

Chapter 8: Thaxted and the Rural Area Strategy

Contents

Core Policy 19: Rural Area Housing Requirement Figures	2
Core Policy 20: Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites.....	17
Development Policy 1: New Dwellings in the Open Countryside.....	18
Development Policy 2: Replacement Dwellings in the Open Countryside.....	19
Development Policy 3: Rural Workers’ Dwellings in the Open Countryside.....	19
Development Policy 4: Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside	19
Development Policy 5: Change of Use of Agricultural Land to Domestic Gardens.....	19
Core Policy 21: Rural Diversification	20

Core Policy 19: Rural Area Housing Requirement Figures

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Affordable housing for local communities would not be delivered.	Comment suggesting that the housing requirement figures set for Larger Villages will not deliver sufficient affordable housing to meet the needs of local communities.	Core Policy 2 sets the spatial strategy and approach to housing delivery for the District. The approach is considered a balanced one that supports delivery in the most sustainable locations, with a proportionate amount of additional housing at the Larger Villages. With the exception of the Green Belt constrained villages of Birchanger and Little Hallingbury the villages have been set housing requirement figures for additional development which is considered of a scale to meet the needs of local communities. Provided that the allocations ultimately made in Neighbourhood Plans are major development (larger than ten dwellings) then under Core Policy 56 they will be expected to deliver affordable housing. Additionally all communities (whether they are Larger Villages or smaller) can pursue Rural Exception Sites (Core Policy 20) to deliver affordable housing which exceeds the housing requirement figures in Core Policy 19. This includes the Larger Villages of Birchanger and Little Hallingbury which are in the Green Belt.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Approach to villages outside of the Green Belt	Paragraph 8.19 of the plan states "The Council does not consider there are any exceptional circumstances for allocating development in the Green Belt in Uttlesford, as there are a large number of opportunities for development in the District that fall outside of the Green Belt". The question is asked what this means for the Larger Villages outside of the Green Belt	As explained in the Larger Villages Housing Requirement Topic Paper, the 600 dwelling figure has been apportioned to Larger Villages outside of the Green Belt taking into account existing population size, the relative sustainability of the settlement (as per the Rural Services and Facilities Study), committed and completed development since the start of the plan period and suitable, available and achievable HELAA capacity to arrive at deliverable housing requirement figures for Larger Villages. This means that the villages outside of the Green Belt have been apportioned relatively more development than would otherwise have been the case had Green Belt Larger Villages been apportioned housing. In light of the Council considering that there is no exceptional circumstances case to amend the Green Belt boundaries the approach is considered sound and evidence based.
ANON-QNH5-RD1D-7	Ian Butcher	On behalf of an Organisation	Artisan New Homes Ltd	Clarification sought over the Little Chesterford Housing Requirement Figure	The Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' with a housing requirement of 96 dwellings and a supply identified to deliver that. There is also an allocation in policy GCLNP/9 in Little Chesterford that contributes towards the supply. Clarification is sought as to the status of the policies in the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood plan relating to the housing requirement figure and the allocations	The Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of the 2005 Local Plan and was informed by a housing requirement figure provided by the local planning authority at that time. The new Local Plan amends the strategy with the settlement hierarchy identifying Great Chesterford as a Local Rural Centre and Little Chesterford as Open Countryside. No housing requirement figure is set in the plan, and therefore the new housing requirement figure for these settlements, and the Neighbourhood Area, is zero. However, the allocations in the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan remain as allocations in the development plan and are included in the 'commitments and completions' figures in the housing trajectory and under Core Policy 2. The development of GLCNP/9 continues to be supported in the development plan. A modification to the plan text will make this clear.
ANON-QNH5-RDNS-K	Andy Stevens	Individual / member of the public	ASP on behalf of Mr John Noble	Comments in favour of allocation of a particular site at a Larger Village	The comment sets out a justification as to why an individual site should be allocated, either through the Neighbourhood Plan process or as a Local Plan allocation.	The decision over which site(s) to be allocated to deliver the Newport and Larger Village housing requirement figures is for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan to address, through consultation, engagement, technical evidence gathering and application of an appropriate site selection methodology. Should allocations not come forward in line with the CP19 policy requirements then a DPD will be prepared by Uttlesford District Council to deliver the required number of dwellings. The HELAA is the starting point for identifying suitable, available and achievable sites that could be allocated to meet the Larger Village housing requirement figures. Where the information updates a HELAA site conclusion, or is a new site not previously known to the Council, the Council will work with the promoter and the Parish Council to ensure any Neighbourhood Plan allocations are based on robust and up-to-date evidence.
ANON-QNH5-RD1H-B	Matthew Thomas	On behalf of an Organisation	CODE Development Planners on behalf of G W Balaam and Son			
ANON-QNH5-RD36-U	Kate Sutton	On behalf of an Organisation	AM Planning on behalf of Richstone Procurement Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD6G-F	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	J M Lukies & Son			

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDWM-P	Alice Maguire	On behalf of an Organisation	The Trustees of the CH Gosling 1965 Settlement			
ANON-QNH5-RDXH-J	Mark Fisher	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDXX-2	Andrew Ttofalli	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDU1-R	Dianne King	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUE-C	Justin Brannon	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUA-8	Gemma Scott	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9K-P	Andrew Ttofalli	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDCW-C	Jane Smith	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9T-Y	James Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD6S-U	Vicky Bambridge	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDDF-V	Mary and Lloyd Tripp	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD77-Z	Derek Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD7J-K	Fiona Price	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDW6-Y	Laurence Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD3D-9	Rosa Jupe	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDHT-E	Lisa Fuller	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDR4-R	Derek Brown	Individual / member of the public		Does not take into account of the amount of recent housing development	Core Policy 19 does not take into account recent development in Henham Parish.	The Larger Villages Housing Requirement Topic Paper explains the methodology applied. The approach takes into account existing population size, the relative sustainability of the settlement (as per the Rural Services and Facilities Study), committed and completed development since the start of the plan period and suitable, available and achievable HELAA capacity to arrive at deliverable housing requirement figures for Larger Villages. The approach is considered sound and evidence based. In accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy (Core Policy 2) development from completions and commitments within the District, including Henham Parish, has been categorised as to whether or not it is at the settlement of Henham, at an adjacent settlement (i.e. Elsenham), or in Open Countryside.
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Essex County Council: Compliance with Minerals and Waste policy	Essex County Council seeks an addition to the Core Policy 19 text to ensure that Neighbourhood Plan allocations are in line with Minerals and Waste policy requirements. The County Council claims that Minerals and Waste policies are often overlooked by those preparing Neighbourhood Plans.	In order to ensure that Neighbourhood Plans are in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan as a whole (which includes the separate Minerals and Waste Local Plans), the Council is happy to include this additional text.
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Essex County Council: Transport and Highways considerations	Essex County Council seeks an addition to the Core Policy 19 text to ensure that Neighbourhood Plan allocations are informed by consideration of transportation and highways matters. Inclusion of an additional paragraph is sought requiring liason with Essex County Council as the Highway Authority	The point from the County Council is understood, however it is not considered that the suggested paragraph text is required for soundness. The precise allocations are to be made through Neighbourhood Plans but the broad spatial strategy (under Core Policy 19) has been tested through the Local Plan process. The County Council will be consulted during the Neighbourhood plan-making process and Core Policies 26 to 31 will apply to any non-strategic allocations and will inform the site selection process.
ANON-QNH5-RD1Q-M	clerk to Stebbing Parish Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Stebbing Parish Council	Facilities may be lost over the plan period	The comment is made that the Settlement Facilities and Services Study that underpins the Settlement Hierarchy and the Larger Villages Housing Requirement Topic Paper will become out of date as facilities close over the plan period.	It is noted that the Settlement Facilities and Services Study is a "snapshot in time" and will become increasingly out of date later on into the plan period; however by adopting the approach of making non-strategic allocations at the Larger Villages and encouraging Parish Councils to make the allocations, it is hoped that any loss of facilities will be avoided and that existing services and facilities can be supported through an appropriate scale of new development
ANON-QNH5-RDMV-N	Colin Geoffrey Sullivan	Individual / member of the public		Future permissions in a Parish should reduce village housing requirement figures	It is suggested that new planning permissions granted in a Parish should be used to reduce the residual housing requirement figure for a larger village	In order to comply with CP2 and CP3 (the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy) the residual housing requirement figures set in CP19 are to be met at or within the larger villages. It would not make sense for development that is granted permission at another settlement (but within the same Parish) to be counted against these figures as it would not be in line with the spatial strategy. Furthermore, the suggested approach could result in more than one settlement 'claiming' the housing as 'theirs'. Monitoring of delivery against the residual housing requirements will be undertaken through the AMR with permissions and completions assigned to the larger villages in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy. Permissions granted at larger villages between Local Plan adoption and adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan would reduce the residual housing requirement. When the Local Plan is adopted the latest available data will be used to inform Core Policy 19.
ANON-QNH5-RDXH-J	Mark Fisher	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDT6-V	Anthony Gibbs	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDU5-V	Dean King	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDU1-R	Dianne King	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUE-C	Justin Brannon	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUN-N	Rob Diggins, Melissa	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Diggins, Halle Diggins and Emmy Diggins					
ANON-QNH5-RDU2-S	Brian Brooks	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9R-W	Matthew Palmer	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9Q-V	J N Bawden	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDCW-C	Jane Smith	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9T-Y	James Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD7Z-3	Michele Turner	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD77-Z	Derek Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWF-F	Amanda Malins	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDW6-Y	Laurence Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWR-U	Philip & Jenny Loader	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWH-H	Catherine Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDR9-W	Peter Canning	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD3D-9	Rosa Jupe	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDHT-E	Lisa Fuller	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDYW-2	Carl Housden - Nexus Planning	On behalf of an Organisation	Hawridge Strategic Land	Green Belt Larger Villages should be set a requirement	To ensure that Core Policy 19 is indeed a sound policy, a comparable level of growth proposed at all other Large Villages needs to be planned for at Little Hallingbury and Birchanger.	As set out in the Larger Villages Housing Requirement Topic Paper Core Policy 19 reflects the spatial strategy and HELAA capacity, which in turn is influenced by the decision that "exceptional circumstances" do not exist to amend the Green Belt boundaries in the District. As a result, the housing requirement figures for Little Hallingbury and Birchanger reflect the completions and commitments and HELAA brownfield capacity within the built-up area of the villages and the fact that there is no suitable, available and achievable capacity in the Green Belt outside of the settlements.
ANON-QNH5-RDWK-M	Neil Waterson	On behalf of an Organisation	Neil Waterson on behalf of Adrian Fox City and Country			
ANON-QNH5-RD6G-F	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	J M Lukies & Son	Hatfield Broad Oak have issued a Call for Sites	In order to inform the Hatfield Broad Oak Neighbourhood Plan the Steering Groups has issued a Call for Sites.	This is a welcome development and shows that the Parish Council is serious in its approach to making non-strategic allocations. Furthermore, by starting the process now (and ahead of Local Plan adoption), it makes the two-year requirement easier to meet.
ANON-QNH5-RDDF-V	Mary and Lloyd Tripp	Individual / member of the public		Henham is taking a disproportionately high level of development	Comment stating that Henham is taking a disproportionately high level of development. One further comment stating that Henham is taking 431 dwellings out of the 600 at all Larger Villages combined.	Henham village is proposed to receive a proportionate amount of development in line with the Larger Villages Housing Requirement Topic Paper. It is recognised that the Parish as a whole is taking more development than this, however in line with the Settlement Hierarchy in Core Policy 3, the majority of this development is taking place at the settlement of Elsenham. The figure for all Larger Villages is 1,114 dwellings, including 514 dwellings from completions and commitments and an additional 600 dwellings as distributed under Core Policy 19. The figures for Henham are 60 dwellings from completions and commitments at Henham village and a residual requirement of 121 dwellings under CP19 resulting in a total of 181 dwellings over the plan period. As a percentage of development at all Larger Villages this equates to 16.2% at Henham.
ANON-QNH5-RDDF-V	Mary and Lloyd Tripp	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9V-1	Clive Branch	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9K-P	Andrew Ttofalli	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDRS-Q	Richard Agnew	On behalf of an Organisation	Gladman Developments Ltd	Housing requirements need to take into account existing service provision and the ability to improve provision	Comment stating that the Larger Village Housing Requirements need to take into account existing service provision and the ability to improve provision	The Larger Villages housing requirements have been set using the methodology in the Larger Villages Topic Paper and taking into account the existing level of services in the Settlement Facilities and Services Study. It is noted that the Settlement Facilities and Services Study is a "snapshot in time"; however by adopting the approach of making non-strategic allocations at the Larger Villages and encouraging Parish Councils to make the allocations, it is hoped that any loss of facilities will be avoided and that existing services and facilities can be supported through an appropriate scale of new development
ANON-QNH5-RD34-S	Adam Davies	On behalf of an Organisation	The Davies Family	Lack of timely engagement with Parish Councils on housing requirement figures	It is suggested that there has not been timely engagement with the Parish Councils on Core Policy 19 and their decision on whether or not to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to make non-strategic allocations	Engagement has taken place with the Parish Councils at the Larger Villages throughout the Local Plan-making process including before Regulation 18 stage and in the time between Regulation 18 and 19. The methodology, settlement hierarchy and HELAA evidence have all been revised following this engagement, including the decision to change the evidence from a "parish" to a "settlement" based approach. The two-year requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be prepared only applies from the date of plan adoption. With an average 18-month examination period the time between Regulation 18 and plan adoption could be two and a half years, with the two-year period on top of this resulting in four and a half years to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. This is considered sufficient, with the Council supporting under the "duty to support" Neighbourhood Planning.
ANON-QNH5-RDNS-K	Andy Stevens	Individual / member of the public	ASP on behalf of Mr John Noble	Larger sites are better able to	It is argued that larger dwellings are better able to deliver Biodiversity Net gain on-site.	The decision over which site(s) to be allocated to deliver the Newport and Larger Village housing requirement figures is for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan to address, through consultation, engagement, technical evidence gathering and application of an appropriate site selection methodology. Strategic policy requirements such as 20% Biodiversity Net Gain will be expected to be delivered through any allocations.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				deliver on-site BNG		
ANON-QNH5-RDWA-A	James Bailey	On behalf of an Organisation	James Bailey Planning Ltd on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land V Limited and Ms Hawkes	Larger village housing requirement figure does not factor in constraints	It is argued that the Larger Village Housing Requirement methodology does not adequately factor in constraints.	The starting point for assessing the capacity under the methodology is the HELAA process, which identifies the suitable, available and achievable capacity in the District. As a result of constraints such as Green Belt, heritage, flood risk and ecology the HELAA has ruled out sites to result in a shortlist of suitable, available and achievable sites which has fed into the Larger Villages Housing Requirement methodology.
ANON-QNH5-RD34-S	Adam Davies	On behalf of an Organisation	The Davies Family	Larger Villages housing requirement will not deliver housing within 5 years	Comment stating that the non-strategic sites at the Larger Villages will not deliver in the first 5 years after plan adoption.	This is acknowledged in the Housing Trajectory. The Local Plan can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply at plan adoption without reliance on the non-strategic allocations, which do not meet the NPPF definition of "deliverable" at present.
ANON-QNH5-RDXX-2	Andrew Ttofalli	Individual / member of the public		Larger Villages methodology does not reflect the capacity for growth	It is argued that the Larger Village Housing Requirement methodology does not reflect the capacity for growth at a settlement. Henham Parish Council suggest that in their view the distribution of the 600 dwellings to be allocated across the Larger Villages does not reflect the true capacity for development in some of these locations, including for example at villages that have more facilities than Henham.	The starting point for assessing the capacity under the methodology is the HELAA process, which identifies the suitable, available and achievable capacity in the District. As a result of constraints such as Green Belt, heritage, flood risk and ecology the HELAA has ruled out sites to result in a shortlist of suitable, available and achievable sites which has fed into the Larger Villages Housing Requirement methodology. The Settlement Services and Facilities Study also informs the Larger Villages Housing Requirement Figure through the Settlement Hierarchy classification as a Larger Village, plus in one of the four scenarios through use of the Services Score. The overall quantum of development is modest (much lower than what has been coming forward in the absence of a plan) and it is expected that some additional development will contribute to the vitality and viability of the settlement.
ANON-QNH5-RDXX-2	Andrew Ttofalli	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDMV-N	Colin Geoffrey Sullivan	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDT6-V	Anthony Gibbs	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUC-A	Trevor Ellis-Callow	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUA-8	Gemma Scott	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9K-P	Andrew Ttofalli	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9N-S	A.F.Eaton	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9N-S	A.F.Eaton	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDMV-N	Colin Geoffrey Sullivan	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDCW-C	Jane Smith	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDXH-J	Mark Fisher	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD92-W	Donna Willcox	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9T-Y	James Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD74-W	Zoe Rutterford	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD7Z-3	Michele Turner	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD77-Z	Derek Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD7J-K	Fiona Price	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWC-C	Julian Barnett	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWF-F	Amanda Malins	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDW6-Y	Laurence Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWH-H	Catherine Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDR9-W	Peter Canning	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDR9-W	Peter Canning	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDHT-E	Lisa Fuller	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD34-S	Adam Davies	On behalf of an Organisation	The Davies Family	Local Plan forces Parish Councils to prepare Neighbourhood Plans	Comment suggesting that Neighbourhood Plans are being forced on Parish Councils that had no intention of producing one, and noting the lack of progress in some areas	Engagement has taken place with the Parish Councils at the Larger Villages throughout the Local Plan-making process including before Regulation 18 stage and in the time between Regulation 18 and 19. The methodology, settlement hierarchy and HELAA evidence have all been revised following this engagement, including the decision to change the evidence from a "parish" to a "settlement" based approach. The Parish Councils have been given a choice over whether or not to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan or to let the District Council make the allocations instead. The Parish Councils for all Larger Villages with housing requirement figures have confirmed their intention to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. The two-year requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be prepared only applies from the date of plan adoption. With an average 18-month examination period the time between Regulation 18 and plan adoption could be two and a half years, with the two-year period on top of this resulting in four and a half years to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. This is considered sufficient, with the Council supporting under the "duty to support" Neighbourhood Planning.
ANON-QNH5-RD34-S	Adam Davies	On behalf of an Organisation	The Davies Family			
ANON-QNH5-RD39-X	Higgins Group	On behalf of an Organisation	Boyer on behalf of Higgins Group	Local Plan should make the allocations	Comment stating that the Local Plan should make the non-strategic allocations and that deferring them to Neighbourhood Plans is delaying delivery.	As shown in the Housing Trajectory the Council will be able to demonstrate that there is a five-year housing land supply at plan adoption, and therefore the non-strategic allocations at the Larger Villages are not required to deliver early in the plan period. During and after the Regulation 18 consultation Parish Councils at the Larger Villages have agreed to make the allocations through Neighbourhood Plans and there is no need for the Council to make the allocations in the Local Plan; however the two-year "sunset clause" provides a fallback mechanism to do this in the event a Neighbourhood Plan is not prepared. Even if this occurs, the "sunset clause" will enable the housing to be delivered in line with the housing trajectory following a plan review, well within the plan period.
ANON-QNH5-RD36-U	Kate Sutton	On behalf of an Organisation	AM Planning on behalf of Richstone Procurement Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD34-S	Adam Davies	On behalf of an Organisation	The Davies Family			
ANON-QNH5-RDNS-K	Andy Stevens	Individual / member of the public	ASP on behalf of Mr John Noble			
ANON-QNH5-RDH1-B	Mary Power	On behalf of an Organisation	PowerHaus Consultancy on Behalf of Richstone Procurement Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDTZ-Z	stacey rawlings	On behalf of an Organisation	Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd on behalf of Catesby land Promotions Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD39-X	Higgins Group	On behalf of an Organisation	Boyer on behalf of Higgins Group	Methodology for arriving at housing requirement figures is unclear.	Comment stating that the methodology for calculating the Larger Village housing requirement figures is unclear, particularly for Birchanger and Little Hallingbury	The methodology is set out in the Larger Villages Housing Requirement Topic Paper, which takes into account constraints, population size, facilities and services and HELAA capacity. Birchanger and Little Hallingbury have lower housing requirement figures because of their location within the Green Belt, and no greenfield sites adjacent to those villages are suitable for development in the HELAA because no "exceptional circumstances" have been determined to release Green Belt land.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Need for housing at the larger villages to meet local needs	Larger villages often need smaller homes for older people. Development at the villages should cater for local needs rather than executive homes	The District has seen a high level of development come forward in recent years in the absence of an up-to-date local plan and five-year housing land supply. For new development policies such as Core Policy 53 (Standards for New Residential Development);54 (Supported and Specialist Housing); 55 (Residential Space Standards) and 56 (Affordable Dwellings) will ensure new development better meets local needs generally. The Neighbourhood Plan process allows for communities to go further in allocating specific sites to meet local needs, providing that they are in general conformity with the strategic policies in the plan.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDNS-K	Andy Stevens	Individual / member of the public	ASP on behalf of Mr John Noble	Neighbourhood Plans - certainty	Comment stating that relying on Neighbourhood Plans to make the non-strategic allocations increases uncertainty, that the Local Plan should make the non-strategic allocations and that deferring them to Neighbourhood Plans is delaying delivery.	As shown in the Housing Trajectory the Council will be able to demonstrate that there is a five-year housing land supply at plan adoption, and therefore the non-strategic allocations at the Larger Villages are not required to deliver early in the plan period. During and after the Regulation 18 consultation Parish Councils at the Larger Villages have agreed to make the allocations through Neighbourhood Plans and there is no need for the Council to make the allocations in the Local Plan; however the two-year "sunset clause" provides a fallback mechanism to do this in the event a Neighbourhood Plan is not prepared. Even if this occurs, the "sunset clause" will enable the housing to be delivered in line with the housing trajectory following a plan review, well within the plan period.
ANON-QNH5-RDCG-V	Ian Dale, Sheena Dale, and Tracey Hunter	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD36-U	Kate Sutton	On behalf of an Organisation	AM Planning on behalf of Richstone Procurement Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDNS-K	Andy Stevens	Individual / member of the public	ASP on behalf of Mr John Noble	Neighbourhood Plans cannot be prepared in two years	The policy stated that Neighbourhood Plans will need to be delivered within two years of adoption of the Local Plan otherwise the allocations will be taken forward in a new DPD. It is suggested that Neighbourhood Planning takes a considerable time in Uttlesford, with approximately 3.5 years from area designation to adoption in Felsted. The suggestion is that Neighbourhood Plans cannot be prepared in time to meet CP19 requirements, and that allocations should be made in the Local Plan itself. Additional criticism that the Local Plan has taken nearly 20 years to get to this point, so it is unfair that Neighbourhood Plans would need to be prepared within two years.	The Parish Councils for all Larger Villages with housing requirement figures have confirmed their intention to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. The two-year requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be prepared only applies from the date of plan adoption. With an average 18-month examination period the time between Regulation 18 and plan adoption could be two and a half years, with the two-year period on top of this resulting in four and a half years to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. This is considered sufficient, with the Council supporting under the "duty to support" Neighbourhood Planning. An up-to-date Local Plan provides greater certainty for Neighbourhood Plans to be prepared, so the 3.5 year example provided for Felsted previously is not likely to be representative of new Neighbourhood Plans in Uttlesford.
ANON-QNH5-RDTZ-Z	stacey rawlings	On behalf of an Organisation	Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd on behalf of Catesby land Promotions Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD39-X	Higgins Group	On behalf of an Organisation	Boyer on behalf of Higgins Group			
ANON-QNH5-RDCZ-F	David Richards on	On behalf of an Organisation	Radwinter Parish Council	No comment provided	The representation indicates that the policy is considered sound, legally compliant and compliant with DtC but provides no further commentary.	No comment necessary.
ANON-QNH5-RDXH-J	Mark Fisher	Individual / member of the public		No consultation on change from parish to settlement	Comment mainly from residents in Henham and Henham Parish Council that there has been no consultation on the change in the plan from a parish-based approach to a settlement-based approach	At Regulation 18 stage numerous representations were made highlighting various issues with the evidence base and strategy being considered at a parish level, rather than a settlement level. The decision to change to a settlement-based approach is in line with the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy - however, this only relates to the Settlement Facilities Study. The response to the Regulation 18 consultation stated that the approach would be updated to a settlement-based approach, and engagement has taken place with Parish Councils since Regulation 18 confirming this and providing updated Housing Requirement Figures reflecting the updated Settlement Hierarchy, Settlement Services and Facilities Study and HELAA. A seminar was held with Parish Councils in Spring 2024 where the Parishes were informed of this decision. The Regulation 19 consultation provided an additional, public consultation opportunity to comment on this. The approach in the Local Plan is considered sound as it is based on up-to-date and accurate data at individual settlements, rather than providing misleading settlement and services scores and HELAA capacity by providing this data at the Parish scale (which may contain multiple settlements).
ANON-QNH5-RDT6-V	Anthony Gibbs	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUC-A	Trevor Ellis-Callow	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUA-8	Gemma Scott	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD92-W	Donna Willcox	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9T-Y	James Ward	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD6R-T	Jean Smith	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDDF-V	Mary and Lloyd Tripp	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD74-W	Zoe Rutterford	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD7Z-3	Michele Turner	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD77-Z	Derek Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWF-F	Amanda Malins	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDW6-Y	Laurence Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWH-H	Catherine Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDAT-7	Fiona Halls	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDR9-W	Peter Canning	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDRM-H	Simon Lee	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDHT-E	Lisa Fuller	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd	Not justified why there is no non-strategic housing requirement figure at Thaxted in CP19	Comment stating that it is not justified why the Thaxted and Rural Area Strategy contains no non-strategic allocations for Thaxted, when Thaxted is a Local Rural Centre and in the second tier of the settlement hierarchy	This matter is also discussed in relation to Core Policy 2 and 3. The Council agree that Thaxted is a sustainable location for development and that development would help to improve the sustainability of the settlement, helping to improve the vitality and viability of local services, including public transport and contribute to supporting additional services and facilities. However, the matter of not being able to provide a primary school was the only matter ECC objected to in the Reg 18 draft Local Plan and the ECC position was very clear that they do not support or deliver anything less than a 2fe primary school. As it would be inappropriate to plan for c. 1,200 homes at Thaxted, i.e., a level of growth necessary to support a 2 fe school, that makes planning for development at Thaxted difficult. Whilst there are other constraints, such as relating to the historic environment or aircraft noise, these are not thought to represent barriers to development. It is the case that in other parts of the UK, albeit with different Education Authorities, that planning for a 1fe school on a site that could accommodate a 2fe school enables more appropriate levels of development to come forward, but with flexibility to enable school expansion over time so that in the longer term a 2fe school could be supported.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						However, whilst this approach is not supported by ECC, this approach is not an option at Thaxted. Given the above, it is not appropriate to plan for non-strategic scale growth as it would not deliver a 2FE primary school
ANON-QNH5-RDTE-B	Helen Mason	On behalf of an Organisation	Flitch Green Parish Council	Parish Council support	Parish Council support of the settlement hierarchy classification, the approach to setting housing requirement figures for Larger Villages outside of the Green Belt and with sufficient HELAA capacity, and no housing requirements for Smaller Villages or settlements within Open Countryside. Support from Flitch Green Parish Council and Stebbing Parish Council.	Support noted and welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RD1Q-M	clerk to Stebbing Parish Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Stebbing Parish Council	Parish Council support	Parish Council support of the settlement hierarchy classification, the approach to setting housing requirement figures for Larger Villages outside of the Green Belt and with sufficient HELAA capacity, and no housing requirements for Smaller Villages or settlements within Open Countryside. Support from Flitch Green Parish Council and Stebbing Parish Council.	Support noted and welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RDWR-U	Philip & Jenny Loader	Individual / member of the public		Parish vs Settlement data	Between Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 the approach to calculating the housing requirement has changed from a Parish-based approach to a settlement-based approach. This is particularly unfair on Henham which has seen a great deal of development within the Parish.	The approach to a settlement-based approach was made in light of feedback received during the consultation that some villages had artificially high scores in the settlement facilities study because of the existence of multiple settlements in a single parish, and that the settlement hierarchy should be based on settlement data rather than parish data. However, this only relates to the Settlement Facilities Study. This was further explained in workshops with parish councils at the larger villages in spring 2024. The spatial strategy relates to settlements and for all intents and purposes is blind to parish boundaries. Development within Henham Parish that is adjacent to the settlement of Elsenham has been calculated as development at Elsenham. This is consistent with the approach taken at all Larger Villages. The residual housing requirement for Henham, and all other Larger Villages, is expected to be met within or adjacent to the settlement, in line with CP2 and CP3.
ANON-QNH5-RDMV-N	Colin Geoffrey Sullivan	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDXT-X	Ray Bell	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDXH-J	Mark Fisher	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDXX-2	Andrew Ttofalli	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDT6-V	Anthony Gibbs	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUC-A	Trevor Ellis-Callow	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUA-8	Gemma Scott	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9K-P	Andrew Ttofalli	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9N-S	A.F.Eaton	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD92-W	Donna Willcox	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD9T-Y	James Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD64-V	Doreen Baker	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD6R-T	Jean Smith	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD6S-U	Vicky Bambridge	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD6S-U	Vicky Bambridge	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDDF-V	Mary and Lloyd Tripp	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD74-W	Zoe Rutterford	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD7Z-3	Michele Turner	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD77-Z	Derek Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD7J-K	Fiona Price	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD78-1	Joan Franklin	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWF-F	Amanda Malins	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDW6-Y	Laurence Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWR-U	Philip & Jenny Loader	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWH-H	Catherine Ward	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDAT-7	Fiona Halls	Individual / member of the public				

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDR9-W	Peter Canning	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDRE-9	Ali Maxwel	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDRY-W	Catherine Hattee	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDR4-R	Derek Brown	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDHT-E	Lisa Fuller	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RD9V-1	Clive Branch	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Questioning how the housing requirement figure arrived at	Comment requesting an explanation of how the housing requirement figure has been arrived at for a particular settlement.	The Larger Villages Housing Requirement Topic Paper explains the methodology applied. The approach takes into account existing population size, the relative sustainability of the settlement (as per the Rural Services and Facilities Study), committed and completed development since the start of the plan period and suitable, available and achievable HELAA capacity to arrive at deliverable housing requirement figures for Larger Villages. The approach is considered sound and evidence based.
ANON-QNH5-RDWP-S	Steven Butler	On behalf of an Organisation	Bidwells on behalf of Julian Butterworth	Site promotion (Smaller Village)	Site promotion for a site at a Smaller Village	The site promotion is noted, however given the spatial strategy there is no need for non-strategic development at Smaller Villages and therefore no housing requirement figures have been set. There may be merit in liaising with the Parish Council at the Smaller Village with regard to a Rural Exception Site or other use of the land that could meet community needs whilst also being in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan.
ANON-QNH5-RDRR-P	Victoria Bennion	On behalf of an Organisation	Rapleys on behalf of Pegasi			
ANON-QNH5-RDWA-A	James Bailey	On behalf of an Organisation	James Bailey Planning Ltd on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land V Limited and Ms Hawkes			
ANON-QNH5-RD1D-7	Ian Butcher	On behalf of an Organisation	Artisan New Homes Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDHU-F	Christopher Loon	Individual / member of the public		Smaller villages should have a housing requirement figure	Comment suggesting that Smaller Villages should also have smaller, proportionate housing requirement figures in order to meet NPPF requirements. It is suggested that 320 dwellings could be apportioned across 32 Smaller Villages at 10 dwellings each, and the Local Plan should make the allocations where a Neighbourhood Plan is not being prepared.	Core Policy 2 sets the spatial strategy and approach to housing delivery for the District. The approach is considered a balanced one that supports delivery in the most sustainable locations, with a proportionate amount of additional housing at the Larger Villages where there is available capacity to deliver it, in accordance with the policies in the plan. It is not considered necessary to allocate or set housing requirements at the Smaller Villages as these settlements do not have sufficient infrastructure to meet day-to-day needs, and slightly larger non-strategic allocations at the Larger Villages will reduce the need to travel by private car. Windfall development is supported at Smaller Villages in line with Core Policy 3, and additionally Rural Exception Sites would be supported in these locations, so some development is expected at Smaller Villages over the plan period.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Status of existing Neighbourhood Plan	Question asking if a Neighbourhood Plan is in place, does this trump Core Policy 19?	Where there is conflict between policies in the Development Plan, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act states that the conflict must be resolved in the favour of the most recently adopted policy. However, in order to meet the 'basic conditions' and become a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan that is part of the Development Plan it needs to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan. Neighbourhood Plans can only contain non-strategic policies. Core Policy 19 is a strategic policy, and therefore any new Neighbourhood Plan policy would need to be in general conformity with Core Policy 19. It will not be possible for a Neighbourhood Plan to 'trump' Core Policy 19, once adopted.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Status of existing Neighbourhood Plan	Comment questioning what happens to the housing requirement figure set in an existing 'made' Neighbourhood Plan where one exists.	Any existing housing requirement figure in a 'made' (adopted) Neighbourhood Plan will have been prepared in the context of the 2005 plan and any withdrawn Local Plans that were in preparation at the time the Neighbourhood Plan was prepared. This Local Plan updates the strategy for the district and is based on up-to-date evidence including housing need, population and housing land availability. The housing requirements in Core Policy 19 will supersede the housing requirement figures in made neighbourhood plans, except for where NPPF Paragraph 14 applies (the plan is less than 5 years old and contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement).
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		housing requirement figures		
ANON-QNH5-RDTZ-Z	stacey rawlings	On behalf of an Organisation	Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd on behalf of Catesby land Promotions Ltd	Strategic scale growth	The scale of development in CP19 is larger than 100 dwellings for five Larger Villages, and 300 dwellings at Newport. These growth levels amount to strategic scale growth and should be properly planned through Local Plan allocations.	The threshold of 100 dwellings is for an individual strategic site, rather than the cumulative scale of development at a settlement or broad location. The scale of development at all Larger Villages as a whole, and at individual Larger Villages, is considered to be proportionate and evidence based taking into account constraints and opportunities. The allocation of specific sites in Neighbourhood Plans is a matter for each individual Neighbourhood Plan, unless a Neighbourhood Plan is not prepared in accordance with the provisions of CP19 when the Council will deal with the allocation in either a Local Plan Review or other Development Plan document. Whilst stated in the CP19 policy wording, the non-strategic threshold of 100 dwellings set in the Local Plan is not considered to be a hard limit for the Neighbourhood Plan, the legal requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be in 'general conformity' with the strategic policies in the development plan provides a degree of flexibility for individual Neighbourhood Plans. Given the residual need identified at individual settlements in CP19 (ranging from 0 to 122 dwellings) it may be possible to allocate a single site to deliver the residual requirement in full, however this is something for the Neighbourhood Plan to consider.
ANON-QNH5-RDH1-B	Mary Power	On behalf of an Organisation	PowerHaus Consultancy on Behalf of Richstone Procurement Ltd	Strategic site promotion can deliver the numbers in full.	The policy approach in CP19 of setting housing requirement figures for more rural areas is not objected to in principle, however the requirement for development at Larger Villages to be of 'non-strategic' scale is objected to.	Support for the broad approach is noted. The scale of development at all Larger Villages as a whole, and at individual Larger Villages, is considered to be proportionate and evidence based taking into account constraints and opportunities. The allocation of specific sites in Neighbourhood Plans is a matter for each individual Neighbourhood Plan, unless a Neighbourhood Plan is not prepared in accordance with the provisions of CP19 when the Council will deal with the allocation in either a Local Plan Review or other Development Plan document. Whilst stated in the CP19 policy wording, the non-strategic threshold of 100 dwellings set in the Local Plan is not considered to be a hard limit for the Neighbourhood Plan, the legal requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be in 'general conformity' with the strategic policies in the development plan provides a degree of flexibility for individual Neighbourhood Plans. Given the residual need identified at individual settlements in CP19 (ranging from 0 to 122 dwellings) it may be possible to allocate a single site to deliver the residual requirement in full, however this is something for the Neighbourhood Plan to consider.
ANON-QNH5-RD6G-F	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	J M Lukies & Son	Suggested alternative mechanism for sites to come forward	Rather than wait for a new DPD, it is suggested that an alternative mechanism within the Local Plan could allow for development to come forward if a Neighbourhood Plan is not 'made' in a timely manner. This could be to allow sustainably located sites adjacent to development boundaries to be delivered in the event that Neighbourhood Plans have not been made. Furthermore it is argued that this mechanism should be applied to Smaller Villages as well as Larger Villages.	It is not considered necessary to include such a provision in the plan as there is a healthy five-year housing land supply at plan adoption and, as the housing trajectory shows, the housing from Larger Villages is not needed within the first few years of the plan period to meet the annual housing requirement. Additionally non-strategic development at Smaller Villages would be in conflict with the Spatial Strategy in Core Policy 2. In any case, should a five-year housing land supply not be able to be demonstrated, the spatial strategy would likely be deemed 'out of date' under NPPF paragraph 11, which would achieve the intended outcome from the comment via the 'presumption'.
ANON-QNH5-RD95-Z	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	Lodge Farm Group			
ANON-QNH5-RD95-Z	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	Lodge Farm Group			

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Support approach	The broad approach in Core Policy 19 for the scale of housing and the approach to making non-strategic allocations is supported.	Support noted and welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDWM-P	Alice Maguire	On behalf of an Organisation	The Trustees of the CH Gosling 1965 Settlement			
ANON-QNH5-RDNS-K	Andy Stevens	Individual / member of the public	ASP on behalf of Mr John Noble	Support figure for Larger Village	The inclusion of Clavering and Hatfield Broad Oak as Larger Villages, and the housing requirement figure for the Larger Villages is supported.	Support noted.
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD6G-F	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	J M Lukies & Son			
ANON-QNH5-RD36-U	Kate Sutton	On behalf of an Organisation	AM Planning on behalf of Richstone Procurement Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDCG-V	Ian Dale, Sheena Dale, and Tracey Hunter	Individual / member of the public		Support the locational strategy, but disagree with the settlement hierarchy classification	The spatial strategy approach of assigning non-strategic development at Larger Villages is supported, however the settlement hierarchy classification of Larger Villages is objected to.	Support for the approach is noted. The classification of settlements in the Settlement Hierarchy (Core Policy 3) has been arrived at following the methodology outlined in the Settlement Facilities and Services Study. The Study was updated between Regulation 18 and 19 following consultation feedback and input from Parish Councils on the settlement scoring and approach based on facilities available at individual settlements rather than across parish areas, which in some instances included more settlements and increased the scoring. The approach taken in the plan is considered sound and evidence based with the proposed number of Larger Villages and their respective housing requirement figures set at a proportionate level, supported by the evidence.
ANON-QNH5-RDWM-P	Alice Maguire	On behalf of an Organisation	The Trustees of the CH Gosling 1965 Settlement	Support the sunset clause approach	The suggested approach in the "sunset clause" of setting a two-year period from adoption to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan before the District Council steps in to make the allocation is supported.	Support noted and welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RDN3-K	Edward Gildea	On behalf of an Organisation	Uttlesford Green Party	Table 8.1 does not list Wendens Ambo	Table 8.1 does not list the Smaller Village of Wendens Ambo	Table 8.1 is titled "Larger Villages and other designated Neighbourhood Areas in Uttlesford District". At the current moment of time the Smaller Village of Wendens Ambo is not a designated Neighbourhood Area, therefore it is not necessary to include it in this table.
ANON-QNH5-RDAR-5	Mark Wellings	On behalf of an Organisation	Montare LLP	Two years is too long	Comment stating that two years is too long to wait for a Neighbourhood Plan to be made, and that it should be shortened to one year.	Two years is considered to be an appropriate time frame to allow for Neighbourhood Plans to be produced by local communities. A shorter timeframe is considered to apply undue pressure on Neighbourhood groups to progress quickly; whilst any longer may delay development unnecessarily. A two year period is considered an appropriate balance that provides a realistic amount of time for the Parish Councils to prepare the evidence and engage with their residents. The two-year requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be prepared only applies from the date of plan adoption. With an average 18-month examination period the time between Regulation 18 and plan adoption could be two and a half years, with the two-year period on top of this resulting in four and a half years to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. This is considered sufficient, with the Council supporting under the "duty to support" Neighbourhood Planning.
ANON-QNH5-RD95-Z	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	Lodge Farm Group			
ANON-QNH5-RD95-Z	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	Lodge Farm Group			

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD6G-F	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	J M Lukies & Son			
ANON-QNH5-RD7A-A	David Fletcher	On behalf of an Organisation	Agent on behalf of Alex Hall			
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		What happens to Neighbourhood Plans if there is a delay to the Local Plan	Question asking what happens to Neighbourhood Plans if the Local Plan is delayed in reaching adoption, particularly in light of NPPF Paragraph 14.	The Council believes that the Local Plan is sound and will pass Examination in Public and become adopted, and does not anticipate any delays in this taking place. Core Policy 19 is worded so as to 'start the clock' for preparing a Neighbourhood Plan at plan adoption, so any delays (should they occur) would still allow for a two-year neighbourhood plan-making process from adoption. NPPF Paragraph 14 provides protection to Neighbourhood Plans that contain policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement where "the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made". This provision will continue to apply regardless of the date of the adoption of the new Local Plan.

Core Policy 20: Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Demonstrating genuine need	Comment asking how the Council will ensure that the people accessing housing from Rural Exception Sites have a genuine need	Core Policy 20 requires all criteria to be met, including criterion i) where "a demonstrable local community need for affordable housing has been established through a local housing needs survey or other relevant study". A development appraisal should accompany the application that clearly demonstrates how the criteria have been met.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Ensuring local need	Comment asking how the Council will ensure that the people accessing housing from Rural Exception Sites are from within the local area.	Core Policy 20 requires all criteria to be met, including criterion i) where "a demonstrable local community need for affordable housing has been established through a local housing needs survey or other relevant study". A development appraisal should accompany the application that clearly demonstrates how the criteria have been met. The supporting text clarifies at paragraph 6.27 that "'Local' in this context means 'within the parish', principally, although the needs of those who live or work in an adjoining parish may also be relevant. This would particularly apply where a scheme is proposed in a Smaller Village that would meet the needs of adjoining smaller communities".
ANON-QNH5-RDCZ-F	David Richards on	On behalf of an Organisation	Radwinter Parish Council	No comment provided	The representation indicates that the policy is considered sound, legally compliant and compliant with DtC but provides no further commentary.	No comment necessary.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Replace Core Policy 20 with Development Policies 1 to 4	The comment states that Core Policy 20 is not needed and that instead the plan should just rely on Development Policies 1 to 4.	Core Policy 20 is compliant with the NPPF approach to supporting rural exception sites and allowing for affordable housing delivery in rural areas. Furthermore, as a strategic policy in the plan it would be a policy that Neighbourhood Plans would need to be in "general conformity" with, in contrast to the non-strategic Development Policies.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Requires the community to demonstrate that it needs affordable housing	Comment criticising that it is for the community to demonstrate that it needs affordable housing. With developers building profitable, large housing local needs will not be met.	Core Policy 20 is about Rural Exception Sites, which are circumstances where normally restrictive planning policies beyond built up areas and in more rural locations regarding the location of housing are exceptionally overridden to deliver affordable housing that meets local needs. This is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. General affordable housing needs are planned to be met through the wider Local Plan strategy including strategic allocation in Core Policy 2 and Core Policy 56 which relates to Affordable Dwellings. The application of Core Policy 20 should deliver more affordable housing overall, including in locations where it is needed and large-scale market housing would not be appropriate.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Rural Exception Sites not supported	The comment states that Core Policy 20 would lead to unsustainable development increasing car use.	Core Policy 20 is compliant with the NPPF approach to supporting rural exception sites and allowing for affordable housing delivery in rural areas. The spatial strategy as a whole seeks to minimise the need to travel via private car within what is a predominantly rural district.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDMU-M	Michael Young	Individual / member of the public		Support	Core Policy 20 is supported to encourage affordable housing on rural exception sites.	Support noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDMU-M	Michael Young	Individual / member of the public		Support rural exception sites: Wimbish Parish Council	Wimbish Parish Council supports the delivery of affordable housing on Rural Exception Sites in Wimbish Parish. The identification of Wimbish as a "smaller village" means that affordable housing is more likely to come forward via this route.	Wimbish Parish Council's support of affordable housing on Rural Exception Sites is noted. Uttlesford District Council and its Housing Department will support Wimbish Parish in the delivery of Rural Exception Sites over the plan period.

Development Policy 1: New Dwellings in the Open Countryside

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDHU-F	Christopher Loon	Individual / member of the public		Criterion v - Individual dwelling of exceptional quality	The respondent suggests that the requirement for new individual dwellings in the open countryside to significantly enhance their immediate setting is overly restrictive and should be deleted. The comment notes that the existing policy already addresses matters relating to landscape character, setting and design by referencing other policies in the Local Plan.	As detailed in Core Policy 3, development in the open countryside will not be appropriate unless specifically supported by other relevant policies as set out in the Development Plan or national policy. The policy approach regarding the development of an individual dwelling in the open countryside, including the requirement for the development to significantly enhance its immediate setting, is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 84e).
ANON-QNH5-RD4E-B	Albert Gerhard	Individual / member of the public		General support	The comment supports Development Policy 1 as it is aligned with the rural thinking of the community.	Support noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Landscape Impacts	The representation supports the supporting paragraph 8.30 relating to Development in the Open Countryside, but suggests that it ignores that many major developments on agricultural land has greater landscape impacts than single development.	Support for the supporting text Paragraph 8.30 of the Plan is welcomed and noted. Core Policy 41 Landscape Character sets out a robust and consistent approach to protect, conserve and manage the landscape character of Uttlesford, including requiring all major development proposals to be supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Smaller development proposals may also require an assessment to be submitted if deemed appropriate, having regard to the type, scale, location and design of the proposed development.
ANON-QNH5-RDCZ-F	David Richards on	On behalf of an Organisation	Radwinter Parish Council	No comment provided - support	The representation indicates that the policy is considered sound, legally compliant and compliant with DtC but provides no further commentary.	No comment necessary.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Policy Definition - Developed Footprint (Flexibility)	This comment suggests that a flexible policy approach which allows for flexibility and changes within the plan period in the nature of settlement boundaries should be included to support the release of land for housing requirement adjacent to settlement boundaries, including in response to any arising five year housing land supply shortfalls.	Development Policy 1 provides guidance for new dwellings in the open countryside, outside developed footprints. The Open Countryside is classified as the lowest settlement tier in Core Policy 3 Settlement Hierarchy, supported by no or a low level of services and facilities. As detailed in Core Policy 3, development in the open countryside will not be appropriate unless specifically supported by other relevant policies as set out in the Development Plan or national policy. The Council considers that limited infill development may only be appropriate at 'Smaller Villages' or above settlements in the settlement hierarchy. The Council considers the Plan when read as a whole provides adequate flexibility in addressing changes to the developed footprint of settlements within the plan period.
ANON-QNH5-RDAY-C	Samuel Bampton	On behalf of an Organisation	Pelham Structures Ltd	Policy Scope - Infill Development	The respondent suggests that the settlement hierarchy identifies many small villages and hamlets as 'Open Countryside', meaning that under Development Policy 1 infill development would not be permitted. The respondent argues that this is in conflict with NPPF Paragraph 83 and the Planning Practice Guidance which recognises the role of housing in enhancing or maintaining the vitality of rural communities. The respondent refers to the Court of Appeal's judgement in the case of Julian Wood v the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Gravesham Borough Council [2015] EWCA Civ 195,	As noted in Core Policy 3 Settlement Hierarchy and throughout Chapter 8, the Council recognises the importance of enhancing and maintaining the vitality of rural communities in line with national policy. In relation to rural housing, Core Policy 3 support some development (including limited infill development) at the Smaller Villages, proportionate to their size and reflects that they are less suitable for greater levels of development. The Council therefore considers Core Policy 3 and Development Policy 1 consistent with national policy and sound. Development Policy 1 provides guidance for new dwellings in the open countryside, outside developed footprints. The Open Countryside is classified as the lowest settlement tier in Core Policy 3 Settlement

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					suggesting that the village boundary defined for a Local Plan would not necessarily be determinative and that regard should be paid to the position on the ground.	Hierarchy, supported by no or a low level of services and facilities. As detailed in Core Policy 3, development in the open countryside will not be appropriate unless specifically supported by other relevant policies as set out in the Development Plan or national policy. The Council notes the relevant case law and is satisfied with the policy wording in Core Policy 3.
ANON-QNH5-RDAY-C	Samuel Bampton	On behalf of an Organisation	Pelham Structures Ltd	Policy Scope - Previously Developed Land	Suggests that 'previously developed land' are considered as a more sustainable location for development irrespective of geographical location and should be considered in Development Policy 1.	Development Policy 1 provides guidance for new dwellings in the open countryside, outside developed footprints. The Council recognises the contribution of previously developed land in meeting local business and community needs in rural areas as set out in national policy, but it is not necessary for the Local Plan to repeat the full requirements. The Plan's approach to previously developed land in the Green Belt is separately addressed in Core Policy 59.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Policy Wording	Proposes amendments to the policy wording to clarify that non-compliant applications will be refused.	Comment noted. The Council considers that the policy text 'will only be permitted when one or more of the following apply' to provide adequate clarity on the policy requirements.

Development Policy 2: Replacement Dwellings in the Open Countryside

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDCZ-F	David Richards on	On behalf of an Organisation	Radwinter Parish Council	No comment provided - support	The representation indicates that the policy is considered sound, legally compliant and compliant with DtC but provides no further commentary.	No comment necessary.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Policy clarification	The representation queries whether the text included in Development Policy 2 essentially means that 'someone can build a barn and turn it into housing without upsetting the planning process'.	Development Policy 2 relates the replacement of an existing dwelling, rather than agricultural buildings, in the open countryside. It sets out the principle of supporting the replacement of existing dwellings in the open countryside, given that a total of five criteria in relation to the original and replacement dwellings are met. The change of use of agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses is addressed separately through the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) (Amendment) Order 2024.

Development Policy 3: Rural Workers' Dwellings in the Open Countryside

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
10/14/2024	ANON-QNH5-RDCZ-F	David Richardson	On behalf of an Organisation	No comment provided - support	The representation indicates that the policy is considered sound, legally compliant and compliant with DtC but provides no further commentary.	No comment necessary.

Development Policy 4: Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDCZ-F	David Richards on	On behalf of an Organisation	Radwinter Parish Council	No comment provided - support	The representation indicates that the policy is considered sound, legally compliant and compliant with DtC but provides no further commentary.	No comment necessary.

Development Policy 5: Change of Use of Agricultural Land to Domestic Gardens

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

ANON-QNH5-RDCZ-F	David Richards on	On behalf of an Organisation	Radwinter Parish Council	No comment provided - support	The representation indicates that the policy is considered sound, legally compliant and compliant with DtC but provides no further commentary.	No comment necessary.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Policy Enforcement	The representation questions past level of enforcement in relation to the change of structures in new garden to the open character of the countryside.	The comment relates to the enforcement of the saved 2005 Local Plan, rather than the policy text in concern, however the support for the principle of Development Policy 5 is noted. The Council has an up to date Planning Enforcement Policy (https://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/media/1241/Planning-Enforcement-Policy/pdf/Adopted_Planning_Enforcement_Policy_Oct_2017_refresh_March_2022.pdf?m=1682334259190) which sets out our commitment and methodology to effective, appropriate and proportionate enforcement of planning control and monitoring of development.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Reduction in Agricultural Capacity	The representation expresses that the reduction of agricultural capacity in the long term is unwelcomed.	The Council recognises the benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services, including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. One of the key criteria in Development Policy 5 therefore requires the change of use of agricultural land to domestic garden to not lead to the irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Core Policy 21: Rural Diversification

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDCZ-F	David Richards on	On behalf of an Organisation	Radwinter Parish Council	No comment provided - support	The representation indicates that the policy is considered sound, legally compliant and compliant with DtC but provides no further commentary.	No comment necessary.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Policy Requirement - Criteria Clarity	Saffron Walden Town Council seeks to clarify whether the stated criteria under Core Policy 21 must all be met.	Noted. Development proposals must meet all criteria noted in Core Policy 21. The Council considers that the policy text 'subject to all the following criteria being met' provides clear guidance on our requirements.
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Policy Requirement - General	A respondent suggests that the policy criteria are too stringent and may prevent old existing buildings from being used due to high conversion costs. It is also suggested that naturally more traffic will occur and infrastructure required, so it is unclear what the proposed standards are.	Core Policy 21 supports development proposals for economic activities that bring about rural diversification in the rural area provided that they meet the five development criteria. These relates to its role in supporting rural businesses, its impact on the character, appearance and setting of existing buildings within the landscape, a preference to the use of existing buildings, provision of sufficient infrastructure and appropriately addressing its transport impacts. It should be noted that the policy wording does not simply prevent development where traffic occurs, but instead requires the development proposals to be supported by an appropriate access and to not give rise to an unacceptable transport impact. The Council is satisfied that the Plan, when read as whole, effectively addresses these issues.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Rural Diversification - Estate Plans	Suggests that the preparation of an agreed Estate Plan should be mandatory.	The Council supports landowners to prepare Estate Plans to facilitate the identification and management of sustainable rural diversification practices and outcomes but accepts other forms of appropriate evidence which demonstrates how the stated criteria in Core Policy 21 have been met.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Rural Diversification - General Support	General support for Core Policy 21.	Support noted and welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RDN3-K	Edward Gildea	On behalf of an Organisation	Uttlesford Green Party	Rural Diversification - Sustainable Practices	There is a lack of mention of how agriculture can be supported in its transition to more sustainable practices.	As detailed in the supporting paragraphs of 8.33 - 8.35, the Council supports the diversification and growth of Uttlesford's rural economy including the use of sustainable agricultural practices. This includes the use of land management techniques, development of 'Estate Plans', support for diversification proposals where it demonstrates sustainable practices and outcomes, and potential growth opportunities in the agri-tech, agri-food and forestry sectors to deliver growth and support sustainable food production.

