that making a proportionate increase to all settlements would provide sufficient housing, but reduce the need for new infrastructure and reduce any harm to the environment.</li><li>The draft plan does not properly consider the Inspector's report for the previous draft local plan. Housing allocations should be spread more widely across the district, and away from Saffron Walden or Thaxted which are both struggling to cope with recent large scale developments.</li><li>There is support for the spatial strategy, broad distribution of homes, links with the Strategic Road Network, and support for small scale development to support the viability of smaller settlements. Support is given for the overarching spatial strategy.</li><li>Chesterford Research Park is a key employer in Uttlesford and is expected to make up around 16% of all job growth over the plan period. The lack of housing allocations in North Uttlesford will make it difficult to recruit the required workers, limiting growth. The policy will encourage commuting from the south of the</li></ul>	A proportionate approach to development would significantly increase development in smaller and less sustainable settlements, leading to much less sustainable patterns of development greater harm to the environment and a less effective approach to planning for Infrastructure. Planning for housing at the main settlements ensures that proposals are more sustainable, that affordable housing is provided where the greatest need arises, that housing is closer to employment and services and facilities and that infrastructure improvements are delivered where they can help to address the deficit resulting from years of relatively unplanned and speculative development. In terms of development at Chesterford Research Park – there is some housing development coming forward at Great Chesterford and there is also c. 1,500 homes coming forward nearby, albeit within neighbouring Cambridgeshire. But, it is also
NDLP1106	Theresa Trotzer Wilson	Director Richstone Procurement Limited					
NDLP974	Mary Power						
NDLP3399	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3400	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3405	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
	Montare LLP						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3407	Mr Mark Jackson	Pelham Structures Ltd				<p>district, increasing pollution and congestion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The largest two allocations within the draft local plan are not justified or consistent with national policy. The plan should consider evenly dispersing growth throughout the district, particularly the small and medium settlements, and where green belt performs poorly. Sites within the green belt should not be unduly precluded.</li> <li>Misleading references to Stansted Airport and more clarity on the importance of the airport as a transport interchange and the contribution to the local economy.</li> </ul>	<p>important to remember that a further Plan update will be needed quickly (to be adopted c. 2030/ 31) that may be able to more effectively consider larger scale growth in the area, and which is more likely to align more effectively with planning for Cambridge, where there is currently some uncertainty – this could, for example, enable development in proximity to the railway station at Great Chesterford, where access is needed from the neighbouring district. Given that Uttlesford hasn't had an up to date plan for some years, it is important that a new plan is adopted quickly, that can start to address the issues associated without having a plan for so long, but it isn't necessary for the new plan to do everything – it may be that having a plan adopted in 2026 that provides a baseline and another plan adopted in 2030 that deals with some larger strategic matters is a more effective way to plan for a district whose most recent plan dates from 2005. Further considerations to the references to London Stansted Airport will be made for Regulation 19.</p>
NDLP3415							
NDLP4159	G W Balaam & Son						
NDLP1450	Savills - Audley End Estate						
NDLP366	Sharon Critchley						
NDLP3932	Pelham Structures Limited						
NDLP127	John Devoti						
NDLP3394	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
	Paula Griffiths						
NDLP2726	D J Bagnall						
NDLP2536	Mr Andrew Taylor						
NDLP1260	Grosvenor Property UK						
NDLP3878	Hawridge Strategic Land						
NDLP3990	Higgins Group						
NDLP3114	Adam Davies						
NDLP3165	Weston Homes Plc	Pelham Structures Ltd					
NDLP3255	Gladman						
NDLP3371	Hillrise Homes Limited						
NDLP3828	Pelham Structures Limited						
NDLP3922	Mrs Christina Cant						
NDLP3053							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2824	Abington Farms Limited	Pelham Structures Ltd					
NDLP76							
NDLP2260	Pete Lewis						
NDLP3935	Landsec						
NDLP3934	Pelham Structures Limite						
NDLP3903	Pelham Structures Limited Pelham Structures Limited						
NDLP3114	Higgins Group						
NDLP4003	MAG Stansted Airport Ltd						
NDLP3107	Higgins Group						
NDLP851	Melanie Harris				Spatial Strategy - Takeley	General objection to development at Takeley – it is suggested that the infrastructure cannot cope.	The proposed allocation at Takeley will deliver considerable infrastructure to the benefit of the local community. This is discussed in more detail in relation to the South Area Strategy.
NDLP913	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings		Spatial Strategy - Appeal Sites	It is suggested that some of the proposed allocations include sites previously rejected planning permission where the decisions were taken at Appeal and that there has been insufficient evidence the relevant matters have been considered.	The areas of land affected by Appeal is generally a very small proportion of the areas proposed to be allocated. In each case, the reasons for refusal have been considered to examine how the issues can be addressed to ensure they can be appropriately overcome. The Council will consider if any additional detail needs to be included in the Site Selection Topic paper.
NDLP2551	Geoff Bagnall	Pelham Structures Ltd					
NDLP3910	Pelham Structures Limited						
NDLP3748	Denise Gemmill				Spatial Strategy - Area Strategies	It is suggested that there does not seem to be any particular logic into dividing the district into specific areas. For example, Stansted Mountfitchet arguably relates more to the M11 and Rail Corridor than the A120. There is no reason why Thaxted is singled out. It is suggested that a hierarchical approach to development would be more logical than an area based one. It is also pointed out that Takeley has more development proposed than Stansted Mountfitchet, despite Takeley having fewer services and facilities than Stansted Mountfitchet. Furthermore, the level of development proposed at Thaxted is said to be out of proportion to development proposed at Great Dunmow (500 vs. 869).	The Area Strategies simply help to make the plan more accessible by providing details for areas of Uttlesford for those interested in specific areas, rather than just treating the district settlement, by settlement. The approach enables more bespoke policies to be developed that affect different areas and provide a more coherent approach to planning for parts of the district, rather than having to consider policies under a range of different thematic topics. The actual level of development in any given location is based on a range of factors, as set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper, but include the Settlement
NDLP3862	Lands Improvement Holdings						
NDLP4132	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd						
NDLP3798							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Belinda Challenger					It is suggested that proposed development should be more proportionate and commensurate with the service levels and sustainability of each settlement.	Hierarchy (strategic growth is directed to the Key Settlements and Local Rural Centres) and the availability of suitable and deliverable sites. It is also important to consider the total level of growth at each settlement (i.e., including completions and commitments) as for example, the total level of growth at Great Dunmow is far greater than at Thaxted and any other settlement in the district. Thaxted is presented in a separate Area Strategy simply as it doesn't relate specifically to either Saffron Walden of the north of the district or Great Dunmow or the south of the district. It does sit separately as part of a more rural area. Stansted Mountfitchet does relate to the M11 and Rail Corridor, but is included in the South Area Strategy, as it also relates closely to Stansted Airport, which is a significant economic feature in the south of the district that falls within the A120 growth corridor. However, this last point is being considered in the context of the updated Reg 19 Plan.
NDLP3567	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering				Spatial Strategy - Ashdon	It is suggested that there are no known potential non-strategic development sites available at Ashdon. Reference is made to the Neighbourhood Plan Landscape Appraisal which identifies the area as having limited capacity for development.	Noted. The Settlement Hierarchy will be updated to inform the Reg 19 Plan. The hierarchy included in the Reg 18 plan considered services and facilities for parishes, but this is being updated to ensure that services and facilities are considered for individual settlements. Furthermore, the housing requirement figures for the Larger Villages is being informed by an update to the HELAA that considers any potential development sites. For the Reg 19 Plan, Ashdon is re-classified as a smaller village.
NDLP3568	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP1823	Essex County Council				Spatial Strategy - ECC	ECC request further discussions to inform the Reg 19 plan following review of the updated completions and commitments at April 2024 to inform the quantum and distribution of growth, in particular in relation to 1,200 homes recently approved through appeal at Great Dunmow.	The Reg 19 Plan is informed by completions and commitments updated to April 2024. The updated figures have enabled some strategic sites to be removed, for example the proposed site at Thaxted for which there was an objection from ECC, to reduce the Larger Village housing requirement, but also to increase the supply buffer to c. 10% as recommended by a number of consultation respondents including the HBF.
NDLP1823	Essex County Council				Spatial Strategy - ECC	ECC request further details on the implications of the 1,000 homes proposed on non-strategic sites that are yet to be identified in Neighbourhood Plans or within the Reg 19 version of the LP.	As noted above, the Larger Village housing requirement has been reduced in the Reg 19 plan. It is a requirement of the NPPF that housing figures are provided for designated neighbourhood plan areas, that development is directed to locations that support the vitality and viability of rural areas and that 10 % of development should be on sites of less than 1 ha. It is also important to note that the quantum of development directed to the Larger Villages is a significant reduction on the level of growth that has been coming forward in these areas in the absence of a plan via speculative development.
NDLP402	Louise Johnson	Parish Clerk Elsenham Parish Council			Spatial Strategy - Elsenham	Elsenham Parish Council support the decision to not propose any additional strategic allocations at Elsenham which is already	Noted. There are a number of sites considered suitable for development, but at the time of preparing the Reg 18 Plan it was understood that these sites

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						subject to a substantial level of development. It is suggested that this should be referenced in policy.	had planning permission. This will be reviewed to inform the Reg 19 Plan. The Reg 19 Plan does include a small allocation for 110 dwellings, although it was thought at the time of preparing the Reg Plan this already had consent – this site will enable the delivery of a new Primary School as requested by ECC.
NDLP3350	The Mackenzie Trust				Spatial Strategy - Existing Commitments	It is suggested that the plan mis-represents the level of housing coming forward and focuses on the 'new' proposals. It is suggested that there is no evidence in the background papers that the total amount of housing coming forwards has been considered. The site selection topic paper is criticised for not showing settlements clearly so it is possible to see the total level of development. The total level of development at Great Dunmow is described. It is suggested that any future consultation documents clearly show the level of development overall. A site at Elsenham has an existing planning permission and a query is raised as to what the Councils approach will be to any such sites that have existing permission in case they should lapse. It is assumed they will be included in the housing trajectory to accompany the Plan and a question is asked whether the settlement boundary will be updated to reflect any existing permissions.	Noted. The housing trajectory will be updated to reflect all commitments as at April 2024 – the Councils 5YHLS does include an lapse rate to cover off the potential that some existing permissions will lapse. In addition, it is proposed that the Policies Map, to accompany the Reg 19 Plan, will be updated and will reflect any commitments at that time. On this basis, should any existing permissions lapse, they would fall within the existing settlement and so any future application would be considered via the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development in accordance with Core Policy 3. It is however the case that completions and commitments have been taken into account and informed the evidence supporting the plan. Table 4.2 (part of Core Policy 2) clearly shows the proposed housing supply, with the level of commitments and completions – indeed, these figures enable the proposed allocations to be reduced as much as they are. The supporting evidence includes a housing trajectory that includes existing commitments and the site selection topic paper annotates any sites that already have permission. The supporting papers also make clear that commitments have increased since April 2023 and that on that basis, some reduction in the 'additional' level of housing that will need to be included in the Reg 19 Plan is likely to be reduced. However, it is recognised that the maps included in the sites selection topic paper should be updated to clearly show all of the existing commitments.
NDLP3730	Countryside Partnerships Plc						
NDLP140	Neil Bromley						
NDLP2623	Matthew Parish						
NDLP3278	Andrew Martin						
NDLP378	Mr Bill Critchley	G W Balaam & Son	Matthew Thomas		Spatial Strategy - General	Further comments are made relating to the Spatial Strategy. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern is raised over the division of different community areas in the plan. It is suggested that Uttlesford is one community and is not divided.</li> <li>It is suggested that the plan is over-reliant on large strategic (over 100) home sites.</li> <li>It is also suggested that is an uneven split between development in the north and south of the district.</li> <li>A number of other comments support the spatial strategy – support is provided for focusing development nearer to jobs, shops, services and other facilities and thereby minimising the need to travel.</li> <li>There is particular support for not allocating sites in Littlebury.</li> <li>The draft plan does not properly consider the Inspector's report for the previous draft local plan. Housing allocations should be spread more widely across the district, and away from Saffron Walden or Thaxted which are both struggling to cope with recent large scale developments.</li> </ul>	Refer to earlier response relating to the split of development between the north and south. The Area Strategies in the Plan are designed to assist readers find detail that affects them rather than having to look through the whole document and to make some of the policies more locally focused. Of the ten strategic sites proposed within the Reg 18 Plan, seven are under 500 units (six under 400); i.e., the majority of the proposed strategic sites are medium or small in size that can be expected to start delivering quickly in the first five years of the plan. Overall, the Council is satisfied the balance of type, size and geography of sites proposed across the plan when taken as a whole. A housing trajectory will accompany the Reg 19 plan and will demonstrate a rolling 5-year housing land supply for the first five years of the Plan and beyond with a good level of flexibility and resilience. Support noted. It has already been made clear that the completions and commitment figures will be updated to April 2024 to inform the Reg 19 plan. The
NDLP1094	James Balaam						
NDLP995	Louise Howles						
NDLP2158	Barry Benton						
NDLP444	Pete Lewis						
NDLP2919	Chelmsford City Council						
NDLP2982	Mr Gary Slaughter						
NDLP2990	Susan Le Good						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3056	Mrs Christina Cant	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is support for the spatial strategy, broad distribution of homes, links with the Strategic Road Network, and support for small scale development to support the viability of smaller settlements. Support is given for the overarching spatial strategy.</li> <li>Chesterford Research Park is a key employer in Uttlesford and is expected to make up around 16% of all job growth over the plan period. The lack of housing allocations in North Uttlesford will make it difficult to recruit the required workers, limiting growth. The policy will encourage commuting from the south of the district, increasing pollution and congestion.</li> <li>The largest two allocations within the draft local plan are not justified or consistent with national policy. The plan should consider evenly dispersing growth throughout the district, particularly the small and medium settlements, and where green belt performs poorly. Sites within the green belt should not be unduly precluded. within the green belt should not be unduly precluded. Non-strategic sites within sustainable settlements should also be promoted.</li> <li>Concern is raised over the level of development at the larger settlements – the towns are already saturated and cannot cope, but that development at larger villages is reasonable (if carefully controlled) and support for infill development at smaller villages by protecting expansion of these settlements – a request is made to add a reference to their village identities being protected.</li> <li>Some comments consider that there is too much reliance on a small number of large strategic sites, with not enough small and medium-sized sites and not enough development focused on the smaller settlements.</li> <li>It is suggested that the Council had previously made a commitment to focus development at communication hubs, particularly where there is good access to public transport, especially railway stations.</li> <li>It is suggested that a previous Inspector rejected a dispersed strategy as the areas infrastructure was inadequate.</li> <li>Reference is made to the level of development committed since April 2023 and it is suggested that the plan will need to be adjusted accordingly.</li> <li>It is suggested that many proposed sites are not located near to Railway Stations and will therefore rely on car journeys. Another respondent provides support for the importance of the Plan being progressed quickly under the transitional arrangements and the level of existing growth at Elsenham and Green Belt status of Hatfield Heath providing appropriate justification to limit growth at these settlements.</li> <li>- It is suggested the plan , doesn't deliver enough small or medium sites in accordance with NPPF paragraph 69</li> </ul>	<p>spatial strategy deliberately focuses on the main and most sustainable settlements, these will help to maximise use and enhancement to public transport. Whilst the railway stations are important, care is needed that all development isn't directed to be located near to them as this will simply increase out-commuting and may fail to plan for the needs of Uttlesford as a whole.</p> <p>The Council does not recognise the comment that a previous Inspector had rejected development being focused on the most sustainable locations providing for a mix of type, size and geography in accordance with national policy – the previous Inspector recommended precisely this as have other Inspectors elsewhere. Delivering housing at these sustainable settlements is the only mechanism available to the Council to help to redress the significant infrastructure deficit.</p>
NDLP3161	BNP Paribas						
NDLP3190	Dianthus Land Limited						
NDLP3594	Pegasi Limited						
NDLP907	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)						
NDLP1239	Mr Bill Critchley						
NDLP1569	David Perry						
NDLP2071	Neha Goel						
NDLP2272	Mulberry House Farms LLP						
NDLP2188	Mr Peter Gomm						
NDLP2362	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP2582	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP2584	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP2852	Jeanette O'Brien						
NDLP2202	Christine Griffin						
NDLP2366	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP2375	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP2588	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP2853	Jeanette O'Brien						



Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3403	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke	Pelham Structures Ltd  Pelham Structures Ltd					
NDLP3224	Weston Homes Plc						
NDLP3272	Weston Homes Plc						
NDLP3388	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3394	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3394	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3402	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3597	Knight Frank						
NDLP3709	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP3722	CH Gosling 1965 Settlement						
NDLP3758	The Hargrove Family						
NDLP3798	Belinda Challenger						
NDLP3798	Belinda Challenger						
NDLP3826	Hillrise Homes Limited						
NDLP3862	Lands Improvement Holdings						
NDLP3906	Pelham Structures Limited						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response					
NDLP3907	Pelham Structures Limited	Pelham Structures Ltd										
NDLP3913	Pelham Structures Limited											
NDLP3984	Hawridge Strategic Land											
NDLP3992	Hawridge Strategic Land											
NDLP4111	Siemens Benefits Scheme Limited											
NDLP3496	Mr and Mrs R A French	Managing Director New Homes Project Managements Ltd										
NDLP2552	Geoff Bagnall											
NDLP2724	Paula Griffiths											
NDLP3594	Pegasi Limited											
NDLP499	Nigel Tedder											
NDLP2824	Abington Farms Limited											

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3891	Grosvenor Property UK				Spatial Strategy - Great Chesterford	It is suggested that more residential development is needed close to Chesterford Research Park which is a significant employment site that is set to expand. It is explained that neither Saffron Walden or Newport are sustainable locations for serving Chesterford Research Park and that Great Chesterford provides the only reasonable option. It is suggested that Chesterford Research Park will become increasingly reliant on commuting from further afield.	Noted. The Council has been clear that larger scale development, such as the potential for New Settlements will be considered in more detail in the next plan, that will need to be adopted, c. 2030. It has been explained that the currently emerging Plan seeks to establish an updated baseline, given that there has been a 20 year gap from the last updated plan in Uttlesford, by providing a 5-Year Housing Land Supply and bringing forward sufficient sites for the short term, and reflecting the constrained nature of the timetable available for the Plans preparation. And, as discussed elsewhere, there are currently constraints on planning for Cambridge that will be clearer in the next few years so are likely to align more for considering larger scale opportunities at Great Chesterford, which undoubtedly also relates strongly to planning for Cambridge.
NDLP3893	Grosvenor Property UK						
NDLP3018	Mr Graham Jolliffe				Spatial Strategy - Great Dunmow	Comments are received that both support and object to development proposed at Great Dunmow. It is suggested that the site is harmful particularly in landscape terms and that the recent appeal decision on c. 1,200 homes permitted to the West of Great Dunmow will enable the site to be removed. Other comments acknowledge the sustainable nature of Great Dunmow and its suitability for development.	Noted. The Reg 19 Plan will be updated in light of commitments up to April 2024 along with considering all the consultation responses and updated evidence. The proposed strategic allocations set out in the Reg 19 Plan will be amended accordingly to reflect this updated position.
NDLP3496	Mr and Mrs R A French				Spatial Strategy - Great Dunmow	Comments are received that both support and object to development proposed at Great Dunmow. It is suggested that the site is harmful particularly in landscape terms and that the recent appeal decision on c. 1,200 homes permitted to the West of Great Dunmow will enable the site to be removed. Other comments acknowledge the sustainable nature of Great Dunmow and its suitability for development.	Noted. The Reg 19 Plan will be updated in light of commitments up to April 2024 along with considering all the consultation responses and updated evidence. The proposed strategic allocations set out in the Reg 19 Plan will be amended accordingly to reflect this updated position.
NDLP3916	Pelham Structures Limited	Pelham Structures Ltd					
NDLP3940	Michael and Sarah Tee						
NDLP3905	Pelham Structures Limited	Pelham Structures Ltd			Spatial Strategy - Larger Villages	A number of comments relate to the Larger Villages, including: • ECC request further discussions to inform the Reg 19 plan following review of the updated completions and commitments at April 2024 to inform the quantum and distribution of growth, in particular in relation to 1,200 homes recently approved through appeal at Great Dunmow. ECC request further details on the implications of the 1,000 homes proposed on non-strategic sites that are yet to be identified in Neighbourhood Plans or within the Reg 19 version of the LP. Greater certainty is required to assist understanding for infrastructure provision and funding. • It is suggested that the level of housing apportioned to the Larger Villages should be increased to ensure greater availability of small and medium sized sites. It is suggested that the current 6% level will not provide the level required by the NPPF. Furthermore, that there is too much reliance on development in the top tier settlements, and that infrastructure requirements for the larger allocations will affect the 5-year housing land supply without more smaller and medium sites. One respondent suggests that there should be a 50 % increase in the non-strategic allocations (to 1,500 dwellings) to increase the number of small and medium sites,	The Council is satisfied that the level of growth proposed for Larger Villages is appropriate, although it has been signalled that the level of 'additional' housing to plan for in the Reg 19 plan is likely to be reduced from that set out in the Reg 18 plan, and so it is likely that any reduction will include some reduction in the level of housing to be planned at the Larger Villages. The Council must balance the need to support the NPPF's requirements to plan for sustainable development, to support the vitality of the more sustainable rural communities, to provide housing figures for any neighbourhood plans that have reached the area designation stage, but also future proof the plan by providing certainty for other villages that may wish to bring forward neighbourhood plans, whilst also ensuring there is a sufficient supply of sites of different type, size and geography and provide for a rolling 5-year housing land supply etc.
NDLP2275	Mulberry House Farms LLP						
NDLP1307	Unknown						
NDLP748	Mr Neil Reeve						
NDLP504	Nigel Tedder	Managing Director New Homes Project Managements Limited	Nigel Tedder				
NDLP505	Nigel Tedder	Managing Director New					

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP671	Ian, Sheena, and Tracy Dale, Dale, and Hunter	Homes Project Managements Limited	Nigel Tedder			<p>increase the contribution from the community and reduce the reliance on windfall sites (discussed elsewhere).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A proportionate selection process for sites in the Larger Villages should also be applied to the rural areas (outside of the Larger Villages).</li> <li>• One respondent provides support for the opportunity for Neighbourhood Plans to bring forward non-strategic sites where they wish to. The value and opportunities associated with neighbourhood planning are outlined although it is requested that the Council should make clearer what support is available to support communities who wish to prepare neighbourhood plans.</li> <li>• Another respondent claims that it will not be possible to identify appropriate sites in the Reg 19 plan and there is no guarantee that the communities or villages will support the proposed allocations. It is suggested that it is not appropriate to leave the 1,000 proposed non-strategic allocations to be identified in the Reg 19 Plan and that any proposals are made available for consultation ahead of any Reg 19 publication. On this basis, it is suggested that the Council cannot claim it is planning for more housing than the identified need, nor that the Plan has been prepared in a transparent manner.</li> <li>• The data used to classify villages and identify the potential for non-strategic allocations needs to be checked. This may alter the proposed approach. For example, Little Hallingbury does not have a Secondary School, the proposed available land in High Easter is about six miles by road from the village centre.</li> </ul>	<p>There is no requirement for any sites that will come forward within Neighbourhood Plans to be identified for the Reg 19 plan. Those sites will come forward through separate Neighbourhood Plans that may take c. two years to be made. Any such instances will be clearly labelled in the Reg 19 Plan. It is only sites that will not come forward in Neighbourhood Plans that need to be set out in the Reg 19 Plan and the process will involve some engagement of the local community. As is stated elsewhere, the Reg 18 plan goes somewhat beyond what is required and some Councils only publish vague options at Reg 18, in some cases not even identifying any preferred sites at all.</p>
NDLP666			Vaughan Bryan				
NDLP913	Robert Fairhead	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd					
NDLP913	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Vaughan Bryan				
NDLP1823	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)		Stacey Rawlings				
	Essex County Council						
NDLP1741	Salings Parish Council				Spatial Strategy - New Settlements	<p>Some comments refer to previously proposed Garden Communities, including that the plan cannot achieve its aims without the allocation of a garden community, and others that provide support for the removal of garden communities from the local plan.</p>	<p>Noted. See above.</p>
NDLP2261	Landsec						
NDLP2536	D J Bagnall						
NDLP3103	Little Easton Parish Council						
NDLP168	Linda Stephenson						
NDLP3330	The North West Essex Constituency Labour Party						
NDLP4105							
NDLP392	Tye Green Farm						
NDLP1024	Ian Vance						
NDLP220	Louise Howles						
NDLP1289	Mr Richard Johnson						
NDLP2255	Mr Jeremy Veitch						
NDLP436							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP468 NDLP3209 NDLP3748 NDLP3862 NDLP3871 NDLP3915 NDLP4103 NDLP2258	Landsec Alan Carter Gordon Pickett Ceres Property Denise Gemmill Lands Improvement Holdings Grosvenor Property UK Pelham Structures Limited Tye Green Farm Landsec	Pelham Structures Ltd					
NDLP3642 NDLP3914 NDLP922	Newport Parish Council Pelham Structures Limited Mike Hannant	Newport Parish Council Pelham Structures Ltd			Spatial Strategy - Newport	Responses are received both supporting and objecting to development at Newport suggesting the proposal is flawed, and that it (along with Great Chesterford, Elsenham and Stansted) are amongst the most sustainable settlements in the district due to strong transport links. However, it is suggested that is the sites were split up they would deliver more quickly.	Noted. The Reg 19 Plan will be updated to reflect the comments considered in the round and updated evidence.
NDLP3496 NDLP3798 NDLP3394 NDLP3498 NDLP3231 NDLP3273 NDLP3339 NDLP3402	Mr and Mrs R A French Belinda Challenger Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke Lois Partridge Weston Homes Plc Weston Homes Plc Welbeck Strategic Land				Spatial Strategy - Non Strategic Allocations	It is suggested that the top tier settlements should also be allocated non-strategic allocations, whether they do or do not have strategic allocations. One respondent suggests that their own evidence identified a specific need for between 986 and 1,519 dwellings at Stansted Mountfitchet between 2020 and 2040 and that non-strategic development would be needed in addition to the proposed strategic development. Concern is also raised over what is described as over-reliance on non-strategic sites, especially through Neighbourhood Plans where there is uncertainty over delivery and timescales. It is suggested that more allocations are needed within the Local Plan itself. A number of comments raise concern over the lack of specific detail about the non-strategic sites within the Reg 18 consultation, but also reiterate that the number of dwellings to be delivered through non-strategic sites should be increased. There are a range of comments suggesting that more development should be supported in the rural areas, particularly the smaller villages as well as the Larger Villages. Some comments reference the need for 10 % of sites to be less than one hectare and what is described as over reliance on windfalls.	The Plan and accompanying evidence is clear that where strategic development is proposed (at the top two tier settlements) there is no additional need for non-strategic development, as that would result in the housing need being exceeded. The Plan is clear that at these (and Larger Villages) the presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply within the existing settlement and so this is where the majority of the windfall development will come forward. Thus, there is no need to consider non-strategic allocations in addition to strategic ones at these settlements. Any non-strategic sites that could form a strategic site by being joined to other smaller sites have automatically been considered as part of the site selection methodology. In terms of relying on sites that may come forward through Neighbourhood Plans, the NPPF requires the LPA to identify a housing requirement for any Neighbourhood Plan that has passed the Area Designation stage, but it is considered prudent to future proof the plan by providing clarity to communities who may decide later to prepare a plan. Furthermore, the Council is not proposing to rely on delivery for non-strategic sites

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3594	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke	Director Richstone Procurement Limited	Mary Power				<p>within the first five years of the plan – thus, if there were any delays to delivery, the five yearly Local Plan review could address any shortfall.</p> <p>Overall, the Council is content that the balance between sites of different size, type and geography has been achieved, with the focus on the Key Settlements and Local Rural Centres for Strategic growth and for non-strategic development at Larger Villages, but that any development at the smaller villages, that are generally more rural and less sustainable, should be restricted to limited infill only. These matters are discussed separately, but the Council is content that at least (more than )10 % of the housing delivery will occur on sites of less than 1 hectare and that the windfall figures is robust and based on sound evidence.</p>
NDLP3594	Pegasi Limited						
NDLP3707	Pegasi Limited Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP3710	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP3406	Montare LLP						
NDLP3600	Knight Frank						
NDLP3736	Enterprise Residential Development						
NDLP3767	Harlow Agricultural Merchants Ltd						
NDLP3110	Higgins Group						
NDLP3153	Bellway Homes						
NDLP3478	Richstone Procurement Ltd						
NDLP3632	C J Trembath						
NDLP3760	The Hargrove Family						
NDLP3966	Mary Power						
NDLP962	The Streeter Family						
NDLP3163	Adam Davies Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3394	Lands Improvement Holdings						
NDLP3862	Daniel Jones	Director Silverley Properties Ltd	Sophie Pain				
NDLP999	Mr Neil Reeve						
NDLP748							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1067	Luxus Homes Stoney Common Limited	Director Luxus Homes Stoney Common Limited	Peter Biggs				
NDLP3191	Dianthus Land Limited				Spatial Strategy - Saffron Walden	Support is provided for the Spatial Strategy and the approach to selecting sites and focusing growth at the key settlements, on the basis they have the ability to support the most sustainable patterns of living through their current levels of facilities, services and employment opportunities. Particular support is provided for the suitability of Saffron Walden for supporting strategic growth, but if anything, it is suggested that the quantum of growth could be increased to support additional infrastructure delivery. There is no reference to the historic importance of Saffron Walden.	Noted.
NDLP2442	Saffron Walden Town Council						
NDLP3941	Michael and Sarah Tee				Spatial Strategy - Smaller Villages	Concern is raised for the lack of managed growth at the 24 smaller villages across the district, which is considered necessary to help support the vitality and viability of rural settlements along with supporting rural bus services, etc. It is suggested that with zero growth, the needs of these local communities will not be met and the approach is described as unsound. Another respondent raises the importance of planning for infrastructure and services and facilities in smaller villages, not just for housing. The response reiterates that Chrishall is classified as a smaller village. It is suggested that a map showing the development boundaries would be appreciated in order to protect the countryside that surrounds the village. It is suggested that the Council should review any planning applications in neighbouring parishes (such as within Cambridge). Concern is raised over a planning application at Swards End and the desire of the village to avoid further development. Clear boundaries are requested to protect Swards End and avoid coalescence with Saffron Walden.	Noted. The plan supports limited infill development within the existing built area of smaller villages, thus allowing for some, albeit small scale development, that is proportionate to the size of settlement. It is not appropriate to support specific allocations at smaller villages, unless brought forward through neighbourhood plans, where there is local evidence and support. Overall it is considered this provides a balanced approach to allowing for some limited development at smaller villages, whilst focusing site allocations at more sustainable locations. The matter of development boundaries is discussed separately (see above).
NDLP168	Linda Stephenson						
NDLP1621	Chelsteen Developments Limited						
NDLP3496	Mr and Mrs R A French						
NDLP1532	Chrishall Parish Council						
NDLP1437	Suzanne Powell						
NDLP3604	Knight Frank				Spatial Strategy - Stansted Mountfitchet	It is suggested that the level of housing proposed at Stansted Mountfitchet is too low and should be increased and that the currently proposed approach is unjustified. It is stated that the Development Site Templates for one of the Stansted Mountfitchet sites is missing from the plan appendices and that clarification is sought for how the numbers were identified (in terms of individual sites and areas).	The Development Template for any sites that form part of the Reg 19 Plan will be included in the Plan at that stage. The Site Selection Topic Paper sets out the methodology and approach for selecting the sites and why individual sites have been selected, or not, as the case may be. Development to the south of Stansted Mountfitchet is impacted by the Metropolitan Green Belt – overall, the Council do not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify development in the Green Belt, where there are alternative and non Green Belt options available.
NDLP3600	Knight Frank						
NDLP3748	Denise Gemmill						
NDLP3917	Pelham Structures Limited	Pelham Structures Ltd					
NDLP3594	Pegasi Limited				Spatial Strategy - Strategic Sites	The plan should consider additional smaller scale, but still strategic allocations, instead of reliance on large strategic sites which are at odds with paragraph 61 of the NPPF.	This matter is discussed elsewhere. Overall, the Council is satisfied the Plan supports an appropriate mix of sites of different size, type and geography, that provides for a five year land supply, for a c. 10 % over supply buffer and provides for flexibility and resilience. The smaller non-strategic sites, are not relied upon in the first five years of the plan, thus providing for additional flexibility.
NDLP3594	Pegasi Limited						
NDLP2368	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP527	Peter Hayward				Spatial Strategy - Takeley	A number of objections were received relating to the proposed development at Takeley. Key points raised include:	Noted. The Council will take all the consultation comments and updated evidence into account when updating the Reg 19 Plan. The updates will seek to overcome any issues/ constraints as far as possible, maximise benefits, including for infrastructure delivery.
NDLP529	Peter Hayward					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site doesn't have convenient access to a railway station</li> <li>• The site includes parcels of land that have previously been refused at Appeal</li> <li>• Large allocations do not align with Paragraph 61 of the NPPF that</li> </ul>	
NDLP884	Caroline Staines						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2987 NDLP2993 NDLP3153 NDLP3594 NDLP3594 NDLP3613 NDLP3710 NDLP3710 NDLP3758 NDLP3918	Susan Le Good Susan Le Good Bellway Homes Pegasi Limited Pegasi Limited Hill Residential Ltd Douglas and Ruth Burton Douglas and Ruth Burton The Hargrove Family Pelham Structures Limited	Pelham Structures Ltd				<p>seeks to support smaller sites – the allocation is too large and is unlikely to be delivered in the plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are various constraints effecting the site including heritage and Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• A question is raised for why so much (60%) of the housing is being put into one location.</li> <li>• It is suggested that the Local Plan doesn't provide any justification for why Takeley and the South Area is identified for development for housing and employment.</li> <li>• It is suggested that there is no infrastructure being planned to support the development.</li> </ul> <p>A number of other comments provide support for the proposed development. Key points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Takeley is the fifth most sustainable settlement in the district benefitting from w a wide range of local services and facilities</li> <li>• The proposal will provide a range of new facilities including new Primary and Secondary schools, along with a local centre, retail and health provision</li> <li>• The traffic modelling indicates that development can be accommodated successfully and the area is less constrained than many alternatives (outside of flood plain/ Green Belt etc).</li> <li>• The site is located on a strategically important transport corridor, in proximity to the district's largest employer, with opportunities for enhancing public transport, cycling and walking.</li> <li>• It is suggested that additional sites could be brought forward at Takeley that would provide more plan flexibility, support greater infrastructure delivery, etc.</li> </ul>	
NDLP3920	Pelham Structures Limited	Pelham Structures Ltd			Spatial Strategy - Thaxted	There is no need for the level of housing proposed for Thaxted and there is insufficient infrastructure at present, or to support housing growth.	Noted. The Council will take all the consultation comments and updated evidence into account when updating the Reg 19 Plan. The updates will seek to overcome any issues/ constraints as far as possible, maximise benefits, including for infrastructure delivery.
NDLP2575 NDLP2600	Stebbing Parish Council Stebbing Parish Council				Stebbing	The allocation of 109 dwelling in Stebbing Parish is understandable in the context of the Inspector's report into the withdrawn local plan, which required development to be dispersed across the district. Stebbing Parish is heavily reliant on private car transport and the local amenities are under severe pressure. Additional development will exacerbate the problems and lead to increased in pollution. New development should be supported by appropriate infrastructure to mitigate the impacts and help tackle climate change in a meaningful way.	Noted. The Council will take all the consultation comments and updated evidence into account when updating the Reg 19 Plan. The updates will seek to overcome any issues/ constraints as far as possible, maximise benefits, including for infrastructure delivery.
NDLP2692 NDLP997	Pascale Muir Great Easton and Tilty Parish Council	Clerk/Responsible Financial Officer Great Easton and Tilty Parish Council	Kate Rixson		Transport	The plan should focus economic growth in the north and west of the district, instead of promoting growth and the increase in private transport within the southern key settlements. The plan should ensure there is adequate parking for existing and proposed development.	Noted. The Spatial Strategy is discussed elsewhere, but development is focused on the largest and most sustainable locations and where there is greatest opportunity to deliver sustainable development. The A120 corridor is a key growth corridor located in proximity to the district's largest employment areas and where the majority of employment need is focused - and where there are significant opportunities to improve public transport and walking/cycling.



Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2275	Mulberry House Farms LLP	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd  Director Luxus Homes Stoney Common Limited	Vaughan Bryan		Windfall Development	A number of respondents suggest that there is an over-reliance on windfall development, that the evidence is insufficient to justify it and that it is not a plan-led system as required by the NPPF. One respondent suggests that the proposed windfall (1,650) homes would account for 21% of the proposed supply (14,377). It is also suggested that combining the non-strategic allocations and windfall allowance would equate to 35% of the total supply where insufficient detail is provided. Another respondent suggests that the Plan does not provide detail for where the windfall sites will come forward. It is suggested that more strategic and non-strategic sites should be allocated and with a reduced windfall allowance. Another respondent provides support for the proposed windfall allowance and approach.	The Council is satisfied the proposed Windfall figures are appropriate and robust and that the supporting evidence provides sufficient justification. The proposed non-strategic development will be set out in the Reg 19 Plan, either by identifying specific allocations, or by clarifying where Neighbourhood Plans will come forward, and in those cases how much development is to be supported at the relevant settlements. Overall, the Council is satisfied the Local Plan provides a sufficient balance between the various factors, including various NPPF requirements. The proposed Windfall allowance is not for 21% of the proposed supply but for around 11% and this percentage may come down in the Reg 19 Plan. Combining the proposed non-strategic and windfall allowance does not equate to 35% of proposed supply but 18%, and as stated above, the percentage windfall contribution may come down as may the level of housing proposed for non-strategic development. Core Policy 3 is clear where windfall development will be supported and clearly states that the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ will apply within the existing built settlements of the top three tier settlements. Furthermore, that limited infill development will be supported at Smaller Villages. This provides clarity for what type of development could come forward where, it is stronger than the existing policy and is clear where windfall development could come forward.
NDLP2369	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP2444	Anchor						
NDLP666	Robert Fairhead		Vaughan Bryan				
NDLP669	Ian, Sheena, and Tracy Dale, Dale, and Hunter		Vaughan Bryan				
NDLP913	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)		Stacey Rawlings				
NDLP1067	Luxus Homes Stoney Common Limited		Peter Biggs				
NDLP1621	Chelsteen Developments Limited						
NDLP3230	Weston Homes Plc						
NDLP3339	Welbeck Strategic Land						
NDLP3360	Gladman						
NDLP3393	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3394	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3402	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3710	Douglas and Ruth Burton						
NDLP3766	Harlow Agricultural						
NDLP3798							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3862	Merchants Ltd						
NDLP3940	Belinda Challenger Lands Improvement Holdings						
NDLP2267	Michael and Sarah Tee						
NDLP3761	Mr Kemp and Ms Shutes						
	The Hargrove Family						

**Table 3 Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy**

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1185	Ashdon Parish Council				Ashdon	Some comments provide support for the classification of Ashdon as a Larger Village which is described as one of the largest and most sustainable villages within the rural area. Other comments object to the classification of Ashdon with residents spread across four separate villages that do not function as a single place, nor are the services and facilities offered across these settlements easily accessible to residents from different villages. Ashdon is described as having one pub, one school and no shop (detail is provided to explain the level of services and facilities more comprehensively). It is stated that a recent Neighbourhood Plan ratified by the local community is seemingly being ignored.	Noted. The methodology for classifying the villages that informed the Reg 18 plan was based on scoring for parishes rather than for settlements and this will be updated to inform the Reg 19 plan. On this basis, Ashdon is being removed from the Larger Village Category and will become a Smaller Village. On this basis, there will be no allocations identified for Ashdon.
NDLP1186	Ashdon Parish Council						
NDLP3533	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3535	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3536	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3540	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3545							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3546	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3548	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3561	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3569	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3570	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3571	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3572	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP672	Ian, Sheena, and Tracy Dale, Dale, and Hunter		Vaughan Bryan				
NDLP1103	Harriet BURROW						
NDLP1292	Harriet BURROW						
NDLP1201	Karen Ainley						
NDLP2293	Ashdon Parish Council						
NDLP204	Stuart Hastie						
NDLP437	John Moran						
NDLP1185	Karmel Stannard						
NDLP3578	Ashdon Parish Council						
NDLP3579	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3574	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP3562	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP1851	Berden Parish Council				Berden	The response notes that Berden is classified as a smaller village however it is requested that development boundaries, for example those included in the 2005 plan are reinstated and presented in the Reg 19 document. It is suggested that these development boundaries provide clarity for where development can and cannot come forward.	Noted. Development boundaries are commented on elsewhere, but overall, it is considered more flexible to rely on the policy wording, rather than an often arbitrary line that will sometimes effectively enable development, rather than restrict it.
NDLP860	Clive Downes				Clavering	A number of objections are raised for the classification of Clavering as a Larger Village. Various details are provided to support this viewpoint, including that Clavering has no public transport and that the nearest health services are in Newport, which is not accessible by public transport.	Noted. The Council is satisfied that Clavering should be designated as a Larger Village - it actually scores the highest level for any villages in the district outside of the Key Settlements and Local Rural Centres. It is important the Plan supports development in the largest and most sustainable rural communities to support their vitality and viability. Whilst supporting sustainable travel is important (the majority of development is directed towards locations that can maximise sustainable travel) we also need to consider the social and economic sustainability of the largest rural communities. Furthermore, there may be opportunities associated with development that could improve travel options - for example supporting an electric pool car scheme, or improving the viability of on demand community transport.
NDLP3164	Adam Davies					Other comments support the designation of Clavering – the response provides an overview of how Clavering has been assessed and suggests that it achieves the highest score for any of the proposed Larger Villages.	
NDLP4157	G W Balaam & Son						
NDLP597	Stephanie Gill						
NDLP692	Nigel Wood						
NDLP2057	Mrs Jacqueline Cooper						
NDLP1096	James Balaam	G W Balaam & Son	Matthew Thomas				
NDLP1484	Dr and Mrs R N Woodhouse						
NDLP2058	Mrs Jacqueline Cooper						
NDLP3057	Mrs Christina Cant				CP 3 - General Comments	General support is given to the settlement hierarchy within the draft local plan. Concerns are raised on the classification of specific settlements, and applying a generic increase in development across all settlements without accounting for local characteristics. There is potential for the character of settlements to be lost. The list and classification of villages should be reviewed. There is also a query to why the previous settlement hierarchy wasn't used , which was consulted on by parish councils.	Noted. Support welcome. In relation to other comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elsenham is not missing from CP3, it is identified as a Local Rural Centre.</li> <li>• The distribution of growth is discussed in CP2: Meeting our Housing Need, which also relates to the Spatial Strategy - although the strategy does deliberately focus growth at the top two tier settlements, in order to support sustainable development.</li> <li>• The approach to identifying housing need and potential development sites in an accordance with national policy, guidance and legislation. The Council's ability to direct new development to existing brownfield sites relies on sufficient brownfield sites being available in suitable locations, for which in Uttlesford there are not.</li> </ul>
NDLP4058	Salacia Ltd						
NDLP4121	Tim and Alexandra Bradshaw						
NDLP3234	Weston Homes Plc						
	Gladman						
NDLP3362	Rosconn Strategic Land Limited						
NDLP3835							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2501	John Collecott						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of adequate planning for infrastructure in recent years is noted. However, the only mechanism available to the Council to support the delivery of new infrastructure is to focus new development to places where the new infrastructure provided by the new development has maximum value to existing communities and settlements as the new ones.</li> <li>• Development in smaller villages is designed to be proportionate to their scale as specified in Core Policy 3.</li> <li>• In terms of the specific categories of individual settlements, the methodology for classifying the villages that informed the Reg 18 plan was based on scoring for parishes rather than for settlements and this will be updated to inform the Reg 19 plan. On this basis, there may be some adjustments made to the classification of individual villages. However, the methodology is clearly set out in the accompanying topic paper. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In terms of the previous hierarchy, this used out of date information therefore as set out in the topic paper a parish survey was carried out in Jan 2021 to attain up to date information to inform the new settlement hierarchy</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
NDLP507	Nigel Tedder	Managing Director New Homes Project Managements Limited	Nigel Tedder				
NDLP1080	Jackie Deane	Parish Clerk Takeley					
NDLP914	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings				
	Jean Johnson						
NDLP125	Julian Sayer						
NDLP1266	Mr Charles Pick						
NDLP1989	Mr David Hall						
NDLP2287	Nick Dukes						
NDLP2793	Mr and Mrs Roberts						
NDLP2828							
	Paula Griffiths						
NDLP2727	Theresa Trotzer Wilson						
NDLP1108	Mr Roy Pike						
NDLP1935	Gill Gibson						
NDLP1974	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP2589							
NDLP3924	Pelham Structures Limited	Pelham Structures Ltd					
	Maddy Marley						
NDLP1547	Dr Colin Durrant						
NDLP1553							
NDLP1042							
NDLP1057							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1650	Sue Cony				Debden	Concern is raised over the number of homes proposed for Debden. In particular, concern is raised for development being planned without due consideration for providing new infrastructure and services, in part based on previous experience, where development has taken place without adequate infrastructure. Concern is also raised over the classification of Debden as a Larger Village. It is stated that Debden has no shops and no suitable public transport – traffic issues are also reported. The nearest GP is in Thaxted that is four miles away. Debden has no gas supply and many properties do not have mains drainage. Reference is made to existing planning applications that will already increase the size of the village.	Noted. The methodology for classifying the villages that informed the Reg 18 plan was based on scoring for parishes rather than for settlements and this will be updated to inform the Reg 19 plan. On this basis, there may be some adjustments made to the classification of individual villages. It should also be noted that any commitments up to 31st March 2024 will be considered and so it is anticipated that the level of 'additional' housing to be planned in the Reg 19 plan will be reduced overall, and its relation to any designated Larger Villages. Any approved applications in individual villages will be off-set against the village requirement figures.
NDLP1653	Patrick Harte						
NDLP1660	Jane Caroline Collins						
NDLP2066	Andrew Gilling						
NDLP2177	Mr Ian Carter						
NDLP2857	Jeanette O'Brien						
NDLP2204	Christine Griffin						
NDLP402	Louise Johnson	Parish Clerk Elsenham Parish Council			Elsenham	The draft local plan identifies Elsenham as a Local Rural Centre but further consideration is not given to protect and enhance the services the village need, given the effects of the level of development that has already taken place.	Elsenham was identified as a Local Rural Centre in the Reg 18 plan, but did not identify any additional allocations. There is however a small allocation being included in the Reg 19 plan, that was previously thought to have permission and that enables the delivery of a primary school and early years provision as requested by ECC. Additional infrastructure, services and facilities etc will be provided through the existing development consents
NDLP3827	Hillrise Homes Limited				Felsted	Felsted should be redesignated as a local rural centre due to size and characteristics in comparison with the other villages.	Noted. The Council is satisfied that Felsted should be designated as a Larger Village. It is important the Plan supports development in the largest and most sustainable rural communities to support their vitality and viability, however this should be proportionate with the majority of growth being directed to the larger settlements.
NDLP4095	S Payne						
NDLP3145	Smith Bros						
NDLP3389	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke				Flitch Green	Flitch Green should be designated as a 'Larger Village'. It is not clear that the plan has properly considered reasonable alternatives in relation to development in Flitch Green. There is a lack of certainty development can be delivered in larger villages, so smaller villages should not be discounted.	Noted. The Council is satisfied that Flitch Green should be designated as a Smaller Village, which will not be apportioned any proposed allocations. The Council has not considered any development options in the Smaller Villages other than through the HELAA process.
NDLP3391	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3395	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3397	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3404	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3371	Gladman						
NDLP3400	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP3405							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP2254	Landsec	Agent Grosvenor Property UK	Claire Galilee		Garden communities	It is suggested that Garden Communities should be supported in this plan, that the previous Inspector did not reject garden communities, but there should be greater balance between different sizes of sites and that soe LPLG Councillors have suggested that insufficient options have been considered by the Council. Also supporting information for a North Uttlesford Garden Community have been submitted by Grosvenor Property UK.	Noted. This is discussed more in relation to CP2. Overall the Council is satisfied that sufficient options have been considered, that LPLG (now LPP) Councillors have adequate information to assist their understanding, and that the proposed approach strikes a reasonable balance between helping the Council to get a plan in place quickly, that addresses those issues necessary for the Plan to be capable of being adopted, whilst still enabling the Council to revisit the potential for a Garden Community in the next plan, to be adopted c. 2031/31. Information on the North Uttlesford Garden Community has been considered in setting out the spatial Strategy
NDLP1029	Guy Kaddish						
NDLP1138	“						
NDLP1141	“						
NDLP1147	“						
NDLP1152	“						
NDLP1133	“						
NDLP1133	“						
NDLP1147	“						
NDLP1163	“						
NDLP1155	“						
NDLP1162	“						
NDLP1154	“						
NDLP1161	“						
NDLP1165	“						
NDLP1136	“						
NDLP1140	“						
NDLP1152	“						
NDLP1156	“						
NDLP673	Robert Fairhead	Pelham Structures Ltd	Vaughan Bryan		Great Chesterford	The classification of Great Chesterford as a Local Rural Centre is supported and as one of the largest and most sustainable settlements in the district. It is stated that public transport, amenities, employment opportunities available at Great Chesterford offer a strategic opportunity for the delivery of housing.	This is also discussed in relation to Core Policy 2. A number of potential development sites have been considered at Great Chesterford but none are suitable at the current time. Garden Community options are also discussed separately.
NDLP3919	Pelham Structures Limited						
NDLP2251	Ian Butcher				Great Dunmow	There is general support for the identification of Great Dunmow as a Key Settlement. There are concerns at the lack of public transport and the potential increase in traffic from new development. Comments note the proximity to major employers. Objections are raised to the allocation 'Church End East'.	Noted. The Council is updating the site selection paper, evidence and reviewing the strategy in light of consultation comments to ensure the Reg 19 plan is fit for purpose, but is also amended to ensure any issues are addressed, and improvements made wherever possible.
NDLP3021	Mr Graham Jolliffe						
NDLP3497	Mr and Mrs R A French						
NDLP4109							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP4115	Siemens Benefits Scheme Limited						
NDLP3011	Siemens Benefits Scheme Limited Mr Graham Jolliffe						
NDLP948	Sarah Brewin				Great Easton	Concern is raised over the classification of Great Easton and the suggestion that it should support some development. It is described as car dependant and a relatively unsustainable location. It is suggested that development will not help to sustain the vitality and viability of facilities if there are no facilities. It is suggested that no information is available as to how the villages have been classified or the housing requirement numbers derived.	The methodology for classifying settlements has been updated to inform the Reg 19 Plan and a consistent approach is being applied across the board. The methodology for the classifications is set out in the Village Facilities study and a separate paper describes the approach to identifying the housing requirements for the Larger Villages. On this basis, Great Eason is re-classified as a Smaller Village and will not have a housing need identified.
NDLP3967	The Streeter Family				Great Hallingbury	The draft local plan does not properly take account of large settlements outside of the plan area, and this places potential allocations in Great Hallingbury at a disadvantage, due to its proximity to Bishop's Stortford.	It is true the Plan does not consider settlements in neighbouring districts. It is a matter for the neighbouring districts to plan for their own settlements and to raise any unmet need issues through the Duty to Cooperate. The Council is not aware of any instances where the Council is being asked to contribute towards unmet need.
NDLP431	Toni Howarth				Hatfield Broad Oak	Concern is raised for the level of development planned for Hatfield Broad Oak. It is questioned why the development needs to be built on one single and large site, rather than on a number of smaller sites. It is suggested that any development will have an impact on local wildlife and the countryside. It is suggested that the local surgery is already over-subscribed, that there are traffic issues and that the village is vulnerable to flooding, in part due to inadequate drainage in the village. There are also a comment of support for this allocation.	The Council is satisfied with the classification of Hatfield Broad Okd as a Larger Village. The methodology for classifying settlements has been updated to inform the Reg 19 Plan and a consistent approach is being applied across the board. The methodology for the classifications is set out in the Village Facilities study and a separate paper describes the approach to identifying the housing requirements for the Larger Villages. There is no requirement for the housing to be delivered on a single site, the expectation is that any development would come forward on non-strategic sites of up to 100, but could easily be made up of a combination of smaller sites. Where communities prepare Neighbourhood Plans they will be responsible for any site selection processes.
NDLP3720	CH Gosling 1965 Settlement						
NDLP3721	CH Gosling 1965 Settlement						
NDLP3723	CH Gosling 1965 Settlement						
NDLP657	Clive Durham						
NDLP1549	Carly Swain						
NDLP2913	Christine Chester						
NDLP280	Rebecca Cox				Hempstead	There is general support for the lack of development proposed for Hempstead. Concerns are raised that development in larger settlements will impact on services for smaller villages.	Noted. Smaller Villages are free to support development where they wish to, for example to support improvements to local facilities through a Neighbourhood Plan.
NDLP500	Richard Wollaston				High Easter	A number of comments raise concern over the classification of High Easter as a Larger Village stating that there are very few facilities in the village. For example, there is no pub, no shops at all and the nearest GO surgery is 6 miles away. Public transport is extremely limited and the local Post Office only operates for two hours a week. The nearest supermarket is in Great Dunmow which is seven miles away.	Noted. The methodology for classifying the villages that informed the Reg 18 plan was based on scoring for parishes rather than for settlements and this will be updated to inform the Reg 19 plan. On this basis, High Easter is classified as a Smaller Village and so does not have any proposed allocations within the Reg 19 Plan.
NDLP1482	Amanda Deans						
NDLP1494	Simon Sutton						
NDLP1656	Christopher Dyer						
NDLP1657	Anne Dyer						



Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1981 NDLP2183	Rebecca Foley Amanda Deans						
NDLP1723	High Roding Parish Council				High Roding	The Parish Council for High Roding is generally supportive of CP3 as the village is classified as a smaller village, suitable only for 'limited infill' development, where it is 'in keeping with local character, proportionate in scale, or meets local housing needs'. However, two specific suggestions are made for how the policy could be amended. Firstly, the phrase 'future parts of the local plan' should be deleted as it is considered unlikely that a future local plan would seek to allocate development at High Roding. And, the phrase 'unless supported by other relevant policies as set out in the Development Plan or national policy' in relation to planning for open countryside.	Noted. In relation to the policy wording, the Council will consider if the phrase 'future parts of the Local Plan', although it would be the case that any future Local Plan would need to be subject to consultation and separate Examination, so there would be no prospect of a change happening (the village classification changing or an allocation being added), without an opportunity for interested parties to comment and participate in the process. In relation to the reference to national policy, this was added to a similar adopted policy through a Examination to a different plan by an Inspector, to ensure the policy was consistent with national policy, that does set out some criteria where limited development in countryside may be acceptable. It is also important for internal consistency as there is a Rural Exceptions policy within the Local Plan that also sets out conditions for where development in countryside may be appropriate. Overall, however, it is considered that countryside is afforded a very high degree of protection and that any development would be in the exception.
NDLP377 NDLP2341 NDLP3398 NDLP3939 NDLP3633 NDLP3636 NDLP2713 NDLP2224 NDLP1620 NDLP162 NDLP772 NDLP329 NDLP2934	David Hennings Richard Haynes Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke Michael and Sarah Tee C J Trembath C J Trembath S Luck N/A Chelsteen Developments Limited Tom Duncan EDWARD GITTINS Philip Kay	Clerk Hatfield Broad Oak Parish Council  DIRECTOR EDWARD GITTINS & ASSOCIATES  Pelham Structures Ltd			Larger and Smaller Villages	There is general support for the identification of smaller villages. There is some support for the plan to support small scale development within smaller villages, to ensure their ongoing vitality. There are also objections to any further development in smaller villages due to the harm that may be caused. A question is raised for how 'limited infill development' is defined and whether this relates to housing or local employment or retail. There is general support for the identification of larger villages. There is some support for the plan to support development in larger villages. Development should be spread across the plan area, including rural settlements. It is suggested that the criteria for classifying villages in one category or another is not clear. Concerns are raised relating to the classification of some villages, particularly Ashdon and Debden along with how the plan references Wimbush and Elder Street. It is suggested that development could have an unacceptable impact on the rural character of the area, particularly for Wimbush and Elder Street which are separated by only a single field.	Noted. The methodology for classifying the villages that informed the Reg 18 plan was based on scoring for parishes rather than for settlements and this will be updated to inform the Reg 19 plan. On this basis, there may be some adjustments made to the classification of individual villages. CP3 does not prevent development altogether, but makes it clear that neighbourhood plans (or potentially other parts of the Local Plan) could allocate sites at these locations, and that limited infill development may be appropriate, along with criteria to help guide this. This ensures flexibility, does allow some development to support the vitality of these smaller settlements, but also ensures that the majority of growth is directed to the larger and more sustainable settlements. It is the Open Countryside category that restricts development to exception sites etc, which the Council consider would typically be expected. It terms of the policy wording, it is interesting that a developer considers the policy is too restrictive given the number of representatives from parishes suggesting they consider the policy is to flexible. Overall, the Council consider the policy is sufficiently clear. 'local' housing needs does not necessarily need to only apply to 'affordable' housing – there may be cases where some market housing is needed locally (albeit more typically smaller units, like terrace houses, that may be 'more' affordable, rather than larger scale homes). The phrase 'within the existing built up areas' is deliberate and will help to ensure that any development is proportionate to the settlement. Overall, the aim is to ensure that development at

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3111 NDLP3923 NDLP3965 NDLP589 NDLP3114	Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield Higgins Group Pelham Structures Limited The Streeter Family G Martyn Porter Higgins Group						Smaller Villages is limited, as a good number of the consultation responses seem to support.
NDLP3242 NDLP3235	Weston Homes Plc Weston Homes Plc				Little Canfield	Little Canfield should be identified as Larger Village, particularly considering the proximity to the strategic allocation.	In relation to planning for strategic development, Little Canfield and Takeley have been considered together as the new development will form a single development scheme. It is possible that when a proportion of development has been delivered, the classification of Little Canfield and Takeley should be re-considered.
NDLP3985	Hawridge Strategic Land				Little Hallingbury	The draft local plan identifies Little Hallingbury within the Rural Areas Spatial Strategy and as a larger village. The policies should clarify the status of Little Hallingbury.	Little Hallingbury is classified in Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy as a Larger Village.
NDLP2620 NDLP2672 NDLP2802 NDLP2834 NDLP2944 NDLP2229 NDLP2146 NDLP2146 NDLP2158 NDLP1600 NDLP2829 NDLP350 NDLP2935	Jonathan Ashe Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield Nick Dukes Mr and Mrs Roberts Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield Gabrielle Winter Dennis Prior Dennis Prior Barry Benton Jillian Occomore Mr and Mrs Roberts Kelly Osborne				Littlebury	A number of comments raise concern that Littlebury is classified as a smaller village and it is stated that it should have perhaps been considered within the 'Open Countryside' category. It is suggested that the services and facilities available in the village are limited. It is also assumed that 'limited infill development' would mean a handful of dwellings. Requests are made for the 2005 development boundary for the settlement to be included in the plan. A number of other comments welcome the classification of Littlebury as a Smaller Village agreeing that it has not been identified as a sustainable location for development and will not be allocated any specific development sites.	Noted. The methodology for classifying the villages that informed the Reg 18 plan was based on scoring for parishes rather than for settlements and this will be updated to inform the Reg 19 plan. On this basis, there may be some adjustments made to the classification of individual villages. However, it should be clear that CP3 makes clear that at smaller villages 'limited infill development may be appropriate within the existing built areas of these settlements or if it is allocated within an adopted Neighbourhood Development or future parts of the Local Plan'. Specific criteria are set out in the policy to provide clarity on what this means: ' i) in keeping with local character, ii) proportionate in scale; iii) meet local housing needs, and/ or provide local employment, services and facilities'. Thus, any development at smaller villages can only be small in scale, in keeping with local character and proportionate in scale. Development boundaries are commented on elsewhere, but overall, it is considered more flexible to rely on the policy wording, rather than an often-arbitrary line that will sometimes effectively enable development, rather than restrict it.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP4122	Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield						
NDLP2092	Tim and Alexandra Bradshaw						
NDLP588	Jane Dukes						
NDLP1630	G Martyn Porter						
NDLP1551	Nikhil Saraswat						
NDLP2100	Dr Colin Durrant						
NDLP1913	Lindsey and Tim Coyne						
NDLP2106	Louise Johnson						
NDLP1502	Amanda Barclay & Iain Black						
NDLP1488	Katie Ransom						
NDLP2046	Kathleen Torbett						
NDLP2159	Mr Robert Osborne						
NDLP2106	Thomas and Isabelle Page						
NDLP2129	Amanda Barclay & Iain Black						
NDLP2154	Malcolm Domb						
NDLP2159	Lucinda White						
NDLP2168	Thomas and Isabelle Page						
NDLP2189	Sally and Stephen Lambert						
NDLP2195	Robin Grayson						
NDLP2196	Robin Grayson						
NDLP2205	Mrs Isobel Grayson						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2401	Claudia Haisman-Green and Mike Green						
NDLP2407	Michael Hancock						
NDLP2469	Jennifer Parkinson						
NDLP2476							
NDLP2504	Rosemary Wild						
NDLP2518	Andrew Figge						
NDLP2522	Michael Cox						
NDLP2664	Tom Hallmark						
	Linda Kelsey						
NDLP2760	Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield						
NDLP446	Mrs Isobel Grayson						
NDLP591							
NDLP3031	Mr Bill Garland						
NDLP1545	G Martyn Porter						
NDLP1769	Mr Brian Johnson						
NDLP1920	Maddy Marley						
NDLP1924	Janice Heales						
NDLP2129	Sally Kennedy						
NDLP2154	Carmel Carline						
NDLP1485	Malcolm Domb						
	Lucinda White						
NDLP1850	Mr and Mrs Keith Winter						
NDLP1784	Catherine Figge						
NDLP2794	Littlebury Parish Council						
NDLP2620	Nick Dukes						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Jonathan Ashe						
NDLP3769	Harlow Agricultural Merchants Ltd				Newport	The classification of Newport as a Local Rural Centre is supported.	Noted.
NDLP3822	N/A	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited					
NDLP536	Mr Frank Woods	Deputy Chair Keep Clavering Rural			Policy Wording - Infilling	The response refers to the conditions on infilling at smaller villages but suggests that these do not apply to the other settlement types and so there is said to be a policy gap with no guidance on infilling at the other settlement types.	CP3 provides clarity on what type of development is appropriate in all types of settlements. It makes clear that the presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply within the existing built areas of Key Settlements, Local Rural Centres and Larger Villages. It is also clear that development in open countryside will not be appropriate unless specifically supported by other relevant policies. On this basis, there is not considered to be any policy gap. Note that CP3 should be amended to refer to Local Rural Centres rather than Small Towns.
NDLP3972	AC Streeter				Role of Bishops Stortford	The plan does not accurately address the presence of Bishops Stortford. Smaller settlements within Uttlesford may be considered more sustainable due to their proximity to Bishops Stortford.	It is true the Plan does not consider settlements in neighbouring districts. It is a matter for the neighbouring districts to plan for their own settlements and to raise any unmet need issues through the Duty to Cooperate. The Council is not aware of any instances where the Council is being asked to contribute towards unmet need.
NDLP3975	AC Streeter						
NDLP4133	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Lt						
NDLP3836	Rosconn Strategic Land Limited				Saffron Walden	The Classification of Saffron Walden as a Key Settlement is supported.	Noted.
NDLP1443	Savills - Audley End Estate						
NDLP675	Robert Fairhead		Vaughan Bryan		Settlement Boundaries	The plan should review all settlement boundaries, as the current settlement boundaries are considered to be out-of-date. New settlement boundaries should consider the proposed extensions to settlements within the emerging local plan.	Settlement Boundaries will be updated for the Key Settlements and Local Rural Centres. There is no proposal to create or update any boundaries for any other settlements. Overall, it is considered preferable to have the flexibility provided by the policy wording to support Development Management decision making on a case by case basis.
NDLP676	Ian, Sheena, and Tracy Dale, Dale, and Hunter		Vaughan Bryan				
NDLP2247	Ian Butcher						
NDLP3479	Richstone Procurement Ltd						
NDLP507	Nigel Tedder	Managing Director New Homes Project Managements Limited	Nigel Tedder		Settlement hierarchy	A question is raised as to why CP3 has four tiers with the fourth tier split into two (Smaller Villages and Open Countryside). It is also suggested that 'countryside' is not mentioned by CP3. It is considered that 'countryside' is not affordable any protection. There is too great a focus on the upper two settlement tiers. It is suggested that CP3 infers that non-strategic sites will not come forward within (or around) Key Settlements or Local Rural Centres such as Stansted Mountfitchet. It is suggested that the policy should be updated to allow non-strategic sites to come forward at the Key Settlements or Local Rural Centres. There are potential issues for the Strategic Road Network (SRN).	The Council consider that CP 3 provides much clearer and stronger protection for the rural areas and countryside in Uttlesford. It is clear where development will or will not be acceptable - for example that development outside or adjoining the relevant settlements, can only come forward where allocated in the LP or in Neighbourhood Plans. Furthermore, that development at Smaller Villages should be restricted to 'limited infill' only and all other settlements (below the smaller villages category) are classified as 'open countryside' where development is not appropriate, except where consistent with the relevant exception policies or in accordance with national policy. Reference to 'existing built areas' is considered very
NDLP2901	Maggie Sutton		Mary Power Peter Biggs				
NDLP969	Mary Powe	Director Richstone Procurement Limited					
NDLP1071	Luxus Homes						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP874	Stoney Common Limited	Director Luxus Homes Stoney Common Limited					clear and, as described above, prevents development adjoining settlements from coming forward unless allocated. The policy is clear that development at smaller villages should be proportionate in scale.
NDLP876	Allison Ward	Parish Clerk Great Canfield Parish Council					
NDLP755	Allison Ward	Parish Clerk Great Canfield Parish Council					
NDLP3599	Virginia Barlow						
NDLP3738	Knight Frank						
NDLP3399	Enterprise Residential Development						
NDLP3400	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
NDLP2380	Strategic Land V Limited & Ms Hawke						
	National Highways						
NDLP1062	Jackie Deane	Parish Clerk Takeley			Settlement Hierarchy - Countryside	Reference is made to NPPF 20d relating to protection of the 'natural, built and historic environment'. It is suggested that the draft LP does not provide adequate protection for 'countryside' and that CP3 is too vague – using terms like 'the developed footprint' 'existing built areas' and 'open countryside'. It is suggested that more explicit protection for the countryside along with a clear definition is needed. It is suggested that CP3 does not provide an adequate replacement for the 2005 Plan policy S7 or ENV5 and that this is a serious omission. It is suggested that any development in smaller villages should be proportionate in scale to the original and that any upscaling is not appropriate.	The Council consider that CP 3 provides much clearer and stronger protection for the rural areas and countryside in Uttlesford. It is clear where development will or will not be acceptable - for example that development outside or adjoining the relevant settlements, can only come forward where allocated in the LP or in Neighbourhood Plans. Furthermore, that development at Smaller Villages should be restricted to 'limited infill' only and all other settlements (below the smaller villages category) are classified as 'open countryside' where development is not appropriate, except where consistent with the relevant exception policies or in accordance with national policy. Reference to 'existing built areas' is considered very clear and, as described above, prevents development adjoining settlements from coming forward unless allocated. The policy is clear that development at smaller villages should be proportionate in scale.
NDLP804	Linda Steer						
NDLP342	Mr W R Bargman						
NDLP1426	Katie Rae						
NDLP2345	Richard Haynes						
NDLP2556	Geoff Bagnall						
NDLP2663	Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield						
NDLP4170	Mulberry House Farms LLP						
NDLP1321	Su Morgan						
NDLP1335	James Redgwell						
NDLP3421	Bloor Homes (Eastern)				Stansted Mountfitchet	The classification of Stansted Mountfitchet as a Key Settlement is challenged, suggesting that it should not fall in the same category as Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow. It is suggested that Stansted has a limited range of shops and industry and one of its	Noted. The classification of settlements in based on methodology set out in the Settlement Facilities Topic Paper. Whilst it is true that Stansted Mountfitchet does have fewer facilities that Saffron Walden or Great
NDLP3438							

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3455	Bloor Homes (Eastern)					only advantages is access to a railway station. It is suggested that the classification is only designed to facilitate a greater level of development. The village centre is described as containing two churches, a Post Office, health centre, pharmacy, railway station, pubs and restaurants, but these are located at Lower Street, not along Cambridge Road. There is also a comment of support for the identification of Stansted Mountfitchet as a Key Settlement, because of its location.	Dunmow, it does nonetheless have many more than any other settlement in the district, including a railway station and secondary school. It is also located in close proximity to one of the largest employment areas in the district that is connected by public transport including by rail. The emerging Local Plan identifies the need for strategic development at both Key Settlements and Local Rural Centres so changing the classification wouldn't impact the level of development identified, which is actually substantially less than that identified for Saffron Walden or Great Dunmow. Furthermore, the classification doesn't change from the 2005 Plan, where Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and Stansted Mountfitchet are classified as the 'main urban areas'.
NDLP1234	Bloor Homes (Eastern)						
NDLP1748	Alan Bore						
NDLP4233	Tony Crosby						
NDLP4230	City and Country Residential  City and Country Residential						
NDLP2981	Mr Gary Slaughter				Takeley	There is support and objection to the identification of Takeley as a Local Rural Centre. The levels of development proposed will have implications for retail and other services, as well as infrastructure and this should be clearly set out in the plan. The plan should consistently refer to Takeley, Prior's Green and Little Canfield.	Noted. Clearer reference should be made to the proposed development at Takeley falling, in part, within the adjoining parishes.
NDLP3049	Anne Cook						
NDLP3154	Bellway Homes						
NDLP3340	Welbeck Strategic Land						
NDLP3614	Hill Residential Ltd						
NDLP3762	The Hargrove Family						
NDLP1000	Daniel Jones	Director Silverley Properties Ltd	Sophie Pain		Thaxted	The classification of Thaxted as a Local Rural Centre is supported which is considered to reflect the sustainability of the settlement and to be a suitable location for growth.  Some comments suggested that there is no need for a new school but there may be need for other services and facilities, which are not considered by the draft plan.	Noted.
NDLP2349	Richard Haynes						
NDLP4315	Vistry Group			Bidwells			
NDLP1378	Kate Woods				Uttlesford	The plan places an undue burden on Uttlesford to accept a flawed plan or face opportunistic development. The plan should spread development across the district.	The Plan does focus development across all three Key Settlements, those Local Rural Centres where development is considered appropriate and to a lesser extent at the Larger Villages. This is discussed more in relation to the Spatial Strategy.
NDLP2326	Mr Edward Gildea				Wendens Ambo	It is suggested that Wendens Ambo should be considered as a suitable location for development given that it has the best served railway station in the district. It is suggested that the approach to classifying settlements is flawed and that this essentially means that small places remain small and development is directed to the largest settlements. If the plan were to support sustainable development, consideration would be given to focusing development around the railway station at Wendens Ambo.	Whilst the value of a railway station at Wendens Ambo is understood, consideration is needed for a wider range of services and facilities needed to support development overall. Given the lack of other services and facilities, any development at Wendens Ambo would effectively be a new settlement and that would need to be larger in scale to be justified. The approach to considering site opportunities has considered the potential for new settlements, and whilst none are required in this plan, there are a range of options that will need to be re-considered in a future plan. This could include at Wendens Ambo.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP663	Katrina Levy				Widdington	Additional information has been submitted by the Parish Council in relation to designations, for example, protected lanes.	Noted.
NDLP1254 NDLP1929 NDLP2025	Mr Stewart Luck Wimbish Parish Council Nigel Poad				Wimbish	Concern is raised over the classification of Wimbush as a larger village. It is suggested that if housing is needed for the Army at Carver Barracks, this should be considered separately. Wimbush no longer has a public house, there are no shops, and it is no longer served by a community bus. It is suggested that the parish of Wimbush is made up of five settlements, none of which should be considered as larger villages. A detailed description is provided for the level of services available in each of these small settlements.	Noted. The methodology for classifying the villages that informed the Reg 18 plan was based on scoring for parishes rather than for settlements and this will be updated to inform the Reg 19 plan. On this basis, there may be some adjustments made to the classification of individual villages. On this basis, Elder Street (Wimbish Parish) is re-classified as a Smaller Village and will not have a housing requirement identified for it.

**Table 4 Core Policy 4: Meeting Business and Employment Needs**

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3951 NDLP4104 NDLP902 NDLP902	Messrs Bull and Robertson Tye Green Farm Jessica Allsopp Jessica Allsopp	  Assistant Planner CBRE Assistant Planner CBRE	  Jess Allsopp Jess Allsopp		Additional employment allocations required around Stansted airport, including B8	More development should be allocated in the area around Stansted airport, particularly B8, and given the strategic importance of Stansted Airport in the regional economy it should not be delivered through Neighbourhood Plans. The Stansted area should play a greater role in the District's economic strategy with further allocations.	The recommendations for employment land shows that out of the 30.4ha residual need for industrial and logistics land (paragraph 6.13) beyond Stanted airport 15ha of the need is at Stansted; 5-10ha is at Great Dunmow (along the A120) and 5ha is needed at Saffron Walden. The majority of need for industrial and logistics is at Stansted and the A120 corridor. The Reg 18 draft makes provision for 30ha of employment land including industrial and logistics at Great Dunmow and Takeley which is within the Stansted area, as recommended in the Employment Needs Assessment Update.



Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP902	Jessica Allsopp	Assistant Planner CBRE	Jess Allsopp		Comment - importance of Stansted Airport and the M11/Stansted corridor to the economy	The role of Stansted Airport in the District and the region is not fully recognised within the plan. There is compelling evidence or a strong industrial and distribution market. The M11/Stansted corridor could become a leading industrial location.	The Employment Needs Update (ENU) recognises the importance of Stansted Airport to the local and regional economy and notes the dual role that the Northside permission will play providing both strategic scale units and units more likely to meet locally derived employment requirements. As a result it is recommended in the ENU that around half of the Northside supply is discounted from that which can support local needs. The strategic role that Stansted Airport plays in the region has been recognised in the decision to have a bespoke policy for the sustainable operation and development of Stansted Airport (Core Policy 11) rather than treating it as a typical "Existing Employment Site" under Core Policy 45.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2327	Mr Edward Gildea				Comment - mismatch between jobs and housing will increase car use and travel (Chesterford Research Park)	There is a mismatch between the level of job creation and housing provision in the north of the district at Chesterford Research Park which will not encourage sustainable transport patterns	Some housing is coming forward at Great Chesterford through commitments and there is nearby development within Cambridgeshire. A number of sites have been assessed in this part of Uttlesford, but are currently not available/ suitable. Planning for larger scale growth in this areas should be tied more with planning for Cambridge where there are currently some uncertainties over the progression of the currently emerging Cambridge Plan. It is assumed that this uncertainty will have been resolved more fully to enable more effective cross-boundary working as part of the next Uttlesford Local Plan. With regard to the sustainable transport credentials for Chesterford Research Park, the promoter identifies that recent applications have provided further measures to improve the accessibility of the Park and sustainable transport options, as well as to ensure any impact on the existing communities in Little Chesterford and Great Chesterford is minimised. Mode share travel surveys, have shown that car use to the Park is 8% lower than compared with the 2011 Census mode share for the local area. Similarly, the Park has a higher sustainable travel mode share proportion (22%%), compared with 2011 employment trips to the local area (17%). 15% of staff use the bus and coach services to travel to the Park, which is significantly higher than the 2011 Census TTW proportions at 2%. The Park operates a Travel Plan, and recent permissions will see the scope of Travel Planning enhanced. This will include for those permissions the provision of sustainable transport vouchers enabling staff to access discounted bus, rail and cycle facilities; as well as continued operation of the Park operated shuttle bus services to Great Chesterford Station and coach services to and from Cambridge. The expansion of the Park has the potential to further develop the existing sustainable transport links.
NDLP3890	Grosvenor Property UK						
NDLP3894	Grosvenor Property UK						
NDLP2327	Mr Edward Gildea						
NDLP1356	Sarah Eley				Comment - mismatch between jobs and housing will increase car use and travel: Great Dunmow	There is a mismatch between the level of job creation and housing provision in the Great Dunmow area which will not encourage sustainable transport patterns. Great Dunmow sees limited employment allocations and is not on the rail network, leading to road-based commuting.	Great Dunmow is identified in the Employment Needs Assessment Update as an important industrial location. There are significant existing employment sites and further commitments in this location. The majority of the need is for the Stansted area and allocations have been made at Takeley and land in between Takeley and Great Dunmow in order to meet this. These sites are accessible to residents at Great Dunmow via sustainable transport modes
NDLP1571	David Perry						
NDLP3885	Grosvenor Property UK				Comment about job growth at Chesterford Research Park	Comments about likely job growth as a result of expanding Chesterford Research Park.	Comments are noted.
NDLP3887	Grosvenor Property UK						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2771	Mrs Isobel Grayson				Comment on lack of employment at Littlebury	Littlebury has no industry and limited employment and will become a feeder dormitory for the other centres in the district.	It is not clear if the comment is supporting further employment development at Littlebury or not, however the spatial strategy is to have limited residential and employment development within the existing built area at the Smaller Village of Littlebury in order to prevent unsustainable travel patterns.
NDLP4151	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Lt				Comment on the role of Northside in meeting local employment need	Comment noting the role of the permissioned Northside scheme in meeting the identified need over the plan period, as referenced in the Employment Needs Assessment Update and Core Policy 4.	The comment is noted.
NDLP1091	Jackie Deane				Commitments data	Comments are made identifying recent planning approvals for employment sites including Weston Homes/Seven Acres in Takeley, Bluegates in Little Canfield and Land East of Braintree Road in Great Dunmow	Commitments and completions data was correct at 11 September 2023 taking into account the Northside permission. The commitments and completions data will be updated with the latest monitoring information for the Regulation 19 draft of the plan.
NDLP2245	Ian Butcher						
NDLP2615	Jackie Cheetham						
NDLP2786	Lorraine Flawn						
NDLP2807	Jackie Cheetham						
NDLP3236	Weston Homes Plc						
NDLP2615	Jackie Cheetham				Commitments data - Northside	The Northside permission is for non-airport related uses and should be counted as such in the evidence base.	The Employment Needs Update notes that whilst there is uncertainty over the role of Phase 2, the overall Northside scheme will meet both strategic and local needs. An assumption in the evidence base has been made that half of the site will provide for local needs which has been deducted from the need to calculate the residual need to be met through new allocations in the plan.
NDLP2786	Lorraine Flawn						
NDLP2807	Jackie Cheetham						
NDLP2903	Maggie Sutton						
NDLP2245	Ian Butcher				Commitments data should be published in full	The commitments and completions data has been used to calculate the residual need to be met through new allocations in the plan under Core Policy 4. This information should be published in full to provide clarity on this source of supply.	The monitoring process is undertaken on an annual basis through the Authority Monitoring Report process. The information will be updated in order to inform the Regulation 19 consultation however the detailed monitoring data may be more appropriately published in the AMR rather than the plan itself.
NDLP3304	24/7 Investments Limited						
NDLP2245	Ian Butcher				Commitments should be allocated	Committed employment sites (sites with planning permission that have not yet been implemented) that are being relied on to meet the identified employment need should be allocated as employment sites in order to ensure their delivery over the plan period, should permissions not be implemented for any reason.	Committed sites fall between being an "existing employment site" under CP45 and an "allocated employment site" under CP4. It is proposed at Regulation 19 stage that employment sites with an extant or recently lapsed permission for employment land are treated favourably for future employment planning applications in
NDLP2250	Ian Butcher						
NDLP2252	Ian Butcher						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3299 NDLP3304	24/7 Investments Limited  24/7 Investments Limited						the policy. This approach will ensure that for any sites with planning permission during the plan-making process that are not implemented, the presumption of employment uses will have been established.
NDLP4138	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd				Criticism of Employment Needs evidence base: net to gross adjustment needed	The Employment Needs Assessment Update does not appear to consider net to gross adjustments for the recommended net absorption trend-based projection of need which risks failing to account for the demand lost due to demolitions and conversions.	Replacement demand is applied to labour scenarios as they are net change above change in stock. Replacement demand is also applied to net stock change as this may be diminishing due to age related inadequacy. Gross absorption does not include move outs so misrepresents demand, whereas net absorption captures all demand unless the market is suppressed through insufficient stock. The margin (20%) and current vacancy top up (UENU para 5.38) are intended to respond to this.
NDLP4138	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd				Criticism of Employment Needs evidence base: Replacement of lost employment land.	Page 56, Table 5.7 of the Employment Needs Assessment Update states that the figure of 34.2 hectares should also include an element of "replacement demand" but yet does not appear to increase the base figure on this basis. The term "replacement demand" is the requirement to replace historic stock that is falling out of functional use. The Iceni Report assumes that the replacement of old for new would not generate the need for more land for employment.	Replacement demand is applied to labour scenarios as they are net change above change in stock. Replacement demand is also applied to net stock change as this may be diminishing due to age related inadequacy. Gross absorption does not include move outs so misrepresents demand, whereas net absorption captures all demand unless the market is suppressed through insufficient stock. The margin (20%) and current vacancy top up (UENU para 5.38) are intended to respond to this.
NDLP4138	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd				Criticism of Employment Needs evidence base: structural shifts not taken into account	The Iceni Report does not appear to have adequately accounted for structural shifts that result in increasing demand for industry and logistics sector premises. These include the growth of e-commerce combined with housing growth, as well as the impact of supply chain shocks such as Brexit, Covid-19 and the war in Ukraine resulting in companies' increasing preference in on-shoring and near-shoring.	Growth in E-commerce is acknowledged. However ONS reporting "Internet sales as a percentage of total retail sales (ratio) (%)" effectively show a steady trend increase from 2006 – 2024 not an increasing curve. Therefore occupier demand trends are baked in to past take up rates on absorption so a further top up does not appear warranted.
NDLP4138	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd				Criticism of Employment Needs evidence base: sub-regional need for Stansted Airport not taken into account	The Iceni Report might not have adequately considered future sub-regional demand and supply balance.	Regarding the wider FEMA / PMA – the study recognises that it forms part of a wider economic area. However this is a study to assess Uttlesford's needs not a joint study. The focus is therefore appropriately on Uttlesford's needs and not its neighbours. A separate joint assessment or one by the County / LEP may be more appropriate for this (PPG ref ID: 2a-025-20190220)
NDLP4138	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd				Criticism of Employment Needs evidence base: suppressed demand due to a supply-constrained market historically	The Iceni Report does not appear to adequately account for suppressed demand despite evidencing the supply-constrained nature of the local market. A 13% provision made by Iceni is considered low given that the availability rate has been below the equilibrium level in Uttlesford for the last decade.	Replacement demand is applied to labour scenarios as they are net change above change in stock. Replacement demand is also applied to net stock change as this may be diminishing due to age related inadequacy. Gross absorption does not include move outs so misrepresents demand, whereas net absorption captures all demand unless the market is suppressed through insufficient stock. The margin (20%) and current vacancy top up (UENU para 5.38) are intended to respond to this.
NDLP2985	Mr Gary Slaughter				Employment development at Takeley is not in line with the Settlement Hierarchy	Takeley as a Local Rural Centre is the second tier of the settlement hierarchy yet is allocated the majority (an estimated 91% according to the comment) of the employment land and 57% of the housing allocations. This is not consistent with the settlement hierarchy.	The Employment Needs Assessment Update identifies a need for 15ha of industrial development and 3-5ha of office in the Stansted Area and 5-10ha industrial in the Great Dunmow area. Takeley is strategically located between Stansted and Great Dunmow, along the B1256 and A120 corridor, outside of the Green Belt. The Employment Site Selection Topic Paper explains the rationale for selecting

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							the employment sites to meet this need, taking into constraints and opportunities. Alongside this there is a need to deliver housing near the employment sites to help achieve sustainable transport patterns. The spatial strategy is considered to balance the existing settlement hierarchy alongside the employment and residential development need in a sustainable manner, ensuring the delivery of much-needed new infrastructure and encouraging sustainable transport.
NDLP4104	Tye Green Farm				Employment sites in South Uttlesford do not all meet the needs of Stansted Airport.	The only proposed employment allocation that relates geographically to Stansted Airport and surrounding land is North Takeley Street which is only 15 hectares across the whole plan period.	The Employment Needs Assessment Update identifies a need of 3-5ha office and 15ha industrial in the Stansted area and 5-10ha industrial in the Great Dunmow area. The Employment Site Selection Topic Paper explains the rationale for allocating the sites however it is considered that the allocation at Gaunts End/Elsenham Business Park and Land North of Takeley Street fully meets this need and the allocation at the B1256 and A120 junction between Takeley and Great Dunmow also contributes towards this need (alongside that of Great Dunmow).
NDLP3236	Weston Homes Plc				Figure 4.2 inconsistent with the text	The employment allocations in Core Policy 4 do not match the key diagram	This is a mistake in the Reg 18 plan. The text is correct whilst the diagram at Figure 4.2 needs to be updated for Reg 19.
NDLP3217	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd				Flexibility over use class at site allocations (B8)	The allocations in Core Policy 4 do not include any B8 which is identified in the Employment Need Assessment Update as a use class for which there is a need to be met through allocations. Greater flexibility is requested.	The conclusions of the Employment Needs Update suggest that the employment allocations within the plan should be flexible in order to meet demand over the plan period. The greenfield allocations along the A120 corridor within the Reg 18 Local Plan are flexible in order to meet the quantitative and qualitative need within the Employment Needs Update however the allocations at The Water Circle/Elsenham Estate and Chesterford Research Park are more specific given they are expansions of established locations. The proposed policy approach with Core Policy 45, 46 and 47 provide flexibility for alternative development over the plan period subject to criteria being met. It is agreed that the lack of a reference to B8 in the allocations at North of Takeley Street and Land Between A120 and Stortford Road is an oversight and this will be clarified in the Regulation 19 draft.
NDLP402	Louise Johnson	Parish Clerk Elsenham Parish Council			Gaunts End / Elsenham Business Park - objects to multi-storey development	The employment allocation at Gaunts End/Elsenham Business Park is within the Countryside Protection Zone, therefore multi-storey development would be objected to.	The CPZ is proposed redrawn to exclude the employment allocation at Gaunts End / Elsenham Business Park. Details over height, layout, density and landscape mitigation will be considered through engagement with the site promoters for Regulation 19.
NDLP402	Louise Johnson	Parish Clerk Elsenham Parish Council			Gaunts End / Elsenham Business Park - previous permission not implemented.	The previous permission UTT/1473/11/FUL was not implemented at Gaunts End/Elsenham Business Park. The reasons for this should be looked into before a new allocation is made.	The landowner at the site has confirmed that the previous permission for a 9-storey office building is not viable and a smaller-scale office development is proposed in its place. The site is being actively promoted for office development. Furthermore in contrast to a detailed planning permission a plan allocation provides flexibility and policy certainty to future-proof the delivery of office development at this site over the plan period.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1947	Mr Loftus Buhagiar				General Comment	A number of general comments summarise the contents of the evidence base and the proposed plan approach. One comment suggests that there are only two major employers in Uttlesford and that too much housing is being planned without sufficient employment need.	Comment noted. The employment and housing need is based on robust and up to date evidence. There are of course a wide range of employers across the whole district.
NDLP2920	Chelmsford City Council						
NDLP3176	Phoenix Life Limited and Mulberry S						
NDLP3573	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group						
NDLP378	Mr Bill Critchley						
NDLP4134	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd						
NDLP3304	24/7 Investments Limited				General support for Core Policy 4	Comment providing general support to the principle of Core Policy 4 in meeting identified employment needs, however some minor amendments are sought to improve the effectiveness.	General support for the policy is noted.
NDLP3634	C J Trembath						
NDLP1785	Littlebury Parish Council						
NDLP3951	Messrs Bull and Robertson						
NDLP3216	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd				Glossary definition of "Industrial"	The plan uses the word 'industrial' to cover both industrial (use class B2) and warehousing and logistics (use class B8). This should be clarified with a glossary definition provided.	This is agreed and will be clarified in the Regulation 19 draft.
NDLP3236	Weston Homes Plc				Insufficient headroom in the supply	The principle of providing headroom in the employment land supply is supported, however it is argued that the headroom is insufficient and should be increased. This is particularly relevant for Saffron Walden (where an industrial allocation of 3ha is made against a need of 'up to 5ha'; and Stansted where 3ha of office development is allocated against a need of 3-5ha).	Support for the principle of headroom is acknowledged; however for the reasons set out in the Employment Site Selection Topic Paper there are insufficient suitable, available and achievable industrial sites to provide headroom in Saffron Walden. The sites at North Takeley Street and the Land Between the A120 and Great Dunmow are allocated for a flexible mix where office development would be supported alongside industrial and logistics. This is intended to be refined in time for Regulation 19. Smaller-scale expansion of existing employment sites is considered through the Employment Land Review.
NDLP3285	Legal and General Property						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2327	Mr Edward Gildea				Insufficient skilled job creation and a lack of job diversity, unable to afford housing	The plan is unsound as existing house prices in Takeley and Great Dunmow in particular are too expensive for workers in low skilled and low paid industrial and warehousing jobs at the proposed allocation sites	The plan seeks to meet employment and housing needs in the most sustainable locations to increase the opportunities for sustainable transport. Existing housing is expensive however new housing would be required to be in accordance with the housing mix set out in the plan, informed by the local housing need assessment, and would deliver affordable housing. This is intended to improve housing affordability over the plan period. A mix of jobs is planned including office, research and development, industrial and logistics for which there is significant demand.
NDLP124	Mr Antony Johnson						
NDLP2139	Paul Hinwood						
NDLP2590	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP3058	Mrs Christina Cant						
NDLP1705	Rosper Estates Ltd				Larger number of smaller employment allocations to provide flexibility and resilience.	A larger number of smaller employment allocations are required in order to provide flexibility and resilience in the employment land supply. A small number of large allocations means makes the strategy vulnerable to under-delivery.	With the exception of the proposed allocation at the Land Rear of Knight Retail Park in Saffron Walden the sites allocated in the Reg 18 draft of the plan are being actively promoted by the landowner and the council continues to engage with the promoters to work up the policy details. The Council intends to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with each promoter confirming the deliverability of the site in advance of Examination in Public. Furthermore, it is noted that the Employment Needs Update states that in the Stansted Area "a larger allocation(s) may be preferable to piecemeal to improve deliverability".
NDLP4138	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd				Need is greater than assessed in the Employment Needs Assessment Update	The need figure in the Employment Needs Assessment is considered an underestimate and should be increased to truly reflect employment needs in the District.	The Employment Needs Assessment Update is considered to be a robust piece of work. Comments have been passed on to the consultants in order to decide if any changes need to be made, with no need to amend the evidence identified.
NDLP2621	Jonathan Ashe				No objection to Littlebury 002 EMP	Comment stating that the development of Littlebury 002 EMP would not be objected to.	Comment noted, however employment development at the smaller village of Littlebury would likely not be in accordance with the spatial strategy or settlement hierarchy. There are no proposals in the Local Plan for development allocations at Littlebury.
NDLP2139	Paul Hinwood				No proven employment need	There is not a proven need for further employment in the area.	The Employment Needs Assessment Update identifies a significant need for further research and development, office, industrial and logistics floorspace.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1091	Jackie Deane	Parish Clerk Takeley			Northside should reduce Takeley's employment requirement	The planning permission granted at the Stansted Northside site should reduce the number and/or scale of employment allocations in the Takeley area.	The Employment Needs Assessment Update addresses the impact of the Stansted Northside permission and the implications for the residual employment need and local need over the plan period. Paragraphs 6.11 deals with the impact of Northside on residual office need whilst 6.12-6.13 deals with the impact on industrial and logistics stating "Beyond Stansted [Northside] there is a remaining need of around 136,900 [m2] or 30.4 ha... It is recommended that more land is allocated in the Stansted vicinity around Takeley / Bishop's Stortford borders / Stansted Mountfitchet / Birchanger of 15ha". The Employment Site Selection Topic Paper outlines the reasons for the allocation of employment sites to meet this residual need.
NDLP3961	The Streeter Family				Object as there are no allocations in the rural area.	The plan is considered unsound as it does not make provision for small scale employment in the rural area. Specifically allocations should be made in the rural area, including the specific site Great Hallingbury 004 EMP.	Core Policy 4 sets out a number of strategic site allocations to meet the identified need in the Employment Needs Assessment Update; whilst other policies including Core Policy 48 (New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites) and Core Policy 3 (Settlement hierarchy) cover windfall development within the built-up area of settlements and open countryside. Additionally the potential for further small-scale non-strategic development of existing employment sites will be considered through a new Employment Land Review for Regulation 19. This combination of approaches will ensure employment needs are met in full, with small-scale development supported through windfall or non-strategic allocations (where appropriate).
NDLP3481	Allison Evans				Object to headroom	The principle of providing headroom in the employment land supply is not supported. Allocating more sites than required to meet identified needs is unnecessary.	Planning to meet identified employment needs "on the nose" is considered to be a risky strategy which means that unforeseen issues at a single site would potentially result in the employment need not being met. Planning for a reasonable amount of headroom or oversupply provided resilience and flexibility in the land supply and is considered to be a positive and pragmatic approach.



Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3503	Kier				Object to site allocation - promoter (Saffron Walden Rear of Knights Park)	The landowner at the proposed employment allocation at the Land Rear of Knights Retail Park, Saffron Walden has confirmed that the site is no longer available for employment use. The site was previously promoted for both employment and residential, and in December 2023 a S62A outline application was made to the Planning Inspectorate for up to 55 dwellings.	The Council notes the landowner's intention to promote residential on the site and the effective withdrawal of the site promotion for employment use at the site. Since the Regulation 18 consultation closed the site has been granted outline permission for up to 55 dwellings. The site is not considered available for employment use, and is no longer allocated in the Local Plan. It remains important to ensure that the industrial need of "up to 5ha" identified in the Employment Needs Assessment Update is met at Saffron Walden on an alternative site.
NDLP4138	Endurance Estates Land Promotion Ltd				Object to site selection topic paper	The Employment Site Selection Topic Paper discounts a particular site (Birchanger 005 EMP) despite it receiving the same HELAA classification (B) as those proposed for allocation, and the outcomes of the Employment Needs Assessment Update recommending allocations in close proximity to Stansted Airport	The Employment Site Selection Topic Paper builds on the HELAA process by further assessing Category B sites for their potential to meet the qualitative and quantitative employment need identified in the Employment Needs Assessment Update. The Stansted Airport area contains constraints such as Green Belt and Countryside Protection Zone which limits the availability of sites. Site Birchanger 005 EMP is within the Green Belt and given the availability of sites outside the Green Belt in the Stansted area no exceptional circumstances have been identified to amend Green Belt boundaries.
NDLP1091 NDLP2903	Jackie Deane Maggie Sutton	Parish Clerk Takeley			Objection - Land between A120 and Stortford Road: heritage	Objection to Land between A120 and Stortford Road employment allocation on heritage grounds	The site is located adjacent to the Grade II listed Strood Hall and a War Memorial. The site area is larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 draft which provides scope to mitigate the impact on heritage, and this will be taken into account in developing the site development templates at Regulation 19 stage.
NDLP1091	Jackie Deane	Parish Clerk Takeley			Objection - Land between A120 and Stortford Road: landscape	Objection to Land between A120 and Stortford Road employment allocation on landscape grounds	The site is not subject to any landscape designations. The site area is larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 draft which provides scope to mitigate the impact on landscape character, and this will be taken into account in developing the site development templates at Regulation 19 stage.
NDLP1091 NDLP2139 NDLP2903	Jackie Deane Paul Hinwood Maggie Sutton	Parish Clerk Takeley			Objection - Land between A120 and Stortford Road: transport/traffic	Objection to Land between A120 and Stortford Road employment allocation on transport and traffic grounds	Updated traffic modelling is being undertaken for the Regulation 19 with mitigation measures identified as necessary. It is understood that the proposals are able to be mitigated to an acceptable level.
NDLP1091 NDLP2234 NDLP2903 NDLP3484	Jackie Deane Jean Johnson Maggie Sutton Allison Evans	Parish Clerk Takeley			Objection - North of Takeley Street employment site: heritage	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation on heritage grounds	The site is located adjacent to 5no Grade II listed buildings on the north site of the B1256. The site area is larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 draft which provides scope to mitigate the impact on heritage, and this will be taken into account in developing the site development templates at Regulation 19 stage.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3484	Allison Evans				Objection - North of Takeley Street: Access	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation on access grounds	The site has an existing agricultural access on the B1256 and there is a large area in the west of the site within which to create a suitable access with sufficient visibility splays.
NDLP3484	Allison Evans				Objection - North of Takeley Street: Airport Safeguarding/Public safety	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation on airport safeguarding and public safety grounds.	The site is within the aerodrome safeguarding area within which the airport operator will need to be consulted, however at Regulation 18 stage MAG have not raised any objections regarding the allocation.
NDLP2234 NDLP3484 NDLP379	Jean Johnson Allison Evans Mr Bill Critchley				Objection - North of Takeley Street: Ancient Woodland	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation due to the impact on Ancient Woodland	The site is adjacent to Ancient Woodland at Priory Wood however no Ancient Woodland is within the site boundary. Furthermore the site area is larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 draft which provides scope to mitigate the impact on Ancient Woodland with a sufficient buffer zone, and this will be taken into account in developing the site development templates at Regulation 19 stage.
NDLP2117 NDLP2234 NDLP3484 NDLP379	John Duignan Jean Johnson Allison Evans Mr Bill Critchley				Objection - North of Takeley Street: biodiversity and Hatfield Forest	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation due to the potential impact on biodiversity and Hatfield Forest, including from recreational users and on the watercourse that drains southwards into the Forest.	The site is located to the north of Hatfield Forest with a watercourse that drains southwards into the Forest. Hatfield Forest is negatively impacted by recreational users of the site whereas the proposed employment allocation is less likely to result in recreational visits compared to residential development. Any negative impacts on the watercourse draining southwards into Hatfield Forest will need to be mitigated. Development of the site will require delivery of biodiversity net gain, and as the site area is larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 draft this provides significant scope to mitigate the impact on biodiversity, and this will be taken into account in developing the site development templates at Regulation 19 stage. The Plan overall will make appropriate provision for mitigation to reduce impacts on Hatfield Forest with new open space and country parks providing accessible spaces for visitors away from Hatfield Forest.
NDLP333 NDLP3484	Martin Dunn Allison Evans				Objection - North of Takeley Street: Countryside Protection Zone	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation due to the removal of the Countryside Protection Zone designation.	The CPZ is proposed to be redrawn to exclude the employment allocation at Land North of Takeley Street. The site occupies a relatively narrow strip of land between Takeley Street and the A120, and the A120 is a defensible boundary that prevents coalescence between the airport and Takeley Street. This plan is seeking to support sustainable development, and thus it is important that any strategic housing and employment development is located where they reduce the need for travel and maximize opportunities for sustainable travel choices, such as walking, cycling and public transport. On this basis, it is proposed that the CPZ area is amended to ensure the rural setting of the airport continues to be protected, but that the sustainable development proposed by this plan is removed from the areas protected by the 1995 policy (Core Policy 12). It is considered that the approach proposed strikes an appropriate balance between preserving the rural setting of the airport, which supports sustainable development in accordance with national and local priorities to support the climate change emergency. The CPZ is retained to the west, east and north of the airport retaining the countryside setting of the airport.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3484	Allison Evans				Objection - North of Takeley Street: Impact on local infrastructure	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation due to the significant impact it would have on local infrastructure and Hatfield Forest.	The site is located to the north of Hatfield Forest. Hatfield Forest is negatively impacted by recreational users of the site whereas the proposed employment allocation is less likely to result in recreational visits compared to residential development. The employment allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on local infrastructure as people employed at the site will access it during working hours and use infrastructure (such as schools and healthcare) elsewhere in the area near their place of residence. Core Policy 5 requires all new development to provide for the necessary on-site and, where appropriate, off-site infrastructure requirements arising from the proposal.
NDLP2615 NDLP2807 NDLP333	Jackie Cheetham  Jackie Cheetham  Martin Dunn				Objection - North of Takeley Street: Landscape character	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment Road employment allocation on landscape grounds	The site is not subject to any landscape designations and it is proposed to be removed from the Countryside Protection Zone (not a landscape designation per se). The site area is larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 draft which provides scope to mitigate the impact on landscape character, and this will be taken into account in developing the site development templates at Regulation 19 stage.
NDLP2117 NDLP2234 NDLP333	John Duignan  Jean Johnson  Martin Dunn				Objection - North of Takeley Street: noise and amenity	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment Road employment allocation on noise and amenity grounds	The site is located to the north of residential properties along the B1256. The site area is larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 draft which provides scope to mitigate the noise and amenity impact on these residential properties, and this will be taken into account in developing the site development templates at Regulation 19 stage. Core Policy 44 (Noise) and Core Policy 52 (Good Design Outcomes and Process) will apply.
NDLP1091 NDLP2117 NDLP2139 NDLP2234 NDLP2786 NDLP2903 NDLP333 NDLP379	Jackie Deane John Duignan Paul Hinwood Jean Johnson Lorraine Flawn Maggie Sutton Martin Dunn Mr Bill Critchley	Parish Clerk Takeley			Objection - North of Takeley Street: transport/traffic	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation on transport and traffic grounds	Updated traffic modelling is being undertaken for the Regulation 19 with mitigation measures identified as necessary. It is understood that the proposals are able to be mitigated to an acceptable level.
NDLP2234 NDLP3484	Jean Johnson  Allison Evans				Objection - North of Takeley Street: water supply and drainage	Objection to North of Takeley Street employment allocation on water supply and drainage grounds	The site is located to the north of Hatfield Forest with a watercourse that drains southwards into the Forest. Any negative impacts on the watercourse draining southwards into Hatfield Forest will need to be mitigated. The site area is larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 draft which provides significant scope to mitigate the impact on water supply and drainage, and this will be taken into account in developing the site development templates at Regulation 19 stage.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1708	Rosper Estates Ltd				Omission site promotion - employment site	Representation received promoting an omission site.	Thank you for confirming the availability of your site. The Employment Site Selection Topic Paper sets out the process through which employment sites have been assessed and ultimately allocated to meet the identified employment need. The allocation of individual sites is ultimately a matter of planning judgement and the Council believes that the sites allocated are suitable, available, achievable and meet the tests of soundness.
NDLP1708 NDLP3285 NDLP3638 NDLP3957 NDLP4138 NDLP902	Rosper Estates Ltd Legal and General Property C J Trembath The Streeter Family Endurance Estates Land Promotion Lt Jessica Allsopp	Assistant Planner CBRE	Jess Allsopp		Omission site promotion - employment site	Representation received promoting an omission site.	Thank you for confirming the availability of your site. The Employment Site Selection Topic Paper sets out the process through which employment sites have been assessed and ultimately allocated to meet the identified employment need. The allocation of individual sites is ultimately a matter of planning judgement and the Council believes that the sites allocated are suitable, available, achievable and meet the tests of soundness.
NDLP3217	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd				Potential for further development: Land North of Takeley Street	The landowner at the Land North of Takeley Street allocation acknowledges that the site is physically capable of delivering more than 15ha of employment land.	The site is much larger than the 15ha allocation in the Regulation 18 however in developing the site development templates for Regulation 19 regard will need to be had to other masterplanning considerations such as biodiversity net gain, Hatfield Forest, water supply, drainage. The eventual capacity of the site allocation will be optimised having regard to site-specific constraints and mitigation requirements.
NDLP2994	Susan Le Good				Question why industrial units are concentrated in one part of the district	Comment querying why the majority of industrial allocations are in a relatively small part of the district, and also near housing development.	The Employment Needs Assessment Update identifies a qualitative and quantitative need for employment land in the District which for industrial and logistics development is predominantly in the Stansted and Great Dunmow area. The Council needs to plan for sustainable development in locations where there are sustainable transport alternatives to car-based commuting, and has accordingly made strategic residential allocations in the South Uttlesford area to deliver this.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP4164	Threadneedle Curtis Limited				Seeking allocation of Northside as a committed employment site.	The Northside permission is a committed site that should be allocated as an employment site. The proposals map should be updated to identify the site as an employment allocations that, whilst well-related to the overarching Stansted Airport designation, can be developed independently of it.	The Employment Land Review will inform the boundaries of "existing employment sites" in the Regulation 19 draft. The Council also intends to update Core Policy 11 (Stansted Airport) to identify those parts of the airport which are airport related. The Council will consider whether to identify the Northside site as a 'general' employment site or whether given the relationship to the airport whether the site (or part of it) should be part of the Stansted Airport policy area under Core Policy 11.
NDLP302	Sally Taylor	Councillor Birchanger Parish Council			Seeking clarity over where employment development is to take place	Query where the employment allocations are made given the employment need evidence references Green Belt locations such as Birchanger.	The allocations are made in Core Policy 4 however it is acknowledged that the allocation mapping is not clear in the Regulation 18 draft. The Regulation 19 draft will provide a detailed Policies Map showing the allocation boundaries and will contain Site Development Templates providing further detail. No allocations are planned for Birchanger or the Green Belt.
NDLP1705 NDLP3638	Rosper Estates Ltd C J Trembath				Support additional non-strategic employment allocations	The plan should additionally make smaller non-strategic employment allocations in order to reduce vulnerability to under-delivery and reduce reliance on windfall.	The Regulation 19 draft will be informed by a new Employment Land Review which will consider the case for additional non-strategic employment allocations. Headroom is provided in the employment supply which mitigates some of the risk of under-delivery whilst windfall employment development is supported in accordance with CP3, CP48 and CP21
NDLP915	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	stacey Rawlings		Support Chesterford Research Park expansion (non-landowner)	Support Chesterford Research Park as a key economic driver for the district and a focus for employment land allocations and job creation	Support acknowledged.
NDLP3643 NDLP3683	Newport Parish Council Newport Parish Council	Newport Parish Council Newport Parish Council			Support employment development at Newport (former Quarry site)	Newport Parish Council considers that the quarry site (Newport 013 RES) would make a good employment site.	Newport 013 RES is not promoted as an employment site however in accordance with CP3 as a Local Rural Centre/Small Town Newport Parish Council can consider making employment allocations outside of existing built areas in their Neighbourhood Plan.
NDLP2711	S Luck				Support for rural employment in villages.	There is a lack of places where small start-up businesses can operate from in villages. The agricultural sector has been overlooked in this plan.	Core Policy 3 allows for limited infill development (including employment) within smaller villages and Core Policy 48 allows for development on unallocated sites. Furthermore Core Policy 21 allows for rural diversification schemes and Core Policy 20 supports rural exception sites for affordable housing in the rural area.
NDLP637	Matt Brewer	Director Urbanspace Planning Ltd	Matt Brewer		Support site allocation - promoter (Chesterford Research Park)	The site promoter at Chesterford Research Park supports the employment allocation.	The support for the allocation is acknowledged. The Council will continue to engage with site promoters to further develop the allocation policy and site development templates with the aim of developing a Memorandum of Understanding to support the Examination in Public.
NDLP3786	Michael Johnstone	Cheergrey Properties			Support site allocation -	The site promoter at Gaunts End / Elsenham Business Park supports the employment allocation.	The support for the allocation is acknowledged. The Council will continue to engage with site promoters to further develop the allocation policy and site development

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP3309	Michael Johnstone	Cheergrey Properties			promoter (Gaunts End)		templates with the aim of developing a Memorandum of Understanding to support the Examination in Public.
NDLP3217	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd				Support site allocation - promoter (Land North of Takeley Street)	The site promoter at Land North of Takeley Street supports the employment allocation.	The support for the allocation is acknowledged. The Council will continue to engage with site promoters to further develop the allocation policy and site development templates with the aim of developing a Memorandum of Understanding to support the Examination in Public.
NDLP3236	Weston Homes Plc				Support the principle of headroom in the supply	The principle of providing headroom in the employment land supply is supported	Support for the principle of headroom is acknowledged.
NDLP2643  NDLP3413 NDLP3481	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service  Mr Mark Jackson  Allison Evans				Traffic modelling and transport impacts	Request further information on the transport impacts of the proposed employment allocations and whether any modelling has taken place	Updated traffic modelling is being undertaken for the Regulation 19 with mitigation measures identified as necessary. It is understood that the proposals are able to be mitigated to an acceptable level.
NDLP3481	Allison Evans				Uncertainty over the role of Stansted Northside in the local economy (larger than local vs local need).	The Northside permission is phased with uncertainty over the role of future phases. The plan is making an assumption over whether the businesses will be airport-related or more local.	The Employment Needs Assessment Update identifies the uncertainty over future phases. Paragraph 6.12 states "the Northside permission will make a substantial contribution to employment provision. It is expected that around half the development will cater for large-scale logistics type needs that do not relate to the locally derived demands of Uttlesford. The remaining components of Stansted are expected to be taken up by Stansted related type occupiers based on a continuation of past absorption of space at the airport." This is considered to be a reasonable assumption as assuming either all or none of the employment land will be for airport-related logistics business will significantly skew the numbers.
NDLP3634	C J Trembath				Windfall employment should have a total number applied to it	The policy does not include or allow for an amount of employment land through windfall development	The NPPF states at paragraph 72 that "Where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply, there should be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends." It is not considered that there is sufficient evidence to make a numerical allowance for windfall development, however windfall development is supported in line with CP3, CP45 and CP21. Furthermore the Employment Land Review may identify additional small employment allocations.

**Table 5 Core Policy 5: Providing Support Infrastructure and Services**

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP447	Kim Rickards	Planning Director Durkan Homes			CIL	A number of comments provide support for the Council preparing a CIL Charging Schedule, including ECC, as this will provide certainty for developers (and ensure infrastructure provision). One of these reps also suggests that careful consideration is needed for the viability of developments, particularly related to rates for residential sites and acknowledging that different parts of the district should attract different rates. Another comment raises concerns that contributions collected via CIL may not be applied locally.	Noted. Any proposals relating to a CIL Charging Schedule will be subject to consultation separately in due course. Whilst CIL can provide a mechanism to assist with delivering more strategic infrastructure, the contributions must be related to the development, and local infrastructure must also be provided for. The existing developer contributions SPD is on the councils website and is likely to be reviewed as part of the ongoing CIL work.
NDLP553	Mr Frank Woods	Deputy Chair Keep Clavering Rural					
NDLP1846	East of England Ambulance						
NDLP1803	Stansted MF Parish Council						
NDLP1834	Essex County Council						
NDLP2591	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP2830	Mr and Mrs Roberts						
NDLP3059	Mrs Christina Cant						
NDLP3237	Weston Homes Plc						
NDLP3575	Ashdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering						
NDLP544	Desiree Ashton	Advocacy & Campaigns Officer Uttlesford Foodbank			Community Facilities	Some comments highlight the importance of charitable services, such as food aid and for other social welfare support. It is suggested that the provision of local community centres is important to ensure outreach services can be provided locally and effectively. Another rep expresses concern that even with adopted plans in place developers may be able to a pay penalty for not including local economy or community facilities and that the plan does not show how these would be adequately safeguarded. The impact on other services is also noted such as schools, GPs and dentists being over subscribed.	Noted. The Local Plan evidence is being updated to ensure there is an up to date understanding of where community centres may be needed. New centres and facilities will be provided as part of the larger proposed allocations, but contributions towards other needs can also be secured where there is an identified local need.
NDLP1363	Charlotte Locke						
NDLP1364	Charlotte Locke						
NDLP112	Dominic Davey				Developer contributions	A number of comments relate to developer contributions. Including: • Providing support for the objectives, but that significantly larger and more timely contributions from new development will be needed than in the past. • Contributions from developers are insufficient and/or inappropriately administered and commitments by	Noted. The Council are aware that in the absence of an up to date plan in recent years in Uttlesford, there has been a significant increase in speculative, essentially 'un-planned', development, where planning for infrastructure is less effective than that considered through a Local Plan process. Having an up to date and adopted Local Plan will provide clearer policy guidance for what infrastructure is
NDLP1992	Mr Charles Pick						
NDLP1976	Gill Gibson						
NDLP1919	Judy Marlow						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP1444	Savills - Audley End Estate					<p>developers are not fulfilled and do not seem to be enforced. It is stated that it is unclear how the extra infrastructure will be funded and that the Local Plan needs to make it explicit who will pay for infrastructure projects and that more detail is needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is stated that in the past, communities have been promised new schools only to be told by Essex County Council that no new schools are needed and there is no funding for them. It is suggested that 'It is common knowledge that all the primary schools in the town and the county high are oversubscribed.'</li> <li>Greater detail is requested for how decisions will be made for what infrastructure is needed.</li> </ul>	<p>needed for each allocation and how applications should be considered. It is intended that the plan is complemented by a CIL Charging Schedule and updated Section 106 Contributions SPD, which will also help to provide increased clarity. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which sets out more detail of what infrastructure is required and where (including off-site) and other policies in the plan that refer to the specific requirements for the proposed allocations (including in the plan appendices). Taken together, this ensures that the proposed allocations will bring forward the identified and necessary infrastructure to ensure they are sustainable.</p>
NDLP1898	Keith Exford						
NDLP1786	Littlebury Parish Council						
NDLP2500	John Collecott						
NDLP2728	Paula Griffiths						
NDLP2836	Mrs Amanda Perry						
NDLP2885	Keith Exford						
NDLP2936	Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield						
NDLP3203	J Damany-Hosman						
NDLP552	Mr Frank Woods	Deputy Chair Keep Clavering Rural			Infrastructure: Cumulative Impact	Core Policy 5 should specifically include the need to address the cumulative impact of separate developments on infrastructure.	Noted. Developer contributions can only be collected for impacts associated with the development in question, but a planned approach will help to achieve a more effective approach to infrastructure delivery through a combination of identifying what infrastructure is needed to support the proposed allocations and through the addition of a CIL Charging Schedule.
NDLP550	Mr Frank Woods	Deputy Chair Keep Clavering Rural			Infrastructure: Definition	One comment suggests that CP5 fails to define infrastructure and seeks to plan for infrastructure in a less specific way than the existing policy GEN6. It is suggested that failing to define the term infrastructure will allow developers to interpret this themselves. Another comment suggests that the Plan / policy confuses the definition of facilities and infrastructure. They suggest 'Facilities include schools, clinics, social centres etc; Infrastructure is by definition, the underlying structure: roads, railways, sewage and water supply systems, internet connectivity, local community energy generation, electric car charging points...' As a result the rep suggests the PPlan is pragmatic rather than comprehensive and coherent in the infrastructure requirements needed across the district. They argue a railway east west is most needed and should form part of the council long term vision.	CP5 does define infrastructure in terms of the two categories of 'essential' and 'other' which are defined in the supporting text and consistently considered in the IDP. The Council is satisfied the policy provides appropriate clarity to ensure an effective approach to delivering infrastructure. Longer term infrastructure requirements can be considered as part of the next plan period.
NDLP482	M Howard				Infrastructure: Delivery	<p>A number of comments provide support for the general principle of ensuring there is sufficient provision of infrastructure. However, many make further comments relating to Infrastructure delivery. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy lacks detail for what specific investments are needed or how they will be run.</li> <li>Infrastructure should be built first and be fit for purpose.</li> <li>Some comments raise concern that the council does not have the power to create new facilities or to compel others to build them and therefore question whether the new facilities will ever come to fruition.</li> </ul>	<p>CP5 is accompanied by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which sets out more detail of what infrastructure is required and where (including off-site) and other policies in the plan that refer to the specific requirements for the proposed allocations (including in the plan appendices). Taken together, this ensures that the proposed allocations will bring forward the identified and necessary infrastructure to ensure they are sustainable, along with more general information and policies to support any windfall development coming forward.</p>
NDLP76	Pete Lewis						
NDLP1752	Araminia Mannion						
NDLP1949	Mr Loftus Buhagiar						
NDLP1558	Paul Chinnock						



Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2496	John Collecott					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One comments that confirmation should be provided if funding and agreement from the county council has been sought that will ensure school provision will come forward for delivery and stop hollow promises. They use Dunmow as an example of where there are plans to move the existing secondary school to a new site, but they understand the county council do not have the funds to build it. Clarity is therefore needed in the Local Plan on how, where and when funding is going to come from and the phasing of delivery of infrastructure provided with development.</li> </ul>	
NDLP2854	Jeanette O'Brien						
NDLP2856	Jeanette O'Brien						
NDLP3315	The North West Essex Constituency La						
NDLP3363	Gladman						
NDLP2626	Matthew Parish						
NDLP326	Mrs Jane Sharp	G W Balaam & Son			Infrastructure: General Comment	<p>Lack of infrastructure and services has been the biggest problem the district has faced to date. It is crucial that the funding for development is agreed before planning permission is granted and that the essential infrastructure is provided before completion of the development. It is suggested that the policy doesn't go far enough in meeting the needs of the extra housing. A list of infrastructure needs are set out (surgeries, dentists, school places, environmental impacts, highway impacts etc). Another respondent provides support for the policy and highlights where specific sites at Clavering could deliver improvements for the village.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council are aware that in the absence of an up to date plan in recent years in Uttlesford, there has been a significant increase in speculative, essentially 'un-planned', development, where planning for infrastructure is less effective than that considered through a Local Plan process. Having an up to date and adopted Local Plan will provide clearer policy guidance for what infrastructure is needed for each allocation and how applications should be considered. It is intended that the plan is complemented by a CIL Charging Schedule and updated Section 106 Contributions SPD, which will also help to provide increased clarity.</p>
NDLP1097	James Balaam		Matthew Thomas				
NDLP1090	Laura Duncan		Laura Duncan				
NDLP644	John Howett	Director Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd	Stacey Rawlings		Infrastructure: Policy Wording	<p>A number of comments relate to the Policy Wording, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several comments suggest that the policy wording should be amended to state, for example that developers 'are required to' not 'expected to' and 'should' to be replaced by 'must' or 'is/ are required to'.</li> <li>Furthermore, a specific part of the policy is described as not appropriate: "Where not covered by CIL Charging Schedule, infrastructure and services including provision for their maintenance, should be delivered directly by the developer through the development management process". It is suggested that direct delivery by the developer may not always be appropriate and that contributions should be flexible to sometimes be provided by others. Alternative wording is offered that includes phrases like "contributions towards the provision of infrastructure 'may' be necessary"; "requirements may be provided on-site or off-site, and that any contributions will be calculated as set out in SPD"; that the policy should be more explicit about the community gains such as "Provision of shops, schools, cafes and other facilities within, or within easy reach of, new developments in excess of [30] units.... to reduce the need for people to travel, and to create a greater sense of community...."</li> <li>One comment objects on the basis that the County Council should be removed from the policy regarding viability assessments, as they are themselves landowners and this is a conflict of interest, e.g. in Takeley.</li> <li>Another recommends it would assist interpretation if the policy were more explicit on the exact nature of requirements that the developer may be required to meet</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted. The Council is generally satisfied the policy wording is appropriate. However, all suggestions will be reviewed in the redrafting of the policy for Reg 19. It does state 'will be required' in the first line and does provide provision for 'on-site, and where appropriate, off-site infrastructure requirements' in addition to 'will be delivered directly by the developer and/ or through an appropriate financial contribution'. The supporting text explains the types of infrastructure covered by the policy. Shops and cafes would be community facilities and covered by another policy in the plan, as is open space and sporting facilities. The County Council are a statutory consultee and are required to be consulted on schemes. Where ECC are the landowner, independent financial advise will be sought in these circumstances. Parish and Town Councils are engaged on planning applications in their areas as part of the normal planning application process and they are engaged throughout the plan making process too. They can also prepare a Neighbourhood Plan if they wish.</p>
NDLP722	Kim Crow						
NDLP916	Catesby Estates Ltd (Stacey Rawlings)						
NDLP1222	Mr Richard Walford						
NDLP2583	Stebbing Parish Council						
NDLP3341	Welbeck Strategic Land						
NDLP3615	Hill Residential Ltd						
NDLP3815	Uttlesford Citizens Advice						
NDLP3900	Saffron Walden Town Council						
NDLP4059	Salacia Ltd						
NDLP4158	G W Balaam & Son						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP402	Louise Johnson	Parish Clerk Elsenham Parish Council				<p>to avoid overly onerous requirements or confusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, another requests clarification in wording on the SPD and CIL provision or a masterplan approach and inclusion of open space and loss of sports fields and a couple of reps seek engagement with Parish and Town Councils. One comment is that this engagement is rarely observed in practice.</li> <li>• The Uttlesford Citizen Advice would like the policy to be amended to include voluntary / charity sector provision to deliver the additional space / increased demand for their services.</li> </ul>	
NDLP1840	East of England Ambulance	Planning Advisor Essex Police  NHS Property Services Ltd			Infrastructure: Supporting text	<p>East of England Ambulance Service suggest a range of amendments to the supporting text including the inclusion of 'facilities' to the heading; the words 'facilities and services' to be added to line 1, line 2, line 6. In the bullet points they'd like partners and infrastructure providers to be included; and ambulance, police and firefighting facilities and their capacity to be reflected. Essex Police request that the emergency services be included within Chapter 4 Spatial Strategy, noting the associated IDP draft plan suggests police could be considered within the provision of community spaces and suggest this could be reflected within the plan too. NHS Property Services Ltd representation supports the approach to Core Policy 5. They recommend that healthcare facilities be added to paragraph 4.42 and therefore identified as essential infrastructure and given a significant amount of weight in decision-making. This is to ensure that healthcare mitigation is appropriately weighted in situations when a viability assessment demonstrates that development proposals are unable to fund the full range of infrastructure requirements. Uttlesford Citizens Advice would like the voluntary sector to be included in the first bullet point so that the text reads '...working with partners, including central government, other local authorities and the third sector, to provide...'</p>	Noted. Recommendations will be considered.
NDLP1841	East of England Ambulance						
NDLP1842	East of England Ambulance						
NDLP1677	N/A						
NDLP2860	N/A						
NDLP3814	Uttlesford Citizens Advice						
NDLP3640	Newport Parish Council	Newport Parish Council			Infrastructure: Transport	<p>A number of reps relate to Transport. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One comment stated that residents are travelling out of the district for work causing increased congestion and asked, how is this going to be resolved?</li> <li>• One respondent refers to Elsenham, where developments have impacted on the road network. The idea that people walk to local facilities is questioned as most people drive, creating great pressure on local networks and parking.</li> <li>• One respondent express that better connections are required if the major employment opportunities are at Stansted Airport and Chesterford Research Park.</li> <li>• MAG commented that they support the general thrust of the policy and the need for the IDP. However, they note an omission in the IDP for improvements to the airport public transport interchange that may be necessary for sustainable transport mitigation measures for new development in the South Uttlesford Area and therefore needs updating.</li> </ul>	The Spatial Strategy focuses the majority of growth at the largest and most sustainable settlements in order to maximise use of sustainable travel. The evidence supporting the Local Plan is ensuring that the level of housing and employment being planned for is reasonably balanced, but the location of the district means that it wouldn't be possible, or appropriate, to exclude out-commuting altogether. It is not intended that CP5 lists all the infrastructure required – the policy provides a framework for decision-making, but is supported by site specific policies for any allocated sites and the plan is accompanied by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
NDLP480	Mrs Ann Hebenton						
NDLP4007	MAG London Stansted Airport						
NDLP1948	Mr Loftus Buhagiar						

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP231  NDLP2769	Mr Roy Warren  Mrs Isobel Grayson	Planning Manager Sport England			Leisure facilities	Support provided by Sport England who states that the policy will help ensure the additional infrastructure generated by development, which would include sport and physical activity infrastructure, will be delivered either by developers or through financial contributions. One rep also highlights that the district has a 40 year old leisure centre, which needs updating or rebuilding. and that any recreational pursuit requires a car.	Noted. Support welcome. Evidence base is being prepared to assist in the supply and demand and condition of the available leisure and open space assets in the district. This will assist in the development of the strategy for leisure for the next plan period in conjunction with proposed development.
NDLP1604  NDLP1489	Anglian Water  Thames Water				Sewerage Infrastructure	Anglian Water welcome reference to 'Essential Infrastructure' but would suggest amending the text from 'foul water upgrades' to 'sewerage infrastructure' as this describes both networks and water recycling centres. Anglian Water support the use of developer contributions by the Council, working with partners, in the provision of flood prevention measures such as natural flood management and retrofitting sustainable drainage systems. Thames Water support the aims of the policy but consider it could be strengthened in relation to the delivery of wastewater infrastructure. Water and wastewater infrastructure upgrades cannot be secured through S106 agreements or CIL contributions. The timescales for delivery of infrastructure can be significant with network upgrades taking 18 months to 3 years to design and implement. To ensure development is aligned with any upgrades, to avoid adverse impacts such as pollution of land or watercourses or sewer flooding, developers are encouraged to engage with the relevant service provider ahead of any application to discuss their infrastructure requirements. Phasing conditions could be used to align the occupation of development with infrastructure delivery. Consider putting the supporting text to Core Policy 34 under this Core Policy 5.	Noted. Recommendations will be considered.
NDLP148 NDLP79 NDLP1458 NDLP1308 NDLP1353 NDLP1559 NDLP1755 NDLP1717 NDLP1901 NDLP2170 NDLP2194 NDLP2537	Nigel Cook  Lauren OSullivan  Phil Hardwick  Unknown Sarah Eley  Jacqueline Kingdom  Rachel Overall  Thaxted Parish Council  Keith Exford  Jennifer Versey  Robin Grayson	Thaxted Parish Council			Supporting infrastructure	A number of comments refer to supporting infrastructure: These include: • Most comments recognise the importance of supporting infrastructure, including stating 'It is imperative that adequate Supporting Infrastructure and Services are a pre-requisite of any new development (and existing)'. • Concern is raised about the cumulative impact of small-scale development over a short period of time (1-5 years) which over time equates to similar quantum of development on a single large development but are not required to deliver the same level of services and amenities. • Two other representations express concerns about traffic congestion, one referencing the lack of inclusion of the M11 at Newport and the bypass for Saffron Walden and fails to promote the new major railway station for Cambridge South and issues with access to healthcare services. • Other comments raise the need for schools and school places, close to where people live (including early years and SEND) and doctors, GP surgeries (and dentists) to cater for the increased numbers of people/housing; affordability and mix of housing type (bedrooms, not all 3 – 5 beds); allocations for sport, recreation and leisure facilities, including quality and accessibility; consideration	The plan explains that the Council's approach to delivering infrastructure will include both a CIL Charging Schedule and a revised Supplementary Planning Document for Section 106. Upon adoption of the CIL Charging Schedule, CIL will be used to pool developer contributions towards a wide range of new and improved infrastructure necessary to deliver new development. Where not covered by the CIL Charging Schedule, infrastructure and services, including provision for their maintenance, should be delivered directly by the developer through the development management process. Planning for new schools in the Reg 18 consultation was consistent with written advice provided by ECC in august 2023 and the Reg 19 Plan will be amended to reflect the ECC written response to the Reg 18 consultation. UDC welcome the support provided by infrastructure providers and will continue to work positively to inform the Reg 19 Plan.

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP2665	D J Bagnall	NHS Property Services Ltd				<p>for parking; increase in recent traffic incidents, sewerage infrastructure, drainage, water supply, low water pressure and flooding issues e.g. by Broad Street and Hammonds Road, Hatfield Broad Oak and Newport Road after the Salmon Field development; and the necessary contributions from developers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four comments raise medical provision, hospitals specifically, including a general hospital within Uttlesford. Expressing that the district cannot continue to rely on neighbouring areas i.e. Cambridgeshire, Chelmsford, Southend, given its ageing population and the potential capacity issues at these hospitals, which need to be understood and access to out of county hospitals without a car is difficult.</li> <li>• NHS Property Services Ltd rep states that new development should make a proportionate contribution to funding the healthcare needs arising from new development. Appropriate funding must be consistently leveraged through developer contributions for health and care services to mitigate the direct impact of growing demand from new housing.</li> <li>• ECC notes that the Draft IDP refers to Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), post 16 and training and skills, however the necessary requirements are not included in the Local Plan. ECC will work with the Council. They highlight consideration must be given to Early Years needs arising from Local Plan growth and provides UDC with an appreciation of the scale of provision that is required for strategic development sites and localities.</li> <li>• ECC require further discussions to consider and work with the Council on the scale of proposed growth in relation to the ability to deliver primary and secondary education to meet the needs of the future communities, otherwise there is an unacceptable financial burden on ECC to fund schools. ECC will need to undertake a full housing scenario test (once a spatial strategy has been agreed) to assess the impact and suitability of individual development sites, particularly in terms of available school capacity, need for new schools, expansion of existing schools, and any need for school transport (which ECC will resist). AN additional assessment for Early Years and SEND provision will also be undertaken.</li> </ul>	
NDLP2710	Mr and Mrs John and Gillian Broomfield						
	S Luck						
NDLP2767	Mrs Isobel Grayson						
NDLP2768	Mrs Isobel Grayson						
NDLP2795	Nick Dukes						
NDLP2858	N/A						
NDLP3202	J Damany-Hosman						
NDLP3287	Uttlesford Citizens Advice						
NDLP3291	Uttlesford Citizens Advice						
NDLP3313	The North West Essex Constituency La						
NDLP3314	The North West Essex Constituency La						
NDLP3493	Allison Evans						
NDLP3782	Enterprise East Group						
NDLP3810	Uttlesford Citizens Advice						
NDLP4123	Tim and Alexandra Bradshaw						
NDLP243	Ms Sheila Young						
NDLP279	Alastair Farr						
NDLP350	Kelly Osborne						
NDLP549	Desiree Ashton	Advocacy & Campaigns Officer					

Comment ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
NDLP693	Nigel Wood	Uttlesford Foodbank					
NDLP3892	Saffron Walden Town Council						
NDLP2916	Christine Chester						
NDLP1823	Essex County Council						
NDLP1823	Essex County Council						
NDLP1272	Kay Ward						
NDLP2201	Mrs Isobel Grayson						
NDLP1273	Kay Ward						
NDLP2956	Mike Tayler						
NDLP141	Bonny White						