

Response to Comments Made by Public Speakers on 15 July 2024

A total of nine speakers made statements to the Panel at its previous meeting:

Mr Bill Critchley spoke as a resident of Takeley. Specifically, setting out concerns with traffic and transport and J8 of the M11. Mr Critchley also raised issues with woodland buffers, Gypsy & Traveler policy / park homes, and that plan does not appear to focus on infrastructure and affordable housing.

The local plan does not propose any major works to J8 of the M11. The level of development proposed in the local plan, when compared to committed growth in Uttlesford and neighbouring districts is small. It does not justify (nor would it be viable) for the local plan to require an intervention to the junction. Other measures, such as proposing three new bus routes through Takeley and providing services such as school and health facility within the settlement, are intended to mitigate against the need for car journeys. Various other mitigations are included within the plan and the council will work with National Highways and Essex Country Council on the points they raise.

Woodland buffers are discussed within the plan but are not as specific as Mr Critchley's suggestion. Those comments are being considered. Gypsy and Traveler pitches have been identified in Core Policy 60. The park homes site in Takeley is not a Gypsy and Traveler site. The point raised about its protection is noted.

The plan includes an affordable housing policy that leans towards more social and affordable rented housing, and the plan is accompanied by an infrastructure delivery plan and will assist in reducing the existing infrastructure deficit.

Dr J Johnson also spoke as a resident of Takeley. Specifically, suggesting that the plan was unsustainable and flawed. Dr Johnson also raised traffic issues, the proposed improvements to the Flich Way and concerns with the allocation of sites, questioning why there is no new garden community.

It is the view of the council that the local plan's spatial strategy is sustainable, after having been through a sustainability appraisal. This reasoning will no doubt be tested at the Examination in Public (EIP). Traffic issues are noted and there is much material published on this topic. During the Reg19 consultation, further transport data was published for residents to interrogate, and the consultation extended accordingly.

The Flich Way is already used as a cycle route to some extent. It is acknowledged it is not ideal, particularly at night, and that adding lighting may affect ecology. The local plan looks to improve the surface for users.

There is no garden community proposed within the local plan. The reasons are set out within the evidence (namely the sustainability appraisal) and have been discussed at meetings before. Uttlesford does not need the numbers of houses required for a standalone new community. And it would not produce a smooth delivery of housing over the plan period. The plan would need a number of medium and smaller sites as

Appendix 1

well as a garden community to be found 'sound'. Such a plan would then need to include thousands more homes than the current one. A new community would not be an alternative to new homes in Takeley.

Cllr Bagnall spoke in relation to Takeley. Cllr Bagnall raised the new government's proposals changes to plan-making and called for a new garden community. He also raised traffic issues.

The proposed changes to plan-making are considered in the main report. Garden communities and traffic are considered above. Studies have been carried out with regards to traffic flow and mitigations proposed. This will, no doubt, be examined during the EIP.

Alison Evans spoke as a resident of Takeley. Specifically, suggesting that officers mislead councilors as to the improvements between Reg18 and Reg19 and that wording in an email was misleading. Councilors will have reviewed the content of the plan prior to full council in July for themselves and will have drawn their own conclusions. Ms Evans also raised the CPZ for which officers have provided commentary at previous LPP meetings. The CPZ review can be found here: [2024-06-18 Uttlesford CPZ Review REPORT Rev A hi-res.pdf](#). Further points on specific details contained within the Taylors Farm employment allocation are being reviewed.

Parish Cllr Jackie Cheetham spoke to Takeley Parish Council. Specifically, with concerns with the level of facilities and services Takeley will have per household compared to Great Dunmow and its transports issues. Cllr Cheetham also raised concerns with the allocation at Taylors Farm and makes three helpful suggestions should the plan go forward. The suggestions are noted.

In terms of facilities, the plan seeks to provide education, health and a local centre. It is noted that historic speculative development has not come with the same level of facilities and services as is proposed in the local plan. The allocation north of Taylors Farm and how this relates to the CPZ has been discussed in earlier LPP meetings.

Cllr Donald spoke for Elsenham and Henham Parish Councils. Specifically, with regards the proposed site at Elsenham and that it was not included in the Regulation 18 version of the plan. Also, that Henham PC is concerned with the way their 'larger village allowance' was brought about.

In terms of Elsenham, the site was introduced between Reg18 and Reg19 stage. The process is an iterative one and the allocation solves an issue in terms of facilitating the delivery of a primary school and early years facility that was raised during the Reg18 consultation. In terms of Henham, the *village* itself has been identified as being suitable for non-strategic housing allocations. This is not the same as the parish boundary. Significant numbers of responses have been received on this point at Reg19. The logic is considered sound and may be tested at the EIP.

Great Dunmow PC submitted a statement, which is published as part of the minutes of the previous meeting. GDPC set out its initial view flagging concerns at Church End and

Appendix 1

Parsonage Downs with overdevelopment, transport and traffic issues, education and infrastructure.

The proposals there include for education provision and other infrastructure. Issues of traffic will no doubt be examined at EIP and the local plan includes much evidence in this respect. GDPC also recommends assessments of chalk streams, which is duly noted.

Cllr Coletta provided a statement in his role as parish Cllr for Takeley and Gt Hallingbury. This covered the CPZ, transport and traffic issues, the Flitch Way and public transport.

Issues of traffic, the CPZ and Flitch Way are discussed above (and have been at previous meetings). The 2016 CPZ study produced for the council does not form part of the local plan evidence base – it is too old – however it is still available online [Uttlesford Countryside Protection Zone Study](#). It is recognized there is a weight of speaker comments on these issues as they relate to the Takeley area. Cllr Coletta's concerns about public transport are noted, and the local plan seeks to improve bus travel and walking and cycling experience once passengers get off buses in Takeley.

Takeley resident, Mr Pinchback, spoke about the proposed active travel (and bus) route through the Takeley/Canfield site allocation and across Smiths Green Lane. He suggested it should not be proposed and buses should instead be directed to the B1256 and the area around Warish Hall designated a country park.

The route is intended to provide bus and cycling opportunities through the site allocation and onwards to the airport transport interchange. It is acknowledged that the surface will have some impact on otherwise undeveloped land. Unfortunately, the area does not meet national requirements to be designated a country park so the local plan promotes it as public open space. Currently members of the public can walk around it however, it is in private ownership and the majority cannot be formally used by the public.