

Uttlesford Local Plan

Main Modifications Habitats Regulations Assessment

Uttlesford District Council

August 2025

Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
Stephen Kenny Graduate Ecologist	Amelia Kent ACIEEM Principal Ecologist	Dr James Riley MCIEEM Technical Director	Dr James Riley MCIEEM Technical Director

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
1	03/09/25	Final	JR	James Riley	Technical Director

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Prepared for:

Uttlesford District Council

Prepared by:

AECOM Limited
Midpoint, Alencon Link
Basingstoke
Hampshire RG21 7PP
United Kingdom

T: +44(0)1256 310200
aecom.com

© 2025 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	5
2.	Likely Significant Effects of Main Modifications (MMs)	5
3.	Conclusion.....	36

1. Introduction

- 1.1 AECOM was appointed by Uttlesford District Council to assist the Council in undertaking a Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Uttlesford Local Plan. The HRA included an appropriate assessment and concluded no adverse effect on the integrity of any Habitat sites (Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas, formerly known as European sites), and that the Local Plan had suitable framework in place that development delivered would not affect the integrity of any Habitat sites either alone or 'in-combination' with other plans and projects.
- 1.2 Following the Examination into the Local Plan, the Inspector has recommended a series of Main Modifications (MM) to be made to the Plan. It is therefore necessary for those modifications to be analysed in order to confirm that they will not themselves introduce new likely significant effects that were not thoroughly investigated for the HRA of the Local Plan. That is the purpose of this report. Main Modifications to Appendices have also been made. However, by definition these relate to information that is informative and supplementary and cannot affect the conclusions of the Local Plan HRA. They are therefore not discussed below.
- 1.3 Note therefore that this report should therefore be considered an Addendum to the HRA of the Local Plan. As such, it does not recap the methodology of the HRA or the results of either the likely significant effects test or appropriate assessment of the Local Plan, including the 'in-combination' assessment. Instead, it focuses specifically on whether the Main Modifications (MMs) will result in likely significant effects on any Habitat sites.

2. Likely Significant Effects of Main Modifications (MMs)

- 1.4 The table overleaf sets out the assessment of each Main Modification (MM).

Table 1 Test of Likely Significant Effects for the Main Modifications to the Uttlesford Local Plan

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment																				
Text in bold italic denotes where changes are proposed to be made to illustrations or figures in the Plan, or to the format of the Plan, such as the re-numbering of policies in the final adoption version of the Plan. Footnotes and paragraphs remain unaltered unless shown as modified and will be renumbered sequentially in the final adoption version of the Plan.																									
MM 1	40	Figure 4.2	Amend Figure 4.2 – Key Diagram to reflect allocation boundary changes:	To reflect updated site boundaries	No likely significant effects This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.																				
MM 2	48	CP2	<p>Amend Core Policy 2 Paragraph 2 as follows:</p> <p>The Plan provides for at least 44,744 15,211 dwellings by 2041 in the interest of providing for flexibility and contingency.</p> <p>Amend Table 4.2 as follows:</p> <table><tr><th>Category</th><th>Number of Dwellings</th></tr><tr><td>Housing requirement for the full Plan period (April 2021 to March 2041)</td><td>13,500</td></tr><tr><td>Housing completions (April 2021 to March 202425)</td><td>1,802 2,452</td></tr><tr><td>Housing Supply</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Known Commitments</td><td>6,812 6,795</td></tr><tr><td>Strategic Allocations</td><td>3,738</td></tr><tr><td>Non-Strategic Allocations</td><td>900 847</td></tr><tr><td>Windfalls</td><td>1,540 1,430</td></tr><tr><td>Lapse Rate</td><td>-51</td></tr><tr><td>Total Housing Supply</td><td>44,744 15,211</td></tr></table> <p>Strategic Allocations</p> <p>Development will be supported at strategic allocations where it (a) meets the requirements set out within the Site Development Templates Frameworks shown by Appendices 2 to 4</p>	Category	Number of Dwellings	Housing requirement for the full Plan period (April 2021 to March 2041)	13,500	Housing completions (April 2021 to March 2024 25)	1,802 2,452	Housing Supply		Known Commitments	6,812 6,795	Strategic Allocations	3,738	Non-Strategic Allocations	900 847	Windfalls	1,540 1,430	Lapse Rate	-51	Total Housing Supply	44,744 15,211	<p>To reflect April 2025 monitoring data</p> <p>To reflect soundness issue identified in Inspectors Letter 31/7/25</p>	<p>Likely significant effects present.</p> <p>This policy sets out plan provision for an increased number of dwellings. It is noted that the dwellings from known commitments, allocations and anticipated windfall development is reduced from the prior version, however the increase in housing completions to date results in overall greater delivery of housing over the local plan period.</p> <p>The following impact pathways are present in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Recreational PressureAtmospheric pollutionWater qualityWater, quantity, level and flow <p>It is noted that the increase in housing provision is entirely due to additional completions since this has</p>
Category	Number of Dwellings																								
Housing requirement for the full Plan period (April 2021 to March 2041)	13,500																								
Housing completions (April 2021 to March 2024 25)	1,802 2,452																								
Housing Supply																									
Known Commitments	6,812 6,795																								
Strategic Allocations	3,738																								
Non-Strategic Allocations	900 847																								
Windfalls	1,540 1,430																								
Lapse Rate	-51																								
Total Housing Supply	44,744 15,211																								

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
					<p>been updated to 2025 rather than 2024 as was included initially. This modification does not increase the provision of planned future housing nor does it increase the number or size of allocated sites. It is assumed that any completed development will have been subject to it's own planning application HRA if required.</p> <p>While there are increased likely significant effects due to this modification, these potential impacts are satisfactorily addressed by the appropriate assessment in the original HRA. This is due to the fact that the issues identified were strategic. The only specific mitigation solution that was identified as being required in the HRA was the Essex Coast RAMS and this would be able to accommodate the small increase in housing over the plan period.</p> <p>Therefore this modification will not lead to an adverse effect as there is an adequate policy framework in the local plan.</p>
MM 3	50	CP2a	<p>Add new text and Core Policy following Paragraph 4.23 and Core Policy 2 as follows:</p> <p>Local Plan Review</p> <p>4.24 Whilst it is expected that an appropriate five-year land supply position, in accordance with national policy and guidance, will be demonstrated at, or soon after, the adoption of the Local Plan, a Local Plan Review policy is included in case this is not demonstrated around six months after Plan adoption.</p>	To reflect soundness issue identified in Inspectors Letter 31/7/25	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification adds text requiring the council to confirm that there is sufficient land supply provided for in the local plan</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>4.25 This was identified as a requirement by the Inspectors presiding over the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021 – 2041 Examination process, which was considering housing land supply using data correct at that point in time (April 2025). As there was some uncertainty over the precise figures being projected for April 2026, or later, the Local Plan Review Policy (Core Policy 2a) has been added as a precautionary measure.</p> <p>4.26 In the event that an appropriate five-year land supply position is not demonstrated six months after Plan adoption, a requirement for an early plan review would be triggered. The precise timing of the plan review would be a matter for the Council considering factors relevant at the time.</p> <p>4.27 It should be made clear that the five-year land supply position for the purposes of Core Policy 2a will be monitored against the housing requirement identified in this Local Plan, shown by Core Policy 2 of 13,500 homes for April 2021 to March 2041.</p> <p>4.28 In the event a Local Plan Review is necessary, any decision making for Development Management purposes would be guided by relevant national policy and guidance at the time.</p> <p>Core Policy 2a: Local Plan Review</p> <p>In the event that Uttlesford is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing in accordance with appropriate national policy and guidance six months from adoption of the Local Plan, a Local Plan Review would become necessary.</p> <p>The five-year land supply position, to inform if a Local Plan Review is necessary, will be monitored against the housing requirement identified in Core Policy 2 of 13,500 homes for April 2021 to March 2041.</p> <p>In such circumstances, the impact on decision making for Development Management purposes would be guided by appropriate national policy and guidance at the time.</p>		<p>to meet ongoing housing land targets and requiring an early local plan review should this not be demonstrated.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>
MM 4	68	Figure 5.1	Amend Figure 5.1 – North Area Strategy to reflect allocation boundary changes and remove allocated green space designations:	To reflect updated site boundaries	<p>No likely significant effects</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>
MM 5	72	CP6a	<p>Amend last paragraph of Core Policy 6a as follows:</p> <p>Development will be supported at non-strategic allocations at Newport through a masterplanning process involving the community, local planning authority, developer and other stakeholders, where development meets the requirements set out within the Newport Neighbourhood Plan and in accordance with the Development Plan taken as a whole. <u>If a Neighbourhood Plan with sufficient allocations to deliver the housing requirement in full has not been 'made' by</u></p>	To include review mechanism of Newport Neighbourhood Plan	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification is a minor insertion in order to permit the LPA to make plans should an adequate Newport Neighbourhood</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment								
			<p><u>the date two years after the local plan is adopted, then the local planning authority will instead make the allocations in either a Local Plan Review or other Development Plan Document. This is to ensure the delivery of the Newport housing requirement during the plan period.</u></p> <p>Amend Core Policy 6a Paragraph 2 as follows:</p> <p>For clarity, the housing requirement over the Plan period 2021-2041 is the figure to be met through non-strategic development at Newport in total, taking into account completions since at 1st April 2024 2025), and known commitments (at 1st April 202425), with the residual figures to be delivered through additional Neighbourhood Plan allocations.</p> <p>Update Table 8.2 as follows:</p> <table><tr><td>Settlement Hierarchy Tier</td><td>Local Rural Centre</td></tr><tr><td>Settlement</td><td>Newport</td></tr><tr><td>2021-41 Housing Requirement Figure (total)</td><td>452</td></tr><tr><td>Residual requirement to be allocated through non-strategic allocations (at 30 November 2023 1st April 2025)</td><td>300</td></tr></table>	Settlement Hierarchy Tier	Local Rural Centre	Settlement	Newport	2021-41 Housing Requirement Figure (total)	452	Residual requirement to be allocated through non-strategic allocations (at 30 November 2023 1st April 2025)	300		<p>Plan not be brought forward.</p> <p>This does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>
Settlement Hierarchy Tier	Local Rural Centre												
Settlement	Newport												
2021-41 Housing Requirement Figure (total)	452												
Residual requirement to be allocated through non-strategic allocations (at 30 November 2023 1st April 2025)	300												
MM 6	86	Figure 6.1	<p><i>Amend Figure 6.1 – South Area Strategy to reflect allocation boundary changes and naming consistency throughout plan:</i></p>	<p>To reflect updated site boundaries</p>	<p>No likely significant effects</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>								
MM7	75	CP8	<p>Delete Paragraph 5.30 in full as follows:</p> <p>Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Transport Schemes in the North Uttlesford Area</p> <p>5.30 Delivery of the strategic transport improvements, will require land to be safeguarded, as set out in Core Policy 8: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Infrastructure Schemes in the North Uttlesford Area.</p> <p>Delete in full Core Policy 8: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Infrastructure Schemes in the North Uttlesford Area as follows:</p>	<p>To implement Inspectors recommendation identified in their Post Hearing Letter 31/07/25</p>	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification removes text safeguarding land for a future link road.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and</p>								

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>Core Policy 8 Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Infrastructure Schemes in the North Uttlesford Area</p> <p>Land is safeguarded to support the future delivery of the following schemes as listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a future section of the link road between Thaxted Road and Newport Road,; <p>Any proposals for development that may reasonably be considered to have the potential to impact the delivery of the identified schemes (as shown by maps in Appendix 8 and the Policies Map)* would need to demonstrate the proposal would not harm its delivery.</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for development that would prejudice the construction or effective operation of the scheme listed.</p> <p>* the area shown on the Policies Map and Appendix 8 illustrates where the policy will apply. It does not seek to show a precise alignment for the schemes, which will need to be informed by detailed design work, carried out in consultation with landowners, Natural England, Essex County Council and other relevant parties.</p>		therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.
MM8	89 23	Figure 6.2 Appendix 3b	<p>Amend Framework Plan 3B – Great Dunmow and Figure 6.2 as follows:</p> <p>To remove Sports Pitches symbol on diagram to the south-west of the site.</p> <p>To show the 'Education Facility' to be consistent with the current key.</p>	To reflect updated site boundaries	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This change updates the figure to be consistent with site boundary changes and an updated key. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>
MM9	92 17	Figure 6.3 Appendix 3A	<p>Amend Framework Plan 3A – Takeley and Figure 6.3 as follows:</p> <p>To remove land at 'Bulls Field' to reflect planning permission UTT/23/1583/PINS</p> <p>To amend site boundary to reflect land ownership</p>	To reflect updated site boundaries	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This change updates the figure to be consistent with granted planning permission and land ownership. This</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
					change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.
MM10	96	CP11	<p>Amend Core Policy 11 as follows:</p> <p>Operation and Development</p> <p>The Council will support the continued use of London-Stansted Airport in relation to the <u>Approved Airport Capacity</u> planned expansion to 43 million passengers per annum.</p> <p>Development proposals within the Airport Uses Operational B boundary should, <u>where appropriate</u> provide enhancements to the multi-modal transport hub (including for cycling and walking) at the airport to support both local connections and journeys associated with airport operations including passengers and all employed on the wider airport site.</p> <p>The Council will support development which contributes to the Airport meeting their climate change targets, delivers ecology and biodiversity projects and supports ecological and environmental monitoring.</p> <p>Development proposals within the Airport Uses Operational B boundary should include mitigation measures to address any environmental and health impacts, particularly in respect of noise, air quality, health, and climate change in compliance with other Development Plan policies.</p> <p>Aerodrome Safeguarding</p> <p>Development within the Safeguarding Zones that would affect the operational integrity or safety of aircraft operating in or around London Stansted Airport will not be permitted.</p> <p>Public Safety Zones</p> <p>There is a general presumption against new or replacement development in the Airport Public Safety Zones (PSZ), including changes of use to existing properties; except for development listed as development permissible within the PSZ in</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification consists of minor wording changes regarding airport development.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>the Department for Transport's "Control of development in airport Public Safety Zones" or any replacement guidance. The Public Safety Zones are detailed on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Airport-related Parking</p> <p>Proposals for airport related car parking should will only be permitted be located within the Ancillary Airport Uses operational B boundary, as shown on the Policies Map. Appropriate mechanisms will be sought to make sure that all airport car parking is integrated into and contributes to funding of the airports surface access strategy.</p> <p>Parking proposals should include secure and prominent cycle parking with provision of safe and direct cycle connections to the wider highway network.</p> <p>Proposals for airport related car parking outside the Ancillary Airport Uses boundary will only be permitted where all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is demonstrated to be a long term car parking need that cannot be met within the Ancillary Airport Uses boundary • they relate well to the strategic road network and do not exacerbate traffic congestion • they do not have an adverse impact on amenity, and • they are in accordance with the most recent Sustainable Development Plan for London Stansted Airport. <p>[Note this wording has now also been agreed by MAG, we are finalising a further SOCG Addendum].</p>		
MM11	100	CP13	<p>Amend Core Policy 13 (Bullet Point 2) as follows:</p> <p>contribute towards delivering strategic cycling and walking infrastructure improvements as identified in the Uttlesford and Essex Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) including connections along the B1256 between Great Dunmow, Takeley, Stansted Mountfitchet and Bishop's Stortford, <u>safeguarding land between Takeley 4 Ashes and Taylors Farm Employment Area for a shared use cycle/ walking facility, and routes between Takeley to London Stansted Airport.</u></p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification comprises minor wording changes to increase clarity. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>
MM12	105	DP10	<p>Add new Development Policy following as follows:</p> <p><u>Development Policy 10: The Takeley Mobile Home Park</u></p>		<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification adds a development management policy to prevent development of The</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<u>The use of the Takeley Mobile Homes Park as defined on the Policies Map for conventional residential or other development proposals will not be permitted. Any additional mobile homes must respect the existing layout, open space provision and quality of landscaping.</u>		Takeley Mobile Homes Park. This policy does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.
MM13	111	Figure 7.1	Amend figure 7.1 Stansted Mountfitchet and Elsenham Area Strategy to reflect allocation boundary changes:	To reflect updated site boundaries	No likely significant effects. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.
MM14	118	CP18	<p>Delete Paragraph 7.27 in full as follows:</p> <p>Land is also safeguarded to facilitate expansion of the existing Forest Hall Secondary School (Appendix 7) in accordance with Core Policy 18. It is anticipated that expansion will be required within the Plan period to support growth in the Stansted Mountfitchet and Elsenham Area. Development proposals will be expected to contribute to secondary provision, along with other education contributions with future provision to be implemented in partnership with Essex County Council in their role as Local Education Authority. As the area in question is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt, it is assumed that any school expansion will comprise Green Belt compatible development. Should further and more detailed feasibility work identify that a Green Belt boundary change is required, this will be considered through a future Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Delete in full Core Policy 18: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Infrastructure Schemes in the Stansted Mountfitchet and Elsenham Area as follows:</p> <p>Land is safeguarded to support the delivery of the following strategic infrastructure schemes:</p> <p>i. ——— 4ha expansion of the existing Forest Hall Secondary School at Stansted Mountfitchet.</p> <p>Any proposals for development that may reasonably be considered to have the potential to impact the delivery of the identified strategic infrastructure scheme (as shown on Appendix 7 and 8 and the Policies Map)* should demonstrate the proposals would not harm their delivery.</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for development that would prejudice the construction or effective operation of the proposed infrastructure schemes listed.</p>	To reflect soundness issue identified in Inspectors Letter 31/7/25	<p>No Likely significant effects</p> <p>This modification comprises the removal of text that would safeguard land for the expansion of the Forest Hall Secondary School.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			*the area shown on the Policies Map and Appendix 7/8 illustrates where the policy will apply. It does not seek to show a precise alignment for the school expansion which will need to be informed by detailed design work, carried out in consultation with Essex County Council and other relevant parties.		
MM15	122	Paragraphs 8.8, 8.9 and 8.12	<p>Amend Paragraph 8.8 as follows:</p> <p>There are no allocations, either strategic or non-strategic, made at Thaxted within the Local Plan. This is principally because the scale of growth needed to deliver a viable primary school would be in excess of what the Council consider would be appropriate within this Plan period, especially considering some of the wider constraints to development that affect Thaxted, including its landscape setting, historic environment and falling within noise restrictions relating to Stansted Airport flight paths. At present, a smaller scale of growth without the delivery of a primary school is also not practical given the existing Thaxted Primary School is at capacity with no potential for expansion.</p> <p>Amend Paragraph 8.9 as follows:</p> <p>In the future the Council would support the community to explore if smaller any non-strategic scale of development could come forward without negatively impacting upon infrastructure provision, such as through a new Neighborhood Plan.</p> <p>Amend Paragraph 8.12 as follows:</p> <p>An exception to this is the Local Rural Centre at Thaxted where heritage and infrastructure-related constraints do not support additional development at the current time.</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification comprises minor wording changes to increase clarity. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>
MM16	123	CP19	<p>Add two additional paragraphs to end of Policy as follows:</p> <p><u>The housing requirement figures become applicable from the date of adoption. Where a neighbourhood plan has been ‘made’ in the context of an historic housing requirement figures, the housing requirement figure will be superseded by this policy. However, any allocations made to deliver any historic housing requirement figure will remain extant.</u></p> <p><u>Any site development proposals are subject to Minerals (Essex Minerals Local Plan Policy S8) and Waste Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan Policy S2) safeguarding policy.</u></p> <p>Amend Core Policy 19 as follows:</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification consists of additional text to clarify that housing requirement figures are applicable from date of adoption, and that these figures superseded existing figures. This modification also reduces the residual requirement to be allocated based on updated information.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment																																																								
			<p>In accordance with the Spatial Strategy in Core Policy 2: Meeting our Housing Needs, the 600547 dwelling residential non-strategic (sites under 100 dwellings) housing requirements for the Rural Area will be distributed across the Larger Villages and other settlements within designated neighbourhood areas in accordance with Table 8.2 shown overleaf.</p> <p>For clarity, the housing requirement over the plan period 2021-2041 is the figure to be met through non-strategic development in each Parish in total, taking into account completions since 1st April 2021 and known commitments (at 1 April 2024), with the residual figures to be delivered through additional Neighbourhood Plan allocations (where a Qualifying Body wishes to do so) or the Uttlesford Local Plan.</p> <p>Update Table 8.2 as follows:</p> <table><tr><th>Settlement Hierarchy Tier</th><th>Settlement</th><th>2021-41 Housing Requirement figure (total)</th><th>Residual requirement to be allocated through non-strategic allocations (at 1 April 2024)</th></tr><tr><td>Larger Villages</td><td>Birchanger</td><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Clavering</td><td>199</td><td>422117</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Debden</td><td>78</td><td>2927</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Felsted</td><td>320</td><td>40495</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Hatfield Broad Oak</td><td>141</td><td>41591</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Henham</td><td>181</td><td>424119</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Little Hallingbury</td><td>21</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Stebbing</td><td>171</td><td>40998</td></tr><tr><td>Smaller Villages</td><td>Ashdon</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Broxted</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Flitch Green</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Great Easton</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Lindsell</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr></table>	Settlement Hierarchy Tier	Settlement	2021-41 Housing Requirement figure (total)	Residual requirement to be allocated through non-strategic allocations (at 1 April 2024)	Larger Villages	Birchanger	3	0		Clavering	199	422 117		Debden	78	292 7		Felsted	320	404 95		Hatfield Broad Oak	141	415 91		Henham	181	424 119		Little Hallingbury	21	0		Stebbing	171	409 98	Smaller Villages	Ashdon	0	0		Broxted	0	0		Flitch Green	0	0		Great Easton	0	0		Lindsell	0	0		
Settlement Hierarchy Tier	Settlement	2021-41 Housing Requirement figure (total)	Residual requirement to be allocated through non-strategic allocations (at 1 April 2024)																																																										
Larger Villages	Birchanger	3	0																																																										
	Clavering	199	422 117																																																										
	Debden	78	292 7																																																										
	Felsted	320	404 95																																																										
	Hatfield Broad Oak	141	415 91																																																										
	Henham	181	424 119																																																										
	Little Hallingbury	21	0																																																										
	Stebbing	171	409 98																																																										
Smaller Villages	Ashdon	0	0																																																										
	Broxted	0	0																																																										
	Flitch Green	0	0																																																										
	Great Easton	0	0																																																										
	Lindsell	0	0																																																										

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification				Reason	Assessment																																								
			<table><tr><td></td><td>Little Dunmow</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Little Easton</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Manuden</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Quendon & Rickling</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Radwinter</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Open Countryside</td><td>Cherry Green</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Duton Green</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Little Chesterford</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Tilty</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Rural Area Total</td><td></td><td>1,114</td><td>600547</td></tr></table>					Little Dunmow	0	0		Little Easton	0	0		Manuden	0	0		Quendon & Rickling	0	0		Radwinter	0	0	Open Countryside	Cherry Green	0	0		Duton Green	0	0		Little Chesterford	0	0		Tilty	0	0	Rural Area Total		1,114	600 547		
	Little Dunmow	0	0																																													
	Little Easton	0	0																																													
	Manuden	0	0																																													
	Quendon & Rickling	0	0																																													
	Radwinter	0	0																																													
Open Countryside	Cherry Green	0	0																																													
	Duton Green	0	0																																													
	Little Chesterford	0	0																																													
	Tilty	0	0																																													
Rural Area Total		1,114	600 547																																													
MM17	134	DP2	Amend criterion ii as follows: ii. the original dwelling is not of any architectural or historical merit significant heritage value and it is not valuable to the character of the settlement or wider landscape.				For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises minor wording changes to increase clarity.																																								
MM18	136	DP4	Amend bullet point 2 as follows: ii. retain the openness of the Rural Area by extending the visual impression of built development , and				For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises minor wording changes to increase clarity.																																								
MM19	148/149	CP22	Amend Core Policy 22 as follows: Requirement 1: Space Heating Demand ii. all new bungalows must achieve a space heating demand of less than 20 kWh/m² GIA/yr or less Part B. Extensions and Conversions				Correction	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises minor wording changes to make corrections to the text. This change does not materially change the plan in such a way that gives rise to likely significant effects.																																								

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>Applications for residential extensions and conversions affecting existing buildings (but excluding listed buildings and conservation areas) are expected to should meet the minimum standard approach fabric specifications set out in table 2 (see Appendix 8 10)</p> <p>Amend Core Policy 22 Requirement 4 as follows:</p> <p>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 solar PV energy generation at a level consistent with either (i) or (ii) below:</p> <p>Delete original footnote *. Original footnote ** becomes new footnote *</p>		
MM20	170	CP27	<p>Amend Paragraph 4 in Core Policy 27 as follows:</p> <p>Where a Transport Assessment or Travel Plan is required, a Transport Related Carbon Emissions Quantification Statement will be necessary and should be integrated into the document. <u>The Quantification Statement should demonstrate how proposed sustainable transport measures and interventions will reduce carbon emissions to the greatest possible extent.</u></p> <p>Amend Core Policy 27 (add new sentence at end of Bullet Point ii) as follows:</p> <p><u>Highway mitigation should be delivered directly by developer via Section 278 having regard to the ECC Developers Guide for infrastructure contributions. In exceptional circumstances, pooled contributions may be required where mitigation cannot be apportioned to a single allocation OR development.</u></p> <p>Add new Bullet Point after v as follows:</p> <p><u>A construction management plan is submitted and agreed with the Highway Authority prior to commencement, with before and after condition surveys as appropriate.</u></p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification comprises minor insertions to clarify certain requirements and add requirement for an agreed construction management plan.</p> <p>This change does not materially change the plan in such a way that gives rise to likely significant effects.</p>
MM21	178	CP31	<p>Amend Paragraph 2 to Core Policy 31 as follows:</p> <p>For all development types, including employment, secure cycle parking should be prioritised over private car parking and will be located in a prominent and obvious position. Cycle storage should include provision for electric cycle charging.</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification comprises several wording and layout changes to increase clarity,</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>Developments which propose flats or homes in multiple occupation should ensure that there is enough cycle parking available for all residents.</p> <p><u>All development types, including employment, should provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>secure and covered cycle parking should be prioritised over private car parking</u> • <u>be conveniently located adjacent to entrances to buildings</u> • <u>enjoy good natural observation</u> • <u>be easily accessible from roads and/or cycle routes</u> • <u>be well lit</u> • <u>be located so it does not obstruct pedestrian and cycle routes</u> • <u>cycle storage should include provision for electric cycle charging, and</u> • <u>developments which propose flats or homes in multiple occupation should ensure that there is enough cycle parking available for all residents.</u> <p>Amend Paragraph 5 to Core Policy 31 as follows:</p> <p>All major developments, including employment, and the strategic allocations should deliver an electric car club scheme of an appropriate scale to the development. <u>Where proposals cannot provide for an electric car club on-site, and it is considered that the creation and/or improvement of off-site facilities in the locality is appropriate, a financial contribution in lieu may be accepted.</u></p> <p>Add new section at the end of the policy as follows:</p> <p><u>Development proposals, including the strategic allocations, will be required to demonstrate how the transport and movement proposals for the site will include proposals to deter 'fly parking' in order to maintain the efficient use of the highway and prioritise residents and the local community. Development proposals which propose airport parking outside the airport boundaries including where airport parking is an ancillary use will not be permitted.</u></p>		<p>including outlining the approach to be taken where electric car-club provision is not appropriate, and a requirement to deter 'fly parking'.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>
MM22	180	C32	<p>Remove supporting text from 6.33 to 6.37 as follows:</p> <p>6.1 Aerodrome Safeguarding ensures the safety of aircraft manoeuvring on the ground, taking off, landing or flying in the vicinity of the aerodrome. Aerodrome safeguarding is a legal requirement and regulated by ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organisation) and the Civil Aviation Authority.</p> <p>6.2 By virtue of its importance to the national air transport system, London Stansted Airport is an officially safeguarded aerodrome. Given this status, there are specific development issues which cannot be addressed by generic development management policies. The Safeguarding Zones around London Stansted Airport are defined on a safeguarding map issued by the Airport. They define certain types of development which by reason of their height,</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification comprises creation of a new policy C32a. This policy prevents development that would harm safeguarding zones for aerodromes, airfields</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>attraction to birds or inclusion of or effect upon aviation activity require prior consultation with the Airport Operator and/or National Air Traffic Services Ltd (NATS).</p> <p>6.3 Policy provisions regarding the safeguarding process are set out in the ODPM/DfT Circular 1/2003 (or any subsequent revisions) Safeguarding aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas. In accordance with this Circular, London Stansted Airport is a statutory consultee for certain planning applications for development that require safeguarding to protect the safety of the airport's operation.</p> <p>6.4 The safeguarding zone for London Stansted Airport covers the whole District. The main implications for the types of development within the zone that will require consultation with the Airport Operator are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any proposal likely to attract birds, such as proposals involving mineral extraction or quarrying; waste disposal sites and management facilities, significant areas of landscaping, reservoirs or other significant areas with water land restoration schemes, sewage works, nature reserves, or bird sanctuaries applications connected with an aviation use renewable energy schemes including all wind turbine applications, and solar arrays and biomass energy plants, and development over a certain height in different areas of the District as specified on the safeguarding maps. <p>6.5 On a precautionary basis, consultations should also be made in relation to telecommunications development within 3km of the Airport's perimeter and to significant lighting or advertising schemes on or near the flight approach path that may cause distraction to pilots.</p> <p>Add a new Core Policy 32A and supporting text after Core Policy 32 (under the "Transport" development management policies) as follows (and update consequential paragraph numbering):</p> <p><u>Aerodrome and Military Safeguarding</u></p> <p>1.116 <u>Safeguarding ensures the safety of aircraft manoeuvring on the ground, taking off, landing or flying in the vicinity of the aerodrome. Aerodrome safeguarding is a legal requirement and regulated by ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organisation) and the Civil Aviation Authority.</u></p> <p>1.117 <u>A number of safeguarding areas exist in Uttlesford, these being London Stansted Airport, Duxford Aerodrome and Carver Barracks Airfield. The Safeguarding Zones around them are defined on a safeguarding map issued by the relevant safeguarding authority. They define certain types of development which by reason of their height, attraction to birds or inclusion of or effect upon.</u></p> <p>1.118 <u>Policy provisions regarding the safeguarding process are set out in the ODPM/DfT Circular 1/2003 (or any subsequent revisions) Safeguarding aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas. In accordance with this Circular, the relevant safeguarding authority is a statutory consultee for certain</u></p>		<p>and airports. The supporting text for this new policy is primarily taken from existing supporting text.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p><u>planning applications for development that require safeguarding to protect the safety of the site's operation.</u></p> <p>1.118 <u>The safeguarding zone for London Stansted Airport covers the whole District. The main implications for the types of development within the zone that will require consultation with the Airport Operator are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>any proposal likely to attract birds, such as proposals involving mineral extraction or quarrying; waste disposal sites and management facilities, significant areas of landscaping, reservoirs or other significant areas with water land restoration schemes, sewage works, nature reserves, or bird sanctuaries</u> • <u>applications connected with an aviation use</u> • <u>renewable energy schemes including all wind turbine applications, and solar arrays and biomass energy plants, and</u> • <u>development over a certain height in different areas of the District as specified on the safeguarding maps.</u> <p><u>Core Policy 32a: Aerodrome Safeguarding</u></p> <p><u>Development within the Safeguarding Zones that would affect the operational integrity or safety of aircraft operating in or around London Stansted Airport, Duxford Aerodrome or Carver Barracks Airfield will not be permitted.</u></p>		
MM23	183/194 /199	CP33/37/ 38	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Core Policy 33 as follows:</p> <p>Proposals which would result in adverse impacts on aviation safety at London Stansted Airport <u>Local Aerodromes</u> will not be supported, as set out in <u>Core Policy 32A: Aerodrome Safeguarding</u> Core Policy 11: Stansted Airport.</p> <p>Amend the second paragraph of Core Policy 37 as follows:</p> <p>Proposals should consider the impact upon aviation in accordance with <u>Core Policy 32A: Aerodrome Safeguarding</u> Core Policy 11: London Stansted Airport</p> <p>Amend the ninth paragraph of Core Policy 38 as follows:</p> <p>where appropriate the implementation of a bird hazard management plan will be secured by condition or planning obligation (Core Policy 11<u>Core Policy 32A: Aerodrome Safeguarding</u>).</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification comprises minor changes to refer to the new Policy 32A in place of Policy 11 regarding impacts on aviation. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects</p>
MM24	186	CP34	<p>Amend the second sentence of the second paragraph (water efficiency) as follows:</p> <p>All new residential development that achieves <u>should achieve</u> at least a water efficiency standard of 90 litres per person per day will be supported.</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effect.</p> <p>This modification comprises minor wording changes for</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>Amend end of Water Efficiency section as follows:</p> <p>retrofitting to increase water efficiency to the same standards</p> <p>Amend Core Policy 34 (in Infrastructure section) as follows:</p> <p>The council will expect new development to connect to mains foul drainage and will restrict the use of non-mains drainage for foul water disposal, in line with Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority guidance. The location of, and likely impact on, the private water supplies within the District must also be taken into account. <u>Development proposals must ensure that this infrastructure can demonstrate that it will contribute to achieving 'good' status under The Water Framework Directive for surface and groundwater bodies.</u></p>		<p>clarity, a requirement to follow Lead Local Flood Authority guidance, and a requirement for development to contribute towards waterbodies achieving 'good' status. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>
MM25	192	CP36	<p>Amend paragraph 1 of Core Policy 36 as follows:</p> <p>All development proposals should <u>follow the sequential approach set out in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance and, where possible, adopt a sequential approach to site layout.</u> <u>Proposals should</u> demonstrate that they will be safe for their lifetime and that they reduce and, where possible, avoid the risk of all forms of flooding to future occupiers, and do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4 of Core Policy 36 as follows:</p> <p>Where <u>built</u> development <u>or land raising</u> is proposed within the 1 in 100 year flood level <u>extent</u>, including an allowance for climate change, floodplain compensation must be provided.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5 of Core Policy 36 to read:</p> <p>Where detailed hydraulic modelling of a watercourse is not available, modelling should be undertaken as part of the site specific flood risk assessment to estimate the <u>1 in 30</u>, 1 in 100 year <u>and 1 in 1000 flood extents and</u> levels, including an appropriate allowance for climate change.</p> <p>Amend Core Policy 36 as follows:</p> <p>iv. include evacuation and flood warning procedures to assist existing communities at risk, and</p> <p>v. raise finished floor levels 600mm above the 1 in 100 year flood level, including an appropriate allowance for climate change</p>	<p>To address issues raised through Duty to Cooperate discussions</p> <p>For additional clarity</p>	<p>No likely significant effects.</p> <p>This modification adds text to require a sequential approach where possible and require SUDS and appropriate drainage strategies and flood assessments where required.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p><u>vi. use sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) for the management of surface water and where possible increase biodiversity and amenity, and</u></p> <p><u>vii. proposals must include a drainage strategy to evidence how the development will mitigate flooding on and off site. This must have regard to the Sustainable Drainage Systems Design Guide for Essex</u></p>		
MM26	194	CP37	<p>Amend Core Policy 37 (add new sentence to the end of the first sentence in paragraph 2) as follows:</p> <p><u>and London Stansted Airport should be consulted regarding any new development within 13km of the Airport, to ensure early input into any viability and requirements of the SUDS proposed.</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification adds text to clarify when London Stansted Airport should be consulted. This does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM27	198/199	CP38	<p>Amend Core Policy 38 as follows:</p> <p>II. any nationally <u>statutory</u> designated site, for example: <u>Sites of Special Scientific Interest</u> (SSSI), and National Nature Reserves <u>and Local Nature Reserves</u></p> <p>III. any locally <u>non-statutory</u> designated site, for example: Local Wildlife Sites, <u>Local Geological Sites and Special Roadside Verges</u></p> <p>To ensure that mitigation or compensation measures take place, which may include Biodiversity Offsetting <u>off-site Biodiversity Net Gain</u>, these will be secured by conditions or planning obligations and will need to include financial support for continued maintenance.</p> <p>Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Mitigation</p> <p>Contributions will be secured from development towards mitigation <u>of the in-combination adverse effects of new development</u> in accordance with the Essex Coast RAMS Habitats Regulations Assessment Strategy Document 2018-2038 and Essex Coast RAMs Supplementary Planning Document 2020. The Essex Coast RAMS tariff will be applied to net additional dwellings, within the zone of influence, as shown on the Policies Map and Appendix 13, including Permitted Development which is required to comply with the Habitats Regulations <u>all new residential development within the zone of influence is expected to meet or exceed Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework Standards, and larger sites should provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) that adheres to Natural England SANG Quality Guidance.</u></p> <p>Protection of Hatfield Forest</p> <p>Where appropriate, within the <u>Hatfield Forest Zone of Influence (11.1km)</u> identified areas as shown on the Policies Map and Appendix 12, <u>vi) contributions¹³⁸ will be required from proposed new residential developments which result in a net increase in dwellings</u> will be secured towards <u>the delivery of the Strategic Access Management Measures (SAMM) as</u></p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects. This modification consists of wording changes to improve clarity by increasing specificity and including reference to external guidance and strategies that impact development within the plan area.</p> <p>This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p><u>set out in the Hatfield Forest Mitigation Strategy.</u> recreational mitigation measures Priority Habitat enhancement/ connectivity at Hatfield Forest Site or Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserve (NNR). <u>vii) high quality on-site green infrastructure provision shall be completed and accessible within the early phases of development in new major developments, including natural and semi-natural greenspace, dog walking routes and dogs off-lead areas.</u></p> <p><u>138 In accordance with the tariffs and guidance set out in the Natural England Hatfield Forest Mitigation Strategy – Project update dated 19th June 2025.</u> https://uttlesford.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s39987/Appendix%20%20NE%20Letter%20to%20LPAs%20Update%20on%20HF%20Mitigation%20Strategy.pdf</p> <p>Update subsequent footnote numbering accordingly</p>		
MM28	202	CP39	<p>Amend Core Policy 39 (add new penultimate paragraph) as follows: <u>Where appropriate a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) must be prepared detailing the management and maintenance of green infrastructure assets and green spaces for the lifetime of the development.</u></p> <p>Amend Core Policy 39 (add new final paragraph) as follows: <u>All proposals which deliver new or enhanced green and blue infrastructure should consider the impact upon aviation in accordance with Core Policy 32A: Aerodrome Safeguarding.</u></p>	For additional clarity	No Likely significant effects. This modification comprises minor insertions to clarify that an LEMP may be required and that proposals must consider the impact on aviation.
MM29	205	CP40	<p>Amend Core Policy 40 as follows: <u>With the exception of development which is exempt from statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, all development proposals will be required to demonstrate a minimum of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain calculated using the most recent Statutory Metric, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that provision in excess of the statutory minimum 10% would make development unviable.</u></p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain Units should deliver gains that are significant at a local or landscape scale. In situations where this is not considered appropriate then the justification must be clearly set out and alternatives arrangements, for example off-site mitigation or financial contribution, to be made.</p> <p>Where proposals involve the creation of natural areas and habitats which are integral to development, they should be accompanied by a long-term management plan which must be approved by the Local Planning Authority <u>in accordance with the requirements of Core Policy 39: Green and Blue Infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>All proposals which include Biodiversity Net Gain should consider the impact upon aviation in accordance with Core Policy 32A: Aerodrome Safeguarding.</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification makes minor changes to clarify that development exempt from statutory Biodiversity net gain is not required to meet additional BNG requirements needed in this plan, and allowing statutory BNG where the increased BNG would make a development unviable. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<u>Planning applications subject to mandatory BNG shall require a biodiversity gain plan. The Plan must be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before commencement.</u>		therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.
MM30	207	CP41	Amend Paragraph 2 of Core Policy 41 as follows: Development will be expected to reflect and enhance local landscape character or its setting in accordance with the applicable guidelines to protect and conserve, manage and plan landscapes outlined for each landscape character area within the Uttlesford Landscape Character Assessment (2023)	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises a minor insertion to clarify setting should be considered.
MM31	211	CP43	Amend first sentence of Core Policy 43 as follows: Development will not be permitted where it might lead if air pollution impacts lead to significant adverse effects on health, the natural environment, <u>or protected sites (as defined by the Environment Act 2021¹⁵⁴) or amenity, including residential amenity.</u> or amenity from emissions to air. Insert new footnote 154: <u>GOV.UK, The Environment Act, 2021, Section 110. www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/30/contents/enacted</u>	For additional clarity and correction	No likely significant effects. This modification amends wording for clarity concerning air pollution impacts. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.
MM32	213	CP44	Amend Core Policy 44 as follows: For aviation transport sources, the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level is considered to occur where noise exposure is above 63dB LAeq,16hr (57dB LAeq,8hr at night) <u>and the lowest observed effect level is considered to be 51DB LAEQ, 16HR (45DB LAEQ, 8HR at night)</u> ¹⁵⁷ Add new Paragraph at end as follows: <u>Outdoor noise on school sites should not exceed 55DB LAEQ (30 MIN)</u>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effect. This modification comprises minor insertions to clarify what is meant by acceptable noise levels.
MM33	223	CP48	Amend Core Policy 48 as follows: Proposals for new employment (Use Classes E (g), B2 or B8) will be supported on unallocated sites in or on the edge of Existing Employment Sites (as defined in Core Policy 45) and the built-up area of Key Settlements, Local Rural Centres and Larger Villages, where there are exceptional circumstances , provided that the benefits are not outweighed by any harmful impacts through consideration of other policies within this plan), where:		No likely significant effects. This modification is a minor wording change removing a necessity for exceptional circumstances. This change does not constitute an increase in planned

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
					development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.
MM34	225	CP49	<p>Amend Core Policy 49 as follows:</p> <p>Applications for large-scale development, 50 dwellings or over 2500m2, must should include a site-specific Employment and Skills Plan (ESP) and the developer will be expected to agree to deliver and monitor the commitments secured in the ESP.</p> <p>Add paragraph to the end of Core Policy 49 that sets out additional flexibility as follows: <u>If it can be demonstrated that there are circumstances specific to the scheme where direct provision is not operationally feasible, or that an alternative means of delivery would result in a more effective outcome a financial contribution in lieu might be considered.</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises a minor wording change and additional text to provide flexibility in the required provisions. This change does not constitute an increase in planned development and therefore does not pose any likely significant effects.
MM35	237	CP51	<p>Amend Core Policy 51 criterion iii) as follows:</p> <p>“iii. at Stansted Airport and Chesterford Research Park: ancillary business hotel and conference facilities, and”</p>	Agreed as part of the DTC	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises a minor change agreed as part of duty to comply. This change does not lead to any new likely significant effects.
MM36	246	CP52a	<p>Amend Core Policy 52a (add new Bullet Point at the end) as follows:</p> <p><u>v. take a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development including respecting existing site constraints including utilities situated within sites.</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises a minor insertion to clarify need for a co-ordinated approach.
MM37	250	CP53	<p>Amend Core Policy 53 as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 2</p> <p>This should be in accordance with have regard to the most up-to-date LHNA (Table 11.1) unless an alternative approach can be demonstrated to be more appropriate or where proven to be necessary due to viability constraints based on a PPG-compliant developer funded viability assessment agreed with the Council (through an open book approach).</p>	<p>For additional clarity.</p> <p>And to implement Inspectors recommendation identified in their Post Hearing Letter 31/07/25</p>	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises minor wording changes for clarity and a minor change concerning the required provision of M4(3) housing. This change does not lead

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>Paragraph 4:</p> <p>The Council expect all residential schemes to be 100% M4 (2) compliant and. The Council expect all major residential schemes to demonstrate 405% of market homes are M4 (3)(a) compliant and 2010% affordable homes are M4(3)(b) compliant – or replacement standards. These M4(2) and M4(3) requirements will apply unless it can be demonstrated that it is not practically achievable or financially viable to deliver in line with this policy based on a PPG-compliant developer-funded viability assessment agreed with the Council (through an open book approach).</p>		to any new likely significant effects.
MM38	256	CP56	<p>Amend Paragraph 5 of Core Policy 56 as follows:</p> <p>Affordable dwellings should be appropriately distributed throughout a new development in small groups and clusters, in groups not larger than ten units, and should be designed to a high quality, with the same or a consistent external appearance as for market dwellings. Where a site is subdivided, the Council will expect each sub-division to contribute proportionally towards achieving the number of affordable dwellings which would have been applicable on the whole site.</p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises a minor wording change for clarity.
MM39	258	CP57	<p>Amend Bullet Point 3 within Core Policy 57 as follows:</p> <p>the proposal does not lead to a continuous frontage or concentration of three or more HMOs or conversions, and</p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises a minor wording change for clarity.
MM40	266	CP60	<p>Amend Core Policy 60 as follows:</p> <p>The <u>Council have published a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) which sets out the accommodation requirement for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People in the District. This identifies that for individuals who meet the definition outlined in the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), to be delivered between 2023 and 2041 there is for 6643 pitches. A further 24 five pitches are required over the same period to meet the needs of those individuals or families who do not meet the PPTS definition, or for whom it is not clear whether they meet the PPTS definition. Allocations towards meeting the identified need have been made through the expansion of existing Gypsy and Traveller Sites and are listed in Table 11.2 below.</u> The contribution and location of all proposed sources of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation is shown on the Local Plan Policies Map and is listed in Table 11.2 below:</p> <p><u>In addition to the allocations above, the Council is currently engaging in the preparation of a separate Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document that will allocate new Gypsy and Traveller sites sufficient to meet the residual identified need at new sites. The Council intend a draft of this document to be published for Regulation 18 consultation in 2025.</u> The Council commits to undertaking an early review of Gypsy and Traveller site supply and demand, beginning at the point of Local Plan adoption, which will seek to clarify where the needs of the community can be best met beyond 2028. Applications for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show People's accommodation on sites not allocated in Table 11.2 will be supported subject to the following criteria being met:</p>	To accommodate recent updated evidence on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs.	No likely significant effects. This modification updates the text to reflect the most recent evidence for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs. This update reflects the period assessed increasing from ending in 2028 to now ending in 2041. This change does not allocate any additional development. However, it does provide higher numbers of required pitches than in the original version of the local plan.

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
					Any allocation of sites brought forward to meet this need would need to adhere to the policy framework that ensures no adverse effects from the original HRA and provide any required strategic mitigation. The documentation providing such an allocation would require an HRA when it is produced. This notwithstanding, the modifications here ultimately do not change the conclusions of the original HRA and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM41	268	CP61	Amend the third paragraph of Core Policy 61 as follows: All applications which affect or have the potential to affect designated heritage assets will be required to provide a heritage statement...	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises a minor wording change for clarity.
MM42	274	CP64	Amend CP64 as follows: Archaeological Assets Where Scheduled Monuments and archaeological assets and their settings are affected by proposed development there will be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation in situ, for example through modification of design, layout, drainage, landscaping or the siting and location of foundations. This presumption will be applied unless it can be demonstrated that public benefits will be secured which outweigh that harm or loss in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework. Development which could adversely affect assets of archaeological interest and their settings will require a suitable desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation that should be submitted as part of any planning application. In the circumstances where preservation in situ of an archaeological asset is not possible or feasible, then development will	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises a minor change to the phrasing and order of sentences in this policy. This change does not materially impact the policy or lead to additional likely significant effects.

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p>not be permitted until a programme for excavation, investigation and recording has been submitted and agreed by way of a pre-commencement condition.</p> <p><u>Development which could adversely affect Scheduled Monuments or non-designated assets of archaeological interest and their settings will require a suitable desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation that should be submitted as part of any planning application.</u></p> <p><u>Where Scheduled Monuments and their settings would be affected by proposed development there will be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation in situ, for example through modification of design, layout, drainage, landscaping or the siting and location of foundations. This presumption will be applied unless it can be demonstrated that public benefits will be secured which outweigh that harm or loss in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. In such circumstances, a programme for excavation, investigation and recording will be required to be submitted and agreed by way of a pre-commencement condition.</u></p>		
MM43	274	CP64	<p>Add new Core Policy 64a as follows:</p> <p><u>Core Policy 64a: Registered Parks and Gardens</u></p> <p><u>Development proposals within or surrounding a Registered Park and Garden should be designed to preserve the significance of the asset, taking account of the landscape setting and any key views either within the asset, or between the asset and its wider environs. Where new landscaping is proposed as mitigation against the impact of development on a Registered Park and Garden, this should be reflective of the pattern and identity of the existing landscaping within the asset.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals which contribute to or better reveal the significance of a Registered Park and Garden will be supported, including the removal of structures and uses that detract from the special historic interest of these historic parks.</u></p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects. This change adds a positive policy that requires development to protect the significance of registered parks and gardens</p> <p>This policy does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.</p>
MM44	278	CP66	<p>Amend Core Policy 66 as follows:</p> <p>i. <u>all</u> development proposals <u>in Use Class C2 (Residential) and Sui Generis Hot Food Takeaways</u> of 100 dwellings or more, or 5,000m² floorspace or more, should undertake a full Health Impact Assessment in accordance with the Essex Design Guide HIA guidance</p> <p>iii. addressing local health issues, outcomes, and needs, as detailed in the JSNA <u>and Uttlesford Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Essex Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy</u></p> <p>Add additional bullet points xi, xii and xiii as follows:</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects. The modification adds text regarding the specifics of health impact assessments and health and wellbeing strategies that development must provide or conform to.</p> <p>This policy does not allocate any additional development</p>

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<p><u>xi. the scope of the Health Impact Assessment is agreed with the Council's Development Management and Public Health team's prior to commencement of the assessment at the earliest opportunity</u></p> <p><u>xii. the assessment is undertaken at an early stage of the development process and there is a clear demonstration that the assessment process has informed the overall design process, and</u></p> <p><u>xii. the assessment is undertaken in accordance with Essex Healthy PLaces Guidance and responds to the latest public health data and community insights gathered by the applicant's team.</u></p>		and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM45	285	CP68	<p>Amend Policy 68 as follows:</p> <p>New, <u>Expansion of or Improvement to</u> Community Uses will be supported, <u>such as local shops, meeting places, cultural buildings, public houses, places of worship, health and care facilities, community centres, education provision and libraries</u> provided that they:</p> <p>Amend Core Policy 68 (amend Bullet Point vi) as follows:</p> <p>vi. an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows that the facility is surplus to requirements is no longer viable. <u>This should be demonstrated with clear evidence that:</u></p> <p>A) <u>the existing use is no longer commercially or economically viable or could not be made commercially or economically viable, or</u></p> <p>B) <u>there is alternative local provision that is accessible to the local community by public transport, walking or cycling; and in either case, and</u></p> <p>C) <u>the premises are no longer required to meet the needs of the local community.</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification adds text providing examples of community uses and clarifying criteria to determine that a community use is no longer viable. This policy does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM46	288	Paragraph 12.3	<p>Add new sentence at the end of Paragraph 12.3 as follows:</p> <p><u>A Housing Trajectory (updated to April 2025) is also shown by Appendix 20.</u></p> <p>Add note after the first sentence of Paragraph 12.3 as follows:</p> <p><u>Except where triggered by Core Policy 2a: Local Plan Review</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification adds text to highlight where the housing trajectory can be found and to clarify the effect of local plan review. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
					lead to any likely significant effects.
MM47	7	Appendix 2-4 Introduction Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Add new Bullet Point 7 under Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Heading as follows: <u>A Green and Blue Infrastructure Plan, and Biodiversity Gain Plan, and/ or for significant BNG a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan, must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority</u>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification requires the provision of a Green and Blue Infrastructure Plan, and Biodiversity Gain Plan, and/ or for significant BNG, a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects
MM48	10	Appendix 2a Proposed Spine Road	Add Bullet after 1 st as follows: <u>The development South of Thaxted Road should deliver a Spine Road to the same specification with an onward connection Safeguarded in the South-West of the site in the approximate location indicated on the framework plan.</u>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification clarifies that a spine road should be delivered matching specification as shown on the framework plan. This change does not allocate any residential or employment development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM49	11	Appendix 5	Delete Appendix 5: London Stansted Aerodrome Safeguarding Zones in its entirety from the Plan. <u>Amend other appendix numbers appropriately.</u> <u>Separate to Local Plan process: add aerodrome safeguarding zones to DM constraints map for:</u> - <u>London Stansted Airport</u>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification amends the DM constraints map and appendix numbering. This change does not allocate any additional

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Carver Barracks</u> - <u>Duxford Aerodrome</u> 		development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM50	14	Appendix 2b Landscap e Bullet 2	<p>Amend Bullet 2 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid degradation of the Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife Site at Emmanuel Wood by ensuring a sufficient <u>at least 15m</u> buffer to the woodland from all development, including from lighting and noise.</p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This change amends wording for clarity as to what constitutes a sufficient buffer around ancient woodland. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM51	18	Appendix 3a Transport New Bullet	<p>Add a new Bullet Point under Transport Heading as follows:</p> <p><u>Contributions/ improvements to the Flitch Way may be required</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This change clarifies that Flitch way improvements may be needed. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM52	32	Appendix 3c	<p>Add new section at end page 30 as follow:</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Undertake a Waste Infrastructure Assessment to meet County Waste Local Plan policy requirements, given proximity to Taylors Farm, for inert recycling</u> • <u>Liaise with ECC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority on minerals and waster matters</u> 	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This change specifies waste management considerations. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM53		Appendix 3b	<p>Amend Bullet 1 as follows:</p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification clarifies that development must be

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
		Flood Risk Bullet 1	<u>Ensure any development is located outside of Flood Zones 2 or 3, including climate change allowance and supported by a site-specific FRA.</u>	To reflect updates in the Council's Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency	located outside of the flood zone. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM54	34	Appendix 3d	<p>Add new section at end page 30 as follow:</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Undertake a Minerals Resource Assessment</u> • <u>Undertake a Minerals Infrastructure Impact Assessment given its proximity to Highwood Quarry</u> • <u>Undertake a Waste Infrastructure Assessment to meet County Waste Local Plan Policy requirements, given proximity to Highwood Quarry for inert waste recycling</u> • <u>Liaise with ECC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority on Minerals and Waste Matters</u> 	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This change specifies minerals and waste management considerations. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM55	N/A	Appendix 4a Transport	<p>Amend Bullet 2 under Transport heading as follows:</p> <p>Make Hornbeam Way and High Lane an attractive and safe route for connecting pedestrian and cycle movement between the town centre and the site and Bentfield Primary School.</p>	To reflect updates in the Council's Statement of Common Ground with the ECC	No likely significant effects. This modification includes wording changes to reflect the council's statement of common ground. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM56	38	Appendix 4a Heritage	<p>Amend Bullet 3 under Heritage heading as follows:</p> <p>Development should be located away from Pennington Land and the existing hedgerow and tree planting running alongside the lane should be preserved to maintain the open, rural views from the road. <u>There should be no new vehicular access to the land from the development</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This policy clarifies that there should be no new vehicular access. This change does not allocate any additional development

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
					and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM57	38	Appendix 4a Landscape New Bullet	<p>Add a new Bullet Point under Landscape Heading as follows:</p> <p><u>Applicants should consult Natural England on Proposed SANG open space in advance of submission of the application to ensure appropriate SANG standards are met</u></p> <p>Amend 5th and 6th bullets as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green amenity space will be designed in accordance with Natural England SANG principles a minimum of 7.5 ha of <u>high-quality Semi-Natural Accessible Greenspace will be provided</u> and will be maintained and managed on behalf of the community by an organisation in accordance with a management plan to be agreed before commencement of the SANG/open space works. Estimated SANG requirements are 5.1 ha which should be the minimum target provision within this allocation. <p><u>An approx. 2.3KM circular walk will be delivered using the on-site greenspace and, where necessary, the existing public Right of Way and highway networks</u></p>	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification includes wording changes including amendments to specify the size and capacity for circular walk in the SANG and requirement to consult with Natural England. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM58	42	Appendix 4b Infrastructure	<p>Amend Bullet 1 under Infrastructure heading as follows:</p> <p>Education facility – expansion of safeguarded site to the south of the allocation to <u>2.1 ha in total to facilitate construction of a new</u> allow for an expanded primary school <u>with</u> and co-located early years <u>and childcare</u> provision, with detailed requirements subject to consultation with Essex County Council</p> <p>Add two new Bullet points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Undertake a Minerals Resource Assessment</u> <u>Liaise with ECC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority on minerals and waster matters</u> 	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification comprises minor changes to clarify the land to be safeguarded for education and childcare and requirements concerning minerals and waste. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM59	46	Appendix 4c	<p>Add new section at end page 30 as follow:</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Undertake a Waste Infrastructure Assessment to meet County Waste Local Plan Policy Requirements, given proximity to Loppingdales for inert waste recycling</u> <u>Liaise with ECC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority on Minerals and Waste Matters</u> 	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This change specifies minerals and waste management considerations. This change does not allocate any

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
					additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects
MM60		Appendix 5	Removal of Appendix 5: London Stansted Aerodrome Safeguarding Zones	For additional clarity	No likely significant effects. This modification removes appendix 5. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM61		Appendix 7	Delete second map on page 12 from Appendix 7: Land Safeguarded for 4ha expansion of the existing Forest Hall Secondary School, Stansted Mountfitchet And amend heading as follows: Appendix 7: Safeguarded Land for Education Uses in relation to Core Policy yes 14 and 18	To implement Inspectors recommendation identified in their Post Hearing Letter 31/07/25	No likely significant effects. This modification removes a map from appendix 7 to only cover Core Policy 14. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM62	14	Appendix 8	Amend Appendix 8 Safeguarding Map for A120 access as shown below	To reflect the boundary in the emerging masterplan on the Taylors Farm site.	No likely significant effects. This modification amends the figure to reflect updated boundaries. This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM63		Appendix 9	Amendment to Appendix 9 to reflect updated Countryside Protection Zone Boundary:	To implement Inspectors recommendation identified in their Post Hearing Letter 31/07/25	No likely significant effects. This modification amends the figure to reflect the updated countryside protection zone. This

Main Mod Ref	Plan page	Policy / paragraph	Main Modification	Reason	Assessment
					change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
MM64		Appendix 20	<p>Add new Appendix 20 as follows:</p> <p>Add Housing Trajectory (updated to April 2025) (see below)</p>	For additional clarity	<p>No likely significant effects. This modification inserts a graph to reflect the anticipated housing trajectory.</p> <p>This change does not allocate any additional development and does not lead to any likely significant effects.</p>

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 Following the analysis of the proposed Main Modifications to the Uttlesford Local Plan it can be concluded that only one (MM2) will lead to likely significant effects on Habitat sites, alone or in combination with other plans and projects.
- 3.2 MM2 sets out plan provision for an increases number of dwellings, and therefore the following impact pathways are present in combination:
- Recreational Pressure
 - Atmospheric pollution
 - Water quality
 - Water, quantity, level and flow
- 3.3 It is noted that the increase in housing provision in MM2 is entirely due to additional completions since this has been updated to 2025 rather than 2024 as was included initially. This modification does not increase the provision of planned future housing, nor does it increase the number or size of allocated sites. It is assumed that any completed development will have been subject to its own planning application HRA if required.
- 3.4 While there are increased likely significant effects due to MM2, these potential impacts are satisfactorily addressed by the appropriate assessment in the original HRA. This is due to the fact that the issues identified were strategic. The only specific mitigation solution that was identified as being required in the HRA was the Essex Coast RAMS and this would be able to accommodate the small increase in housing over the plan period.
- 3.5 It is the conclusion of this assessment that the material changes in MM2 do not invalidate the conclusions reached at the appropriate assessment stage of the existing Local Plan HRA.
- 3.6 It is noted that MM40 represents a substantial increase in the required provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches to meet the need by 2041. This is in part due to the most recent assessment of need covering up to 2041, whereas prior assessment only covered until 2028. While this modification does not bring forward any additional development to meet this need, it is noted that any further allocation of sites to meet this need would be required to adhere to the policy framework to ensure no adverse effects from the original HRA and provide any required strategic mitigation. The documentation providing such an allocation would require an HRA when it is produced.
- 3.7 This notwithstanding the modifications here ultimately do not change the conclusions of the original HRA and does not lead to any likely significant effects.
- 3.8 We therefore conclude that the main modifications do not undermine the conclusions of the HRA of the Local Plan.

