

# Chapter 10: Economy and Retail

## Contents

Core Policy 45: Protection of Existing Employment Space.....	2
Core Policy 46: Development at Allocated Employment Sites .....	3
Core Policy 47: Ancillary Uses on Existing or Allocated Employment Sites .....	3
Core Policy 48: New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites.....	4
Core Policy 49: Employment and Training.....	5
Core Policy 50: Retail and Main Town Centre Uses Hierarchy .....	6
Development Policy 6: Hot Food Takeaways .....	7
Development Policy 7 New Shops or Cafes in Smaller Settlements .....	8
Core Policy 51: Tourism and the Visitor Economy .....	8
Development Policy 8: Tourist Accommodation.....	8

## Core Policy 45: Protection of Existing Employment Space

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Asset of Community Value	If a site is an Asset of Community Value, when providing proof of 12 months with no sale, when do the 12 months begin? Is this after the 6 month ACV period, therefore evidence of 18 months would need to be provided?	An Asset of Community Value is defined as "A building or other land is an asset of community value if its main use has recently been or is presently used to further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community and could do so in the future". The Localism Act states that 'social interests' include cultural, recreational and sporting interests. It is not considered likely that an existing employment site would be capable of meeting the criteria for nomination as an ACV, however should this be the case the Community Right to Bid gives a six week period for a community organisation to decide if they want to be a potential bidder, which if triggered is then followed by a six month moratorium during which a community organisation can develop a proposal and raise the money required to bid to buy the asset. The asset would then be put up for sale on the open market so in such circumstances there would still need to be a 12 month period of marketing evidence, albeit with 6 months where no sale could take place due to the moratorium.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Market Value	Policy CP45 part 1 second bullet point makes reference to 'reasonable price' which is considered ambiguous and the term 'market value' should be used in its place.	In response to the comment raised at Regulation 18, the policy has been amended to "a reasonable price reflecting market value and local land values".
ANON-QNH5-RD1R-N	Neil Hargreaves	On behalf of an Organisation	Steering Group of the Newport Quendon & Rickling Neighbourhood Plan	Newport Existing Employment Sites	Comment stating that the Existing Employment Sites in Newport are incorrect; notably that the garden centre is now closed and the sites at the Maltings near the station should be included.	The designation of Existing Employment Sites is informed by an up-to-date Employment Land Review (2024) which was informed by site visits. Sites are designated where they meet the criteria in the ELR and are considered justified in being afforded policy protection over the plan period. The Policies Map for Newport shows that only one site within Newport is designated, and this is the site at The Maltings, near the station.
ANON-QNH5-RDT1-Q	Sharon Critchley	Individual / member of the public		No consideration of agriculture	The policy is considered unsound because it does not contain any reference to agriculture	Agriculture is an important sector in the Uttlesford economy, particularly in the rural area. However, Core Policy 45 is specifically about safeguarding existing employment sites in the B and E use classes, which is supported by evidence in the Employment Land Review. Agriculture is appropriate and supported in rural areas in the Open Countryside (as defined through Core Policy 3) in accordance with national policy on agriculture and the rural economy (NPPF paragraphs 84 and 88). Core Policy 21 (Rural Diversification) also seeks to support the viability of agricultural businesses, whilst Development Policy 3 sets out criteria related to proposals for rural workers' dwellings.
ANON-QNH5-RD97-2	Lydia Sadler	On behalf of an Organisation	Stansted Airport Limited	Object to Existing Employment Site designation at Northside and south of Long Border Road	Stansted Airport Limited object to the designation of Stansted Northside and Taylors End as Existing Employment Sites in the plan. Furthermore the airport requests that all of the land within the operational airport boundary is instead designated "Stansted Airport - Airport Use".	Stansted Airport's importance in the District as the largest employer is recognised and supported in the plan through the inclusion of a bespoke and standalone Core Policy 11. The designation of Existing Employment Sites is informed by an up-to-date Employment Land Review (2024) which was informed by site visits. Sites are designated where they meet the criteria in the ELR and are considered justified in being afforded policy protection over the plan period. The Policies Map shows two sites adjacent to Stansted Airport as 'Existing Employment Sites' - Stansted Northside and Taylors End. These sites, plus the "Ancillary Areas", are all within the boundary promoted by the airport as being within the operational airport boundary. The Existing Employment Sites are publicly accessible employment sites which, whilst on land owned by Stansted Airport, meets wider business needs and is not "airside" and closed to the public. The sites are important employment sites for the district that are considered warrant policy protection. The wider Stansted Airport boundary point is dealt with under Core Policy 11.
ANON-QNH5-RD97-2	Lydia Sadler	On behalf of an Organisation	Stansted Airport Limited	Stansted Airport should be added to Appendix 14	Comment stating that Stansted Airport, including the FedEx Cargo Warehouse, should be added to the list of Existing Employment Sites in Appendix 14. It is not clear that a Policies Map Existing Employment Sites designation is also being sought.	Stansted Airport's importance in the District as the largest employer is recognised and supported in the plan through the inclusion of a bespoke and standalone Core Policy 11. Furthermore, a significant part of the airport ("airside") is not accessible to the general public and/or fulfils a more specialist role supporting airport operations - including the FedEx Cargo Warehouse. The designation of Existing Employment Sites seeks to protect the best and highest quality general employment land within the District, as part of an overall strategy to ensure sufficient employment land is available to meet the District's economic needs over the plan period. The designation of the publicly accessible employment sites adjacent to the airport - Stansted Northside and Taylors End - supports economic development at the airport. Ancillary areas (as defined on the Policies Map)
ANON-QNH5-RD7H-H	Charlotte Cook	On behalf of an Organisation	SEGRO			

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						could be used to provide flexibility and support windfall development, subject to compliance with Core Policy 48 and policies relating to parking provision.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support	The policy is sound and in accordance with the NPPF. Great Dunmow Town Council consider it also supports their Neighbourhood Plan policies E1 (Employment Land) and E2 (Loss of Employment Land). Additionally Ropemaker Properties Ltd support the designation of their site at Stansted Distribution Centre, Start Hill as an Existing Employment Site	Support noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDWE-E	Graeme Warrnier	On behalf of an Organisation	Stantec on behalf of Ropemaker Properties Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD1R-N	Neil Hargreaves	On behalf of an Organisation	Steering Group of the Newport Quendon & Rickling Neighbourhood Plan	Wendens Ambo Existing Employment Sites	Comment from the Newport, Quendon and Rickling Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group that the employment sites at Wendens Ambo should be designated as Existing Employment Sites	The Policies Map for Newport shows that two sites at Wendens Ambo - Bearwalden and Saffron Business Centre - are designated as Existing Employment Sites

### Core Policy 46: Development at Allocated Employment Sites

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDAU-8	Alex Cole	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd	Support	Site promoter at Land North of Taylors Farm supports the proposed policy approach.	Support noted and welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RDAX-B	Tom Vernon (Agent)	On behalf of an Organisation	Portland Capita	Sui generis use	The site promoter at the Elsenham Estate allocation objects to the policy as it is considered too inflexible, recommending that "sui generis use" is added to the list of use classes under the asterisk at the end of the policy.	The policy intent behind Core Policy 46 is to allow for flexibility over the mix of employment uses at allocated employment sites over the plan period should the need for employment change, in accordance with NPPF Paragraphs 126 and 127. There is already flexibility in the policy approach, providing that it is within one of the employment use classes. The introduction of "sui generis use" into this policy could result in unintended consequences whereby other, non-employment uses would be policy compliant on an allocated site. It is noted that sui generis is not a use class in and of itself, but rather a "class of its own", and includes uses such as hot food takeaways, tattoo parlours, large HMOs, concert halls and cinemas. It is not considered that adding sui generis uses to the policy would be sound and could undermine the plan's strategy for employment land provision. Consideration of whether or not a sui generis proposal is appropriate should take place through the development management process on a case-by-case basis.

### Core Policy 47: Ancillary Uses on Existing or Allocated Employment Sites

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD35-T	Natalie Makepeace	On behalf of an Organisation	Aldis of Barking Ltd	Inconsistency with Core Policy 50 relating to retail	It is suggested that Core Policy 47 as drafted is inconsistent with Core Policy 50 which sets out the Retail and Main Town Centre Uses Hierarchy, the sequential test and the Retail Impact threshold. It is argued that the sequential test should not apply to ancillary retail development at Existing or Allocated Employment Sites under Core Policy 47. It is recommended that for the policy to be sound the Retail Impact Threshold of 1,000sqm in Core Policy 50 should be referenced and defined as the upper limit for what constitutes "small scale ancillary" retail. A specific change is requested adding the following to	The sequential test in Core Policy 50 aims to focus retail and main development and town centre uses to existing centres and then the edge of centre locations, with a Primary Shopping Area as the focus for retail development in designated Town Centres. Under CP47 and the NPPF other locations that are not 'town' or 'local' centres, or on the edge of 'town' or 'local' centres, are described as 'out of centre' locations. The Existing or Allocated Employment Sites are located in differing contexts across the district with very few that can be described as 'edge of centre'. The vast majority are 'out of centre' locations. The policy change as requested would undermine the application of the sequential test by elevating Existing or Allocated Employment Sites into the retail and main town centre uses hierarchy, which would not be sound as the retail and main town centre uses hierarchy is designated based on evidence as outlined in the Retail Capacity Study Update, whereas the employment sites
ANON-QNH5-RDNP-G	Natalie Makepeace	On behalf of an Organisation	Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd			

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					Core Policy 47: “Proposed small scale ancillary retail uses on existing employment sites would not be subject to a retail sequential test.”	are designated based on the Employment Land Review evidence. Regarding the Retail Impact Threshold in Core Policy 50, this is set at a level that is judged to not harm existing designated centres. The approach in Core Policy 47 of allowing some ancillary non-employment development is to allow for some non-employment development to come forward that supports the wider employment function of the employment site, without undermining its ongoing viability through a loss of employment uses. Given the policy approach in CP47 intends for it to apply to 'ancillary' non-employment development it is not considered necessary to use the same threshold of 1,000sqm, which is for retail and leisure uses and does not necessarily result in the loss of employment land on designated employment sites.
ANON-QNH5-RDAX-B	Tom Vernon (Agent)	On behalf of an Organisation	Portland Capita	Sui generis	The site promoter at the Elsenham Estate allocation is supportive of the general approach, however objects to the policy as drafted as it does not include "sui generis use" within the policy.	The policy intent behind Core Policy 47 is to allow for flexibility over the mix of employment uses at allocated employment sites over the plan period and to ensure the long-term attractiveness and viability of employment sites. The introduction of "sui generis use" into this policy could result in unintended consequences whereby other, non-employment uses would be policy compliant on an allocated site. It is noted that sui generis is not a use class in and of itself, but rather a "class of its own", and includes uses such as hot food takeaways, tattoo parlours, large HMOs, concert halls and cinemas. It is not considered that adding sui generis uses to the policy would be sound and could undermine the plan's strategy for employment land provision. Consideration of whether or not a sui generis proposal is appropriate should take place through the development management process on a case-by-case basis.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support	The policy is sound and in accordance with the NPPF, allowing flexibility but also setting restrictions over non-employment development at designated and allocated employment sites. Great Dunmow Town Council consider it also supports their Neighbourhood Plan policies E1 (Employment Land) and E2 (Loss of Employment Land).	Support noted.

### Core Policy 48: New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDA6-9	Jonathan Dixon	On behalf of an Organisation	Savills on behalf of Endurance Estates Limited	Lack of a reference to Bishop's Stortford	It is argued that the lack of reference within the policy to sites on the edge of Bishop's Stortford is unsound, as the policy only refers to the top three tiers of the Uttlesford Settlement Hierarchy. Bishop's Stortford is larger than any settlement within Uttlesford District and adding Bishop's Stortford to the list of locations where development may be suitable subject to exceptional circumstances would be a sound approach.	Development adjacent to Bishop's Stortford would be considered to meet the needs of Bishop's Stortford and East Herts. Uttlesford District Council has not been requested to accommodate unmet employment needs, and no "exceptional circumstances" have been identified to amend Green Belt boundaries adjacent to Bishop's Stortford. The land surrounding Bishop's Stortford is within the Green Belt and therefore applications for employment development would be subject to the "very special circumstances" test. The policy as drafted is sound because it identifies many locations beyond the Green Belt which would be more suitable in principle for employment development than adjacent to Bishop's Stortford.
ANON-QNH5-RDNB-2	Kevin Coleman	On behalf of an Organisation	Rosper Estates Ltd	Lack of clarity in the policy	The policy is not considered sound because the policy wording is unclear. It is understood that the policy is intended to be a supportive one providing flexibility and specifying when additional windfall development would be supported; however the policy as drafted does not achieve this. Furthermore, the 'exceptional circumstances' test is too restrictive and too high a bar for the policy to truly support windfall employment development. It is considered that there is insufficient detail or clarity in the policy to provide certainty as to when applications would be supported. A rewritten Core Policy 48 is provided that is considered effective in achieving the policy intention, which (in summary) removes the 'exceptional circumstances' test, explicitly links the consideration of need to the evidence base, and removes reference to the Smaller Villages and Open Countryside.	The assumed intention of the policy is correct, it is intended to guide applications for windfall development on unallocated sites and provide a steer as to when the Council would support such sites. In Core Policy 4 the Council has met the identified need in full, and exceeded the need with 'headroom'. The Council does not require additional greenfield employment sites to meet its employment needs, however over the plan period the Council will support further windfall development in appropriate locations. This will support the organic growth of SME businesses and provide flexibility in the employment supply. The use of an 'exceptional circumstances' test is deliberate in that it allows the Council as a decision-maker to grant further permissions where appropriate to do so. It would not be appropriate to define what those 'exceptional circumstances' are as this will be a matter for the decision-maker to decide on a case-by-case basis. The consideration of need was deliberately left vague as this could be the district-wide need, or the need of an individual business or site operator.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDAX-B	Tom Vernon (Agent)	On behalf of an Organisation	Portland Capita	Object to exceptional circumstances text	Comment from the promoter at the Elsenham Estate that the exceptional circumstances test is too high a bar and will restrict development. The conventional planning balance should be applied. Exceptional circumstances either needs to be clarified (for example, with regard to need) or removed. Additional comment that criterion ii) in the policy duplicates national and local policy and should be deleted.	The plan as a whole makes sufficient provision for employment land, including headroom. Despite this, Core Policy 48 allows the Council to approve additional planning applications on unallocated sites providing that "exceptional circumstances" are demonstrated, rather than the conventional planning balance. This is considered justified as the Council has acted positively to over-allocate to ensure delivery, and allows the Council to approve additional development for exceptional proposals (which are deliberately not defined) should proposals be particularly advantageous and a need for the development can be established. The suggestion that criterion ii) duplicates other plan policies and the NPPF is agreed; and this is something that could potentially be removed from the policy.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Policy is sound	The policy is considered sound. Additionally Great Dunmow Town Council believes the policy supports Neighbourhood Plan policies E1, E2 and HST1.	Support for the policy is noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDAX-B	Tom Vernon (Agent)	On behalf of an Organisation	Portland Capita	Sui generis	The site promoter at the Elsenham Estate allocation objects to the policy as drafted as it does not include "sui generis use" within the policy. This suggestion inclusion is made across Core Policy 46, 47 and 48.	As per the responses to Core Policy 46 and 47, the introduction of "sui generis use" into this policy could result in unintended consequences whereby other, non-employment uses would be policy compliant. It is noted that sui generis is not a use class in and of itself, but rather a "class of its own", and includes uses such as hot food takeaways, tattoo parlours, large HMOs, concert halls and cinemas. It is not considered that adding sui generis uses to the policy would be sound and could undermine the plan's strategy for employment land provision. Consideration of whether or not a sui generis proposal is appropriate should take place through the development management process on a case-by-case basis.

### Core Policy 49: Employment and Training

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDAU-8	Alex Cole	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd	"Should" rather than "must"	The policy approach is supported in principle however it is considered that additional flexibility should be introduced by removing the word "must" and including the word "should" instead.	The change sought in the representation is supported to provide flexibility. "Should" is considered strong enough to encourage compliance with the policy, however as with other policies in the plan relating to viability there may be a need for flexibility and allow non-compliance in appropriate circumstances.
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Latest Essex Developers Guide	Essex County Council has updated the Essex Developer's Guide to Infrastructure. The latest version should be referenced in the plan.	The latest available version will be cross-referenced to, and the text will be updated to make it clear that the Guide will be updated over the plan period.
BHLF-QNH5-RDEH-Y	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	On-call firefighters	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service wish to encourage opportunities to support On-call employment within commercial and employment opportunities	Supporting On-call employment is something that the Council is willing to work with the Fire and Rescue Service to encourage, however this is better focused at a district-wide scale covering existing employment rather than something to be targeted solely at large-scale new development under Core Policy 49.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Policy is sound	The proposed Core Policy 49 is considered sound. Great Dunmow Town Council strongly support the policy and consider it is in accordance with the NPPF	Support noted.
ANON-QNH5-RD4S-S	Bill Critchley	Individual / member of the public		Policy should capture all important local industries	Uttlesford is a rural district with arable agriculture being an important sector, and a sector which is in need of new young workers. Heritage arts should be supported to support Uttlesford's rich heritage. The policy disproportionately focuses on Stansted Airport-related industry.	The policy threshold for 'significant development' has been set at a level which is considered to be able to viably deliver the policy requirements, and in order to meet the 'three tests' set out in legislation (that they must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development) to be secured via S106. It is not proposed that all development (regardless of scale) would be required to meet CP49 requirements as this is considered disproportionate on smaller-scale development. As a result, the largest developments are permitted during the plan period are the ones that are most likely to deliver employment and training opportunities. The policy is flexible to accommodate a wide variety of employment and training opportunities.



Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDN3-K	Edward Gildea	On behalf of an Organisation	Uttlesford Green Party	Support the policy, but the focus should not solely be on construction	The policy approach is supported however it is considered that it is too restricted focusing on construction, and the scope of the policy should be widened to incorporate other industries and sectors, including energy.	The policy is flexible to accommodate a wide variety of employment and training opportunities. This can relate to employment and training opportunities during both construction and operational phases. Construction-based employment and training can provide the opportunity to improve local skills regarding sustainable construction as part of new development. The operational employment and training opportunities will depend on the end user of the large scale development which may include sustainable construction businesses. Planning policies can only apply where 'development' (as defined by the Town and Country Planning Act) is proposed and therefore it is likely that construction-related training and employment opportunities will be generated by new development. Green and renewable energy development is supported, subject to criteria, by Core Policy 25, and such proposals may be caught by Core Policy 49 provisions.
ANON-QNH5-RDC4-9	margaret shaw	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Target levels	The policy as drafted is unsound because it does not include target levels for apprenticeships and employment and training for young people.	It is not considered necessary to included these requirements in the policy, as the Essex Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions sets out the detail behind this calculation and is updated from time-to-time reflecting the latest available costs.

### Core Policy 50: Retail and Main Town Centre Uses Hierarchy

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD35-T	Natalie Makepeace	On behalf of an Organisation	Aldis of Barking Ltd	Existing Employment Sites: Retail Hierarchy	Existing Employment Sites should be included in the retail and main town centre uses hierarchy, and the exception test does not apply as a result.	The Retail evidence identifies the locations in the district where the greatest proportion of main town centre uses are found, and where it is considered justified to protect the loss of floorspace from redevelopment to alternative uses. The boundaries have been defined through, amongst other things, the collation of quantitative and qualitative evidence and analysis of spending patterns. Existing Employment Sites are designated for their value as important employment sites within the District. It is not considered justified to introduce employment sites into the retail hierarchy as this could lead to unintended consequences involving the loss of employment land and new concentrations of main town centre uses that could undermine the existing designated Town and Local Centres, and Primary Shopping Areas.
ANON-QNH5-RDNP-G	Natalie Makepeace	On behalf of an Organisation	Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD35-T	Natalie Makepeace	On behalf of an Organisation	Aldis of Barking Ltd	Existing Employment Sites: Retail Impact Assessment	Proposals for ancillary retail at Existing Employment Sites (under Core Policy 47) should be exempt from the requirement for a Retail Impact Assessment.	This is superfluous as the threshold at which a Retail Impact Assessment is required for schemes that include main town centre uses is 1,000sqm. It is unlikely that a scheme of greater than 1,000sqm would be deemed 'ancillary' for the purposes of Core Policy 47.
ANON-QNH5-RDNP-G	Natalie Makepeace	On behalf of an Organisation	Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Great Chesterford Supporting Text	Comment querying whether reference should be made within Paragraph 10.33 to the train station, neighbouring industrial, office and business units at Great Chesterford Court	The chapter is about retail and main town centre uses in Great Chesterford, therefore it is not considered necessary to make this change
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council	Need for retail at Great Dunmow	Comment stating that Great Dunmow needs more main town centre uses, in particular a food store	The evidence base identifies a need for a food store at Great Dunmow. An allocation for this has not been made as a Lidl food store has resolution to grant planning permission from Planning Committee on 21 August 2024 reference UTT/23/2006/FUL, and this site would meet that need. No alternative food store sites were identified.
ANON-QNH5-RDNM-D	Graham Mott	On behalf of an Organisation	Elsenham Parish Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDN3-K	Edward Gildea	On behalf of an Organisation	Uttlesford Green Party	Out of centre retail net gain in employment	Out of centre (or out of town) shopping is harmful to existing centres and encourages greater car use. As a result, any proposals for out of centre retail (notably supermarkets) should only be granted where there is a net gain in employment overall, taking into account projected job losses in existing centres.	The designated Town Centres of Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden, Stansted Mountfitchet and Thaxted have designated Primary Shopping Areas where ground floor retail floorspace has greater protection. Core Policy 50 includes reference to the NPPF sequential test (paragraph 91 and 92 of the December 2023 NPPF) steering development towards existing centres, and then edge of centre locations before deeming out of centre locations suitable, with proposals over 1,000 sqm subject to a Retail Impact Assessment (lower than the NPPF default threshold of 2,500sqm). The Retail Impact Assessment would assess the impact of out of centre development on existing centres, taking into account the impact on investment in the centre and on the
ANON-QNH5-RDC4-9	margaret shaw	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						centre's vitality and viability. NPPF paragraph 95 states that "where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on one or more of the considerations in paragraph 94, it should be refused." It is not possible to specify a net gain in employment as a policy requirement for out of centre retail proposals. The NPPF requirement is to avoid "significant adverse impacts", and furthermore the Retail Impact Assessment only applies to larger developments (1,000sqm and above), though through application of Core Policy 50 as a whole it should result in the avoidance of significant adverse impacts on existing centres.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Policy is sound	Great Dunmow Town Council strongly supports Core Policy 50 and considers that it is sound, in accordance with the NPPF, and supports the Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan	Support for the policy and its soundness is acknowledged.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Saffron Walden Supporting Text	Comment suggesting additional text to Paragraph 10.27 including reference to "independent outlets" and the Saffron Walden twice weekly market. The comment also queries whether the Local Plan will designate the town centre with an Article 4 direction.	The additional supporting text proposed at paragraph 10.27 is not considered necessary for soundness. An Article 4 Direction cannot be designated in a Local Plan, and in any case it is unclear what the Article 4 Direction would seek to achieve. The Council does not currently consider that there is a case for removing permitted development rights in Saffron Walden Town Centre.
ANON-QNH5-RDDS-9	Jim Backus	Individual / member of the public		Takeley has two town centres	Comment suggesting that Takeley has two town centres: one at Four Ashes and one at Priors Green.	There are two areas of main town centre uses in Takeley however only one of them - at Four Ashes in the centre of the village - is deemed of such a significance to be designated as a Local Centre. The Priors Green provision is more akin to a local parade of shops.
ANON-QNH5-RDDS-9	Jim Backus	Individual / member of the public		Takeley needs more main town centre uses	Comment suggesting that Takeley needs more main town centre uses, particularly when considered alongside planned growth.	There is a designated Local Centre at Takeley which will be protected for main town centre uses under Core Policy 50; and the new Takeley Strategic Allocation under Core Policy 10A proposes a new local centre which has been planned in accordance with the findings of the Retail Capacity Study Update Addendum 2024. Under Core Policy 50 there is flexibility to allow additional retail floorspace in that proposals for additional retail development at or on the edge of the local centre boundary would be policy compliant and in accordance with the retail sequential test, should market conditions and demand for additional retail justify additional floorspace at Takeley.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Thaxted's role is overstated	The plan states that Thaxted plays an important role in the Uttlesford economy as a tourist destination and as a hub providing shops and services for the rural area. This is not considered accurate; instead Thaxted has more in common with Larger Villages	Thaxted has been classified as a Local Rural Centre in Core Policy 3 (the Settlement Hierarchy) and, in terms of retail and main town centre uses under Core Policy 50, it is supported by the evidence contained in the Retail Capacity Study Update as being of such relative importance that it warrants the designation of a Primary Shopping Area on the Policies Map, the only Local Rural Centre to do so. Paragraph 6.20 of the Retail Capacity Study Update states "The only further amendment we propose is that the wording of Core Policy 50 be altered slightly to allow for one of the Local Rural Centres (Thaxted) to incorporate a Primary Shopping Area. This is to align with the made Thaxted Neighbourhood Plan which incorporates designated frontages within the overall Town Centre Boundary (see Section 3), as well as being in recognition of its role in serving a wider hinterland."

### Development Policy 6: Hot Food Takeaways

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDN3-K	Edward Gildea	On behalf of an Organisation	Uttlesford Green Party	Development Policy 6 - Health Impact Assessment	The Health Impact Assessment should take into account proliferation of hot food takeaways and higher obesity levels in deprived areas where poorer communities cannot easily access out of town supermarkets.	The HIA will include and take into consideration the health profile of the local population to ensure the reduction of negative impacts and enhance positive impacts.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Development Policy 6 - support.	Great Dunmow Town Council in support of Development Policy as it is in accordance with the NPPF.	Development Policy 6 is supported by Great Dunmow Town Council.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	ECC Comments DP6	Paragraphs 10.51 - 10.54 need to include two references i.e. the Tackling Obesity Strategy and Office for Health Improvement and Disparities since they outline actions to tackle obesity and focus on levelling out health disparities respectively.	The proposed Minor Modification is supported.

### Development Policy 7 New Shops or Cafes in Smaller Settlements

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	New shops and cafes in smaller settlements	Policy requires strengthening by providing development thresholds for provision of small retail units.	Development Policy 7 New Shops or Cafes in Smaller Settlements is considered robust enough because the location of new shops or extension of existing shops should be within or adjacent to existing settlements. The Retail Capacity Study Update Addendum identifies where new main town centre uses would be justified alongside new development.

### Core Policy 51: Tourism and the Visitor Economy

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-QNH5-RDES-A	Andrew Marsh	On behalf of an Organisation	Historic England	Supporting Visitor economy	Historic England comment that the support in the plan for the strengthening of the heritage tourism offer at Audley End is welcome. Additionally Great Dunmow Parish Council support the plan and note that it will support Neighbourhood Plan Policy HSTC2.	Support noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDY4-Y	Matt Brewer	On behalf of an Organisation	Chesterford Park (General Partner) Limited (C/O Urbanspace Planning Ltd)	Chesterford Research Park Support	Chesterford Park ( General Partner) Limited in support of policy due to additional ancillary facilities thus promotion sustainability of the Reasearch Park.	Support noted.
ANON-QNH5-RD97-2	Lydia Sadler	On behalf of an Organisation	Stansted Airport Limited	Stansted Airport facilities	Stansted Airport Limited supports inclusion of hotel and conference facilities but objects to qualification of "business hotel"	The Council is open to discussing whether or not 'business' should be deleted from 'business hotel' during the examination process.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Visitor economy	Page 236 , paragraph 10.56, the third sentence cites three town centres but the fourth sentence incorrectly refers to "both". The last sentence in paragraph 10.56 requires qualification of visitor economy.	The response incorrectly references ULP page 228. The correct ULP page is page 236. The word "both" should be deleted from the fourth sentence and the visitor economy should be qualified to include the word "sustainable".

### Development Policy 8: Tourist Accommodation

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
No Comments Recorded						