

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN - DEVELOPMENT – SHAPING STANSTED MOUNTFITCHET

Each chapter in the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan is under constant review and refinement. Not all of the Appendices are yet available but they will be posted on the website as and when they are ready. The text in the chapters should be sufficient, however, to enable you to respond to the questions which are in the leaflet and repeated at the end of the section for your convenience.

What is Stansted Mountfitchet?

What distinguishes a town from a village? Villages have greater social cohesion – the bonds, or “glue” that holds a society together, often through common values, beliefs, and behaviours. Villages are one place, whereas towns have distinct areas. People typically feel safer in villages; they know their neighbours and have a right to say Hello to anyone. Villages are quieter than towns, with less traffic and less light, noise and air pollution. Residents may feel a greater responsibility for their village than they might to a larger settlement. On the other hand village residents may need to travel significant distance to access services such as major hospital or a post office. Towns have more facilities: for example, for sport and recreation, restaurants, public transport, shops, public facilities and employment. Compared to towns, villages are distinguished by smaller geographical size and population, fewer facilities and “oneness” and community.

If this assessment is used then Stansted Mountfitchet continues to have some social characteristics for a village but, with the population pushing towards 10,000, there is a loosening of the close social relationships, so that it more resembles a small town. Perhaps it is best to leave the definition to individual parishioners to decide.

Stansted Mountfitchet has seen two major phases of expansion since the Second World War:

- The 1960s – early 1970s saw the construction of the Mountfitchet Estate and the Hargrave Estate, the first in the east and the second in the west of the parish. Between 1961-71 the population of the parish increased by 38% to 4664
- 2011-21 witnessed 74 % growth in population to 9,600 with most of the development in the east of the parish with the major development at Foresthall Park (715 dwellings) followed by Walpole Meadows to the north and Elms Farm close to the centre.

Over the whole period between 1961 and 2021 the population of the parish increased by 184 % while since 2001 the rise has been 74%.

This pace of growth is far faster than the numbers for Uttlesford, Essex and England as is shown in the tables below:

POPULATION	2011 CENSUS	MID-2019 ESTIMATES	% INCREASE
Stansted Mountfitchet	6,011	9,091	51.2
Uttlesford	79,443	91,284	14.9
Essex	1,393,600	1,489,189	6.85
England	53,012,456	56,286,961	6.17

SOURCE: ONS Population estimates for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland: mid-2019 using April 2020 local authority district codes

DWELLINGS	2011	2019 ESTIMATES	% INCREASE
Stansted Mountfitchet	2,624	3,977 *SSV	51.6
Uttlesford	32,862	38,008	15.6
Essex	581,589	642,307	10.4
England	22,976,066	24,413,501	6.2

SOURCE: ONS Table 100: number of dwellings by tenure and district, England 2011-2019

*SSV Bloor Homes objection document

Population and social trends need to be taken into account:

- Uttlesford District Council Housing Strategy 2016-21 (December 2015) projects a 27% increase in population and a 77% rise in residents aged over-65 which is matched by the trend in people with dementia.

- High housing prices are demonstrated in the same document with prices substantially above the regional average. The average house price is eighteen times average income which, at that date, was £24,575pa.
- The 2011 Census shows the average number of vehicles per household at 1.7 in Uttlesford which compared to 1.4 in Essex and 1.2 in England. Not surprisingly, this leads to traffic issues in small towns and reflects the rural nature of the District with limited public transport.

The factors shaping the parish now and looking forward:

- *A small town with village characteristics* with the latter being much valued by many residents. There is still a friendliness and a recognition which is sustained despite the population now approaching 10,000.
- *There is a widespread support for maintaining Stansted Mountfitchet as a separate community* with strong opposition to any threat of coalescence with surrounding communities, namely Bishop's Stortford (2 miles) to the south, Manuden (1.75 miles) to the west, Ugley Green (2.2 miles) to the north, Elsenham (1.9 miles) to the north-east and Birchanger (1.8 miles) to the south. Meeting this wish imposes constraint on the location of further development.
- *The proximity of Bishop's Stortford is relevant* to Stansted Mountfitchet both in terms of its history and its future shape. Although the parish is well served in terms of daily shops the number of non-food shops has declined virtually to nothing in response to the offer available in Bishop's Stortford and more recently online purchases. There is a logic in suggesting that the two communities should work together in the development and use of facilities.
- *The proximity to Stansted Airport is relevant* albeit the impacts are not all favourable. Whilst the airport and associated companies are a major employer, the downsides include noise, worsening air quality and increased traffic volumes on inadequate local roads.
- *Good communications* often trigger population growth and development pressure. Apart from the rail connection between London, Stansted Airport and Cambridge, the parish is situated within three miles of the M11 & A120 and close to Stansted Airport.
- *Stansted Mountfitchet is surrounded by attractive countryside* with much of it being fertile agricultural land (mostly Grade 3 but with some Grade 2) and greenbelt. It is easy to access the countryside from any part of the village with a comprehensive network of footpaths/bridleways albeit some are in need of maintenance.
- *The physical structure of the village adds a complication* with Chapel Hill, which is steep, acting as a divide between the two commercial centres, one in Lower Street and the other on Cambridge Road.
- *Education and Health facilities are modern.* There are three primary schools, two of which have been built in the last five years, and a secondary school with the possibility of expansion. The Health Centre was opened in 2014 but, for most other services, visits have to be made to Princess Alexandra Hospital in Harlow (12 miles away) or Addenbrookes in Cambridge (approximately 23 miles away).
- *Facilities for cultural and sporting activities are limited* although some of the gaps are met in Bishop's Stortford.
- *A major problem is the local road infrastructure.* None of the key roads in the centre of the village is capable currently of absorbing more traffic generated by new housing development either within the parish or in the surrounding area.

With these in mind the debate over further housing development can be pursued. In reaching a decision on further expansion there are arguments which point in different directions.

Uttlesford District Council is responsible for delivering Government housing targets.

The process should operate as follows:

- District Councils (or any other planning authority) are required to produce local plans which comply with housing targets laid down by the Government. The supply shortfall in housing has led the Government to increase substantially allocated targets.
- Each planning authority is required to have a five-year land supply of approved sites for housing. If the Local Authority lacks such a supply then development applications outside of the Plan, if considered "sustainable", will be given more favourable consideration in the planning process. The five-year land

supply is arrived at once the government calculated housing figure is known by dividing the total for the relevant years left on the plan, subtracting what is already built, and dividing the remainder by the number of years left in the Plan to provide the number

- Uttlesford District Council has no in date Local Plan. The Government allocated housing allocation for Uttlesford currently stands at 11,600 for the period to 2040. The District Council has presented a new Local Plan for examination on two occasions and each Plan has been rejected by the Planning Inspectorate. A new version of the Plan is in preparation but, even if all goes well, it is unlikely to be adopted before 2025.
- The five-year land supply is recalculated annually and as at January 2021 was 3.1 years. At this level there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, at over three years the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan would carry weight.

What number of new dwellings, if any, will be allocated to Stansted Mountfitchet is unknown. The next sections will, therefore, concentrate on meeting perceived local need.

Assessing housing need in the parish

The Current Stock of Homes in Stansted Mountfitchet

The development programme over the recent decade by size of dwelling is tabulated below (data provided by UDC for 2015-20):

Open Market Housing

Size of property	Open Market	Affordable (rent and shared ownership)
1-bed	11	32
2-bed	34	52
3-bed	40	23
4 + bed	97	1
5-bed	n/k	n/k

The 2011 Census showed the 2,624 dwellings split as follows:

	No	% of total
Detached	745	28.4
Semi-detached	851	32.4
Terraced	603	23.0
Flats	398	15.1
Caravans/trailers/other	27	0.1
	2624	100.0

As in many communities a substantial number of properties have been extended and this continuing trend reduces the stock of smaller dwellings. Over the past six years 217 houses have been extended. (Source: UDC Planning Dept March 2021)

What Amount of Housing, and of what type, is needed?

The results of the Housing Needs Survey (see Appendix **).

This survey, carried out by RCCE on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Group in 2017, established an affordable housing need for predominantly smaller 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom properties (85%). There is also a need for shared ownership properties, including family housing, alongside housing for social or affordable rent. This recognises the aspiration of local people and to increase home ownership options within the Parish. The table below summarises the limited number of responses.

	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	Total
Shared Ownership	4No. (14%)	5No. (19%)	4No. (14%)	13No. 48%
Affordable Rent	9No. (33%)	5No. (19%)	0.No	14No. 52%
	48%	37%	15%	27No
Market (SHMA)				

Five points need to be considered when assessing local need:

- *Over many decades there has been a trend, which is continuing, to see families moving from east London and the suburbs into East Herts and Uttlesford. The purchasing power of these incomers is usually significantly higher than that of local residents and this has been a contributory factor leading to high house prices relative to local incomes. This is confirmed by the official Strategic Housing Market Assessments commissioned by UDC. The demand particularly for family homes, has influenced developers’ preference in terms of larger house sizes.*
- *The greater need for smaller houses is confirmed by UDC’s housing waiting list:*

Size of property	Number of applicants	%
1 bed	46	47%
2 bed	32	32%
3 bed	18	18%
4 bed	3	3%
Total	99	

UDC operate a choice-based lettings (CBL) system which allows applicants on the housing register to express an interest in a property throughout the Uttlesford district and so although there are 99 applicants registered at an address in Stansted they may or may not just be seeking housing in Stansted.

SOURCE: Uttlesford District Council Housing Department March 2021

- *The point is emphasised by the needs of people on Local Housing Allowance (LHA). The table below shows the housing need by people in Uttlesford on LHA*

Employment Status	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4-bed	5-bed	Total
Employed	0	2	2	0	1	5
Unemployed	11	1	0	0	0	12

- *Care needs to be taken in considering affordable housing whether for purchase or rent.*

Affordable housing, ie market value less 20%, is not affordable to a large number of people seeking homes. Therefore, more investment is needed in social housing particularly in smaller properties.

However, the Plan supports the requirement for affordable/social housing in all developments **over XX dwellings** with an appropriate mix and tenure. Only in exceptional circumstances should financial contributions be taken for off-site affordable housing.

- *The needs of older residents*
The preference for future development to be targeted towards smaller properties is strengthened by the indication that there is a proportion of older residents who would like to remain in Stansted Mountfitchet but need to downsize. The development proposals in the Plan should take account of this need.

In summary, two trends are evident but are pulling in different directions. Newcomers migrating into the area tend to seek larger houses and have greater purchasing power which developers naturally endeavour to satisfy whereas local demand is tending to require smaller properties and cheaper prices/rents. Current trends – an ageing population and a reducing occupancy per household – are likely to continue thus reinforcing the need for smaller properties.

There are a number of arguments which are put forward in support of further development in or around Stansted Mountfitchet and which have superficial attraction.

Development – assessment of opportunities

- The village, in terms of population, has increased by a substantial 74% since 2001 (see Appendix xx) without investment in infrastructure keeping pace. There is, therefore, a reluctance to accept further development of scale given the issues already posed to social cohesion and the physical difficulty of finding sites which are sustainable and not destructive to the environment around this and other nearby communities.
- Proximity to the M11 and A120 is offset by the already overused local road network (see Chapter XX). Without investment in highway infrastructure further development can only worsen the quality of life for existing residents.
- Three primary schools and a secondary school may seem inviting but available capacity is limited. There are waiting lists for nursery and pre-schools, spaces in one primary school, some availability as the secondary school is expanded being offset by the likelihood of reduced spaces in Bishop's Stortford schools and the absence of a sixth form which reduces the attraction of Forest Hall School. Overall, local educational provision is inadequate to meet the needs of additional residents without investment.
- Walking, cycling and public transport are put forward as arguments in favour of sustainability. In practice, footpaths and roads do not encourage walking and cycling while bus services lack frequency or proximity to persuade car users to switch.

Three other factors are critical:

- Coalescence with any other community is unacceptable. If this position is supported then this imposes severe constraints on the options for any development of scale given that Stansted Mountfitchet is surrounded by a number of communities all within two miles.
- Supporting retention of the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Countryside Protection Zone removes the option of development in much of the east, south-east, the south and the south-west.
- The landscape looking across the Stort Valley is much valued by a high proportion of local residents

As a general policy, the Neighbourhood Development Plan seeks to protect the natural environment from the impact of human activity, particularly related to new development in the countryside. Where development impacts this will only be accepted if there is a like-for-like replacement/relocation/compensation which will result in net biodiversity gain for the area in relation to quantity, quality and connectivity.

With this overview in place it is now appropriate to assess the results of the Call for Sites recently undertaken by Uttlesford District Council as part of their emerging Local Plan. The map below shows the sites which are relevant to Stansted Mountfitchet both within the parish boundary and those in contiguous parishes which would have serious implications for us if developed.

INSERT MAP OF SITES

Views on all of the sites situated within the parish boundary are summarised in Appendix XX. Within this chapter the concentration will be on the substantial developments even if situated outside the parish or on some smaller sites which, if developed, would have a material adverse impact. After discussing the sites rejected (by the Parish Council?) there are a small number of sites which, subject to securing community benefits and meeting the identified housing needs of the village, could be supported.

Sites considered unsuitable for development

Most of these sites are taken from the document issued by the Local Plan Leadership Group on Uttlesford District Council to identify larger scale housing and housing-led developments. Before reviewing the key sites two points should be borne in mind:

First, the population of Stansted Mountfitchet is estimated at XXXX with the number of dwellings being XXXX. Second, apart from an outline of the site and an indicative number of dwellings and hectares, nothing else is known. What about changes to the road network, schools, health centres, sports and community facilities, open space and contribution to creating sustainable villages/towns whilst supporting biodiversity and environmental priorities.

Key sites considered but rejected

- Bollington Hall Farm located west of Ugley and north of Stansted Mountfitchet and situated in Ugley Parish has a gross area of 323 hectares accommodating 5812 dwellings. Effectively, this is a town larger than Stansted Mountfitchet. Grounds for objection are:
 - Coalescence would take place between Stansted Mountfitchet, Ugley Green, Rickling Green and Quendon.
 - Contrary to Local Plan Policy S1 in that it is outside the development limits of the village.
 - Contrary to Local Plan Policy S7 in that it is within the countryside.
 - Contrary to Local Plan Policy GEN1 in that the highway network is incapable of handling the volume of additional vehicles.
- Birchanger is identified as the centre for a substantial extension to an existing settlement with a gross area of 241 hectares to add 4337 dwellings. For perspective, Birchanger Parish has a population of XXXX with XXXX dwellings. Grounds for objection are:
 - The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt
 - Coalescence would take place between Bishop's Stortford, Birchanger and Stansted Mountfitchet.
 - Contrary to Local Plan Policy S1 in that it is outside the development limits of the village.
 - Contrary to Local Plan Policy GEN1 in that the highway network does not have the capacity to handle the volume of additional vehicles.
- Tye Green, Elsenham at Brook Farm is proposed for consideration as a new settlement with a gross area of 181 hectares to add 3263 dwellings. To put this in context Tye Green has a population of XXX, Elsenham a population of XXXX with XXXX dwellings. Grounds for objection are:
 - Coalescence would take place between Elsenham and Stansted Mountfitchet.
 - Contrary to Local Plan Policy S1 in that it is outside the development limits of the village.
 - Contrary to Local Plan Policy S7 in that it is within the countryside.
 - Contrary to Local Plan Policy GEN1 in that the highway network does not have the capacity to handle the volume of additional vehicles.
- Bentfield End in Stansted Mountfitchet includes five separate sites with a gross area of 60 hectares which could provide 1508 dwellings. There are four major sites put forward in this area. Two of the proposals are on sites which have been in whole, or in part, rejected at a number of planning Appeals with the most recent decision being delivered in September 2021. Many of the objections to development on these sites are common to all of the proposals. However, for the sake of clarity the grounds for rejection are shown, despite repetition, for each of the four major sites:

West of Stansted Mountfitchet – there are numerous grounds for objection:

- Contrary to LPP S6 in that it is within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- Contrary to LPP S1, in that it is outside development limits of the village.
- Contrary to LPP S7, in that it is within the countryside.
- Contrary to LPP Gen1, in that access to the main road access is difficult, i.e. via a non-designated heritage asset, Limekiln Lane, a 'protected lane', which cannot be widened. Additionally, the existing road network is not capable of safely accommodating the traffic that would be generated.
- Contrary to ENV9, in that it would result in harm to the character of Limekiln Lane, a 'protected lane'.
- Contrary to NPPF, para 105, which relates to sustainable transport, in that the distances are such that people will use their vehicles to access facilities and schools in the absence of genuine transport modes.
- Permanent adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locally valued rural landscape on the edge of the village. Harm to visual amenity.

South of Bentfield End Causeway – there are numerous grounds for objection:

- Contrary to LPP S6 in that it is within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

- Contrary to Local Plan Policy S1, in that it is outside development limits of the village
- Contrary to LPP S7, in that it is within the countryside
- Contrary to LPP Gen1, in that the existing road network is not capable of safely accommodating the traffic that would be generated. Access would be on the sharp bend on Bentfield Road which is impractical and dangerous. This access is also through the Bentfield Green Conservation Area.
- Contrary to NPPF Chapter 16, which relates to conserving and enhancing the historic environment, in that traffic concerns will lead to harm to designated heritage assets, i.e., the Bentfield Green Conservation Area. Such harm would be 'less than substantial', within the parlance of the NPPF, para 196 applies. However, the harms are notable, and serious.
- Permanent adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locally valued rural landscape on the edge of the village. Harm to visual amenity.

West of Pennington Lane (1) – there are numerous grounds for objection:

- Two previous Planning Refusals for the same location by UDC and subsequent Appeal Dismissals; Taylor Wimpey Jan 2014, Bloor Homes Sept 2021
- Contrary to Local Plan Policy S1, in that it is outside development limits of the village
- Contrary to LPP S7, in that it is within the countryside and would have a substantial adverse landscape and visual impact.
- Contrary to LPP ENV1, ENV2, in that the proposed development would have an unjustifiably adverse effect upon the character of the Bentfield Green Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings.
- Contrary to LPP GEN1, in that access to the main road would be problematic and further exacerbate an existing highway problem
- Contrary to ENV9, in that it would result in harm to the character of Pennington Lane, a 'protected lane', and the causes of this harm have an excessive adverse impact upon the enjoyment of local amenity.
- Contrary to NPPF, para 105, which relates to sustainable transport, in that the distances are such that people will use their vehicles to access facilities and schools in the absence of genuine transport modes.
- Contrary to NPPF, para 174(b), which requires recognition be paid to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which is valued, in that it would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of SM in this location.
- Contrary to NPPF Chapter 16, which relates to conserving and enhancing the historic environment, in that traffic concerns will lead to harm to designated heritage assets, i.e., the Bentfield Green Conservation Area. Such harm would be 'less than substantial', within the parlance of the NPPF, para 196 applies. However, the harms are notable, and serious.
- Permanent adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locally valued rural landscape on the edge of the village. Harm to visual amenity.

West of Pennington Lane (2) – there are numerous grounds for objection:

- Adjacent to and overlapping with 2 Previous Planning Refusals for the same location by UDC and subsequent Appeal Dismissals; Taylor Wimpey Jan 2014, Bloor Homes Sept 2021
- Contrary to Local Plan Policy S1, in that it is outside development limits of the village
- Contrary to LPP S7, in that it is within the countryside and would have a substantial adverse landscape and visual impact.
- Contrary to LPP ENV1, ENV2, in that the proposed development would have an unjustifiably adverse effect upon the character of the Bentfield Green Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings.

- Contrary to LPP GEN1, in that access to the main road would be problematic and further exacerbate an existing highway problem
- Contrary to ENV9, in that it would result in harm to the character of Pennington Lane, a 'protected lane', and the causes of this harm have an excessive adverse impact upon the enjoyment of local amenity.
- Contrary to NPPF, para 105, which relates to sustainable transport, in that the distances are such that people will use their vehicles to access facilities and schools in the absence of genuine transport modes.
- Contrary to NPPF, para 174(b), which requires recognition be paid to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which is valued, in that it would significantly diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of SM in this location.
- Permanent adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locally valued rural landscape on the edge of the village. Harm to visual amenity.

Four other sites put forward for development should be rejected

Three of the sites are located on the B1051 between Stansted Mountfitchet and Elsenham. With the distance between the two communities little more than 1.5m (check that all distances throughout doc are miles or km, not a combination!!!) coalescence is likely if these sites were supported. None of the sites can be considered to be sustainable. Detailed grounds for objection include:

- Contrary to Local Plan Policy S1 in that they are outside the development limits.
- Pedestrian links are poor and there is no street-lighting.
- Contrary to Local Plan Policy GEN1 in that the existing road network is not capable of safely accommodating increased traffic, particularly on the single carriageway Grove Hill with consequent knock-on impact into the commercial area of Lower Street.
- One site is situated within the poor Air Quality Zone of the M11.

The fourth site for 100 houses is situated on Alsa Street, an unclassified road located to the north of the village. Grounds for objection are:

- Risk of coalescence with Ugley.
- Inadequate highway infrastructure.

Sites considered suitable for development will need to satisfy the following criteria:

- Locations must provide easy connection to services and shops and encourage mixed age communities (see Chapter X for further analysis) and social cohesion.
- Housing density must be appropriate to the location in respect of the character and architectural heritage of the area and the quality of life of residents, not least by the provision of adequate usable open space and green corridors.
- Access must not worsen existing pressure points on roads already at, or over, capacity.
- Additional development should be weighted towards small dwellings with a strong bias towards adding to the stock of social housing. Local buyers and tenants should be the priority.
- Any development, but particularly one of size, would need to bring infrastructure and community benefits. Too little attention has been paid to the needs of the residents of new developments and the impact upon the existing community has not been taken into account.

It is recognised that the Plan period is expected to run for at least fifteen years thus ending around 2035-40. Support for limited development takes into account three factors:

- No development for over fifteen years is not a viable option
- There is selective local need for smaller houses and social housing
- The Uttlesford Local Plan will most likely allocate housing to this parish or in close proximity.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan has tried to identify sites which are sustainable, which cause the least damage and which may bring gains for the whole community.

Identifying possible sites for development

Four sites could be considered to meet local needs for housing:

- Walpole Meadows North (site 015 in the Call for Sites)
 - The advantage of this location is direct access onto the B1383 with a roundabout already in place. The downside is the additional pressure on an already heavily trafficked road especially as it is likely that around 80% of the vehicle movements will head south (evidence given at the Bloor Homes Pennington Lane Appeal in 2021).
 - Provided that there is no access onto Pennington Lane and that a substantial green buffer with a minimum 30m width is planted prior to construction this site would be less damaging than any other in the parish.
 - The size of the site is sufficient to provide the housing to meet the projected identified needs whilst also being able to incorporate substantial community and sporting facilities which would be of benefit to all residents.
 - It should be noted that this extension north brings the two parishes of Stansted Mountfitchet and Ugley closer together whilst the distance to facilities including shops, health care and schools does not fall into the category of sustainable development.

- Land to the east of High Lane (site 013 in the Call for Sites)
 - Ideally single-storey development close to roadside.
 - Development would not be supported if high density is proposed.
 - Community benefits required.
 - Sustainable in terms of access to shops and services.
 - A footway/cycle path should link to the Aubrey Buxton Nature Reserve.
 - Create Green Corridor route.

- Land to the east of High Lane (site 023 in the Call for Sites)
 - Ideally five houses developed close to roadside.
 - Sustainable in terms of access to shops and services

- Land at Elms Farm, Church Road (site 018 in the Call for Sites)
 - Consider as an exception to Metropolitan Green Belt Policy as the development delivers significant community benefits including Almshouses, additional allotments and land to extend the parish cemetery.
 - Sustainable in terms of access to shops, services and public transport. Would provide the opportunity to improve pedestrian footpath and add a cycle path.

- Stansted Youth Centre, Lower Street (site 020 in the Call for Sites)
 - Sustainable central location suitable for an assisted housing development.
 - Support is conditional upon Essex County Council re-siting the Youth Centre and Spangles Children's Centre to the Peter Kirk site on St John's Road or another suitable central location.

- Stansted Northside, Stansted Airport (site 025 in the Call for Sites)

Approval is subject to two conditions:

- Provision of significant community gains in the way of sports provision with football pitches a priority.
 - Improve footway and cycleway links to Stansted Mountfitchet and Bishop's Stortford.
- Land south of Alsa Business Park (site 007 in the Call for Sites)
 - Care would need to be taken in the scale of buildings given that this is a substantial expansion of the existing site.
 - Some harm to landscape and visual amenity points to caution.
- Land adjacent to M11 Business Link, Forest Hall Road (site 006 in the Call for Sites)
 - Support for light industrial use if development is an extension of the existing M11 Business Link.
 - Require the same access onto Forest Hall Road to be used.

Responses to the Consultation to be completed – some have already commented as below

Those residents prepared to consider some development supported the emphasis on smaller properties and considered that the location for any additional building should be to the north of Stansted Mountfitchet with access onto the B1383.

The pressures resulting from the inadequate infrastructure should, in the eyes of most residents (or respondents????), rule out any substantial development

POLICIES

- SMD1 Housing mix on new developments will only be supported if the mix of sizes meets identified local needs. Any supported development should have a size make-up which includes an above average proportion of smaller one and two bed properties.
- SMD2 Development on sites which provide for 11 dwellings or more, or residential floorspace of more than 1000sqm (combined gross internal area), will be required to offer 40% of the total number of dwellings as affordable dwellings on the application site and as an integral part of the development. Off-site provision will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and sites may not be artificially sub-divided. A proportion of the affordable housing should be social housing.
- SMD3 Housing densities should be appropriate to site context including location, scale, character and built form in neighbouring areas. As a rule the average net density **should be X** dwellings per hectare within, or adjacent to, the village. Higher densities will only be acceptable if justified by site context or specific use and has provision for adequate car parking.
- SMD4 It will have to be demonstrated that developments will not have a detrimental impact on the rural setting of the town/village by removing or diminishing valued views from, or towards, the town/village. Applicants will be required to provide visual evidence of the impact of the proposed development while conditions will be included in any permission to require that visual evidence cited in an approval accurately reflects the reality of the built development.
- SMD5 Development will not be supported in the Metropolitan Green Belt or in the Countryside Protection Zone unless exceptional community benefits override the downside of the development in these areas of high protection.

Relevant policies in the ULP and UDLP

- ULP Policy S1 Development Limits for the Main Urban Areas
- ULP Policy H1 Housing Development
- ULP Policy H9 Affordable Housing
- ULP Policy SM2 – Residential Development within Stansted Mountfitchet's Built Up Area
- ULP Policy SM3 – Site on corner of Lower Street and Church Road
- ULP Policy SM4/BIR1 Rochford Nurseries

- UDLP Policy SP2 The Spatial Strategy 2011-2033
- UDLP Policy SP3 The Scale and Distribution of Housing Development
- UDLP Policy SP9 Development within Development Limits
- UDLP Policy STA1 Land east of Cambridge Road (B1383) and west of High Lane
- UDLP Policy STA2 Land west of 8 Water Lane
- UDLP Policy STA3 Residential Commitments
- UDLP Policy STA5 Development Opportunity Development Site

Relevant Evidence Base Documents

- Stansted Mountfitchet Neighbourhood Plan Housing Strategy Paper, DAC Planning, February 2020
- Parking Standards, Essex County Council, September 2009
- Stansted Mountfitchet Housing Need Survey, Rural Community Council of Essex, 2017
- West Essex and East Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Opinion Research Services, September 2015 and July 2017

NB THE PARISH COUNCIL IS STILL TO DETERMINE A POSITION ON A SMALL NUMBER OF THE SITES SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY DEVELOPERS IN RESPONSE TO UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL' CALL FOR SITES & Strategic Land Availability Assessment