

Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041

Main Modifications Consultation – Summaries and Responses

November 2025

Contents

Main Modification 1 1

Main Modification 2 2

Main Modification 3 2

Main Modification 4 4

Main Modification 5 4

Main Modification 6 5

Main Modification 7 6

Main Modification 8 6

Main Modification 9 8

Main Modification 10 8

Main Modification 11 9

Main Modification 12 10

Main Modification 13 10

Main Modification 14 11

Main Modification 15 11

Main Modification 16 12

Main Modification 17 12

Main Modification 18 13

Main Modification 19 13

Main Modification 20 13

Main Modification 21 14

Main Modification 22 14

Main Modification 23 (No Comments Recorded) 15

Main Modification 24 15

Main Modification 25 16

Main Modification 26 (No Comments Recorded) 17

Main Modification 27 17

Main Modification 28 17

Main Modification 29 18

Main Modification 30 18

Main Modification 31 19

Main Modification 32 19

Main Modification 33 19

Main Modification 34 21

Main Modification 35 (No Comments Recorded) 21

Main Modification 36 (No Comments Recorded) 21

Main Modification 37 (No Comments Recorded) 22

Main Modification 38 22

Main Modification 39 (No Comments Recorded) 22

Main Modification 40 (No Comments Recorded) 22

Main Modification 41 22

Main Modification 42 22

Main Modification 43 23

Main Modification 44 (No Comments Recorded) 23

Main Modification 45 23

Main Modification 46 (No Comments Recorded) 24

Main Modification 47 24

Main Modification 48 (No Comments Recorded) 24

Main Modification 49 (No Comments Recorded) 24

Main Modification 50 24

Main Modification 51 25

Main Modification 52 25

Main Modification 53 25

Main Modification 54 26

Main Modification 55 26

Main Modification 56 26

Main Modification 57 (No Comments Recorded) 27

Main Modification 58 27

Main Modification 59 27

Main Modification 60 (No Comments Recorded) 27

Main Modification 61 27

Main Modification 62

28

Main Modification 63

30

Main Modification 64

32

Sustainability Appraisal.....

32

Habitats Regulations Assessment (No Comments Recorded)

35

Policies Map Modifications

35

Additional Modifications.....

37

Main Modification 1

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Robert		Pegasus Group	Bloor Homes (Eastern)	Approval alignment	Comment noting the fact the redline boundary for the site 'East of High Lane' doesn't align with the one in the red line boundary of the full planning application UTT/25/1061/FUL approved on 22.10.2025.	The council is satisfied with the boundary presented in the plan reflects the allocation as made by the Local Plan. It is a matter for the landowner/ site promoter if they wish to submit a planning application that differs from this and this will be considered through the Planning Application process.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding as an individual	George				Great Dunmow Proposed Allocation	Comments regarding the transparency around the alternative draft spatial arrangement as per document UTT10. The comment highlights the fact that the public hasn't received a fair chance to provide comments on it and claims this fails to accord with the principles of good planning practice and procedural fairness. The comment requests that MM1 be modified to address this by reverting to this plan to have an overall capacity of 515 dwellings.	The Council has not proposed any changes to the site in question and they do not form part of the Main Modifications. This matter is also considered in relation to MM8.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Andrew		Andrew Martin – Planning Ltd	S. Robinson Farms Ltd			
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding as an individual	Allison				Legibility	General comment regarding the site allocation numbers are inconsistent across different maps (e.g., 'Site 7' in MM1 and 'Site 4' in MM6). A suggestion to amend the mapping so it is consistent throughout.	The maps show different things (i.e., all of the proposed allocations in Figure 4.2 and only the proposed allocations for the South Uttlesford Area in Figure 6.1); on that basis, the Council is satisfied the maps are sufficiently clear.
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Robert		Pegasus Group	Bloor Homes (Eastern)	Stansted Mountfitchet Country Park	Objection to the proposed allocation boundary for Site 2A (Walpole Meadow North). The core issue of the objection is for the inclusion of a large country park to the northern end of the site. The consultee objects to the inclusion of this on the grounds of unjustified, financially unsustainable, and burdensome for the development's scale (although this does not relate to the Main Modification).	The matter raised does not relate to the Main Modification. The information submitted was raised through the Examination and has therefore already been considered. The Council is satisfied the policy requirements are clear and have been sufficiently justified by evidence and informed by viability testing. The site falls within Hatfield Forest Zone of Influence and the requirement to provide public open space to Natural England standards as an alternative outdoor green space to Hatfield Forest.
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	Support	Support for the amendments made to the boundaries in the Key Diagram, specifically around the: - the removal of the Bull Field site (UTT/23/1583/PINS) from the East Takeley allocation. - the addition of Land North of Ugley Brook, Stansted Mountfitchet to be consistent with the Framework Plan 4A, and - for how the proposed allocation either side of the Broadway is presented.	Support Noted
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Richard	Agnew	Gladman				
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Robert	Barber	Pegasus Group	Bloor Homes (Eastern)			

Main Modification 2

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RVM-9	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council		Location of Additional Homes	470 additional homes have been added to the plan and further information is required to identify the location of the revised allocations.	The additional supply of homes to be delivered by 2041 stems entirely from new housing completions and permissions (commitments). There are no new or revised allocations to show the location of.
ANON-HSYM-3RFJ-P	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley					
BHLF-HSYM-3RV1-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Adam	Davies	Ceres Property	M Scott Properties Ltd			

Main Modification 3

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RF2-X	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		General Support	Comments that provide general support to the modification whilst noting the potential for minor wording changes to either the policy or supporting text, including:	The general support for the modification is noted. With regards to the wording recommendations: 1) This is already the case as required by the NPPF, the change is unnecessary. 2) The change is largely semantic, the policy outcome is the same. 3) The change relates to the supporting text which is contextual only, the policy already requires the 5YHLS test to be triggered 'at' 6-months from adoption.
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes		1) Mentioning that the 5YHLS should be assessed including the 'appropriate buffer'. 2) That the Council will 'undertake a Local Plan Review', rather than a Local Plan Review would 'become necessary'. 3) 'Around' six months from adoption should be replaced with 'At' six months.	
BHLF-HSYM-3RVA-W	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Marie	Jasper	hgh Consulting	Landsec			
BHLF-HSYM-3RF8-4	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Rosanna	Metcalfe	Strutt and Parker	City & Country	Greater Stringency Needed in Policy Wording	Many comments welcomed the principle of the introduction of an early Local Plan Review policy, but stated that the policy did not go far enough to ensure the housing land supply issues identified at examination had been addressed. Respondents stated several contextual reasons as to why amendments to the modification are critical to plan soundness, namely:	In relation to the contextual matters that have been raised by the respective representations, the Council considers the following: 1) This is incorrect. Using the dwelling supply agreed by the Inspectors during the examination (4.77 years) but applying a 5% buffer instead of 20%, results in a 5YHLS of 5.45 years, which represents a circa 300 dwelling surplus. For additional context, MHCLG have confirmed to the Council that they intend to publish both the 23/24 and 24/25 HDT's at the same time. Based on housing completions data that has already been submitted to MHCLG and the relevant Standard Method figures for those periods, the Council are confident that this would bring HDT performance to approximately 100%, ensuring that a 5% buffer will apply in the very near term. 2) The Local Plan does address strategic issues to 2041 and the Council has fulfilled its Duty to Co-operate with all
ANON-HSYM-3RUM-8	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Gareth	Pritchard	Bidwells LLP	Hill Residential Limited		1) Upon adoption, even assuming a 5% buffer is applied, the Council would only have a 1 dwellings surplus on its 5YHLS, which is tenuous.	
ANON-HSYM-3RUR-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Ryan	Walker	Iceni Projects	Aberdeen Investments and Mulberry Strategic Land Ltd		2) The Local Plan does not grapple with long-term strategic issues, including accommodating growth relating to Greater Cambridge.	
BHLF-HSYM-3RV1-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Rachel	Bryan	Sworders	The Hargrove Family		3) The need for an early review of the Local Plan was highlighted within the Planning Portfolio Holder's opening	

Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041
Main Modifications Consultation – Full Summaries and Responses

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RV9-N	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Jon	Goodall	DLP Planning	Salacia Limited		statement.	neighbouring authorities. However, and as stated during the Examination, it is anticipated that the next round of Local Plans will be prepared for new Unitary Councils and be informed by preparation of a Spatial Development Strategy for Essex, which will provide a more effective mechanism for longer term and more strategic planning.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVR-E	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Neil	Tiley	Pegasus Group	Pegasi Limited		4) There is limited ability for developers to challenge a future 5YHLS position statement other than through the appeal process which is lengthy and costly.	3) The Council will be undertaking preparatory work for the next Local Plan as soon as possible, owing to the dynamic political environment surrounding devolution, Local Government Reorganisation, and plan-making reform. However, these factors do not relate to the emerging Local Plan and do not necessitate a policy provision mandating an early plan review.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVD-Z	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Rachel	Bryan	Sworders	Mr and Mrs D Hill		5) The optimal solution for remedying the issue (i.e., undertaking additional evidence gathering and focused consultation to allocate new sites now) has not been pursued.	
BHLF-HSYM-3RVN-A	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Oliver	Bell	Nexus Planning	Hawridge Strategic Land		Consequently, several amendments to MM3 are proposed, including:	
BHLF-HSYM-3RVE-1	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Trevor	Dodkins	Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd	Lands Improvement Holdings		6) Additional wording to be introduced that sets out explicit timescales of the Local Plan Review. Suggested timings include the need for plan submission to PINS within 2-years from the point of the review being triggered.	
BHLF-HSYM-3RVN-A	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Isabella	Ingram	Iceni Projects	Mulberry Homes and St Edmunds Lane Management Limited		7) The immediate Local Plan Review should not be contingent on 5YHLS matters and should be mandatory for the Council to undertake in any event.	
BHLF-HSYM-3RV1-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Adam	Davies	Ceres Property	M Scott Properties Ltd		8) The policy should make clear that a 'full' review of the plan will be required, not just those policies related to housing.	
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Richard	Agnew	Gladman			9) The Local Plan Review would be triggered if a shortfall in 5YHLS were demonstrated at any point within 5 years from plan adoption, either through a routine annual position statements, by appeal, or by an independent review of the 5YHLS that should occur 6 months from adoption.	5) The Inspectors 'post hearing letter' is clear that delay in the adoption of the Plan, which further evidence gathering, site selection and consultation would be counterproductive. This is reaffirmed by the letter of the Minister Matthew Pennycook's MP dated 9 October 2025 to PINS encouraging a degree of flexibility to expedite the adoption of Local Plans. It should however be made clear that the Inspectors letter considers that it is likely there will be a five-year land supply at, or soon after plan adoption.
							10) That in the circumstances a plan review is triggered, principle support is given to development on unallocated sites at Rural Service Centres and Larger Villages, and that it is explicitly stated that the adverse impact of development is unlikely to outweigh the benefits.	The Council's response to the suggestions for amendments to MM3 is as follows:
								6) Any new plan to be prepared would need to comply with the new planning system that sets strict timelines for plan-making with completion in 33 months including examination. Specifying a timeline for the production of a new plan would therefore be unnecessary.
								7) The Main Modification relates to the short-term land supply issue. The comments therefore fall outside the remit of the Main Modification. The matters raised have already been considered through the Examination.
								8, 9 and 10) These largely fall outside the remit of the Main Modification, but in any case, are considered to be matters for national policy, and are unnecessary in relation to the MM.

Main Modification 4

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RUC-X	Responding as an individual	Andrew	Ketteridge			General Support	A number of comments provide general support to the MM.	Support Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVV-J	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Johnathan	Dixon	Savills (UK) Ltd	Audley End Estate			
BHLF-HSYM-3RVJ-6	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd			
BHLF-HSYM-3RV9-N	Responding as an individual	Andrew	Ketteridge					

Main Modification 5

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Richard	Agnew	Gladman		General Support	The comment provides general support for the MM. Wider comments are made about the emerging Newport Neighbourhood Plan (although these do not relate to the MM).	Support Noted. Newport Neighbourhood Plan is a separate process to the Local Plan and will be subject to a separate Examination in due course. The Neighbourhood Plan will need to demonstrate that it complies with basic conditions, including general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVA-W	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Rachel	Bryan	Sworders	Mr and Mrs D Hill	General Support – Policy Wording	General support for the MM is provided, but further comments are made about the need for further proposals (which do not relate to the MM). It is suggested that the policy needs to make clearer the need for any Neighbourhood Plan allocations to be deliverable.	Support noted. The Council is content the policy wording provides sufficient clarity, for example ‘sufficient allocations to ‘deliver’ the housing requirement’ and that in any case, in the event a Neighbourhood Plan was made, that did include allocations, but these allocations did not come forward in a timely manner, a Plan Review would still provide a further mechanism to ensure development still came forward well within the plan period.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVZ-P	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Neil	Hargreaves	Newport Quendon & Rickling Neighbourhood Plan Steering group		General Support – Scale of Development	The comment provides general support for the MM. Further comments are made that relate to the emerging Newport Neighbourhood Plan (that do not relate to the MM).	Support noted. Newport Neighbourhood Plan is a separate process to the Local Plan and will be subject to a separate Examination in due course. The Neighbourhood Plan will need to demonstrate that it complies with basic conditions, including general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVU-H	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Steven	Butler	Bidwells	Vistry Group	Scale of Development	The comment refers to the scale of development and the emerging Newport Neighbourhood Plan (although this does not relate to the proposed MM).	Noted. Newport Neighbourhood Plan is a separate process to the Local Plan and will be subject to a separate Examination in due course. The Neighbourhood Plan will need to demonstrate that it complies with basic conditions, including general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVH-4	Responding on behalf of	Neil	Hargreaves	Newport Quendon & Rickling				

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	an organisation			Neighbourhood Plan Steering group				

Main Modification 6

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RU3-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			Accuracy	A few comments refer to the accuracy of the diagrams referred to in MM6. These include: • Taylors Farm site is 27ha not 18ha. • Map does not show highway safeguarding areas as identified elsewhere in the Plan.	The Council are satisfied the diagram referred to in MM6 is correct. In relation to the two points raised: • The areas annotated on the diagram in relation to the employment allocations show the amount of employment development that is proposed (for example in accordance with Core Policy 4) and that would count towards the identified need. The more detailed map, and policy requirements, included in the Site Development Framework for the site, are clear that not all of the site will be developed for employment uses. • The diagram referred to in MM6 does not show any transport safeguarding areas, these are shown elsewhere in the Plan.
BHLF-HSYM-3RV7-K	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
BHLF-HSYM-3RVU-H	Responding as an individual	Allison	Evans					
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			General Comments	A number of general comments are made about some of the proposed allocations and the exclusion of a recent planning permission from the diagram referred to in MM6. However, these comments do not relate to the Main Modification.	Noted. The diagram shows the allocations made by the Local Plan. They do not show existing planning permissions.
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	General Support	Support is provided for MM6 and the clarity it provides.	Support Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVZ-P	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Richard	Agnew	Gladman				
BHLF-HSYM-3RVJ-6	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Andrew	Martin	Andrew Martin – Planning Ltd	S. Robinson Farms Ltd	General Objection - Process	A number of general comments are made, these include: • The diagram is misleading as it shows sites areas in full, even though some of the areas identified are to be developed as green space, or not developed for housing, for example. • Reference is made to discussions that were referred to at the hearing between the Council and Historic England, that alluded to alternative proposals for the Great Dunmow proposed allocation that is reported to be less harmful. It is suggested that this information has not been made available to the Examination. • It is stated that no documents have been uploaded to show any changes. Additionally, it is suggested that the MM is not legally compliant for the following reasons: • The public have not had the opportunity to be consulted on	Noted. The comments do not appear to relate specifically to the Main Modification which is the subject of the consultation. In relation to the specific points raised: • The diagram is intended to simply show the location of the allocations in the area. There are a series of other more detailed plans, including the illustrative frameworks within the Site Development Templates, that provide more detail which is considered to be more than adequate. • It is common for discussions to occur between the Council and a range of stakeholders, however, the Council have not sought to make any proposals to the Great Dunmow allocation and as such, no further information is required. The consultation relates to the MM as proposed. • The MM document clearly shows two versions of the diagram showing what has changed.
ANON-HSYM-3RF4-Z	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley					
BHLF-HSYM-3RV7-K	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Trevor	Dodkins	Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd	Lands Improvement Holdings			

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							<p>any alternatives that may have been discussed between the Council and Historic England.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reported to be outstanding objections from Historic England. • Reference is made to planning proposals for the sites that are said to deviate from the Local Plan policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation relates to the proposed Main Modifications. As there are no other changes proposed, there are no other documents required. • Historic England submitted material to the Examination which has been considered. It is a matter for the Inspectors what recommendations they have sought to make and the Main Modifications they have identified. • Any planning applications for Local Plan allocations will be determined through the Development Management process, which sits outside the plan-making process. It is expected that any proposals would be consistent with the Local Plan policies as adopted.

Main Modification 7

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RV8-M	Responding as an individual	Andrew	Ketteridge			General Comments	Some general comments are made but they are not thought to relate to the MM.	No further comments
ANON-HSYM-3RUC-X	Responding as an individual	Andrew	Ketteridge					
BHLF-HSYM-3RV8-M	Responding as an individual	Andrew	Ketteridge					
BHLF-HSYM-3RVG-3	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Johnathan	Dixon	Savills (UK) Ltd	Audley End Estate	General Support.	General Support is provided for the MM.	Support Noted.
ANON-HSYM-3RGN-U	Responding as an individual	Dominic	Davey			General Objection	General Objection to the removal of safeguarding for future provision of a southern relief road for Saffron Walden. It is suggested that this modification underlines the fact that the plan is focused on house building rather than on the overall planning of infrastructure for the community.	The Local Plan overall, makes a significant contribution to planning for infrastructure. The Council accepts the Main Modification proposed by the Inspector. However, the Modification does not in itself, prevent future road provision being considered through a future Local Plan, should that be considered appropriate/ necessary, etc.

Main Modification 8

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Responding as an individual	George	Catchpole			General Objection to Development	<p>A number of responses raise general objections to the proposed development at Great Dunmow (which appear to largely not relate to the proposed Main Modification). Specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General references to the Test of Soundness in relation to the proposed allocation. 	The consultation related to the proposed Main Modifications and the material made it clear that it was not an opportunity to repeat material that has already been considered through the Examination process. The majority of comments do not appear to relate to the proposed Main Modification, however, in relation to the specific points:
ANON-HSYM-3RG7-4	Responding as an individual	Martin	North					

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFE-H	Responding as an individual	Simon	Carpenter				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MM fails to address many of the issues raised through the Examination process. • The MM does not fully address the concerns raised by Historic England. It is also suggested that revised masterplan was discussed between the Council and Historic England, but this is not before the Examination. • The re-introduction of an Education facility will lead to increased traffic impact. • Reference is made to a planning application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation relates to the MM, not to the proposal per se. • It is a matter for the Inspectors to recommend Main Modifications and these have been subject to consultation. A substantial amount of material was before the Examination and it is understood this has been considered. • As above and see separate response below relating to the Historic England response to the consultation. • An education facility is not re-introduced, it was clearly listed as a policy requirement in the original policy wording and included on the key of the illustrative framework diagram. The MM is simply to show this facility on the plan for consistency with the policy wording. • Planning Applications are considered through the Development Management process which is separate to the plan-making process. It is expected that any proposals would need to be consistent with the Local Plan policies.
ANON-HSYM-3RFF-J	Responding as an individual	Linda	Carpenter					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUZ-N	Responding as an individual	Keith	Yates					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUY-M	Responding as an individual	Claire	Bent-Marshall					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUG-2	Responding as an individual	David	Perry					
BHLF-HSYM-3RU3-E	Responding as an individual	Claire	Bent-Marshall					
BHLF-HSYM-3RV2-E	Responding as an individual	George	Catchpole					
BHLF-HSYM-3RU8-K	Responding as an individual		Elaine					
BHLF-HSYM-3RU6-H	Responding as an individual	William	Tracey					
BHLF-HSYM-3RV2-E	Responding as an individual	Cameron	Coulson					
BHLF-HSYM-3RVS-F	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		General Objection to Development - Historic England	Historic England repeat their concerns about the potential for harm to the historic environment from development at Great Dunmow. This does not appear to relate to the proposed Main Modification. It is stated that this is frustrating given that the Council had previously identified a viable alternative that would have reduced the level of harm. The Council are asked to demonstrate a more balanced and transparent approach that recognised the significance of the affected assets and actively seeks to minimise harm.	The consultation relates to the proposed Main Modifications, which are those recommended as necessary by the Planning Inspectors. The consultation material is clear that it is not an opportunity to revisit matters that have been already considered through the Examination process. Historic England submitted material to the Examination which has been considered. The Council understands that the concerns raised by Historic England through the MM consultation relating to the Great Dunmow proposed allocation were already before the Inspectors as part of the Examination process. In relation to two specific points, there were discussions between the Council and Historic England about a potential for an alternative scheme, but whilst Historic England noted that they considered that proposal would reduce harm, they did not support it. The Council have maintained throughout that they consider the existing proposals already reached an appropriate compromise in seeking to minimise any impacts – this was considered through the Examination process. In relation to the Council demonstrating a more balanced and

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								transparent approach, to reiterate, the Main Modifications are those recommended by the Planning Inspectors who are presiding over the Examination.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVT-G	Responding on behalf of an organisation	J	Nugent	Pigeon		General Support	General support is provided for the MM and the clarity it provides.	Support Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVD-Z	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Richard	Agnew	Gladman				

Main Modification 9

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	Parkers Farm	Comment raises a query on the removal of the access track to the north of Parkers Fram and the land holding of Parkers Farm itself. The consultee highlights that these should be included in the allocation, in the interests of good planning practice that involves all stakeholders in the process.	The changes are simply to ensure the framework plan is consistent with the Policies Map as presented at the Regulation 19 Plan submission stage. The Council are content with the changes as proposed.
ANON-HSYM-3RFH-M	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Loss of SANG Area	Comment highlighting that the plan shown should address the loss of the SANG area through the permitted Bulls Field Development (ref: UTT/23/1583/PINS).	Although the area at Bulls Field has been removed due to the application referenced, the overall site needs to be delivered in accordance with the landscape and Green Infrastructure requirements set out in the wording of the Takeley Site Development Template. This will require the developer to deliver 29.7 ha of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace. This, alongside the requirements to enhance and enlarge Priors Wood, which is unchanged since the Regulation 19 plan. The Council is content the site is large enough to allow the policy requirements to be met in full with no further amendments necessary.
ANON-HSYM-3RFH-M	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Commitment omissions	Comment highlighting that the plan for Takeley at Appendix A does not reflect the 100 homes approved to the west side of Station Road and the 155 approved north of Takeley Cricket Ground.	The committed development referred is shown on this plan as greyed out areas, as described in the Key.

Main Modification 10

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council		Airport Capacity	Comment refers to the replacement of '43 million passengers per annum' with 'Approved Capacity' as being vague and promoting potential expansion.	The Council needs to ensure the policy is fit-for-purpose and is future proofed to remain up to date pending the currently application for increasing capacity of the airport.

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			General Comments	Some general comments refer to various aspects of the airport, including its expansion and the provision for parking, but they do not appear to relate to the Main Modification.	No further comments.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council				

Main Modification 11

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Rachel	Perryman			General Objection	A number of comments raise objections to the Main Modification, in particular, that there does not appear to be a map available showing the area to be safeguarded. It is also suggested that any such route would likely require land controlled by London Stansted Airport and that any such proposals would have implications for Airport surface access operations and as such, such provision is not considered deliverable. Concerns are also raised about the area available and the safety of the road.	On reflection, the Council accept that in the absence of a map showing the area referred to as 'safeguarded' the MM would be ineffective and on that basis, the Council would be content for the MM to be deleted. The absence of the MM does not prevent the Council from working with the Highways Authority to seek to deliver a scheme through S278 highway works and the Site Development Template already require the provision of active travel routes from the site to enhance access to Takeley and deliver any strategic walking and cycling enhancements identified in the Uttlesford and Essex LCWIP.
ANON-HSYM-3RFW-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Lydia	Sadler	Stansted Airport Limited				
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Ann	Boyle					
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley					
BHLF-HSYM-3RVQ-D	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		General Support	Two comments provide general support for the Main Modification, including from Essex County Council, who have responsibility as the Highway's Authority, who note that the proposed wording reflects that suggested by ECC to the Regulation 19 Local Plan. However, a question is raised about whether the area referred to should be shown on the Policies Map.	On reflection, the Council accept that in the absence of a map showing the area referred to as 'safeguarded' the MM would be ineffective and on that basis, the Council would be content for the MM to be deleted. The absence of the MM does not prevent the Council from working with the Highways Authority to seek to deliver a scheme through S278 highway works and the Site Development Template already require the provision of active travel routes from the site to enhance access to Takeley and deliver any strategic walking and cycling enhancements identified in the Uttlesford and Essex LCWIP.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Tom	Vernon	Quod Limited	Portland Capital			
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Other Comments	One response makes wider comments about the need for alternative routes and options to support sustainable travel (although it is not considered these relate to the MM).	Noted.

Main Modification 12

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			General Support	General Support provided for MM	Support Noted.

Main Modification 13

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Robert	Barber	Pegasus Group	Bloor Homes (Eastern)	Site Allocation Open Space Requirement	<p>The representation reintroduces and expands upon arguments made during the examination with regards to the viability of the Walpole Meadows Phase 2 allocation's open space requirement and the potential issues of future management arrangements. Consequently, it is requested that the respective map be amended to remove the vast majority of northern parcel of the allocation in line with the developer's new masterplan.</p> <p>The amendments to Site 1B within MM13 are supported, albeit the removal of a minor wedge that is associated with another site is recommended.</p>	<p>The intent of MM13 is to ensure the site allocation boundaries shown on Figure 7.1 are consistent with the wider plan and its appendices. The representation is therefore not relevant to the modification at hand and is instead used to reintroduce and expand upon arguments already heard at examination.</p> <p>The Council has already set out the myriad of reasons that such a change is unjustified, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The substantive need for public open space at Stansted Mountfitchet as identified in the Council's evidence and as required as SANG by Natural England. - The design and landscape benefits resultant from keeping the land north of the delineating hedgerow free of development. - That the allocation requirements were reflective of the developer's proposal that was already well progressed through the DM process, including through the Uttlesford Quality Review Panel. - The viability of the allocation and its policy requirements were satisfactorily tested through the Council's Viability Assessment.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council		Loss of Green Space	A comment which states that MM13 results in the loss of allocated green space and that this is detrimental and not justified.	<p>Figure 7.1 is a contextual map. The removal of the green space 'hatched' area in MM13 is to ensure that the map is kept simple to assist legibility and is only intended to show the allocation boundaries.</p> <p>The policy requirements for green space at the site and set out within the Site Development Template (Appendix 4) and remains unchanged.</p>
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council		Removal of Land from the Green Belt	Parsonage Farm/Forest Hall and Stansted Park appear to have been removed from Green Belt.	MM13 does not result in any changes to the Green Belt.

Main Modification 14

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Alternative Community Use	Should the safeguarded land be allocated instead for an alternative community use or another form of development?	The sole intention of the safeguarding designation was to reserve the land for a future decision on education facility provision. An allocation for an alternative community use would not meet this requirement.
BHLF-HSYM-3RF8-4	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Rosanna	Metcalfe	Strutt and Parker	City & Country	General Support	Support for the principle of MM.	Support Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Adam	Davies	Ceres Property	M Scott Properties Ltd			
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Jonathan	Ward			Green Belt Status	Comments querying the implication of the safeguarding designation on the land's Green Belt status.	The site falls within the Green Belt and this is unaffected with or without the Main Modification.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council				
ANON-HSYM-3RFJ-P	Responding as an individual	Jonathan	Ward			Objection to the Removal of Safeguarded Land	The safeguarded land should be retained to accommodate future housing growth in the area. The school is beyond its design life and the safeguarded land would provide space for a rebuild/expansion if necessary, which could help resolve the present highways issues.	The original proposal was to safeguard land for possible future education provision and this is removed by the Main Modification. On that basis, the comment does not relate to the MM. Any future housing requirements will be considered through a future Local Plan process.

Main Modification 15

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Jon	Goodall	DLP Planning	Salacia Limited	Modification Proposals are Insufficient	The Plan must be consistent with national policy in terms of outlining Thaxted's potential role and function in terms of contributing to growth and how any substantiated constraints may be overcome. The proposed modifications in Chapter 8 are insufficient in achieving this goal and modifications to the supporting text in Chapter 4 are also required.	The recommended amendments to MM15 are disproportionate to the issue at hand, which is simply to clarify which constraints at Thaxted are fundamentally prohibitive to residential growth at Thaxted, and which are not. It is considered that the proposed modification achieves this goal.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVQ-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Steven	Butler	Bidwells	Vistry Group		Amendments to MM15 are suggested, namely, to Bullet 1 under the 'Thaxted and Rural Area' section of figure 4.1 and to paragraph 8.8 to state the potential for Thaxted to accommodate future growth is recognised where it can viably accommodate education capacity requirements. Furthermore, any reference to any other constraints at Thaxted should be removed.	It is not, as has been suggested, necessary to remove reference within the Local Plan to wider constraints at Thaxted that may influence how development is brought forward, such as heritage. Heritage issues are especially prevalent within Thaxted and it is entirely appropriate for the supplementary text of a Local Plan to highlight this, albeit distinguishing this from the principal issue of education provision, which has been done through MM15. The representations also seek the introduction of supplementary text which explicitly recognises the potential for

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								future growth at Thaxted should the education issue be overcome. Such a statement is unnecessary, pre-emptive, and not in keeping with the contextual information provided within figure 4.1 or the respective area strategies for any other settlement.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			General Support	General support is provided for MM15	Support Noted.

Main Modification 16

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RF3-Y	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Lisa	Foster	Richard Buxton Solicitors	Henham Parish Council	Objection to Modification	<p>The modification is unsound for two reasons. Firstly, permissions granted between 1st April 2025 and Local Plan adoption will not be counted towards meeting the Neighbourhood Plan housing requirement, which is illogical.</p> <p>Secondly, permissions granted within the parish but not at the settlement will not be counted toward meeting the requirement, meaning Henham would be accommodating an unsustainable quantum of development.</p>	<p>Permissions granted at the settlement beyond 1st April 2025 will count towards meeting the Neighbourhood Plan requirement. The Council will provide updates to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Groups on their overall requirement as needed, but the housing requirement at a specific point in time (1st April 2025) was needed for the purposes of drafting MM16.</p> <p>The matter of the housing requirement representing a settlement based figure rather than a parish based one was discussed during the examination hearing sessions and does not relate to the content of MM16.</p>
ANON-HSYM-3RF4-Z	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner			General Support	Comment in general support of the modification.	Support Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVM-9	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council				

Main Modification 17

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFW-3	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner			Debden Implications	This comment notes the modification and implications it has for the Debden Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Architectural merit	The comment asks the council to recognise that architectural merit does not necessarily mean that the asset may not be a heritage asset.	The updated wording clarifies Criterion (ii), insofar that it restricts replacement dwellings in the open countryside by preventing the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset as part of any replacement dwellings in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Main Modification 18

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner			Debden Implications	This comment notes the modification and implications it has for the Debden Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.

Main Modification 19

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		Clause 3 (ii) Modification - Essex County Council	Essex County Council (ECC) has requested an additional modification to MM19 hasn't been included, but was discussed and agreed between UDC and ECC at a meeting dated 08/05/2025 (in response to ECC Reg 19 representation Ref 62 UTT3B). This is in regard to clause 3 (ii) as follows: '3ii. on larger sites in exceptional circumstances this may be met on each individual phase as a site-wide residential average (weighted by floor area), provided that no single dwelling has an EUI of >6045kWh/m2/yr'	The Council is content the MM and policy overall is appropriate.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Part B	Comment highlighting that the change from 'are expected' to 'should' is a meaningless change and is not robust after the amendment.	The Council is content the MM is appropriate.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		Wording correction	Comment suggesting that two minor 'Additional Modifications' are made to very slightly adjust the wording of CP 22 as follows: 1. Add 'by' as follows: Renewable energy must be generated on-site for all new development (1 or more new dwellings or 100m2 or more non-residential floorspace) by whichever of the following results is the greater amount * of by solar PV energy generation at a level consistent with either (i) or (ii) below: 2. It is suggested that an amendment is needed to how the footnote is referenced.	The Council will make an additional Additional Modification to add the word 'By' to the policy as indicated. The second suggestion is considered unnecessary as the policy is considered to be correct in this regard.

Main Modification 20

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			General Objection	Concern is raised about the wording relating to pooled development being consistent with ECC guidance and contributions only being pooled in exceptional circumstances. It is suggested that this approach is unsound. Some wider comments are raised but these are not thought to relate to the MM.	The Council is content with the MM as worded. It is understood to be consistent with the ECC approach, that ECC, as Highways Authority support the proposed change, but that the policy wording does allow for contributions to be pooled where necessary.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council				

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			General Support	ECC provides support for the MM, which is as per their previous recommendations. However, on reflection, ECC now have new wording they would like to propose as follows: “Highway mitigation should be delivered directly by the developer via Section 278 having regard to the ECC Developers’ Guide for Infrastructure Contributions. Where necessary, the Council will secure financial contributions (via S106) to deliver highways projects necessary to accommodate the growth from this Plan, including collecting pooled contributions where mitigation cannot be apportioned to a single allocation or development”.	The Council is content with the MM as worded. However, the Council would not object to a minor adjustment to the policy along the lines of those proposed by ECC, if the Inspectors consider that is helpful, so long as this does not require any further consultation.

Main Modification 21

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Alternative Wording	One comment suggests that more detail is required on how ‘fly parking’ will be deterred and another suggests that the description for ‘all development including employment’ should list ‘residential, commercial, educational, transport and leisure’ uses. ECC make comments about the wider policy that is not subject to Main Modification.	The Council is content with the MM as worded. The phrase ‘all development’ provides sufficient clarity without listing all types individually. It is considered the wording provides sufficient guidance for the matter of ‘fly parking’. Whilst the ECC comments are noted, they are outside the scope of the MM; all previous comments from ECC were before the Examination.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council				
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council				
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	General Support	General Support is provided for the MM.	Support Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RV9-N	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd			

Main Modification 22

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Andrewsfield Airfield	Comment querying why Andrewsfield Airfield is not referenced in Core Policy 32A.	In accordance with the ODMP/DfT Circular 1/2003 the only official safeguarding zone within Uttlesford is London Stansted Airport. The circular highlights that for other civil aerodromes that are not listed, they are responsible for taking steps to protect their locations from the effects of possible adverse development.

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RVR-E	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Christopher	Waldron	Defence Infrastructure Organisation		Military Safeguarding	Comment from the MOD request Core Policy 32A and relevant appendixes are updated to reflect the capability and relevant safeguarding provision to better inform developers of the statutory requirement that MOD is consulted on development that triggers the criteria set out on Safeguarding Plans, and the constraints that might be applied to development as a result of the requirement to ensure defence capability and operations are not adversely affected.	The Council is content the MM is sufficient and does refer to relevant guidance and successor documents. The additional detail provided is considered to be unnecessary
BHLF-HSYM-3RVR-E	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Christopher	Waldron	Defence Infrastructure Organisation		Eastern WAM network	Additionally, the MOD request that their new asset (East 2 WAM Network) is also included on the Policies Map as part of the Safeguarding Area.	The Council has made every effort to obtain the most up-to-date data from the MOD to ensure the mapping is updated correctly, but the MOD have stated that due to capacity constraints they are unable to provide this information. The Council will be happy to update the Policies Map at such time the information is available, although note that this can occur outside the scope and/ or remit of the Local Plan Examination.

Main Modification 23 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 24

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner			Debden Implications	Comment notes interest in whether new developments in Debden will be expected to connect to mains foul drainage once the Local Plan is adopted.	Noted.
ANON-HSYM-3RFW-3	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			General Objection - Mains foul drainage	Some objections to the requirements in the policy that directs foul drainage for developments specifically referring to: - The meaningless nature of the word 'restrict' and that it is open to interpretation. - Comments regarding concerns around the foul water connection to 'Land North of Taylors Farm' referenced in the plan - Concerns around pollutants from commercial/employment development - Consideration that the plan is unsound when it would permit any 'major' commercial development to operate on non-mains foul water disposal.	The comments do not appear to relate to the Main Modification. The word 'restrict' is part of the policy, it is not affected by the MM. There are no references to the Land North of Taylors Farm site in the policy. General concerns are noted. The section of the policy relating to non-mains foul water disposal relates to the existing policy, it is not part of the MM.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Responding as an individual	Allison	Evans					
BHLF-HSYM-3RF2-X	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		General Objection - Water Efficiency	General objection to the requirement for development to have a water efficiency standard of 90 lppd. However, this does not relate to the proposed MM.	The MM does not alter the proposed efficiency standard; it simply amends the policy wording to improve clarity. The Council remains satisfied with the MM.
ANON-HSYM-3RFH-M	Responding on behalf of		Tessa	Strategic & Spatial	Anglian Water	General Support - Water Efficiency	Anglian Water support the 90 litres per person per day (l/p/d) water efficiency standard for new homes, which aligns with the collaborative "Shared Standards for Water Efficiency in Local	Support Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	an organisation			Planning Lead			Plans" published in June 2025. The standards developed by multiple water companies and environmental agencies, recommend that Local Planning Authorities adopt policies stricter than the 110 l/p/d building regulation to ensure a sustainable water supply. Anglian Water endorses the 90 l/p/d requirement, noting that tighter water efficiency also reduces wastewater flows, consequently lowering operational carbon from pumping and treatment.	
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Wording Revision	Comment requesting a wording revision: "All new developments will be expected to achieve a maximum water usage of 90 litres per person per day."	The council is satisfied with the MM as it is currently worded.

Main Modification 25

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFW-3	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			Building Heights	General comment about the impact of height of buildings combined with land raising to affect the amenity to nearby neighbouring properties.	The comments do not relate to the MM. The MM addresses concerns from the Environment Agency around the wording to make clear that the description of development covers both built development and land raising operations concerning matters of flood risk. It does not concern amenity to neighbouring properties, and the council considers that these matters are adequately addressed in Core Policy 42, 43 and 44.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Tom	Vernon	Quod Limited	Portland Capital	Sequential Test	Comment highlighting that the policy should be updated to reflect amendments to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on flood risk. Notably the changes to the need for a sequential test and that if a flood risk assessment demonstrates that development can be made safe throughout its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere, the sequential test does not need to be applied.	The council is satisfied with the current wording set out in the main modification, which is future-proofed by highlighting that the sequential approach should be taken that is set out in the PPG. This would include the exemption that the consultee is referring to.
ANON-HSYM-3RFH-M	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Tessa	Saunders	Anglian Water		General Support	Supportive comment from Anglian Water around the use of SuDS for the management of surface water and the submission of a drainage strategy.	Support Noted.
ANON-HSYM-3RFX-4	Responding as an individual	Stephanie	Gill			Policy Wording	Comment querying the phrase 'where possible' in paragraph 1 of the policy to highlight that this would lead to housing being built in areas liable to flooding.	This wording has been agreed with the Environment Agency through a Statement of Common Ground. The Council remain satisfied with the wording as presented in the MM.

Main Modification 26 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 27

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee		Hatfield Forest - effects of Employment	Comment suggesting that the tariff applied through the Strategic Access Management Measures (SAMM) for Hatfield Forest should include employment sites.	The evidence from the visitor surveys that justified the tariff showed that the majority of visitors to Hatfield Forest came from residential origin rather than from their place of employment. However, the policy ensures that all development proposals should protect or enhance sites of international, national or local importance, which includes SSSI's.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee		SSSI biodiversity	Comment suggesting that it is inappropriate to have off-site Biodiversity Net Gain to mitigate impacts on Sites of Special Scientific Interest.	In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance on Biodiversity Net Gain (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 74-008-20240214) the policy follows the mitigation hierarchy when applying Biodiversity Net Gain. This ensures that onsite habitats are prioritised but if they cannot be avoided the mitigation of those effects should be through off-site biodiversity gains.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		General Support	Support for the Main Modification as proposed.	Support noted.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Takeley Allocation	It is suggested that recent planning permissions adjacent to the proposed allocation at Takeley will reduce the level of SANG to be provided by the strategic allocation.	Whilst this matter is addressed in relation to MM9, the Council are content the site is large enough that it can still provide for the policy requirements set out in the Local Plan, including for the identified SANG need.
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			Policy Wording	General comment querying the use of the phrase 'where appropriate' in Core Policy 38 under 'Protection of Hatfield Forest.	The wording 'Where appropriate' is not affected by the MM. However, the wording was used to ensure that it is clear that the tariff only applies in circumstances set out in the Natural England guidance on the SAMM strategy.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				

Main Modification 28

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Endowment Conflict	Comment querying whether the requirements set out in the MM conflict with the policy requirement for an endowment sum for the maintenance of Green and Blue Infrastructure.	This requirement does not conflict with the requirement to provide an endowment sum. These two requirements are meant to complement each other as the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) could be a method of setting out how the endowment sum would be used to maintain the GBI.

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		Support	Supportive comment from ECC for the requirement of a Landscape and Ecological Management (LEMP) to deal with the management and maintenance of Green Infrastructure (GI).	Support noted.

Main Modification 29

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RVQ-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd	Further amendments - Detailed consent	Comments that consider a further amendment should be required to the MM to ensure that it is clear the requirement for a Biodiversity Net Gain plan should only apply to full applications or reserved matters, as this will not be known at the outline stage.	The council is content with the policy wording and MM as stated and that any further revision would be unnecessary.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVM-9	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Isabella	Ingram	Iceni Projects	Mulberry Homes and St Edmunds Lane Managemen t Limited			
BHLF-HSYM-3RF2-X	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		General - 20% BNG comments	Comments that highlight support for the provisions of MM29 however continue to raise objections to the 20% BNG requirements based on the stipulations of Planning Practice Guidance	Support for the modification is noted; however, the MM does not alter the proposed BNG standard; it simply amends the policy wording to improve flexibility. The Council remains satisfied with both the policy and the MM.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVD-Z	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Marie	Jasper	hgh Consulting	Landsec			
BHLF-HSYM-3RVQ-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd	General Support	Support the greater flexibility provided under the main modification around schemes that maybe unviable to secure 20% BNG.	Support noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVM-9	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Isabella	Ingram	Iceni Projects	Mulberry Homes and St Edmunds Lane Managemen t Limited			

Main Modification 30

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFW-3	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner			Support	Comment supporting the policy and noting its usefulness in supporting the Debden Neighbourhood Plan.	Support noted.

Main Modification 31

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			Policy Wording	Comment querying the acceptable levels that would be considered significant harmful effects and that there is no indication in the policy for how this is defined. Comment also refers to the effects of 'Land North of Taylors Farm ' on Hatfield Forest.	The comments do not relate to the MM as the wording referred to is unchanged. The Council remain satisfied the wording is appropriate.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			General Support	Comment supporting the MM	Support noted.

Main Modification 32

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-W	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Lydia	Sadler	Stansted Airport Limited		Refusal of Applications	This comment highlights that the proposed modification is not sound as it does not include reference to the refusal of planning permission for new dwellings.	Even though the comment does not relate to the MM, Paragraph three of the policy does make it clear that residential dwellings and other noise sensitive development proposed in areas exposed to LOAEL and SOAEL noise levels will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that noise impacts for future users will be made acceptable.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Taylors Farm	General comment relating to the viability of providing Acoustic measures for the Taylors Farm development site.	The comment does not relate to the MM proposed. The council is satisfied that the policy ensures that noise implications will be considered at the planning application stage for all developments proposed.

Main Modification 33

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RVQ-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Tom	Vernon	Quod Limited	Portland Capital	Alternative Policy Wording	Support is provided for the proposed Main Modification. Details are provided for a development site that are not relevant to the proposed MM. It is suggested that sui generis uses are added to the policy.	Support noted. Whilst outside the scope of the MM consultation, it is not considered necessary to add Sui Generis uses to the policy. The Policy relates to main employment types and is considered to provide sufficient flexibility.
ANON-HSYM-3RGZ-7	Responding as an individual	Crisoulla	Colocasidou			General Objection - Impact of Development	A number of comments object to the removal of the wording 'where there are exceptional circumstances' and it is suggested this would make it easier to approve large employment developments on unallocated sites. A number of the comments refer to the potential for impacts on local amenity, noise, loss of green space, traffic impacts and the risk of enabling incremental development, in particular. Some comments raise concerns about the phrase 'on the	The Council are content with the MM as proposed. The policy sets out a series of detailed criteria to guide decision making which do relate to amenity and access, for example and taken together, are considered to be satisfactory. The phrase 'on the edge of existing employment sites' does not form part of the MM. It is understood that the criteria set out in the policy provide
ANON-HSYM-3RGT-1	Responding as an individual	Dmitry	Grishin					
ANON-HSYM-3RGK-R	Responding as an individual	Simon	Roberts					

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RGP-W	Responding as an individual	Rodelle	Beauchamp				edge of existing employment sites’ (however, this does not form part of the Main Modification).	details of what the exceptional circumstances are where the policy will apply, so repeating the phrase in the text would introduce ambiguity.
ANON-HSYM-3RGX-5	Responding as an individual	Lisa	Etter				It is suggested that retaining the phrase does not make the plan unsound, serves no purpose, but does weaken the policy. One comment refers to the potential for existing sites to be expanded in a way that may be harmful.	It considered the policy criteria provides sufficient protection against inappropriate expansion of existing sites, particularly criteria iv.
ANON-HSYM-3RFQ-W	Responding as an individual	Hailey	Baker					
ANON-HSYM-3RFC-F	Responding as an individual	Florence	Burdikin					
ANON-HSYM-3RFN-T	Responding as an individual	Ronald	Beauchamp					
ANON-HSYM-3RF1-W	Responding as an individual	Steven	Stylianou					
ANON-HSYM-3RUD-Y	Responding as an individual	Susan	De Ats					
ANON-HSYM-3RUN-9	Responding as an individual	Alan	Vye					
ANON-HSYM-3RUF-1	Responding as an individual	John	Duignan					
ANON-HSYM-3RUV-H	Responding as an individual	John & Diane	Chandler					
ANON-HSYM-3RUE-Z	Responding as an individual	Amanda	Ward					
ANON-HSYM-3RUM-8	Responding as an individual	Rachel	Perryman					
ANON-HSYM-3RFJ-P	Responding as an individual	Ann	Boyle					
ANON-HSYM-3RFW-3	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner					
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson					
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley					

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Responding as an individual	Allison	Evans					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
ANON-HSYM-3RFG-K	Responding as an individual	Martin	Dunn					
ANON-HSYM-3RU9-M	Responding as an individual	Marie	Goodey			General Objection to Development Proposal	The comment makes a general objection to a development proposal which does not relate to the proposed MM.	No Comments.

Main Modification 34

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RF6-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Graeme	Warriner	NWS Planning	Ropemaker Properties Limited	Application on Existing Employment Sites	<p>This comment objects to the application of the policy on Existing Employment sites, highlighting issues around:</p> <p>a) It would penalise property owners for seeking to improve stock and maintain business occupiers needs.</p> <p>b) It would hinder commercial viability as existing employment sites already have a use value.</p> <p>c) Developers are separate to potential business occupiers and it is unclear how they could insist on a number of apprenticeships for a business.</p>	The comments do not relate directly to the MM. However, policies related to skills and training are commonplace and there are numerous instances where they have been highly successful in their operation. The Council remains satisfied with the approach.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Policy Wording	This comment objects to the use of the word 'should' as it allows for developers to argue that an assessment is not required	'Should' is considered strong enough to encourage compliance with the policy, however as with other policies in the plan relating to viability there may be a need for flexibility and allow non-compliance in appropriate circumstances.

Main Modification 35 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 36 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 37 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 38

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	General Support	General support is provided for MM38.	Support Noted.

Main Modification 39 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 40 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 41

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFW-3	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner			Implementation of Policy	A question is raised around the implementation of the policy (which doesn't relate to the MM): Will it be necessary for a building/structure to be actually designated or listed, if it can be described as a heritage asset?	The comment doesn't relate to the MM. However, heritage assets fall into two categories, designated and non-designated. Those designated can be found on Historic England's National Heritage List, whilst non-designated assets can be viewed on Uttlesford's 'Local Heritage List'. The purpose of MM41 is simply to ensure a heritage statement needs to be submitted where an application for a development proposal has the potential to affect assets from either category.

Main Modification 42

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RVE-1	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		Inconsistency with NPPF	MM42 does not reflect the NPPF, particularly in relation to substantial harm to designated heritage assets such as Scheduled Monuments. The current wording does not distinguish between substantial and less than substantial	The wording of MM42 was agreed with Historic England in the signed Statement of Common Ground - Addendum No.2 (May 2025).

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							harm, and total loss. A recommendation for revised wording is provided.	The policy intent is not to duplicate the provisions of the NPPF, which already speaks to the respective tests for applications based on the level of heritage harm caused. Rather, the policy seeks to clarify the information required to support an application that has effects on Scheduled Monuments and to set out a presumption in favour of the retention of such assets in situ. On this basis, the Council is content with the wording of the policy and MM as stated.

Main Modification 43

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council		Stansted Park	Stansted Park should be identified as a 'Registered Park'.	The comments do not relate to the MM specifically. However, Registered Parks and Gardens are designated heritage assets that are identified by Historic England. Core Policy 64a does not seek to identify new assets, but rather to clarify the policy requirements for development affecting existing assets.

Main Modification 44 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 45

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFW-3	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner			General Support	Supportive comments for the strengthening of the policy for community assets but a query is raised concerning whether the definition could go further.	Support noted. The Council is satisfied that the current wording of the policy includes sufficient examples of community uses. Further detail on identified district and neighbourhood need for community uses is set out in the IDP and future Neighbourhood Plans respectively.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley					

Main Modification 46 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 47

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RVM-9	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd	Biodiversity Gain Plan Phasing	The requirement for a Biodiversity Gain Plan is onerous for outline applications and should be reserved instead for only detailed applications, where a design has been refined.	The Council is content with the policy and Main Modification. Core Policy 40 requires the Biodiversity Gain Plan to be submitted and approved in writing "before commencement." The phasing of such a condition provides ample time for the refinement of a development proposal prior to this requirement 'biting'.
BHLF-HSYM-3RV1-D	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Isabella	Ingram	Iceni Projects	Mulberry Homes and St Edmunds Lane Management Limited			
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		General Support	General support provided to MM47.	Support Noted.

Main Modification 48 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 49 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 50

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		Support	Comment of support from ECC that notes and welcomes the proposed amendment in the MM.	Support noted.

Main Modification 51

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			Further detail - FLitch Way	Comment highlighting that the policy requirement is unsound and not legally compliant as full costings have not been detailed. Because of the strategic importance of the route, these costings should have been detailed and published as part of the documentation for the Local Plan.	The Council is satisfied with the wording of the MM, which addresses a consistency point, as the need to contribute to the Flitch Way was already identified as a requirement in Core Policy 13.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	General Support	Supportive comments regarding this amendment with clarification from the developer for the Takeley site that requirements for contributions and improvements will be part of the sustainable transport strategy for the site. There is a suggestion that these contributions should be transferred to the Essex Wildlife Trust rather than the Flitch Way specifically depending on the specific need.	Support noted. The specific requirement around the Flitch Way upgrades for sustainable travel was identified in the IDP (INF10) and LCWIP (TRA4).
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley					

Main Modification 52

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Typos	Comment highlighting a couple of typos in the modification proposed, notably being:	The Council acknowledges these minor typos within the main modification text and proposes an Additional Modification to address the following: • Undertake a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment to meet County Waste Local Plan policy requirements, given proximity to Taylors Farm, for inert recycling • Liaise with ECC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority on minerals and waste matters
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council			- The text on the second bullet point needs amending – ‘waster matters’ should read ‘waste matters’. - No need to capitalise minerals and waste matters. - The Waste Infrastructure Assessment should read Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment.	

Main Modification 53

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RVV-J	Responding on behalf of an organisation	J	Nugent	Pigeon		Support	Comment of support for the MM.	Support noted.

Main Modification 54

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		Typo - Impact Assessment	<p>Comment highlighting a couple of typos in the modification proposed, notably being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No need to capitalise minerals and waste matters - The Waste Infrastructure Assessment should read Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment 	<p>The council acknowledges these minor typos within the main modification text and proposes an Additional Modification to address the following:</p> <p>Add new section at end page 30 as follows: Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake a Minerals Resource Assessment • Undertake a Minerals Infrastructure Impact Assessment given its proximity to Highwood Quarry • Undertake a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment to meet County Waste Local Plan Policy requirements, given proximity to Highwood Quarry for inert waste recycling • Liaise with ECC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority on Mminerals and Wwaste Mmatters

Main Modification 55

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council		Highways Considerations	Access from Walpole Meadows will most likely be onto Pennington Lane, which is a rat run.	Vehicular access onto Pennington Lane is explicitly resisted by the allocation requirements.

Main Modification 56

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Typographical Error	There is an error where 'Pennington Lane' is spelt as 'Pennington Land'.	The comment is noted, this typo will be rectified as an Additional Modification.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council				

Main Modification 57 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 58

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council		Walpole Meadows Education Provision	Comment states that ECC have declined the provision of land for education provision at Walpole Meadows.	The Council is satisfied with the policy and MM as currently written, which is consistent with wording discussed with ECC as Education Authority.

Main Modification 59

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUK-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		General Support	General support is given to MM59.	Support Noted.

Main Modification 60 (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Main Modification 61

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Ruth	Clifford	Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council		General Objection	Comment querying the removal of safeguarding policy at Forest Hall school and whether alternative arrangements are in place considering education provision also no longer exists at Walpole Meadows.	The Council had originally proposed safeguarding for future secondary provision at the request of the Education Authority, in case such provision was needed in the future. However, it was acknowledged by the Education Authority through the Examination that there is no evidence to require this provision at the current time. Overall, the Council is satisfied with the MM. A future Local Plan process will be able to address the need to plan for future education provision informed by updated evidence.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Adam	Davies	Ceres Property	M Scott Properties Ltd	General Support	Supportive comments for this MM.	Support noted.

Main Modification 62

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RGU-2	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Sandra	Green	National Trust		Air Quality	The comment suggests that updated air quality evidence is needed to support the proposed safeguarding.	The comment does not relate to the MM specifically, as the MM is to modify the area safeguarded, not to introduce safeguarding. Any future proposals for a new highway connection would need to be subject to specific evidence and feasibility work. The safeguarding of land simply ensures the potential is retained and is a common approach used elsewhere.
ANON-HSYM-3RF1-W	Responding as an individual	Steven	Stylianou			General Objection - CPZ	A number of comments raise concern over the amendment to the safeguarded area for potential future access to the A120. A number of these comments refer to the area being located within the CPZ, thus it is suggested there is an inconsistency between the two policies. Other comments refer to the size of the area being disproportionate and larger than is likely to be required. It is also stated that any future road would need to cross MAG owned land and is therefore considered to be undeliverable. Some comments refer to the wider proposed allocation (but this does not relate to the proposed Main Modification).	<p>The MM amends the area safeguarded, it does not introduce the safeguarding per se. The area is amended to increase flexibility for a future scheme (i.e. to allow a possible road to connect to different parts of the employment site depending on how the site is masterplanned), but it is not expected that the area would be needed in its entirety. Any future highway scheme would be subject to detailed feasibility work, which is clearly stated by the policy. Safeguarding is a commonly used approach to assist with planning for highways infrastructure.</p> <p>The area is not proposed for development, it is simply safeguarded for a potential future highway scheme. The site remains in the CPZ, however the CPZ policy includes a series of criteria, that would not preclude some highway development, subject to the detail of any scheme being considered at the time, i.e., as informed by detailed feasibility work.</p>
ANON-HSYM-3RFN-T	Responding as an individual	Ronald	Beauchamp					
ANON-HSYM-3RGZ-7	Responding as an individual	Crisoulla	Colocasidou					
ANON-HSYM-3RGK-R	Responding as an individual	Simon	Roberts					
ANON-HSYM-3RGP-W	Responding as an individual	Rodelle	Beauchamp					
ANON-HSYM-3RGX-5	Responding as an individual	Lisa	Etter					
ANON-HSYM-3RFC-F	Responding as an individual	Florence	Burdikin					
ANON-HSYM-3RFG-K	Responding as an individual	Martin	Dunn					
ANON-HSYM-3RFQ-W	Responding as an individual	Hailey	Baker					
ANON-HSYM-3RGT-1	Responding as an individual	Dmitry	Grishin					
ANON-HSYM-3RUR-D	Responding as an individual	Susan	De Ats					
ANON-HSYM-3RUD-Y	Responding as an individual	Alan	Vye					
ANON-HSYM-3RUN-9	Responding as an individual	John	Duignan					

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RUF-1	Responding as an individual	John & Diane	Chandler					
ANON-HSYM-3RUV-H	Responding as an individual	Marie	Goodey					
ANON-HSYM-3RU9-M	Responding as an individual	Amanda	Ward					
ANON-HSYM-3RUE-Z	Responding as an individual	Ann	Boyle					
ANON-HSYM-3RFJ-P	Responding as an individual	Alan	Vye					
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson					
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley					
BHLF-HSYM-3RVQ-D	Responding as an individual	Allison	Evans					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
ANON-HSYM-3RGS-Z	Responding as an individual	Frankie	Arnone					
ANON-HSYM-3RG6-3	Responding as an individual	Lynda	Pinchbeck	Mrs L Pinchbeck		General Objection - Process	It is suggested that the modification does not appear to meet the objectively assessed need of the district, particularly in relation to housing, infrastructure, and environmental sustainability. It is suggested that there is no clear rationale for the modification, nor is there evidence of any reasonable alternatives being considered. A number of other details are suggested, such as a lack of delivery framework.	The MM proposes to amend the area safeguarded for a potential future highway scheme, it does not introduce the safeguarding per se. The area is amended to increase flexibility for any future scheme, however, any future proposals would need to be subject to detailed feasibility work, as is clearly stated by the policy. Safeguarding is a commonly used tool to assist planning for highway infrastructure; a delivery framework would follow at a future point in time, subject to the outcome of any feasibility work.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVG-3	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Steven	Butler	Bidwells	Messrs Bull & Robertson	General Support	General support is provided for the MM.	Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUT-F	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Alex	Cole	Director	Savills			

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFJ-P	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Lydia	Sadler	Stansted Airport Limited		Land Ownership	It is stated that some of the safeguarded land falls within the Airport Operational Boundary and should be removed. It is stated that it would place priority in the development of the adjacent land ahead of the purpose of the land being held for statutory undertaking.	No highway scheme is currently proposed. The land is safeguarded on a precautionary basis to assist with a future highway scheme, should that be required, subject to detailed feasibility work, as clearly stated by the policy. There is nothing to prevent, in principle, highway provision being made on land that falls within an Airport Operational Area, as evident by the extent of highway schemes across the existing airport site. Furthermore, the land in question, currently has no obvious function related to airport operations, thus the safeguarding policy, does not in itself, create any conflict with the Airport Operational Boundary. Should a highway scheme be proposed in the future, it would be subject to detailed feasibility work, and all appropriate and necessary planning considerations at the time.
BHLF-HSYM-3RSM-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Fiona	Martin	Natural England		MM62 – Natural England	<p>Natural England state that they support the proposed MM, but suggest that it indicates that access to the site would be solely from the A120, but also add that they consider that further air quality modelling is required.</p> <p>Natural England make a number of other comments relating to the Employment Allocation (but these do not appear to relate to the proposed Main Modification).</p>	<p>The MM proposes to amend the area safeguarded for a potential future highway scheme, it does not introduce the safeguarding per se. The area is amended to increase flexibility for any future scheme, however, any future proposals would need to be subject to detailed feasibility work, as is clearly stated by the policy.</p> <p>It is not considered that the safeguarding implies that access would be solely from the A120. Transport and access related matters are clearly set out in the Site Development Template for this site, which are not changed by the MM.</p> <p>The issues raised by Natural England have been raised previously and have already been available to inform the Examination.</p>

Main Modification 63

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUU-G	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Mark	Coletta	Great Hallingbury Parish Council		CPZ Area - Great Hallingbury	The response raises some general comments and concerns about the CPZ. It does not relate to the Proposed Main Modification per se.	Noted. The Council is content with the MM as per the evidence submitted and discussed through the Examination process.
ANON-HSYM-3RF1-W	Responding as an individual	Steven	Stylianou			Link to MM62	A number of comments provide support for MM63, but also highlight the area safeguarded for a possible future highway scheme that relates to MM62, which is stated to be contradictory with MM63. Some comments question how the proposal relates to the PINS letter.	Support for MM63 noted. Please refer to responses relating to MM62 for further details about that MM. The Proposed Main Modifications are the recommendations of the Planning Inspectors presiding over the Local Plan Examination who asked the Council to prepare them in accordance with their findings..
ANON-HSYM-3RFN-T	Responding as an individual	Ronald	Beauchamp					
ANON-HSYM-3RGZ-7	Responding as an individual	Crisoulla	Colocasidou					
ANON-HSYM-3RGK-R	Responding as an individual	Simon	Roberts					

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RGP-W	Responding as an individual	Rodelle	Beauchamp					
ANON-HSYM-3RGX-5	Responding as an individual	Lisa	Etter					
ANON-HSYM-3RFQ-W	Responding as an individual	Hailey	Baker					
ANON-HSYM-3RFC-F	Responding as an individual	Florence	Burdikin					
ANON-HSYM-3RFG-K	Responding as an individual	Martin	Dunn					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUJ-5	Responding as an individual	Ann	Boyle					
ANON-HSYM-3RFX-4	Responding as an individual	Susan	De Ats					
ANON-HSYM-3RUM-8	Responding as an individual	Alan	Vye					
ANON-HSYM-3RUR-D	Responding as an individual	John	Duignan					
ANON-HSYM-3RUD-Y	Responding as an individual	John & Diane	Chandler					
ANON-HSYM-3RUN-9	Responding as an individual	Amanda	Ward					
ANON-HSYM-3RF4-Z	Responding as an individual	Rachel	Perryman					
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson					
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				

Main Modification 64

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	General Support	Comment in general support of MM64.	Support Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RF2-X	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		Greater Detail Needed	Appendix 20 is simply a bar chart. An additional table is needed setting out the specific number of homes expected to be delivered each year.	The housing trajectory is an informed estimate on delivery projections. It is not a requirement that the Council will be measured against and the real world delivery which is inherently variable. Consequently, a bar chart is a suitable format to present such projections.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Bill	Critchley			Inclusion of all Commitments	The trajectory must include all existing housing commitments and allocations, including those at Takeley.	The trajectory includes all elements of housing supply relied upon within the Local Plan, including known permissions up to 1st April 2025.
BHLF-HSYM-3RV9-N	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Jon	Goodall	DLP Planning	Salacia Limited	Removal of Allowances from Supply	The comment reintroduces arguments made at the Examination hearing sessions with regards to the inclusion of a windfall allowance and the non-strategic housing requirements for larger villages. It is considered that these elements should not form part of the trajectory.	This comment is not relevant to the modification at hand, the purpose of which is simply to include the trajectory within the Local Plan as required by the NPPF, rather than existing as an external document. The matter of windfall has already been discussed at length during the examination process and the Council has set out in great detail why its inclusion is acceptable.
BHLF-HSYM-3RF2-X	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		Revised Wording for Clarity	The contents of Paragraph 12.3, which relate to the procedure for the ongoing monitoring of the Council's 5YHLS references the NPPF 2023. Whilst this is the NPPF the plan is being examined under, the monitoring of 5YHLS going forward would be guided by the NPPF 2024, therefore this paragraph should be amended to reflect this. New wording has been proposed by multiple respondents.	The comments do not relate to the MM and are therefore outside the scope of the consultation. However, the Council is content with the wording as proposed, especially as the plan is being examined in relation to the December 2023 NPPF, for which it is consistent. It may be the case with any Local Plan that they may not be consistent with future national policy updates, but in those instances, the national policy would provide adequate guidance. It is considered that no further amendments are required.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVR-E	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Jon	Goodall	DLP Planning	Salacia Limited			

Sustainability Appraisal

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee		General - 2024 Report objections	A number of comments criticising the conclusions made as part of the 2024 Sustainability Appraisal, specifically: - That there was a broadly neutral effect in relation to landscape and that there has been a significant improvement since the draft plan stage in relation to this topic. - In relation to the effects on land, soil and resources and the fact that it was difficult to envisage an alternative strategy that would have less significant impacts on agricultural land. - That there were moderate or uncertain negatives effects of the uncertain nature of the outstanding wastewater challenges along the A120 corridor. These should be resolved before development starts.	This comment is specifically referring to conclusions from an extract from the 2024 Sustainability Appraisal, which are outside the scope of the Main Modifications consultation. . The previous stages of the SA have already been considered as part of the examination.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
BHLF-HSYM-3RUP-B	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				

Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041
Main Modifications Consultation – Full Summaries and Responses

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee			That there is a limited consideration of the biodiversity impacts of development proposals especially in relation to the Taylors Farm allocation and there is not enough feasibility studies to justify this.	
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee				
BHLF-HSYM-3RVD-Z	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Adam	Davies	Ceres Property	M Scott Properties Ltd	Housing Supply	Comment querying the assertion that the requirement for a early review of the plan as per MM3 would boost supply significantly in the latter period of the plan period. They highlight that this is incorrect as the trajectory only shows a temporary boost before a declining picture for the latter part of the plan period.	The SA's assertion is correct as it shows that strategic sites factually have a significant impact on the overall housing supply and shows a significant boost from 2030/31 throughout the rest of the plan period.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee		Infrastructure conclusions	Comment highlighting that there are no alternatives to whether infrastructure would be delivered within the plan, particularly water infrastructure.	This is outside the scope of the Main Modifications consultation, However, the provisions in Local Plan Core Policies 5 and 34 ensure that sufficient infrastructure will exist prior to site occupation. In addition, the SA also ensures that careful monitoring of plan objectives will take place, and this framework is set out in Core Policy 71.
BHLF-HSYM-3RUX-K	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Adam	Davies	Ceres Property	M Scott Properties Ltd	MM14 Commentary	Comment highlighting that there does not remain a high level argument for taking a precautionary approach by safeguarding land to minimise the risk of future secondary school capacity issues.	The inspectors have taken the view that safeguarding the land for Core Policy 18 would not be necessary. However, safeguarding land for potential infrastructure need is a common method to reduce risk. This is so that sufficient land becomes available for when the need for infrastructure arises, therefore the assertion made in the SA is reasonable.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVJ-6	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Andrew	Martin	Andrew Martin – Planning Ltd	S. Robinson Farms Ltd	Reasonable Alternatives	Comment highlighting that the reasonable alternatives section is flawed as it fails to assess the UDC Note and Framework Plan 3B as part of UTT10 as a reasonable alternative.	This is outside the scope of the Main Modifications consultation. There are no proposals being made in relation to the site in question and the details referred to are not relevant. The scope of the SA was to consider whether reasonable alternatives arise from the Main Modifications..
BHLF-HSYM-3RV4-G	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Jon	Goodall	DLP Planning	Salacia Limited	Thaxted constraints	<p>Conditional support for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Main Modifications, making it contingent on suggested changes to MM3, MM15, and MM46 being accepted. It argues the original plan's rejection of Thaxted for growth was "unsound," based on "vexatious claims" and "unsubstantiated constraints" that officers at the hearings later conceded were false. While the new SA correctly identifies Thaxted as a sustainable location, it wrongly justifies not revisiting growth options by relying on a future "early review."</p> <p>The comment insists that this review is "very likely" to be triggered imminently by a failure to demonstrate a five-year land supply, and therefore, the issue should have been "fundamentally" addressed now, as correcting the original plan's flawed premises would have necessarily led to different appraisal findings.</p>	<p>The council is content with the current wording of MM3, MM15 and MM46 and has provided sufficient justification to why this is the case in response to the suggested amendments made against each respective policy. The discussions at the hearings highlighted the only clear showstopper constraint at the settlement of Thaxted, i.e., relating to primary school provision, which the inspector requested the council clarify through the inclusion of MM15.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied the SA is justified in its conclusions in regard to the early review policy.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RUH-3	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Jean	Johnson	Takeley Street Action Group Committee		Transport Assessments	Comment querying the conclusions made in regard to transport effects of the main modifications. Comment is requesting more clarity on what is meant by significant and that some of the modelling for recent planning applications haven't been considered as part of this assessment.	The SA Addendum that was subject to consultation focused on changes made to the conclusions of the 2024 Sustainability Appraisal based on the main modifications. The comments are therefore outside the scope of the consultation.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (No Comments Recorded)

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
--------------	----------------	------------	-----------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

Policies Map Modifications

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
BHLF-HSYM-3RVK-7	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Isabella	Ingram	Iceni Projects	Mulberry Homes and St Edmunds Lane Management Limited	Great Dunmow Settlement Boundaries	To ensure a consistent approach to mapping of existing commitments, application ref. UTT/20/1744/FUL should be included within the settlement boundaries of Great Dunmow	The application being referred to was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal.
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	PMM1 Support	General support is given to the provisions of PMM1.	Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVE-1	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Johnathan	Dixon	Savills (UK) Ltd	Audley End Estate	PMM8 Support	General support is given to the provisions of PMM8.	Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	PMM9 Support	General support is given to the provisions of PMM9.	Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RSM-6	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Fiona	Martin	Natural England		PMM14 – Natural England	Comments repeat those made in relation to MM62.	Please refer to the response to the comments relating to MM62.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVM-9	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Jon	Goodall	DLP Planning	Salacia Limited	Rural Area Strategy Map	An area strategy map should also be provided that indicates the status of each settlement in the settlement hierarchy. The update to the Thaxted Map is supported.	The support for the Thaxted mapping updates is noted, however, the comment relating to an area strategy map for the rural areas is not relevant to PMM4.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVS-F	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Steven	Butler	Bidwells	Messrs Bull & Robertson	Typographical Error	PMM14 is stated to relate to CP16, rather than CP14. This needs to be corrected.	This comment is correct and the error will be rectified as an Additional Modification.
BHLF-HSYM-3RVN-A	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Robert	Barber	Pegasus Group	Bloor Homes (Eastern)	Walpole Meadows Open Space Requirement	The representation reintroduces and expands upon arguments made during the examination with regards to the viability of the Walpole Meadows Phase 2 allocation's open space requirement and the potential issues of future management arrangements. Consequently, it is requested that the respective map be amended to remove the vast majority of northern parcel of the allocation in line with the developer's new masterplan. The amendments to Site 1B are supported, albeit the removal	The intent of PMM15 is to ensure the site allocation boundaries shown on the Policy Map are consistent with the wider plan and its appendices. The representation is therefore not relevant to the modification at hand and is instead used to reintroduce and expand upon arguments already heard at examination. The Council has already set out the myriad of reasons that such a change is unjustified, namely: - The substantive need for Hatfield Forest related SANG
BHLF-HSYM-3RVR-E	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Robert	Barber	Pegasus Group	Bloor Homes (Eastern)			

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							of a minor wedge that is associated with another site is recommended.	public open space at Stansted Mountfitchet as identified in the Council's evidence. - The design and landscape benefits resultant from keeping the land north of the delineating hedgerow free of development. - That the allocation requirements were reflective of the developer's proposal that was already well progressed through the DM process, including through the Uttlesford Quality Review Panel. - The viability of the allocation and its policy requirements were satisfactorily tested through the Council's Viability Assessment.

Additional Modifications

Whilst not part of the Main Modifications Consultation, the proposed Additional Modifications were published for information. The following table provides a summary of the comments received and the Council’s response to them.

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RGU-2	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Sandra	Green	National Trust		AM10	The National Trust request that the wording amended to be as follows: For additional clarity, AM10 Para 2.27 Bullet 3 should be amended to read in full ‘to adopt and implement the Hatfield Forest Mitigation Strategy developed in conjunction with neighbouring Districts, Natural England, and the National Trust to mitigate visitor pressure and impact and preserve the value of Hatfield Forest NNR, along with increasing access to other Green Infrastructure and accessible open spaces.’	The Council is content to make these changes as a further Additional Modification
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			AM103	It is suggested that employment should be added, not just residential.	Evidence shows that the impact is derived from residential schemes not from employment. The Council is content with the wording as proposed.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			AM103	It is suggested that SANG should be provided before construction.	This relates to the wider policy, for which the Council are satisfied provides appropriate clarity.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			AM11	The responses suggests that reference to 99.6 occupancy is removed as it dates from 2023 and is out of date. It is suggested that lettings nationally have reduced substantially.	The Council are content with the wording as proposed. It relates to the latest available evidence and is accurate in that it states what the evidence states. Economic cycles change over time, but the Local Plan must still meet the identified need as informed by the latest available evidence. Planning for some headroom in any event is good practice.
10/28/2025 12:03	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd	AM14	General Support provided for AM14.	Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	AM142	Support Provided for AM142	Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	AM145	Support Provided for AM145	Noted.
10/28/2025 12:43	Responding on behalf of an organisation	J	Nugent	Pigeon		AM147	Alternative wording is provided for parts of Appendix 3B, however the proposed change does not relate to the AM.	No further comments.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			AM147	Comments are made relating to the additional text and whether it relates to a specific site. Clarity is requested around what is meant by clean water.	The Council are satisfied that the EA and relevant Water Companies are content with the wording and that no further changes are necessary.

Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041
Main Modifications Consultation – Full Summaries and Responses

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			AM149	Clarity is requested relating to how developer contributions are collected and utilised.	This detail is provided elsewhere and is set out in the Council's SPD and ECC guidance.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			AM24	It is suggested that 'timely way' is too vague and should be more specific.	The Council are content with the wording as proposed. It is necessary for Local Plans to reflect some degree of flexibility.
10/28/2025 12:03	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd	AM29	General Support provided for AM29.	Noted.
10/28/2025 12:03	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd	AM32 and AM38	General Support is provided for AM32 and AM38	Noted.
10/28/2025 12:03	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd	AM37	General Support provided for AM37	Noted.
10/28/2025 12:03	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Sophie	Innes	Iceni Projects	Dianthus Land Ltd	AM41	General Support provided for AM41	Noted.
BHLF-HSYM-3RFV-2	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Greg	Blaquiere	Eagle Planning & Development	Weston Homes	AM53	Support Provided for AM53	Noted.
10/28/2025 14:01	Agent responding on behalf of a client	Robert	Barber	Pegasus Group	Bloor Homes (Eastern)	AM64	Reference is made to material submitted related to two of the proposed allocations but the comments do not relate to the AM.	No further comments.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			AM94	It is suggested that should be changed to must.	In general, the changes in the Plan are from Must to Should. The Council are content with the wording as stated.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			Appendix 2	Various changes are requested relating to Appendix 2.	The Council is content with the wording as proposed.
ANON-HSYM-3RFB-E	Responding as an individual	Jean	Johnson			Appendix 3C	Comments are made relating to the origins of the proposed change suggesting it has come from the developer.	The only change to Appendix 3C relating to Design Principles is to add the use class E (g)(iii) which is simply to ensure internal consistency in the plan with the relevant policy.
10/28/2025 14:16	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		ECC - Climate Change	ECC request various additional changes relating to Local Plan text relating to Climate Change.	The Council will review these seeking to correct any minor typos etc through the Additional Modifications process.
10/28/2025 14:16	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		ECC - Minerals and Waste	ECC request that any reference to a Waste Infrastructure Assessment should be amended to a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment. And wherever the assessment is required, the following text should be used: o Undertake a Minerals Infrastructure Impact Assessment in	The Council will seek to make any relevant changes through the Additional Modifications process.

Consultee ID	Consultee Type	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Clients Name (Agents Only)	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							compliance with mineral safeguarding policy given its proximity to... o Undertake a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment in compliance with waste safeguarding policy given its proximity to...	
10/28/2025 14:16	Responding on behalf of an organisation	Zhanine	Smith	Essex County Council		General Comment - ECC	ECC note that changes are made relating to safeguarding for Forest Hall through the MM process and that no actions are needed in relation to the AM schedule.	Noted.
ANON-HSYM-3RUE-Z	Responding as an individual	April	Gardner			General Support	General Support is provided for the AM's in general terms.	Noted.
ANON-HSYM-3RFT-Z	Responding as an individual	Jonathan	Ward			Misc.	Comments refers to highway safety at Stansted Mountfitchet.	Noted.