

# Chapter 11: Building Healthy and Sustainable Communities

## Contents

Core Policy 52: Good Design Outcomes and Process .....	2
Core Policy 52a: Good Design Outcomes and Process for Strategic Allocations.....	3
Development Policy 09: Public Art .....	5
Core Policy 53: Standards for New Residential Development.....	5
Core Policy 54: Supported and Specialist Housing .....	7
Core Policy 55: Residential Space Standards.....	8
Core Policy 56: Affordable Dwellings.....	9
Core Policy 57: Sub-Division of Dwellings and Houses in Multiple Occupation .....	12
Core Policy 58: Custom and Self-Build Housing .....	12
Core Policy 59: The Metropolitan Green Belt.....	13
Core Policy 60: The Travelling Community .....	15
Core Policy 61: The Historic Environment.....	16
Core Policy 62: Listed Buildings .....	16
Core Policy 63: Conservation Areas.....	17
Core Policy 64: Archaeological Assets .....	18
Core Policy 65: Non-Designated Heritage Assets of Local Importance .....	18
Core Policy 66: Planning for Health .....	19
Core Policy 67: Open Space, Sport and Recreation .....	21
Core Policy 67a: Management of Public Open Space.....	23
Core Policy 68: Community Uses.....	24
Core Policy 69: New Cemeteries and Burial Space .....	26
Core Policy 70: Communications Infrastructure.....	26

## Core Policy 52: Good Design Outcomes and Process

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD4R-R	Roy Warren	On behalf of an Organisation	Sport England	Active Design	The respondent supports the policy in relation to the delivery of new healthy and active communities within the allocation. The respondent states that the design of new communities should take cognisance of the 'Active Design' guide, also embedded within the Essex Design Guide. The policy is considered to meet the test of soundness and would comply with para. 96c of the NPPF.	Support for this policy is noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Compact design / car parking	The respondent suggests that the aim of building in a compact form is at odds with good quality design and sufficient space in the public realm for play space and car parking. Further concerns are raised about parking obstructing of public footpaths. Request for speed-reduction initiatives to encourage cycling.	The Council's ambition for development to be built in a compact way relates to efficiencies of land-use and walkable-neighbourhood principles. This is not at the detriment of providing adequate space for amenity, play or car-parking within the public realm. The Uttlesford Design Code has further detail on car-parking and how high-quality design is expected to be delivered in the district to create well-functioning communities and use the available land efficiently.
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd	Design Codes, Masterplans and Quality Review Panels	One respondent states support for the overall design ambitions of the policy but suggests that Design Codes and masterplans are not mandatory for major development schemes. Additionally, the respondent states that the threshold for the UQRP should be raised to 100 dwellings. Another respondent states that masterplans should only be required for schemes of over 100 dwellings. Another respondent states that a requirement for design review panels for developments over 50 dwellings is unreasonable and unnecessarily onerous.	The policy wording is clear that major development schemes should either prepare Design Codes and Masterplans to demonstrate compliance with the policy or through other means, such as within the Design & Access Statement. Therefore, the council believes there is sufficient flexibility within the policy wording to allow applicants to demonstrate compliance through a variety of means, appropriate to the scale of development proposed. The council believes the threshold for mandatory Quality Review Panels (UQRP) is reasonable and appropriate, based on the potential impact to the surrounding landscape and built-form context from schemes of 50 dwellings and above.
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon			
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDWQ-T	Amy Lomath	On behalf of an Organisation	Taylor Wimpey			
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Design Review	The respondent states that the UQRP should apply to all forms of development, including employment, and should not be limited to schemes of 50 dwellings or more.	The wording of the policy is such that proposals for residential schemes of over 50 dwellings are mandated to use the UQRP. This does not preclude the use of the UQRP by other schemes and this will be dictated on a case-by-case basis between DM officers and applicants. It would not be feasible or appropriate to require all schemes to use the UQRP process, however, the UQRP is available to all proposed developments where it is deemed appropriate.
BHLF-QNH5-RDEH-Y	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	Fire Safety	The respondent has stated the requirement for any development to adhere to all relevant building regulations and Fire Safety Orders and to implement construction management plans to minimise risks of fire and road traffic incidents during the construction phase.	Adherence to Fire Safety Orders and Building Regulations is a legal requirement of any development, irrespective of whether it falls within a local plan allocated site and so these requirements are expected to be met as a matter of course.
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd	Masterplans	The respondent suggests that masterplans (and Design Codes) should only be required for complex schemes of more than 100 dwellings.	The Council places high value on the quality of the design of developments within the district. It is seeking development that is aware of its context and appropriate to place and so the policy wording requires developments to demonstrate their design vision and principles at an early stage so that generic and acontextual development can be avoided. This will usually be through the development of a masterplan and a supporting document that demonstrates compliance with the Uttlesford Design Code. The policy states this can be through a site-specific code or a Design & Access Statement. Masterplans are a useful tool to establish design parameters for sites of all scales and will vary in level of detail required based on the complexity of the site in question. The National Model Design Code states 'The level of detail will vary depending on whether the authority or developer is preparing the masterplan and the complexity of the site.' Therefore, the Council believes the policy is in line with national guidance.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support of policy and sound	The representation states support for the policy and considers it to be sound.	Support for this policy is noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDZX-4	Johnathan Dixon	On behalf of an Organisation	Savills on behalf of Audley End Estate			
ANON-QNH5-RD9A-C	Nick Dukes	On behalf of an Organisation	Littlebury Residents Group			
ANON-QNH5-RDRA-5	Robert Barber	On behalf of an Organisation	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern	Support of policy	The representation states support for the policy.	Support for this policy is noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDRS-Q	Richard Agnew	On behalf of an Organisation	Gladman Developments Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDRT-R	Tracy Coston	On behalf of an Organisation	Littlebury Parish Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDWQ-T	Amy Lomath	On behalf of an Organisation	Taylor Wimpey	Ten characteristics of a well-designed place	The respondent suggests that it is not reasonable to expect all schemes to demonstrate how the ten characteristics have been addressed.	The ten characteristics in Core Policy 52 are those that are set out in the National Design Guide and have been identified as considerations that are relevant to all well-designed places. We therefore do not agree that these are unreasonable and not applicable to some developments. We would expect to see all development in the district delivering good design and these characteristics are in line with that aim.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Typographical errors and omissions	The respondent notes three specific corrections and revisions.	The Council thanks the respondent for noting these omissions. The net-zero reference had been corrected post Reg18. The UDC Community Engagement Protocol is still in draft format and will be reviewed during the examination period. Finally, there is no reference to the UQRP, it is stated as a sub-panel of the Essex Quality Review Panel in parenthesis.
ANON-QNH5-RD4R-R	Roy Warren	On behalf of an Organisation	Sport England	Active Design	The respondent supports the policy in relation to the delivery of new healthy and active communities within the allocation. The respondent states that the design of new communities should take cognisance of the 'Active Design' guide, also embedded within the Essex Design Guide. The policy is considered to meet the test of soundness and would comply with para. 96c of the NPPF.	Support for this policy is noted.

## Core Policy 52a: Good Design Outcomes and Process for Strategic Allocations

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD4S-S	Bill Critchley	Individual / member of the public		Community Engagement	The respondent notes a number of errors within the plan (identified elsewhere) but primarily comments in relation to community engagement, suggesting that applicants should include within their submission a copy of consultation work conducted and an analysis of same.	The policy states that community engagement must adhere to national and local guidance when conducting community engagement, such as the MHCLG PPG18 Design: process and tools. This will ensure that applicants must be fair and transparent in their representation of the community engagement process.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon	Design Codes	Respondents suggest that the requirement for strategic sites to prepare a design code is unjustified and lacks flexibility. Other respondents suggest that preparing Design Codes for strategic is too onerous for applicants in the initial stages of the design process.	The Council does not agree with the position that Design Codes (or demonstration of compliance with the Uttlesford Design Code) at an early stage in the design is unnecessary. The purpose of these design codes is to establish early on the that the out-turn schemes will be able to deliver the expected level of design quality, rather than assume that this can be delivered later based on a set of design principles that may or may not have been tested. The Council would expect strategically significant sites to demonstrate their compliance with the Council's ambitions for high-quality design at an early stage. The Site Development Templates policy states a requirement for; 'A site-specific Design Code or a detailed Design & Access Statement that demonstrates how the proposals comply with Uttlesford's own Design Code (Uttlesford Design Code – July 2024 or its successor) and how the proposed development will create a successful and well-considered place with high quality homes and supporting infrastructure.' Additionally, Core policy 52, part xi states that major development schemes should either prepare Design Codes and Masterplans to demonstrate compliance with the policy or through other means, such as within the Design & Access Statement. Therefore, the council believes there is sufficient flexibility within the policy wording to allow applicants to demonstrate compliance through a variety of means, appropriate to the scale of development proposed.
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDRA-5	Robert Barber	On behalf of an Organisation	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern			
ANON-QNH5-RDRS-Q	Richard Agnew	On behalf of an Organisation	Gladman Developments Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDNM-D	Graham Mott	On behalf of an Organisation	Elsenham Parish Council	Design Requirements	The respondent suggests that the requirements proposed for strategic sites should be used for all development above 6 dwellings.	The Council believes that the strategic allocations should be subject to the most stringent design-quality requirements and that is why the policy wording of 52a is proposed. There are tiered requirements for all development, major development and major development above 50 dwellings in Core Policy 52, which, in our opinion, provides sufficient design requirement strata for all scales of development. The proposed threshold of 6 dwellings does not fit within the Council's own definition of development scales; under 10 dwellings being considered minor development and over 10 being considered major development.
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd	Design Review	The respondent suggests that the requirement for strategic sites to undergo a design review process is unjustified.	The Council has developed its own Design Code and established its own design review panel (UQRP) as part of its ambitions to secure high-quality and well-designed development within the district. The Design Code sets our expectations for good design based on a recognised national methodology (NDG & NMDC) and the UQRP brings independent design critique to strategically significant projects (as well as non-strategic projects not described within this policy). The Design Code and UQRP work together and are not considered to be mutually exclusive, therefore the Council believes the use of design review panels for strategically important sites to be valid and justified.
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon	Development Frameworks	The respondent considers the requirement to provide Development Framework for strategic sites is unnecessary as the site development templates provide development frameworks and that developers / promoters should prepare masterplans instead.	The masterplans set out within the site development templates are noted as indicative and so these development frameworks may be used to bring forward schemes on strategic sites, however, if any variance to these frameworks is proposed, then the Council believes that it is only appropriate to do so by demonstrating the proposed variance through a new development framework. In any event, schemes that come forward on strategic sites should, at the earliest stages of design (such as an outline application), be able to demonstrate to the local authority the sitewide vision for the scheme and illustrate this vision through a masterplan or development framework relative to the size of the site coming forwards.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support of policy	The representation states support for the policy and considers it to be sound.	Support for this policy is noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDYM-R	Brian Flynn	On behalf of an Organisation	Bloor Homes (Agent: Carter Jonas)			
ANON-QNH5-RDZX-4	Johnathan Dixon	On behalf of an Organisation	Savills on behalf of Audley End Estate			
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes			

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDY7-2	Matt Verlander	On behalf of an Organisation	Avison Young	Utilities Infrastructure	The respondent on behalf of a national utilities infrastructure provider suggest the inclusion of wording in respect of utilities within sites.	The Council acknowledges the significance of due cognisance to the presence of major utilities infrastructure within strategic sites and will revise the policy to include the suggested wording.
ANON-QNH5-RD6J-J	Matt Verlander	On behalf of an Organisation	Avison Young on behalf of the National Grid			
ANON-QNH5-RDAU-8	Alex Cole	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd	Flexibility of policy	The respondent suggests that core policy 52a should only apply to strategic projects ‘where appropriate’.	The Council believes that major applications for strategic sites should deliver the highest possible standards of design. This would entail suitable community engagement, peer review of design proposals and a clearly articulated design vision and demonstration of Design Code compliance. As such, it is difficult to envision a major strategic project that would not need to provide this level of engagement or design scrutiny and therefore the Council believes the current wording is appropriate. Adding a suffix to the policy of ‘where appropriate’ would lead to ambiguity around the application of the policy and the aim of the policy is to provide clarity around requirements and expectations.

## Development Policy 09: Public Art

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon	Public Art - Funding & Delivery	Several respondents state that there is no detail within policy on how public art contributions will be calculated or how projects will be delivered. One respondent suggests that the Council is best placed to manage public art and that public art may not be required to be included within development proposals. One respondent suggests that this requirement does not meet the relevant tests for planning obligations.	The Council considers the policy as drafted is a reasonable approach to make provision for some contributions to public art, albeit that details would be considered on a case by case basis. However, the Council would not object to considering a modification to DP9 should this be considered helpful.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council			
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes			
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDAU-8	Alex Cole	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd			

## Core Policy 53: Standards for New Residential Development

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd	Additional Evidence Required	The comment states that additional evidence is required to justify the inclusion of Core Policy 53, especially evidence that considers need, viability, and a consideration of site specifics. One comment states that the Council's Local Housing Needs Assessment does not provide justification for the proposed M4(3) requirement and that this should be reduced to 5% for market homes and 10% for affordable homes.	The Council have published a number of evidence documents in support of the new Local Plan. Principally, the Local Housing Need Assessment (LHNA) highlights the trend towards an ageing population within the District, resulting in a clear need to increase the supply of accessible and adaptable dwellings and wheelchair user dwellings. The exact scale of future need is highlighted in more detail within the assessment itself.
ANON-QNH5-RDRA-5	Robert Barber	On behalf of an Organisation	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern			The LHNA suggests that between 5-10% of all new homes should achieve M4(3) standards, however, the policy requirement relates to major development only. Therefore a higher percentage is required to ensure that overall



Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						<p>needs are met.</p> <p>In terms of viability, the M4(2) and M4(3) requirements were factored into the assumptions which underpinned the Council's Viability Assessment and are therefore appropriately considered.</p> <p>Lastly, on site specifics, the Core Policy 53 makes explicit provision for the requirement to not apply in instances where it is not practically achievable or financially viable. This provides for a nuanced approach which is sensitive to site specifics issues, either on the ground or in relation to costs.</p>
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Application of Table 11.1	1) One comment queries how Table 11.1 will be applied? Why do the columns not add up to 100% vertically?	<p>1) The columns are not intended to add up to 100% vertically, rather the percentages should be viewed horizontally. The table applies in such a way that, development proposals for market housing should deliver 25% as 1-2 bedroom homes, 45% as 3 bedroom homes, and 30% as 4+ bedroom homes. This same principle applies to the different types of housing addressed in the subsequent rows, albeit with a different split being required.</p> <p>2) The table, taken directly from the Council's most recent Local Housing Needs Assessment, requests a large proportion of older persons homes to be 1-bed. The remainder is then anticipated to be distributed across a variety of sizes to cater to a variety of needs.</p>
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council		2) Another comment questions whether this table incorrectly implies 3 and 4+ bedroom are preferable for older people.	
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Distribution of Housing Types	Page 249 should reference the need to ensure an appropriate distribution of house types and sizes across a development.	The Council consider the supporting text to adequately cover the intent of Core Policy 53. Detailed design policy and guidance is stated in Core Policy 52 and the Uttlesford Design Code, including on the appropriate distribution of housing.
ANON-QNH5-RDDJ-Z	Mark Behrendt	On behalf of an Organisation	Home Builders Federation	Flexibility on Housing Mix Requirement	<p>Some comments state that Core Policy 53 should provide greater flexibility to ensure that a deviation from the most recent Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) housing mix is acceptable where it is justified by site-specific circumstances or robust evidence. It is noted that the LHNA is not a Development Plan document and cannot be given that status.</p> <p>One comment supports the policy's existing flexibility in relation to the LHNA housing mix, but notes it will be important to adequately account for new evidence which reflects the changing market conditions.</p>	<p>The Council consider that, with regards to policy flexibility, exemptions from the housing mix standard already exist for both viability constraints and for site specific circumstances where "an alternative approach can be demonstrated to be more appropriate." This could include scenarios such as a physical/environmental constraint or a preferable alternative mix desired within a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The policy does not seek to give the LHNA Development Plan status, rather it utilises the evidence to adopt a housing mix standard which is flexible enough to respond to future market conditions as may be set out in updated iterations of the evidence.</p>
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDWQ-T	Amy Lomath	On behalf of an Organisation	Taylor Wimpey			
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes			
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Flexibility on M4(2) and M4(3) Standard	1) One comment requests text to show consistency with the Planning Practice Guidance and that the Council should note that the M4(2) and M4(3) requirement is flexible in instances where site topography or vulnerability to flooding may indicate this type of housing is less suitable.	<p>1) The policy already accounts for practical barriers to the provision of M4(2) housing, further, the Planning Practice Guidance is a material consideration in any future planning decisions and does not need reiterating within the policy itself. This change is therefore unnecessary.</p> <p>2) As stated by other consultation responses, national policy and guidance allows for deviation from M4(2) requirements in specific instances. The Council are therefore of the opinion that the current wording is correct.</p>
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council		2) Another comment requests a change to the supporting text (paragraph 11.23) to state that the Council 'requires' compliance with the M4(2) requirement, rather than 'expects'.	
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Gated Communities	Reference should be added to paragraph 11.19 that gated communities should be avoided.	Core Policy 52 provides a list of design requirements for new development, which requires integrated movement networks and public spaces to facilitate social interaction. This policy requirement would establish resistance to the creation of gated communities through new development.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Live/Work Units	One comment suggests the removal of the reference to live/work units, stating that these are not typically retained and are instead converted fully to residential. Another comment suggests the reference to live/work	The Council consider the policy support for live/work units a proportionate response to accommodating flexible working arrangements. No prescriptive requirement for such units is made, therefore supply will largely be market led. The support for live/work units does not supersede the requirement for new developments to meet the preferred housing mix set out within the policy.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes		units should be flexible enough to encourage these units only 'where feasible'.	
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Priority for M4(3)(b) Dwellings	The Council should amend Core Policy 53 to ensure that new M4(3)(b) dwellings are prioritised when negotiating Section 106 affordable housing contributions.	The Council has demonstrated a clear intent to prioritise wheelchair accessible housing at affordable rates. This is demonstrated by the higher proportion of M4(3)(b) housing being required (20%) when compared to the market housing equivalent (10%). The Council consider that the current policy requirements are appropriate.
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Supported Housing	The comment notes that paragraph 11.16 and 11.17 should refer to both specialist and supported housing, for clarity.	Noted. The Council will make this modification.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Supportive of Core Policy 53	Comments provide general support for the provisions of Core Policy 53.	The comments of support are acknowledged and appreciated.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDNM-D	Graham Mott	On behalf of an Organisation	Elsenham Parish Council	Undersupply of Bungalows	One comment notes that Uttlesford have placed insufficient importance on the need to deliver a greater proportion of new housing as bungalows to support the ageing population. It is proposed that Core Policy 53 be amended to include a requirement for 7.5% of all new homes to be delivered as bungalows in order to meet the need identified in the Local Housing Needs Assessment.	<p>The comment is noted, and the Council are actively seeking to improve the availability of accessible accommodation for the District's ageing population. Indeed, Core Policy 53 sets out the requirement for all new dwellings to be accessible via wheelchair (Building Regulations standard M4(2)) and 10% of all new dwellings to be suitable, or easily adaptable, for wheelchair user occupation (Building Regulations standard M4(3)).</p> <p>This policy therefore requires a sizeable contribution from new development towards meeting the needs of elderly residents who wish to preserve their independent living status. The policy does not explicitly mention bungalows as the application of M4(2) and M4(3) standards is a more stringent and uniform approach.</p>

## Core Policy 54: Supported and Specialist Housing

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDYM-R	Brian Flynn	On behalf of an Organisation	Bloor Homes (Agent: Carter Jonas)	Practicality of Specialist Housing Requirement	<p>The Council should not rely on strategic sites to deliver specialist accommodation and instead sufficient specialist accommodation allocations should be made. One comment notes that the Elsenham allocation would only deliver 6 specialist units which is insufficient to attract a specialist operator.</p> <p>The care related requirements of such housing, including on-site facilities and personnel has not been adequately considered, especially for the provision of 'extra care' units.</p> <p>It is unclear how the Council's Viability Assessment has calculated a 7.5 % assumed build cost for specialist housing.</p>	<p>The Council note that specialist and supported housing comes in a variety of forms with a varying degree of healthcare provision. Not all forms will require a specialist operator and some, such as age restricted market housing may be more appropriate where sites cannot achieve the critical mass required to support a healthcare element.</p> <p>Market value research and the professional experiences of Dixon Searle Partnership has informed the build costs, which are notably flagged as assumptions, as is proportionate at a more strategic plan-making stage.</p>
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDRA-5	Robert Barber	On behalf of an Organisation	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern			
ANON-QNH5-RDRS-Q	Richard Agnew	On behalf of an Organisation	Gladman Developments Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council			

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD1X-U	Rachael Donovan	On behalf of an Organisation	NHS Hertfordshire and West Essex	Specialist Housing Developer Contributions	The supporting text should clarify that for planning applications relating to specialist housing, the NHS will seek developer contributions to mitigate the impact on local service provision.	Acknowledged, however, the Local Plan notes within Core Policy 5 that new development will be subject to infrastructure contributions, including in relation to healthcare. The proposed change does not impact upon the function of Core Policy 54.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Supportive of Core Policy 54	The comments provide support for the provisions of Core Policy 54, however, one comment notes that this support does not extend to the allocation for specialist housing at Great Dunmow.	The comment in support of the policy as written is noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon			
ANON-QNH5-RDTZ-Z	Stacey Rawlings	On behalf of an Organisation	Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd on behalf of Catesby land Promotions Ltd	Types of Specialist/Supported Housing	Comments note the need to include explicit reference to a variety of types of specialists and supported housing. This includes the provision of: - single-storey accommodation without an element of care where a care element would be unsuitable; - sheltered housing for adults with learning difficulties; - housing for victims of domestic abuse; - housing for those leaving care or prison institutions; - children's housing for looked after children; and - supported housing for the homeless.	Acknowledged. An amendment is proposed to the glossary to ensure the various types of specialists and supported housing is highlighted and supported through Core Policy 54.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council			
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council			

## Core Policy 55: Residential Space Standards

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd	Additional Evidence Required	Additional evidence is required by the Council to justify the policy requirement for new development to meet Nationally Described Space Standards.	Noted. The Council have prepared a Viability Assessment which factors new dwellings being built to Nationally Described Space Standards into its assumptions, thus confirming that the policy does not implicate development viability.
ANON-QNH5-RDDJ-Z	Mark Behrendt	On behalf of an Organisation	Home Builders Federation			
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes			
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDRS-Q	Richard Agnew	On behalf of an Organisation	Gladman Developments Ltd			



Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDNM-D	Graham Mott	On behalf of an Organisation	Elsenham Parish Council	Stringency of Policy	One comment notes that the policy is too loosely worded in referring to the Uttlesford Design Code. Specifically, a modification is proposed that would require developments to deliver 25sqm of private communal space regardless of whether or not the development lies within 400m of a public open space.	The proposed modification relates to a separate document, the Uttlesford Design Code, which was informed by consultation, research and best practice, and was published as a supplementary planning document in July 2024. It is deemed that this is an up to date document that provides clarity on achieving high quality design through the planning process. The Local Plan seeks to utilise rather than supersede this design code which is new and accurately reflects the Council's design ambitions.
ANON-QNH5-RDN3-K	Edward Gildea	On behalf of an Organisation	Uttlesford Green Party	Supportive of Core Policy 55	General support is given to the provisions of Core Policy 55.	The Council acknowledge the comment of support.

## Core Policy 56: Affordable Dwellings

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDRA-5	Robert Barber	On behalf of an Organisation	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern	Cumulative Impact of Policy Requirement s	It is noted that the Local Plan establishes a number of policy requirements that will have implications for a developments viability, including the Core Policy 56 affordable housing requirement and the Core Policy 22 net zero operational carbon requirement. The financial implications of these requirements must be test holistically.	Noted. The Council's Viability Assessment has factored each of the Local Plan's requirements into its calculations as to whether development across the District will remain viable. It is considered that the appropriate balance between infrastructure contributions, environmental standards, and housing affordability has been struck to deliver the greatest social gain whilst ensuring development remains viable.
ANON-QNH5-RDWU-X	Tara Lewis	On behalf of an Organisation	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Salacia Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd	Distribution of Affordable homes	1) One comment seeks a modification to the policy so that only 'where possible', is the distribution of affordable homes in groups not larger than 10 required. Moreover, another comment states that registered providers of affordable housing often prefer the housing to be grouped together, especially in flatted developments, for ease of management. A limit on affordable housing clusters could threaten interest in affordable housing delivery from providers. 2) Other comments ask for the inclusion of a clear number or percentage of dwellings that can be located together before it is considered inappropriate clustering.	1) In relation to the first points, Core Policy 56 sets out the Council's ambition to ensure that affordable dwellings are appropriately distributed and a numerical limit on clusters is helpful for applicants and decision takers in determining what an 'appropriate distribution' entails. The inclusion of a caveat that this is only required 'where possible' would undermine the policies intent in providing resistance against inappropriate clustering. Whilst this policy sets clear expectations for the distribution of affordable homes, if there are material considerations which would justify a deviation from this standard, there is nothing preventing these from being raised at application stage. Such considerations could include a lack of interest from registered provides unless a specific grouping of affordable housing is met. This approach is reflective of the legal basis for decision taking held by Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. 2) A numerical limit of 10 is already stated within the policy.
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon			
ANON-QNH5-RDWQ-T	Amy Lomath	On behalf of an Organisation	Taylor Wimpey			
ANON-QNH5-RD39-X	Higgins Group	On behalf of an Organisation	Boyer on behalf of Higgins Group	Dynamic Affordable Housing Requirement	Concern is raised that the affordable housing requirement could change over the plan period without prior consultation or examination.	There is no provision within the policy for such a change to occur. Any amended policy requirement would need to come forward through a Local Plan Review.
ANON-QNH5-RD13-P	Rachel Bryan	On behalf of an Organisation	Rachel Bryan on behalf of The Hargrove Family	Emerging National Policy	The Council should be delayed to take account of emerging national policy and the proposed higher housing requirement to ensure local affordable housing needs are met.	The Government, within their proposed national policy, have set out clear transitional arrangements for draft Local Plans that are substantively progressed. The Council are proceeding in accordance with these arrangements and further delays in the adoption of a new Local Plan would not be conducive to greater housing delivery.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDUP-Q	Loftus Buhagiar	Individual / member of the public		Exceptions Based on Viability	One comment queries the inclusion of a provision within the policy which allows for developers to reduce the percentage of affordable homes being provided if they can demonstrate it is unviable. Another comment states that the policy is not effective as the provision of affordable housing is always subject to site specific viability discussions and that therefore, a one size fits all approach is not appropriate.	As part of the examination of the Local Plan, the plan will be tested for conformity with National Policy and guidance. On viability, the Government's Planning Practice Guidance is clear that, where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that fully comply with them should be assumed to be viable. However it also notes that, at application stage, the applicant may demonstrate that particular circumstances justify a site-specific viability assessment and that based on this assessment, a deviation from the policy requirement may be allowed. Core Policy 56 has therefore been written to establish a clear requirement which is reflective of the local need demonstrated within the evidence base, but it also is compliant with national policy in that caveats exist to allow for site specific viability discussions at application stage. The policy as drafted is considered to be a balanced approach that mediates the need for a clear affordable housing standard, whilst also providing flexibility for site specific discussions.
ANON-QNH5-RD39-X	Higgins Group	On behalf of an Organisation	Boyer on behalf of Higgins Group			
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd	Flexibility of First Homes Requirement	Some comments note that criterion i) of the policy should allow for full flexibility between the delivery of First Homes or shared ownership products.	On the 24th May 2021, a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) was published which remains extant policy against which the Local Plan will be tested for conformity. This WMS details that a minimum of 25% of all affordable housing units secured through developer contributions should be First Homes.  Core Policy 56 as currently drafted seeks to discharge this requirement, whilst allowing for flexibility to deliver alternative affordable home ownership products and also meeting the clear need for social and affordable rented properties as demonstrated by the Council's Local Housing Need Assessment. It is not considered that any further flexibility within the policy would be consistent with the extant WMS.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Genuinely Affordable Housing	It is not clear how the policy reduces the average median house price in the District, which is presently very high and far exceeds the national average.	The Council seek to reduce house prices in the District in the following ways: - Establishing new allocations for strategic residential developments that will support a consistent supply of new homes, thereby mitigating costs associated with scarcity. - Establishing new standards for residential developments whereby a greater proportion of new homes are delivered as 1, 2, and 3 bedroom properties, which are more suitable for first time buyers or those looking to downsize. - Setting an affordable housing standard whereby 35% of all new homes delivered on major (10 homes or more) sites are required to deliver a mixture of tenures. This will include homes for purchase that are sold at a discounted rate, but more critically, a priority towards the delivery of social rented and affordable rented properties, which are the most genuinely affordable types of new homes.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Interaction with Core Policy 53	Within Core Policy 56, there is duplication of the housing mix and accessibility standards held within Core Policy 53	The Council do not consider there to be duplication between the requirements set out in relation to affordable housing in Core Policy 56, and the broader housing standards set out in Core Policy 53.
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Interaction with Core Policy 54	There is a need for Extra Care units to be delivered at Social Rented levels of affordability. The Local Plan should support Extra Care units across a range of tenures.	Acknowledged. Core Policy 54 is clear that that, wherever possible, specialist forms of housing should be delivered in accordance with the affordable housing requirement set out in Core Policy 56. This interaction therefore outlines the Council's support for specialist housing (including Extra Care) at a variety of tenures, particularly prioritising Social Rent levels.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Local Housing Needs Assessment	The Council's Local Housing Needs Assessment highlights the acute need for affordable housing in sustainable locations to help alleviate rising prices due to out-migration from London. As such the early delivery of sites must be prioritised.	Acknowledged. The Council, by planning for some headroom above the local housing need figure, will ensure a steady delivery of housing over the plan period. Core policy 56 will require a large proportion of this to be affordable housing of a variety of forms in order to meet the acute needs highlighted.
ANON-QNH5-RDA3-6	Hyacynth Cabiles	On behalf of an Organisation	NHS Property Services (NHSPS)	NHS - Affordable	The availability of affordable housing in the right locations is important for the NHS's ability to recruit and retain staff at specific workplaces. In tandem with additional housing growth, additional health services will	In preparing evidence which calculates Uttlesford's local housing need, the Government sets out the 'Standard Method' by which these needs should be assessed. The Council has prepared its evidence on housing need in accordance with this 'Standard Method', as is required. However, to ensure an appropriate supply of housing,

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				Housing for NHS Staff	be required meaning proportionate increases in NHS staff will be required. The Council should engage with the NHS and its partners to ensure that the need for NHS housing is factored into the Local Housing Needs Assessment and other evidence documents. Further, site selections should address the identified need, particularly in relation to nearby large healthcare employers.	the Council have allocated sufficient sites to provide an approximate 10% buffer over the calculated local housing need. This, in combination with 35% of all major residential sites being delivered as affordable housing, will provide a variety of housing opportunities for NHS workers, including through a mixture of affordable tenures. Over the plan period, sites for major residential development will be distributed throughout the District, but with the vast majority being delivered within Uttlesford's key settlements, local rural centres, and larger villages. Consequently, new affordable housing provision will be located in close proximity to existing healthcare employers, as well as at Takeley where a new health facility forms part of the overall allocation. The Council will continue to liaise with the NHS in the lead in to the examination of the Local Plan, to ensure its needs can be met as part of the joint Duty to Cooperate.
ANON-QNH5-RD1X-U	Rachael Donovan	On behalf of an Organisation	NHS Hertfordshire and West Essex	NHS - Policy Clarification	Request for the policy to specifically refer to key worker housing when addressing what comprises 'affordable housing'.	It is not considered necessary to update the policy wording to refer to key worker housing, as it is already adequately addressed in the supporting text.
ANON-QNH5-RDYU-Z	Louise Pepper	Individual / member of the public		Percentage of Affordable Homes	The proposed affordable housing ratio of 35% is insufficient and should be increased, taking account of the present housing crisis. One comment notes that an increase to 40% (including social and affordable rent, affordable home ownership, and affordable homes for disabled residents) would be consistent with the NPPF and would be representative of local needs. The comment notes the need for affordable homes demonstrated within the West Essex and East Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).	The Council is proposing to plan for some 'headroom' of additional housing that is above Uttlesford's assessed need (derived through the standard method). As such, it is the case that 35% of a higher figure will deliver more affordable housing, than 40% of a lower figure, whilst also balancing a range of other factors, such as ensuring developers deliver appropriate infrastructure and environmental standards Underpinning the Local Plan is the Council's Local Housing Need Assessment (LHNA), which sets out a more recent and focused (to Uttlesford) assessment of housing needs than the West Essex and East Hertfordshire SHMA. The Council's LHNA sets out the projected housing needs for a variety of social groups which the Local Plan has sought to respond through a range of new policies. This includes a mix of affordable housing with a high proportion of affordable rent (Core Policy 56), more small-medium sized dwellings and wheelchair accessible dwellings (Core Policy 53), and new specialist/supported housing to support the ageing population (Core Policy 54).
ANON-QNH5-RDDG-W	Jane Sharp	Individual / member of the public				
ANON-QNH5-RDWQ-T	Amy Lomath	On behalf of an Organisation	Taylor Wimpey	Policy Exemptions	One comment notes that the policy as written is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 66) as the policy does not reiterate the exemptions from the minimum 10% affordable housing requirement held in national policy.	Core Policy 56 as written does not contradict or nullify the provisions of paragraph 66 of the NPPF. There is no inherent need to duplicate the provisions of the NPPF which will be a material consideration in future planning decisions in any event. There are several examples of affordable housing planning policies having been found sound at examination without duplicating this information. In response to the second point, national policy and guidance require local planning policies to provide flexibility with regards to affordable housing requirements. This includes instances where affordable housing provision may affect overall viability. Consequently, the policy builds in an element of flexibility on the delivery of on-site affordable housing (as required) whilst ensuring that this is only justified where the a satisfactory and procedurally compliant viability assessment has been submitted to the Council.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council		Another comment states that whilst the proposed mix and distribution of affordable housing is supported, the potential for developers to pay a financial contribution in-lieu of on-site affordable housing should be removed.	
ANON-QNH5-RD4S-S	Bill Critchley	Individual / member of the public		Prioritisation of Brownfield Land	It is suggested that in order to incentivise the delivery of more brownfield sites for redevelopment, a lower affordable housing requirement could apply to such sites.	On the potential for a reduced affordable housing requirement on brownfield sites, Core Policy 56 includes a provision whereby a reduced requirement can be acceptable on grounds of viability. Brownfield land typically has increased development costs (owing to the need to remediate the site) which can affect the viability calculation for the site. As such, promoters of brownfield land could potentially argue for a reduced affordable housing requirement on a case by case basis, however, a lesser requirement is not provided as standard to ensure that the delivery of much needed affordable homes is not compromised.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD3H-D	Kim Rickards	On behalf of an Organisation	Durkan Estates Ltd	Support for Core Policy 56	Comments which are supportive, in principle, of a policy which seeks to deliver affordable homes that address local needs.	The Council acknowledge the comments detailing general support.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council		Some comments note that the policy as written is robust/sound and that they welcome the stated tenure mix and flexibility built into the policy.	
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon			
ANON-QNH5-RDRT-R	Tracy Coston	On behalf of an Organisation	Littlebury Parish Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDRS-Q	Richard Agnew	On behalf of an Organisation	Gladman Developments Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council			
ANON-QNH5-RD6D-C	Sophie Innes	On behalf of an Organisation	Dianthus Land Ltd			

### Core Policy 57: Sub-Division of Dwellings and Houses in Multiple Occupation

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

### Core Policy 58: Custom and Self-Build Housing

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDYM-R	Brian Flynn	On behalf of an Organisation	Bloor Homes (Agent: Carter Jonas)	Additional Evidence Needed	It is noted that, from the Council's most recent Self and Custom Build Register, the need for new Custom and Self Build plots is being met by single building permissions. It is therefore suggested that there is not an evidenced demand for additional Custom and Self Build plots which would justify the policy. If the Council consider there to be demand, it should include additional allocations to deliver specifically Custom and Self Build proposals.	Firstly, it is important to note that since the introduction of the Levelling up and Regeneration Act in 2023, Local Planning Authorities are no longer allowed to count permissions for single dwellings as part of the supply of self/custom build housing within the Custom and Self Build Register, unless they are explicitly shown to meet this status. This means that the supply of Custom and Self Build housing on the register will likely fall over the Local Plan period.  Additionally, Core Policy 58 includes a caveat that strategic scale sites need only comply with the 5% Custom/Self Build requirement where there is a demonstrable need for new plots on the register. The policy is therefore evidence and flexible to future market conditions.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes			
ANON-QNH5-RDRA-5	Robert Barber	On behalf of an Organisation	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern			
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Co-housing Reference	Reference should be made to 'co-housing', which comprises private homes specialised for intergenerational communities with shared facilities.	The Council do not consider that a reference to co-housing proposals is necessary. Significant flexibility on design and specification is afforded to Self and Custom housing builders.



Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Town Council					
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Construction Practicalities	There are practical issues affecting health and safety which arise from having multiple contractors working on-site and it is difficult to accommodate the development of single plots by individuals.	As part of any detailed planning approvals, a Construction Environment Management Plan will be conditioned and will need to be submitted and approved by the Council prior to the commencement of development. This document will need to coordinate the construction process across site (or relevant phase of a site) including how health and safety risks will be mitigated. It is not uncommon for a site to have more than a single developer and it is for developer(s) to coordinate an acceptable approach to site construction management.
ANON-QNH5-RDTZ-Z	Stacey Rawlings	On behalf of an Organisation	Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd on behalf of Catesby land Promotions Ltd	Custom and Self Build Exception Sites	Core Policy 58 should provide an exception which would facilitate Custom and Self Build homes at the edge of existing settlements where a demand is shown to exist. This would help to deliver housing in locations that would otherwise not be developed for standard residential proposals.	Through the proposed Spatial Strategy, the Council are seeking to set clear parameters for the locations and scenarios in which speculative residential growth will be permissible. This is supported by reducing the number of policy exceptions to the proposed spatial strategy as possible. Therefore, a policy exception which would allow Custom and Self Build housing on sites that would otherwise be inappropriate for residential development is not sought.
ANON-QNH5-RDAY-C	Samuel Bampton	On behalf of an Organisation	Pelham Structures Ltd			
ANON-QNH5-RDAY-C	Samuel Bampton	On behalf of an Organisation	Pelham Structures Ltd	Existing Custom and Self Build Permissions	The Council should allocate two permitted sites UTT/22/2035/FUL & UTT/21/2719/FUL to ensure they are delivered as Custom and Self build.	As the sites in question are already consented, there is little value in proposing them as allocations within the Local Plan.
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon	Plot Passports	The requirement for Plot Passports for individual plots on larger schemes is onerous. One comment suggests that design principles could be more easily established through Parameter Plans or through planning condition. Another comment suggests that, instead, a design code should accompany the application, but that this should only apply to applications with more than 10 self/custom build plots.	The requirement for plot passports is an important feature of Core Policy 58 which ensures that, where multiple Custom or Self Build plots are proposed, clear parameters for the units are confirmed at Outline stage. This is important for future Custom and Self Build developers that may take on responsibility for the plots to progress to Reserved Matters stage, so that they have a clear understanding of the limits of what will be accepted. Whilst this is required for each individual plot, there is no inherent requirement that the plot passports for each plot will be fundamentally different, rather, they may have a high degree of similarity. However, individual plot passports provide the flexibility to tweak the parameters of individual plots where its location may necessitate this. It is not considered that the alternatives suggested achieve this same degree of flexibility.
ANON-QNH5-RDTZ-Z	Stacey Rawlings	On behalf of an Organisation	Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd on behalf of Catesby land Promotions Ltd			

## Core Policy 59: The Metropolitan Green Belt

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	Green Belt - Bishops Stortford	It is suggested that the Plan does not make sufficient provision for new employment land and provides details of an omission site close to Bishops Stortford that could meet the described shortfall. This provision could assist the neighbouring authority and so as the Plan does not release land from the Green Belt for this additional employment site to meet additional need and for a neighbouring authority, it is suggested that Plan is unsound. Details are provided for the omission site which are stated to only contribute partially to one of the Green Belt Purposes.	The Local Plan fully meets the identified employment need with some over-provision. The Council has not been asked to consider any employment need for neighbouring authorities, although it should be noted that Stansted Airport includes substantial employment provision that has a wider role and is considered out-with the Uttlesford need, thus there is already a substantial contribution to the needs of the wider area. The Council's approach to Green Belt is addressed in relation to other responses.
ANON-QNH5-RD4S-S	Bill Critchley	Individual / member of the public		Green Belt - Changes to National Policy	It is suggested that the Local Plan should reflect the 2024 proposals to amend the NPPF, including changes to Green Belt policy, including to make greater use of what is described as the grey belt. It is suggested that we are preserving poor quality agricultural land whilst being forced to build on good quality agricultural land. It is suggested that the blanket decision not to demonstrate exceptional	The proposed changes to the NPPF include clear transitional arrangements where Local Plans at Reg 19 stage (or beyond) at the time the new NPPF is adopted, and where the annual increase in housing numbers is less than 200 (in Uttlesford the annual increase is 74); the Plan should be examined under the existing (expected to be previous) NPPF. The existing NPPF is clear that 'exceptional circumstances' are needed to justify development in the Green Belt and that non-Green Belt alternatives should have been considered first. As there are plenty of non-Green Belt sites available across Uttlesford, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to



Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					circumstances because the majority of the district is not washed over by Green Belt and because there are alternative, non-Green Belt sites available, is at the cost of not pursuing a sustainable spatial strategy. Reference is made to the draft NPPF that proposes changes to national policy relating to Green Belt. Detail is provided explaining why the omission site in question could contribute towards sustainable development.	seek to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances'. Furthermore, the Council is satisfied the Spatial Strategy fully supports sustainable development appropriately. The Council are committed to preparing a plan review quickly (commencing c. 2026 with adoption c. 203) and that will provide an opportunity to consider the Green Belt again in light of whatever is the final form of the updated NPPF policies.
ANON-QNH5-RDWK-M	Neil Waterson	On behalf of an Organisation	Neil Waterson on behalf of Adrian Fox City and Country	Green Belt - Changes to National Policy	It is suggested that the Local Plan should reflect the 2024 proposals to amend the NPPF, including changes to Green Belt policy, including to make greater use of what is described as the grey belt. It is suggested that we are preserving poor quality agricultural land whilst being forced to build on good quality agricultural land. It is suggested that the blanket decision not to demonstrate exceptional circumstances because the majority of the district is not washed over by Green Belt and because there are alternative, non-Green Belt sites available, is at the cost of not pursuing a sustainable spatial strategy. Reference is made to the draft NPPF that proposes changes to national policy relating to Green Belt. Detail is provided explaining why the omission site in question could contribute towards sustainable development.	The proposed changes to the NPPF include clear transitional arrangements where Local Plans at Reg 19 stage (or beyond) at the time the new NPPF is adopted, and where the annual increase in housing numbers is less than 200 (in Uttlesford the annual increase is 74); the Plan should be examined under the existing (expected to be previous) NPPF. The existing NPPF is clear that 'exceptional circumstances' are needed to justify development in the Green Belt and that non-Green Belt alternatives should have been considered first. As there are plenty of non-Green Belt sites available across Uttlesford, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to seek to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances'. Furthermore, the Council is satisfied the Spatial Strategy fully supports sustainable development appropriately. The Council are committed to preparing a plan review quickly (commencing c. 2026 with adoption c. 203) and that will provide an opportunity to consider the Green Belt again in light of whatever is the final form of the updated NPPF policies.
ANON-QNH5-RDAQ-4	James Firth (Agent)	On behalf of an Organisation	Bower Croft Ltd and Oaks Croft Ltd	Green Belt - Stansted Mountfitchet	It is suggested that as the original Green Belt was identified in 1964 with no substantive review since the 2005 Plan other than a more high-level review in 2016 to inform the previous (withdrawn) Local Plan that the Green Belt boundary is out of date. Details are provided for an omission site that is considered to have some merit for development and contributes in a limited way to the purposes of the Green Belt. It is suggested that without an updated and comprehensive review of the Green Belt, the plan is unsound and does not support sustainable development.	The NPPF is clear at Paragraph 145 that once established: 'there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified'. Furthermore, at Paragraph 146 that: 'before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development'. A review of the Green Belt was undertaken in 2016 and an addendum to this work was carried out in 2023 to inform the currently emerging Plan. This did not identify any significant factors. As stated above, there is no requirement for the Green Belt to be reviewed at all. As has also been stated elsewhere, there is no shortage of non-Green Belt sites available for consideration in Uttlesford that support sustainable development and this considering any Green Belts in further detail is unnecessary. The proposed development to the north of Stansted Mountfitchet is c. 1 km from the town/ village centre, which is within an acceptable walking distance for some destinations and well-within an easy cycling distance for a wide range of destinations and it is located on an existing and good public transport route. Stansted Mountfitchet is the third largest settlement in Uttlesford that offers a range of services and facilities, including employment and a railway station. This proposal is considered to be sustainable and capable of being made to be even more sustainable.
ANON-QNH5-RD3M-J	Adam Davies	On behalf of an Organisation	Ceres Property on behalf of Richard Martin M Scott Properties Ltd	Green Belt - Stansted Mountfitchet	It is suggested that as the original Green Belt was identified in 1964 with no substantive review since the 2005 Plan other than a more high-level review in 2016 to inform the previous (withdrawn) Local Plan that the Green Belt boundary is out of date. Details are provided for an omission site that is considered to have some merit for development and contributes in a limited way to the purposes of the Green Belt. It is suggested that without an updated and comprehensive review of the Green Belt, the plan is unsound and does not support sustainable development.	The NPPF is clear at Paragraph 145 that once established: 'there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified'. Furthermore, at Paragraph 146 that: 'before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic-policy making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development'. A review of the Green Belt was undertaken in 2016 and an addendum to this work was carried out in 2023 to inform the currently emerging Plan. This did not identify any significant factors. As stated above, there is no requirement for the Green Belt to be reviewed at all. As has also been stated elsewhere, there is no shortage of non-Green Belt sites available for consideration in Uttlesford that support sustainable development and this

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						considering any Green Belts in further detail is unnecessary. The proposed development to the north of Stansted Mountfitchet is c. 1 km from the town/ village centre, which is within an acceptable walking distance for some destinations and well-within an easy cycling distance for a wide range of destinations and it is located on an existing and good public transport route. Stansted Mountfitchet is the third largest settlement in Uttlesford that offers a range of services and facilities, including employment and a railway station. This proposal is considered to be sustainable and capable of being made to be even more sustainable.
ANON-QNH5-RD39-X	Higgins Group	On behalf of an Organisation	Boyer on behalf of Higgins Group	Green Belt - Washed Over Settlements	It is suggested that Government is clear that Green Belt designations should be reviewed comprehensively be reviewed as part of a Local Plan process. It is suggested that the Green Belt boundaries in Uttlesford out of date and that the Plan is unsound. It is also suggested that for evidence to be robust and effective, it should start from a position of transparency and opportunity. It is stated that it cannot be justified where the Council has no plans to establish exceptional circumstances. It is also stated that the 'washed' over' settlements in the Green Belt are sustainable settlements that could support some development yet this opportunity has been discounted by the Council.	Refer to Response relating to Green Belt – Stansted Mountfitchet. The NPPF does not state that Green Belt boundaries should be comprehensively reviewed as part of the Local Plan process – the NPPF states that there is 'no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed of changed when plans are being prepared or updated'.
ANON-QNH5-RD1Q-M	clerk to Stebbing Parish Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Stebbing Parish Council	Local Green Space	It is suggested that as the Local Plan, or Policies Map, does not specifically mention Local Green Space, it is unsound, and as such, does not support Parish or Town Councils who may choose to designate Local Green Space. It is suggested that these are added to the Policies Map and that a policy is created for Local Green Space within the Local Plan.	National policy relating to Local Green Space is set out in Paragraphs 105 to 107 of the NPPF. National policy makes provision for Neighbourhoods plans to 'identify and protect' green areas of particular importance to them and where in accordance with the criteria set out by NPPF Paragraph 106. It is not necessary for Local Plans to repeat national policy, and doing so would not alter the ability of communities to designate Local Green Space in Neighbourhood Plans, where they are consistent with national policy. The Policies Map that accompanies the Local Plan includes those policies contained within the Local Plan – it does not include policies included in any Made Neighbourhood Plans, as those will differ for different areas and will change over time when new Plans are Made. Any decision making on planning applications should consider both the adopted Local Plan and relevant Made Neighbourhood Plans. The Local Plan does not seek to identify any Local Green Space, but communities are free to consider this matter through Neighbourhood Plans if they wish to.
ANON-QNH5-RD9B-D	Urška Sydee	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Hallingbury Parish Council	Boundary Changes	Objections are raised to the proposed changes to the Green Belt where planning permission has been granted in case those permissions are not implemented in full.	The changes are modest in scale and result from the Green Belt Addendum work that has informed the Local Plan. The Council is content that on the basis planning permission is granted for the sites in question it is appropriate to make the amendments.

## Core Policy 60: The Travelling Community

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDZV-2	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Chelmsford City Council	Chelmsford City Council - Acknowledgment	Chelmsford City Council acknowledge the content of Core Policy 60, but do not flag any concerns or proposed modifications.	Noted.
ANON-QNH5-RD4X-X	Sally Taylor	On behalf of an Organisation	Birchanger Parish Council	General Support	One comment provides general support to the policy provisions, including the publication of a new survey identifying Gypsy and Traveller requirements, the allocation of additional pitches, and the intention to undertake an early review of Gypsy and Traveller needs following Local Plan adoption.	The Council acknowledge and appreciate the comment of support.
ANON-QNH5-RD4X-X	Sally Taylor	On behalf of an Organisation	Birchanger Parish Council	Gypsy and Traveller Education	One comment notes that Gypsy and Traveller sites should be considered within the context of accessibility to both early years, primary, and secondary education facilities, including specialist centres, in collaboration with Essex County Council.	The Council agree that Gypsy and Traveller pitches, like general residential development, should prioritise sustainable accessibility to education. However, the Council do note that unlike most residential development, the extent of land being made available for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation is often limited. The Council

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				Requirements		will work with Essex County Council to develop options for the supply of appropriate sites to meet longer term Gypsy and Traveller needs immediately upon Local Plan adoption.
ANON-QNH5-RD4S-S	Bill Critchley	Individual / member of the public		Takeley Mobile Home Park	The comment notes that Takeley Mobile Home Park has strict requirements and benefits from Takeley Local Policy 4 within the adopted Uttlesford 2005 Local Plan. It is stated that this policy is being proposed to be replaced through the new Local Plan by Core Policy 60 and that this is incorrect as the Takeley Mobile Home Park is not a Gypsy and Traveller community.	Acknowledged. A modification to Appendix 1 of the plan will be made so that Takeley Local Policy 4 is no longer conflated with Core Policy 60. The Council will look to 'save' Takeley Local Policy 4 to ensure its requirements are retained even after the new Local Plan is adopted.
ANON-QNH5-RDT1-Q	Sharon Critchley	Individual / member of the public			A new policy is requested that covers the matters addressed in Takeley Local Policy 4, which prevents the redevelopment of the mobile home park for traditional residential development.	

## Core Policy 61: The Historic Environment

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	Historic England - Support	Historic England welcome CP61.	Noted. Support Welcome.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support	Comment received that were in support of Core Policy 61. One comment notes that it would be preferable if the policy provided even stronger protections to the historic environment, however, that the policy was 'sound' as written.	Noted. Support Welcome.
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon			
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council			

## Core Policy 62: Listed Buildings

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	Historic England - Support	Historic England welcome CP62.	Noted. Support Welcome.
ANON-QNH5-RDWV-Y	Gary Spilman	Individual / member of the public		Listed Building Consent Orders	A respondent suggests that secondary glazing, double glazed, and replacement wooden framed windows should be allowed by a Listed Building Consent Order to make improvements to windows to help meet climate targets.	The Local Plan in Chapter 9 under the Climate Change section states for Heritage Assets at para 9.31 that 'Retaining, reusing, refurbishing and retrofitting historic buildings can contribute to meeting climate targets. There can be sensitive issues that need to be addressed when it comes to improving the energy efficiency and climate resilience of heritage assets. Any schemes should have regard to the specific advice and guidance provided in the Essex Design Guide - Climate Change and the Historic Environment Essex Design Guide and/or applicable Historic England Guidance and Best Practice.' The Council is happy to include a reference to the Essex Design as part of the proposed modifications to supporting paragraph 11.66.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Policy wording	Saffron Walden Town Council believe the policy wording should be strengthened to read 'will' or 'must' instead of 'should' conserve character. A developer considers that the policy duplicates national	In the NPPF December 2023, the section on considering potential impacts para 205 to 207 in particular on heritage assets in chapter 16 conserving and enhancing the historic environment, national policy refers frequently to the word 'should'. The Council therefore considers CP62 to be NPPF compliant in this context. It is

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Town Council				policy and therefore is unnecessary and can be removed. ECC recommend adding reference to the Essex Design Guide on Climate Change and the Historic Environment to para 11.66 in the supporting text as this provides an appreciation of a whole building, fabric-lead approach. They recommend use of the word 'setting' in policy point i rather than 'curtilage' and 'context' to ensure compliance with the NPPF.	acknowledged that CP62 duplicates national policy but this is only a material consideration in decision making until the planning reforms make the new development management policies statutory. It is therefore considered appropriate to set out in the LP applicable policies of relevance to Uttlesford for clarification and is NPPF compliant.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes			
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support	Great Dunmow Town Council supports policy CP 62 and agrees it is consistent with the NPPF and thus sound.	Noted. Support Welcome.

## Core Policy 63: Conservation Areas

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	Article 4 Directions	Saffron Walden Town Council question if its the Council's intention to add to the Article 4 areas? They mention it would be helpful to add a footnote to the conservation appraisal document to para 11.74 too. Within Core Policy 63 itself they ask if this should refer to development within article 4 areas?	If the Council were to add to its list of Article 4 Directions they would follow the process set out in the supporting text and policy. In the supporting text in para 11.74 it states that 'The Council has also applied Article 4 directions in a number of settlements, as appropriate, to limit certain permitted development rights within these areas.' CP63 sets out the criteria under which planning applications in conservations areas need to comply, whether an Article 4 Direction applied or not, which is consistent with national policy and guidance. The Council agree that it would be beneficial to include a link to its website where more information can be found on the most up to date conservation appraisals.
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Conservation Area Appraisals	ECC seeks a commitment that Conservation Area Appraisal's will be updated every 5 years and reflected in both supporting text at para's 11.74 – 11.77 and Core Policy 63.	The Council are proposing a program of Conservation Area appraisal reviews following the adoption of the Local Plan. The Council considers the Policy NPPF compliant and therefore Sound as currently drafted. It should however be made clear that all the Conservation Area Appraisals will not be updated every five years, although this would be supported. Many updates will rely on communities undertaking and funding the work individually and on that basis, it is impossible for Uttlesford (or any Local Authority we are aware of) to make such a commitment.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Policy wording	A developer considers that the policy duplicates national policy and therefore is unnecessary in accordance with para 16 of the NPPF Dec 23 and can be removed.	It is acknowledged that CP63 duplicates national policy but this is only a material consideration in decision making until the planning reforms make the new development management policies statutory. It is therefore considered appropriate to set out in the Local Plan applicable policies of relevance to Uttlesford for clarification and is considered NPPF compliant.
BHLF-QNH5-RDES-A	Andrew Marsh	On behalf of an Organisation	Historic England	Support	Historic England welcome CP63 and Widdington Parish are pleased that conservation areas and protected lanes will continue to be considered important in future planning decisions. Great Dunmow Town Council supports the principles of CP63 however maintains that the policy conflicts with the site framework 3B in Appendix 3 for Church End in Great Dunmow but does consider CP63 a sound policy and compliant with national policy. Two comments were received from Little Easton Parish Council in support of CP63 sighting that the Conservation Area in Little Easton is a major visitor attraction. They reference Little Easton Manor and the Barn Theatre having been visited by Charlie Chaplin and George Bernard Shaw; and HG Wells also resided in the Conservation Area.	Noted. Support welcome. The Council consider CP63 to be NPPF compliant and therefore robustly worded for Uttlesford. In the Dunmow context, each site allocation will have a detailed masterplan and further planning application processes to go through where site specifics can be addressed, but on the whole, the Council is satisfied the allocation is policy compliant.
ANON-QNH5-RDX8-2	Katrina Levy	On behalf of an Organisation	Widdington Parish Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council			



## Core Policy 64: Archaeological Assets

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	Compliance with NPPF	Historic England appreciate the inclusion of a policy covering archaeological assets but consider the policy unsound because it doesn't align with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly regarding the treatment of designated and non-designated heritage assets. They refer to thresholds in paragraph 205 -208 of the Framework being different. They suggest Core Policy 64 should clearly state if it applies specifically to non-designated archaeology of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments. They recommend a proposed modification to Core Policy 64 on Archaeological Assets to ensure consistency with the NPPF.	Non-Designated Heritage Assets of Local Importance are covered under CP65. CP61 is the overarching heritage policy that all developments will need to comply by. It may also be useful to explain further at para 11.80 of the supporting text that 'The National Heritage List for England (NHLE) is the only official, up to date, register of all nationally protected historic buildings and sites in England - listed buildings, scheduled monuments, protected wrecks, registered parks and gardens, and battlefields.' A proposed modification has been added to the schedule included in the Councils submission pack of documents.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Removal of CP64	A developer considers that the policy duplicates national policy and therefore is unnecessary in accordance with para 16 of the NPPF Dec 23 and can be removed.	It is acknowledged that CP64 duplicates national policy, but this is only a material consideration in decision making until the planning reforms make the new development management policies statutory. It is therefore considered appropriate to set out in the LP applicable policies of relevance to Uttlesford for clarification and is NPPF compliant, not withstanding any minor additional modifications that may follow.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support	Great Dunmow Town Council welcomes and supports CP64 which they consider to be consistent with national policy and therefore sound. Little Easton Parish Council commented a couple of times supporting the policy reflecting the Archaeological Assets of St Mary's Church, 12th Century, Grade 1 building in their parish.	Noted. Support Welcome.
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council			

## Core Policy 65: Non-Designated Heritage Assets of Local Importance

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	Designated heritage assets	Historic England welcome Core Policy 65. They suggest the Plan should include specific policies for parks and gardens, similar to those for other heritage assets like listed buildings. This is because National Planning Policy makes it clear that Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens are to be regarded as being in the category of designated heritage assets of the highest significance to which the greatest weight should be given to their conservation. Additionally, they think that local authorities may create a Local List for non-designated historic parks and gardens. They recommend proposed modifications for a new Core Policy covering both Registered Parks and Gardens and non-designated historic parks and gardens be added to the Plan.	The Council agrees that including designated heritage assets as well as non-designated assets is appropriate. However, we do not believe a separate policy is necessary. CP61 is the overarching heritage policy that all developments will need to comply by, with CP65 can remain the policy for non-designated heritage assets.
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Policy wording	ECC consider that at para 11.85 the balancing exercise referred to para 209 of the NPPF but has been misquoted. They consider the balance is between the scale of harm or loss and the significance of the asset, not the significance of the harm. Therefore para 11.85 and policy need to be amended as follows: “balancing the scale of harm against the significance of the heritage asset”.	The Council is satisfied the policy wording, as amended following discussion with Historic England is appropriate.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Removal of CP64	A developer considers that the policy duplicates national policy and therefore is unnecessary in accordance with para 16 of the NPPF Dec 23 and can be removed.	It is acknowledged that CP65 duplicates national policy but this is only a material consideration in decision making until the planning reforms make the new development management policies statutory. It is therefore



Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						considered appropriate to set out in the LP applicable policies of relevance to Uttlesford for clarification and is NPPF compliant, notwithstanding any minor additional modifications that may follow.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support	Great Dunmow Town Council welcomes CP 65 but recommends it be more absolute. They do however consider the policy NPPF compliant and therefore sound. Little Easton Parish Council support CP65.	Noted.
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council			

## Core Policy 66: Planning for Health

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDW1-T	Teresa Hudson	On behalf of an Organisation	British Horse Society	Considerations of Equestrians through Open Space Assessments (British Horse Society)	<p>The British Horse Society suggests the inclusion of equestrians within open space assessments. It is estimated that there are over 37,000 horses passported to residents in Essex, contributing over £247 million per annum to the local economy and providing diverse employment opportunities. Equestrian activities in the areas around the proposed development sites are also suggested to offer an increasingly popular tourism attraction.</p> <p>The respondent also shared research undertaken by the University of Brighton and Plumpton College on the benefits of horse riding and associated activities, particularly in relation to encouraging physical activity and contributing to health targets.</p>	The Council recognises the importance of the equestrian community and has undertaken an Open Space evidence base. Core Policy 30 of the Plan seeks to protect, enhance, and promote the Public Rights of Way network, including bridleways and byways, for access to Uttlesford's unique countryside.
ANON-QNH5-RDAU-8	Alex Cole	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon (Takeley) Ltd	Health Impact Assessments (General)	A respondent supports the thrust of the policy to improve health inequality and lifestyles but considers the requirement for a full Health Impact Assessment for large schemes, without a preceding screening assessment, overly prescriptive and should be relaxed.	The Council feels that the policy approach is pragmatic and proportionate. It is asking those smaller scale schemes of 50 dwellings or more to screen developments to determine if a full HIA is needed. Their steer should be guided by the Essex Design Code Guidance on HIA and also working in partnership with the case officer. The first stage of a full HIA is assessing the scope of the HIA in context with the proposal as each will be different. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary for major developments (over 50 dwellings or 1,000 sqm) to have a separate screening process.
ANON-QNH5-RD1X-U	Rachael Donovan	On behalf of an Organisation	NHS Hertfordshire and West Essex	Health Impact Assessments (NHS Hertfordshire and West Essex)	<p>NHS Hertfordshire and West Essex raises the following concerns on Core Policy 66:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no reference within the policy or its supporting text to healthcare facilities and services and health infrastructure as 'essential' infrastructure.</li> <li>• Paragraph 11.92 requires all development to consider health impacts but does not then require an assessment of those impacts to identify a suitable level of mitigation in the form of provision of, or funding for, additional healthcare facilities and/or services, contrary to the Essex Healthy Places HIA Guidance.</li> <li>• Core Policy 66 does not represent an appropriate strategy for securing the necessary supporting infrastructure to deliver sustainable development as the list of topics to be covered in HIAs does not include an assessment of existing capacity within healthcare facilities and services that would be affected by development proposals, or an assessment of impact on these facilities arising from development proposals, or identification of the scope, scale, and nature of mitigation</li> </ul>	In relation to adding existing capacity within healthcare, this is considered unnecessary as it is covered under the third point in the policy which states 'iii. addressing local health issues, outcomes, and needs, as detailed in the JSNA'. Furthermore, it is stated as not a limited list. Regarding the specific proposed modifications to the policy, this is considered unnecessary as these are covered in other policies in the local plan and the Plan should be read as a whole. Healthcare facilities have been added to the examples of essential infrastructure listed in the supporting text for Core Policy 5.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<p>required to address these impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledgement at paragraph 11.89 that securing the delivery of new health facilities or financial contributions towards health facilities would support the ambition to address existing health inequalities is welcomed.</li> </ul>	
ANON-QNH5-RD1Q-M	clerk to Stebbing Parish Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Stebbing Parish Council	Local Green Spaces	<p>Stebbing Parish Council suggests that as the Local Plan or Policies Map does not specifically mention Local Green Space, it is unsound and does not support Parish or Town Councils who may choose to designate Local Green Space. It is suggested that these are added to the Policies Map and that a policy is created for Local Green Space within the Local Plan.</p>	<p>National policy relating to Local Green Space is set out in Paragraphs 105 to 107 of the NPPF. National policy makes provision for Neighbourhood Plans to 'identify and protect' green areas of particular importance to them and where in accordance with the criteria set out by NPPF Paragraph 106. It is not necessary for Local Plans to repeat national policy, and doing so would not alter the ability of communities to designate Local Green Space in Neighbourhood Plans, where they are consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Policies Map that accompanies the Local Plan includes those policies contained within the Local Plan – it does not include policies included in any Made Neighbourhood Plans, as those will differ for different areas and will change over time when new Plans are Made. Any decision-making on planning applications should consider both the adopted Local Plan and relevant Made Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>The Local Plan does not seek to identify any Local Green Space, but communities are free to consider this matter through Neighbourhood Plans if they wish to.</p>
ANON-QNH5-RD1W-T	Zhanine Smith	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Council	Policy and support text wording amendment (Essex County Council)	<p>Essex County Council suggests the following modifications to Core Policy 66:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type of development subject to a HIA currently omits Use Class C2 and should be amended. ECC refers to Tendering Local Plan's Inspector Report which recommends the inclusion of all development in Use Class C2.</li> <li>• Development Policy 6 of the Plan requires proposals for 'sui generis' hot food takeaways to be supported by a HIA, which should also be explicitly stated in Core Policy 66.</li> <li>• CP66 should be amended to secure early and relevant stakeholder and community engagement.</li> <li>• There should be clearer references to the local Health and Wellbeing Strategy and articulating the priorities of this, and within the supporting text for Core Policy 66, which then links to the statutory Joint Essex Health and Wellbeing Strategy.</li> <li>• In addition to the JSNA refers to in point iii of the e policy, other documents applicable to health and wellbeing including the Uttlesford Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Essex Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy should be referenced</li> <li>• There should also be an alignment with the local validation list, and consideration of how this policy will be monitored in the AMR or equivalent framework – and that detailed in Appendix 18 of the Reg 19 Local Plan. For example, the number of HIAs completed and those that positively shape proposals.</li> <li>• It is also noted that many of the weblinks in the section do not 'work' and should be amended accordingly.</li> </ul> <p>Essex County Council also suggests the following modifications to the supporting text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Paragraph 11.89 to be more inclusive of wider age cohorts</li> <li>• Amend Paragraph 11.92 to read ' the social, economic and environmental factors that shape the quality and length of life'</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The Council agrees with the importance of including wider age cohorts in the Local Plan. The Council also agrees that the policy should explicitly refer to Use Class C2 and sui generis hot food takeaway uses with regards to HIA requirements. The Council also accepts the importance of various County strategies referenced. The Council will propose the modifications to be made through an amendment of the Plan. The Council will check and amend the weblinks in the Local Plan as appropriate.</p>

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include an additional paragraph to explain why Figure 11.1 is included the plan and its link to the policy</li> </ul>	
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Policy and support text wording amendment (General)	Saffron Walden Town Council suggests changing the policy text ‘should’ to ‘must’.	The Council considers the current policy text to be sound, effective and clear.
ANON-QNH5-RDZN-T	Fiona Martin	On behalf of an Organisation	Natural England	Role of Green and Blue Infrastructure (Natural England)	Natural England suggests referencing Core Policy 39 Green and Blue Infrastructure in CP66, to ensure that an explicit link is made between the two policies and ensure maximum benefit for both people and the natural environment.	The Council notes the relationship between the opportunities of well-designed green and blue infrastructure in contributing to health and wellbeing; however, as the Plan should be read as a whole, an additional reference within Core Policy 66 to Core Policy 39 is considered not necessary.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support (General)	Several respondents are supportive of Core Policy 66 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great Dunmow Town Council strongly supports CP66 and agrees it is consistent with the NPPF and therefore sound.</li> <li>Uttlesford Green Party applauds CP66 vii inclusion of social community space to reduce social isolation and support mental health.</li> <li>Little Easton Parish Council supports CP66.</li> </ul>	Noted. Support welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RDN3-K	Edward Gildea	On behalf of an Organisation	Uttlesford Green Party			
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDA3-6	Hyacinth Cabiles	On behalf of an Organisation	NHS Property Services (NHSPS)	Support (NHS Property Services)	NHS Property Services welcomes and supports the inclusion of CP66 that supports healthy lifestyles, and the requirement for Health Impact Assessments on significant residential developments of 100 dwellings or more.	Noted. Support from NHS Property Services is welcomed.

## Core Policy 67: Open Space, Sport and Recreation

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Access to facilities	A developer would like to see maximum community benefit made from those facilities at new schools to ensure that the halls, sports facilities etc have a community agreement for shared use with the public out of hours.	The Council have undertaken three in depth leisure studies on open space, built and indoor facilities and playing pitch and sports facilities. The Indoor and Built Facilities Strategy report does reflect that the sharing of facilities both of existing and new schools will assist in meeting existing and future needs of the District. Some agreements are already in place. New facilities and access to these for public use will be negotiated through the development management process via S106 Agreements. CP5 in the local plan Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services covers this aspect and the Plan should be read as a whole.
ANON-QNH5-RD1Q-M	clerk to Stebbing Parish Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Stebbing Parish Council	Local Green Spaces	Stebbing Parish Council suggested that as the Local Plan, or Policies Map, does not specifically mention Local Green Space, it is unsound, and as such, does not support Parish or Town Councils who may choose to designate Local Green Space. It is suggested that these are added to the Policies Map and that a policy is created for Local Green Space within the Local Plan.	<p>National policy relating to Local Green Space is set out in Paragraphs 105 to 107 of the NPPF. National policy makes provision for Neighbourhoods plans to ‘identify and protect’ green areas of particular importance to them and where in accordance with the criteria set out by NPPF Paragraph 106. It is not necessary for Local Plans to repeat national policy, and doing so would not alter the ability of communities to designate Local Green Space in Neighbourhood Plans, where they are consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Policies Map that accompanies the Local Plan includes those policies contained within the Local Plan – it does not include policies included in any Made Neighbourhood Plans, as those will differ for different areas and will change over time when new Plans are Made. Any decision making on planning applications should consider both the adopted Local Plan and relevant Made Neighbourhood Plans.</p>

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						The Local Plan does not seek to identify any Local Green Space, but communities are free to consider this matter through Neighbourhood Plans if they wish to.
ANON-QNH5-RD1B-5	Hazel Izod	On behalf of an Organisation	Sworders Agricultural	NPPF Compliance	A developer considers the Draft Local Plan unsound as it fails to fulfil the duty to cooperate and is inconsistent with national policy, particularly the requirements in Paragraph 35 of the NPPF. They suggest it should be amended to allocate specific sites for sport and recreation to meet the identified district wide need (and the needs of adjacent districts) and as set out by the Council's evidence. They promote the allocation of site reference Farnham 001 COM – Land north of the A120, Bishop's Stortford, CM23 1JF as a possible strategic level sports site for the provision of football, rugby, athletics, skateboarding, BMX, cricket and hockey and supporting facilities including a pavilion/clubhouse with changing facilities. They also suggest the plan policy should proactively support the development of new open space sport and health facilities, similar to Policy LCA4 in Uttlesford District Plan 2005. And the potential wording for this policy could be; "Proposals for new open space, indoor and outdoor sport and recreation facilities which meet identified needs will be encouraged in suitable locations, served by a choice of sustainable travel options."	The Council have undertaken three in depth leisure studies on open space, built and indoor facilities and playing pitch and sports facilities. These were all reviewed and updated for this Plan period. The reports are considered to be NPPF compliant and also CP67. The studies completed provided us with an indication of the needs and supply across the District and also an idea of where people where travelling to and from to use facilities elsewhere.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Policy wording (General)	Saffron Walden Town Council seeks clarification on the policy wording difference between points i-iii and iv-vii and the use of the words 'or' and 'and' between requirements and seek consistency between both using 'and'. Furthermore they wish an alternative form of wording to be used for the loss of provision using 'beyond reasonable doubt' instead of 'can be demonstrated that'.	To clarify regarding points i - iii, these are addressing the loss of facilities and therefore the word 'or' is applicable and appropriate so that in any one of those three cases the policy would apply if an asset were to be lost, and is NPPF compliant. Policy points iv - vii are with regards to development proposals so the use of the word 'and' is appropriate to ensure that all development proposals for new facilities make provision for each of these points to ensure the best outcomes for communities.
ANON-QNH5-RDZN-T	Fiona Martin	On behalf of an Organisation	Natural England	Provision of Informal Open Space (Natural England)	Natural England would like an explicit reference made in Policy under the section on Open Space in New Development within CP 67 to Natural England's published Green Infrastructure Standards, and the Accessible Greenspace Standards (Appendix 2 of NE Green Infrastructure Standards for England - Summary), which set out the minimum requirements for the provision of informal open space in new developments.	The Council have undertaken three in depth leisure studies on open space, built and indoor facilities and playing pitch and sports facilities and consider Core Policy 67 NPPF compliant. Natural England's standards for accessible greenspace relates to green infrastructure and covered under chapter 9 of the local plan. Whilst the Council recognise that open space for formal and informal play form part of the GI network, not all open spaces under CP67 are unlikely to meet these standards. Other standards apply instead e.g. FIT.
ANON-QNH5-RDW2-U	Oliver Spencer	On behalf of an Organisation	Oliver Spencer on behalf of Robert Eburne Denbury Homes	Site submission	A developer refers to a site at land north of Henham Road, Elsenham that is in private ownership and proposed for open space in the Local Plan. However, they suggest this is undeliverable as the site is hoped to be put forward for residential development which includes a small LEAP (from reviewing the submitted plans, with the representation) and therefore as its not available or deliverable and been unused for 7 years following a fire at the cricket ground (supported by the KKP studies) the proposed allocation should be removed from the Local Plan.	It is the Council's view that the respondent has mistaken the parcel of land being allocated in the local plan. The parcel submitted in the representation lies to the south of the proposed allocation and is unaffected by the Local Plan proposals. Any application that should be submitted on this site will be judged on its own merits at the time of its submission based on the available evidence.
ANON-QNH5-RD4S-S	Bill Critchley	Individual / member of the public		Sports facilities	Respondent suggests that sports facilities should not be limited to football pitches.	The Council have undertaken three in depth leisure studies on open space, built and indoor facilities and playing pitch and sports facilities. The Council is satisfied that the Local Plan sufficiently reflects all forms of sports where they are needed.
ANON-QNH5-RDN8-R	Great Dunmow Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Great Dunmow Town Council	Support	Great Dunmow Town Council welcomes CP 67 stating its clear focus on healthy activity spaces and therefore strongly supports the Plan here and its compliance with the NPPF and their own neighbourhood plan,	Noted. Support Welcome.



Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council		thus is considered sound. A couple of responses from Little Easton Parish Council support CP67.	

## Core Policy 67a: Management of Public Open Space

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RD1Q-M	clerk to Stebbing Parish Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Stebbing Parish Council	Local Green Spaces	Stebbing Parish Council suggests that as the Local Plan or Policies Map does not specifically mention Local Green Space, it is unsound and does not support Parish or Town Councils who may choose to designate Local Green Space. It is suggested that these are added to the Policies Map and that a policy is created for Local Green Space within the Local Plan.	National policy relating to Local Green Space is set out in Paragraphs 105 to 107 of the NPPF. National policy makes provision for Neighbourhood Plans to ‘identify and protect’ green areas of particular importance to them and where in accordance with the criteria set out by NPPF Paragraph 106. It is not necessary for Local Plans to repeat national policy, and doing so would not alter the ability of communities to designate Local Green Space in Neighbourhood Plans, where they are consistent with national policy. The Policies Map that accompanies the Local Plan includes those policies contained within the Local Plan – it does not include policies included in any Made Neighbourhood Plans, as those will differ for different areas and will change over time when new Plans are Made. Any decision-making on planning applications should consider both the adopted Local Plan and relevant Made Neighbourhood Plans. The Local Plan does not seek to identify any Local Green Space, but communities are free to consider this matter through Neighbourhood Plans if they wish to.
ANON-QNH5-RDDG-W	Jane Sharp	Individual / member of the public		Objection to Management Bodies Hierarchy and Management Strategy	Resident explains their first hand experience of living on an estate where management fees apply and how unfair, not fit for purpose and unaffordable these are. They specifically refer to one management organisation and the poor running of this organisation. They consider that the policy should purely ensure that public open spaces are adopted by Parish or Town Councils or by the District Council.	The Council is satisfied that the policy approach is the right one to provide the flexibility required for different types of development. The supporting text clearly sets out the justification for this. Some landowners wish to retain a share in the land they are developing for long-term stewardship reasons and this can often provide better community outcomes. Therefore the policy provides flexibility to enable this whilst safeguards are in place to ensure costs are appropriate and management plans are effective for example.
ANON-QNH5-RD4R-R	Roy Warren	On behalf of an Organisation	Sport England	Support (Sport England)	Sport England supports the policy, stating that it provides clarity on the Council’s approach to the management and funding arrangements of public open space and sports facilities. Sport England considers the policy to be justified by the Council’s evidence base for open space and sport, positively prepared, and sound.	Support from Sport England is noted and welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RDCT-9	Sophie Pain	On behalf of an Organisation	Pigeon	Support (General)	Several respondents including Pigeon, Saffron Walden Town Council and Little Easton Parish Council, support the policy for public open space. A few modifications are suggested as below: • Pigeon suggests that there has been a reduction in the capacity for towns and parish councils to take on the responsibility of maintaining open spaces, and therefore the policy should provide sufficient flexibility to enable landowners to retain management of these space if they wish to • Pigeon does not agree that the responsibility for the management of open space should be covered by a hierarchical approach. The key factors for the management of open space are that the space is maintained to an agreed specification and with public access secured. These matters can be secured via a planning condition or obligation. The identity of the management body is not a relevant factor in this regard and the policy wording should therefore provide suitable flexibility. • Saffron Walden Town Council suggests SUDs should have a specific category and adopted by water authorities and reference made to S106	Noted. The Council considers the policy to be sound. It provides the necessary detail required to assist a range of stakeholders involved in the development of and maintenance of open space and sporting facilities to give certainty on the requirements the Council is looking for to enable the necessary discussions to take place as part of the planning application process to aid a speedier process for delivery of proposals. SUDs are addressed in CP37 but it is recognised they form part of open spaces and wider GI. The local plan should be read as a whole in this context and any future planning applications and S106 will address these matters as such. CP67a sets out at the end of the policy how funding will be dealt with, through commuted sums. The Council's Developer Contributions SPD will be updated following the Adoption of the Local Plan. The Council considered the wording of the policy otherwise fit for purpose with the Parish and Town Council's being the first port of call for the management of open spaces.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council			
ANON-QNH5-RDRD-8	n/a	On behalf of an Organisation	Little Easton Parish Council			



Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					contributions. These should be included in line with the Developer Contribution SPD. SWTC suggests that this should be strengthened in line with the community involvement statement, ensuring parish councils 'must' be involved in early engagement with developers. They highlight that the current Developer SPD only permits 15 years whereas this policy is seeking 30 years management maintenance, asking which takes precedence. Suggest policy reworded so that parish councils are given first refusal on management of open space, the UDC followed by management companies.	

## Core Policy 68: Community Uses

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDYF-H	Tom Clarke MRTPI	On behalf of an Organisation	Theatres Trust	Assessment Approach to the Loss of Existing Community Facilities	The Theatres Trust recommend replacing “viability” in policy CP68 with “surplus to requirements” because this would show the lack of need in the community, which should be backed by demonstrable evidence. They suggest that viability is problematic as a measure to justify loss because facilities that are not viable in the full commercial sense could operate successfully under alternative models such as community ownership. They also state that the policy should set out the expectations for what evidence should be submitted. They propose modifications to make the plan sound by editing point vi, removing “viability” and amending it to: “vi. an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows that the facility is surplus to requirements.” They suggest that this evidence includes expectations around marketing attempts for a minimum period of 18 months at an appropriate sale or rent value for the existing use without development potential or condition.	Criteria vi of Core Policy 68 specifically refers to “an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows that the facility is surplus to requirements or is no longer viable” to provide flexibility and make effective use of land. The Council accepts that there could be greater clarity on the viability test and therefore an amendment to reference Core Policy 5 will be proposed to ensure that the relevant assessment is independent and involves an open book approach.
ANON-QNH5-RD97-2	Lydia Sadler	On behalf of an Organisation	Stansted Airport Limited	Expansion and Improvement of Existing Facilities (Stansted Airport)	Stansted Airport Limited welcome CP68, which seeks to support existing community uses and the Plan’s use of the NPPF’s definition of community use, which includes education. However, they suggest the policy could be improved by referencing the expansion and/or improvement of existing facilities, rather than solely focusing on ‘new’ community facilities. They cite Stansted Airport College as an example of a facility that is at capacity.	The Council welcomes the support and agrees that some clarification could helpfully be added regarding upgrading existing facilities as well as providing new ones. A modification to this effect is included in the proposed modifications schedule within the Council’s submission documents.
ANON-QNH5-RD3Z-Y	James Lawson	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex Police	Infrastructure Providers (Essex Police)	Essex Police consider that they should be referenced in Paragraphs 11.111 and 11.112 as they are a key infrastructure provider, contributing to sustainable new communities. Therefore, they require developer-funded police infrastructure and facilities to mitigate and manage the impacts arising from planned housing and population growth on their operational capacity and resources. By not being referenced, they consider the local plan inconsistent with NPPF Paragraph 35 and recommend a modification to insert reference to the police in two areas, as follows: after ‘health care’ insert “and police”; and omit ‘emergency services’ in line 9 and insert “the Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner and East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust”.	The Council does not consider it necessary to reference all infrastructure providers within the Plan and in relation to all relevant policies. The requirements are identified in the IDP, which is a live document, and any specific requirements are set out in the Site Development Templates. More generally, specific requirements may vary on a case-by-case basis through the DM process.

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	Off-site provision	Saffron Walden Town Council considers that the policy should include off-site provision as well as on-site.	The Council considers the policy's aim is to locate any community uses that are needed as close to the newly created communities as possible for ease of access and by sustainable modes of travel. Therefore, on-site provision is the primary mechanism and purpose of this policy for community uses and commuted sums. The Council's IDP lists the various infrastructure requirements across the District, and development management officers, in negotiation with developers when working on the final masterplans for proposals, will need to take these factors into account. Off-site provision would not necessarily be ruled out depending on local need.
ANON-QNH5-RD7K-M	David Poole	On behalf of an Organisation	Weston Homes	Out of Hours Use of School Sports Facilities	The respondent suggests that CP67 and CP68 include a requirement for new schools to have a community agreement in place for the public to use those facilities out of hours. This could support the viability of these facilities and align with the principle of increasing sports facilities within walking distance of residential developments, as outlined in the Uttlesford Design Code.	The Council have undertaken three in depth leisure studies on open space, built and indoor facilities and playing pitch and sports facilities. The Indoor and Built Facilities Strategy report does reflect that the sharing of facilities both of existing and new schools will assist in meeting existing and future needs of the District. Some agreements are already in place. New facilities and access to these for public use will be negotiated through the development management process via S106 Agreements. CP5 in Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services covers this aspect and the plan will need to be read as a whole.
ANON-QNH5-RD4X-X	Sally Taylor	On behalf of an Organisation	Birchanger Parish Council	Support (General)	Birchanger Parish Council supports the policy, particularly for community organisations that find themselves under threat, for example, the air cadet squadron based at Stansted Airport.	Support noted and welcomed.
ANON-QNH5-RD4R-R	Roy Warren	On behalf of an Organisation	Sport England	Support (Sport England)	Sport England broadly welcomes CP 68 because it has a supportive approach to new community facilities and the additional requirements from development. However, they seek a modification to the plan to ensure its effectiveness and consistency with national policy and would like clarification on whether the scope of the policy includes open space and sports facilities. Therefore, at the end of paragraph 11.111, they suggest adding: "Core Policy 67 will apply to open space and sports venues and Core Policy 68 will apply to all other community uses identified above." They suggest this will help improve clarity on which policy relates to open space and sports facilities when the policy is applied. Furthermore, Sport England highlights two criteria (vi and vii) of CP 68 that broadly align with criteria a) and b) of paragraph 102 of the NPPF. However, it does not include criterion c), which is required for proposals affecting open space/sport. They therefore recommend CP67 applies specifically to open space and sport/recreation as the policy relates to that and accords with NPPF paragraphs 102 and 103. CP68 should then apply to other community facilities.	The Council is in agreement with the proposed amendment from Sport England to improve clarity on which policy covers which community use. The Council will therefore clarify this through a proposed modification to paragraph 11.111 and CP68.
ANON-QNH5-RDA3-6	Hyacinth Cabiles	On behalf of an Organisation	NHS Property Services (NHSPS)	Surplus Health Facilities (NHS)	NHS Property Services supports the approach where developer contributions towards healthcare infrastructure are being sought and requests that the Council continues its engagement with the NHS to further refine the identified healthcare needs and proposed solutions to support the level of growth proposed by the Local Plan prior to submission. It is highlighted that options for mitigation measures should include financial contributions, new on-site healthcare infrastructure, free land/infrastructure/property, or a combination of these, which the NHS will work with the Council to formulate. While the NHS supports the inclusion of healthcare facilities in the Local Plan's definition of community facilities, they note that the policy approach in preventing the loss or change of use of health facilities and assets can potentially harm the NHS's ability to dispose of sites and properties that are redundant or no longer suitable for healthcare at best value, helping to fund new or improved services within a local area. They commented that requiring NHS disposal sites to explore the potential for alternative community uses and/or to retain a substantial proportion of	The Council is committed to continuing engagement with the NHS through the Duty to Cooperate and is happy to meet to discuss any further matters that are required. The Council recognises the importance of providing flexibility for surplus NHS health facilities to be disposed of as part of the estate strategy and will propose an amendment to supporting paragraph 11.112.

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					community facility provision adds unjustified delay to vital reinvestment in facilities and services for the community. A relevant modification to supporting paragraph 11.112 is proposed.	
BHLF-QNH5-RDEH-Y	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	On behalf of an Organisation	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	Use of facilities (Essex County Fire and Rescue Services)	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service would like to use community spaces as a hub for their Prevention teams to deliver Fire Safety and Education visits, and make use of the electric charging points as part of these new developments.	The Council notes that Essex County Fire and Rescue Service is interested in accessing community spaces for their prevention teams. The Local Plan proposed allocations do include community buildings, but their use will be a matter for the local community and Town or Parish Councils.

## Core Policy 69: New Cemeteries and Burial Space

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation /Individual	Organisation	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-QNH5-RDNM-D	Graham Mott	On behalf of an Organisation	Elsenham Parish Council	New cemetery provision	Elsenham Parish Council highlight that their cemetery is full and that they do not have the resources to buy more land and that any land around the village has been allocated for housing. They therefore suggest that the land adjacent and to the east of the proposed allocation for 110 dwellings could be provided for a new cemetery.	The Council is aware that Henham PC are considering doing a Neighbourhood Plan following the outcome of the EiP, particularly on housing figures for their area. Elsenham may consider preparing a neighbourhood plan, including proposals for a small scheme to help improve their retail offer. However, the Council does not object to the principle of this matter being considered as a possible modification to the proposed allocation should that be considered appropriate.
ANON-QNH5-RD7U-X	Saffron Walden Town Council	On behalf of an Organisation	Saffron Walden Town Council	Funding	Saffron Walden Town Council would like to ensure that S106 funding is required to allow town councils to purchase land for burial use.	Local Plan CP5 Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services provides details of how funding for infrastructure will be brought forward through development. Where a local need exists through the planning application stage this could be negotiated with the developer at that time.

## Core Policy 70: Communications Infrastructure

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