

# Local Plan Sub-Committee AGENDA



THE PUBLIC MAY ATTEND THIS MEETING

Please note this meeting will be webcast and audio recorded.

**Date: Wednesday, 16 March 2016**

**Time: 18:00**

**Venue: Council Chamber , Braintree District Council, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree, Essex, CM7 9HB**

## **Membership:**

Councillor D Bebb  
Councillor Mrs L Bowers-Flint (Chairman)  
Councillor G Butland  
Councillor T Cunningham  
Councillor D Hume

Councillor Mrs J Money  
Councillor Lady Newton  
Councillor J O'Reilly-Cicconi  
Councillor Mrs W Scattergood  
Councillor Miss M Thorogood

**Members are requested to attend this meeting, to transact the following business:-**

## **PUBLIC SESSION**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**  
To declare the existence and nature of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, other Pecuniary Interest, or Non-Pecuniary Interest relating to Items on the Agenda having regard to the Code of Conduct for Members and having taken appropriate advice where necessary before the meeting.
- 3 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**  
There are no Minutes to approve.
- 4 Public Question Time**  
(See paragraph below)
- 5 Braintree District Draft Local Plan - Draft Village Site Allocation Maps** 4 - 32

**6 Urgent Business - Public Session**

To consider any matter which, in the opinion of the Chairman, should be considered in public by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) as a matter of urgency.

**7 Exclusion of the Public and Press**

To agree the exclusion of the public and press for the consideration of any Items for the reasons set out in Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Local Government Act 1972.

*At the time of compiling this Agenda there were none.*

**PRIVATE SESSION**

**8 Urgent Business - Private Session**

To consider any matter which, in the opinion of the Chairman, should be considered in private by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) as a matter of urgency.

Cont'd

E WISBEY  
Governance and Member Manager

**Contact Details**

If you require any further information please contact the Governance and Members Team on 01376 552525 or email [demse@braintree.gov.uk](mailto:demse@braintree.gov.uk)

**Public Question Time**

Immediately after the Minutes of the previous meeting have been approved there will be a period of up to 30 minutes when members of the public can speak.

Members of the public wishing to speak should contact the Governance and Members Team on 01376 552525 or email [demse@braintree.gov.uk](mailto:demse@braintree.gov.uk) at least 2 working days prior to the meeting.

Members of the public can remain to observe the whole of the public part of the meeting.

**Health and Safety**

Any persons attending meetings at Causeway House are requested to take a few moments to familiarise themselves with the nearest available fire exit, indicated by the fire evacuation signs. In the event of a continuous alarm sounding during the meeting, you must evacuate the building immediately and follow all instructions provided by a Council officer who will identify him/herself should the alarm sound. You will be assisted to the nearest designated assembly point until it is safe to return to the building.

**Mobile Phones**

Please ensure that your mobile phone is either switched to silent or switched off during the meeting.

**Comments**

Braintree District Council welcomes comments from members of the public in order to make its services as efficient and effective as possible. We would appreciate any suggestions regarding the usefulness of the paperwork for this meeting, or the conduct of the meeting you have attended.

Please let us have your comments setting out the following information

Meeting Attended..... Date of Meeting .....

Comment.....

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Contact Details: .....

<b>Braintree Draft Local Plan – Proposed Allocations</b>		<b>Agenda No: 5</b>
<p><b>Corporate Priority:</b> Securing appropriate infrastructure and housing growth</p> <p><b>Portfolio:</b> Planning and Housing</p> <p><b>Report Presented by:</b> Emma Goodings</p> <p><b>Report Prepared by:</b> Sean Tofts and Alan Massow</p>		
<p><b>Background Papers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</li> <li>• National Planning Practise Guidance (NPPG)</li> <li>• Localism Act (2011)</li> <li>• Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)</li> <li>• Local Plan Review (2005)</li> <li>• Core Strategy (2011)</li> <li>• Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (2015)</li> </ul>		<p><b>Public Report:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Key Decision:</b> No</p>
<p><b>Executive Summary:</b></p> <p>A key part of the new Local Plan is to produce a site allocations map for each defined settlement within the District. This map known as an inset map and sets out key data for that area, including development boundary, conservation area, areas allocated for development and areas protected for specific uses such as open space, allotments or employment. As part of the draft Local Plan, the allocations and development boundary for each town and village in the District have been reviewed. This review has included ensuring that the development boundary is in the correct location and making an assessment of the sites submitted in the Call for Sites as potential development options. Town and Parish Councils have also been consulted and their comments have been summarised where provided.</p> <p>In the draft Local Plan an inset map for each area will be produced setting out the preferred option and an alternative map will also be produced which shows all the sites that have been considered.</p>		
<p><b>Decision:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That there is no development boundary for Alphamstone and that no sites are allocated for development.</li> <li>2. The Inset map for Audley End set out in Appendix 3 be approved.</li> <li>3. That the inset map for Belchamp Otten set out in Appendix 4 be approved and that no sites are allocated for development.</li> </ol>		

- 4. To approve the Belchamp St Paul inset map as set out in Appendix 5 and to not allocate sites for development.**
- 5. That there is no development boundary for Birdbrook.**
- 6. That there is no development boundary within Borley Parish and that no sites are allocated for development.**
- 7. The inset map for Lamarsh set out in Appendix 8 should be approved.**
- 8. That there is no development boundary within Middleton.**
- 9. That there is no development boundary for Ovington and no sites are allocated for development.**
- 10. That there is no development boundary for Pentlow and no sites are allocated for development.**
- 11. That the inset map for Stambourne Chapel End Way and Stambourne Dyers End as set out in Appendix 12 be approved.**
- 12. That there is no development boundary for Great and Little Henny.**
- 13. To approve the inset map for Tilbury Juxta Clare as set out in Appendix 14.**
- 14. That there is no development boundary for Twinstead.**
- 15. To approve the inset map for Wickham St Paul set out in Appendix 16 and to not allocate a site for development.**
- 16. To approve the inset map for Great Bardfield set out in Appendix 17 and to not allocate sites for development.**
- 17. To approve the inset map for Finchingfield as set out in Appendix 18 and do not allocate sites for development.**
- 18. To approve the inset map for Cornish Hall End as set out in Appendix 19, including a minor amendment to the development boundary to include Willow Tree House.**
- 19. To approve the inset map for Panfield as set out in Appendix 20 and do not allocate sites for development adjacent to the village.**
- 20. To approve the Ridgewell Inset map set out in Appendix 21 including the allocation of site RIDG359 for residential development, and the extension of the development boundary on Stambourne Road and to the rear of the Kings Head Public House.**
- 21. To approve the inset map for Steeple Bumpstead as set out in Appendix 22 including the allocation of site STEB395 for residential development.**
- 22. To approve the inset map for White Colne as set out in Appendix 23 and to allocate no sites for development.**

**Purpose of Decision: To agree the draft site allocation maps for inclusion within the draft Braintree Local Plan**

### **Corporate Implications**

<b>Financial:</b>	The preparation of the Plans set out within the Local Development Scheme will be a significant cost which will be met through the Local Plan budget.
<b>Legal:</b>	To comply with Governments legislation and guidance.
<b>Equalities/Diversity</b>	The Councils policies should take account of equalities and diversity.
<b>Safeguarding:</b>	None
<b>Customer Impact:</b>	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
<b>Environment and Climate Change:</b>	This will form part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and will inform policies and allocations.
<b>Consultation/Community Engagement:</b>	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
<b>Risks:</b>	The Local Plan examination may not take place. The Local Plan could be found unsound. Risk of High Court challenge.
<b>Officer Contact:</b>	Emma Goodings
<b>Designation:</b>	Planning Policy and Land Charges Manager
<b>Ext. No.</b>	2511
<b>E-mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:emma.goodings@braintree.gov.uk">emma.goodings@braintree.gov.uk</a>

## **1 Background**

- 1.1 Braintree District Council is working on a new Local Plan which will guide development in the District between now and 2033. Once adopted this will replace the 2011 Core Strategy and the 2005 Local Plan. As part of the Local Plan, the Council is required to boost significantly the supply of housing as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 1.2 In 2013 and 2014 the Council consulted on the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan document. This included a proposed new inset map for all defined settlements (towns and villages) within the District. During this time significant detailed revision of many of the inset maps were considered. For the new Local Plan these maps will provide a starting point for any further changes and updates required.
- 1.3 The preferred inset map for each defined settlement, together with a map showing the alternative site options that were considered and not taken forward will be contained within the draft Local Plan for public consultation in the summer.

## **2 Methodology**

- 2.1 Planning policy officers have visited all the proposed sites and villages within the District and have also carried out a desk based assessment of the village and any proposed changes. In a small amount of cases, detailed historic buildings advice is currently being sought to supplement the current information.
- 2.2 Informal consultation has been carried out with the relevant Parish or Town Council and where we have received their comments, they have been included within the committee report. All relevant Parish, District and County members have been notified of the committee agenda and made aware of the opportunity to speak if they wish to do so.
- 2.3 The development boundary for each village has been assessed using the criteria set out in the settlement boundary review report.
- 2.4 Officers have reviewed the areas that are protected for uses, such as allotments, visually important open space and recreational land to ensure that the area covered is still in use and is appropriate.
- 2.5 Sites submitted in the call for sites have been considered for whether they are suitable for development. All sites have been subject to a screening regarding a Sustainability Appraisal and where it has been judged to be potentially having a significant impact has been assessed against the criteria and a summary of that draft assessment is set out in the report.
- 2.6 If sites are considered suitable and are for sites of 10 or more, they are shown as orange on the maps and will be incorporated within the settlement boundary. This would include sites which currently have planning permission (either outline or full) or which are currently under construction. Where there are small sites which may accommodate less than 10 they would not be formally designated but where necessary the settlement boundary would be extended around the site. The key to maps is located in **Appendix 1**.
- 2.7 It should be noted that rural exception sites to facilitate affordable housing do not need to be specifically allocated but would be assessed against the policy within the Local Plan. As such there is an opportunity for small sites to meet local need to come forward in addition to those which are set out here.

## **3 Format of this Report**

- 3.1 Villages and settlements are taken in turn throughout the rest of this report, with a specific section for each individual village or settlement within the District. Maps to go alongside each of these reports is contained within the Appendix booklet and the relevant appendix number to find maps related to that area is highlighted in bold in the text.

- 3.2 A separate recommendation relating to each village or settlement is included at the end of each section.

#### **4. Alphamstone**

- 4.1 Alphamstone is a dispersed settlement in the north east of the District, close to the River Stour, which forms the Essex/Suffolk border in the local area.

- 4.2 Current policy position - Alphamstone does not have a defined settlement boundary and as such is located within the countryside.

- 4.3 Sites submitted and assessed previously - No sites were previously submitted.

#### **4.4 New Sites**

- 4.5 ALPH 101 – The site is in the curtilage of Joss Cottage, Goulds Road, Alphamstone and proposed for 4 dwellings. The site is approximately 0.8 hectares.

- 4.6 ALPH 525 – The location of the site is Sycamore Cottage, Goulds Road, Alphamstone. The site is currently residential and the area of the site is 0.34 hectares. It is proposed for residential development.

- 4.7 A map of these sites can be found in **Appendix 2**.

#### **4.8 Parish Council Comments**

- 4.9 With regard to the two new sites put forward, the comments are as follows:

- 4.10 ALPH525: Sycamore Cottage, Goulds Road, Alphamstone

- 4.11 The Parish Council's view is that the site at Sycamore Cottage is already fully developed and therefore no further housing can be fitted in.

- 4.12 ALPH101: Joss Cottage, Goulds Road, Alphamstone

- 4.13 The Parish Council objects to this site being designated for housing development, as it is set along a sparsely developed road, where the highway is unsuitable for further development.

#### **4.14 Officer Comments**

- 4.15 Alphamstone does not have a defined development boundary and is therefore located within the countryside. Both sites are suitable for less than 10 dwellings and therefore would not be specifically allocated for development and could only be incorporated within a development boundary. It is not considered appropriate for a development boundary to be added for Alphamstone due to the rural and dispersed nature of the houses.



## **Recommendation**

- 1. That there is no development boundary for Alphamstone and that no sites are allocated for development.**

## **5. Audley End**

- 5.1 Audley End is a small hamlet to the south of Gestingthorpe and located within the same Parish.
- 5.2 Current policy position - Audley End is identified as an 'Other Village' in the Core Strategy. Audley End has a development boundary that closely follows the linear built form of the dwellings.
- 5.3 Sites
- 5.4 Three sites had been previously been submitted for consideration at Audley End, but have not been resubmitted in the latest Call for Sites
- 5.5 Parish Council Comments
- 5.6 We believe that the lack of employment in the village, the narrow lanes without separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and the remoteness from key services, A roads, railways and centres of employment, make any housing developments in the Parish, beyond those required for local needs, unsustainable.
- 5.7 Officer Comments/Conclusions
- 5.8 The village is not considered a sustainable place for new growth and the current development boundary accurately reflects the current built development.

## **Recommendation**

- 2. The Inset map for Audley End set out in Appendix 3 be approved**

## **6. Belchamp Otten**

- 6.1 Belchamp Otten is a small village with approximately 40 dwellings in the Stour Valley. There is a church and hall however no shops within the village. The village is approximately 5.5 miles from Sudbury, the nearest town.
- 6.2 Current policy position - Belchamp Otten is identified in the Core Strategy as an 'other village'. The village has a development boundary and conservation area which covers the area around the Rectory and extends beyond the development boundary to the east. The churchyard is protected as such and also as a local wildlife site.

6.3 Submitted and Assessed Previously

6.4 BELO 105 is a site previously identified as BLO1 (also part of BLO3). The location is north of The Street and has an area of 0.74 hectares.

6.5 BELO 106 is adjacent to Branfields, The Street and has an area of 0.11 hectares. This site was previously considered for the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan 2014 under the reference BLO4.

6.6 BELO 107 is located east of the junction between The Street & the road leading to Puttock End. The site has an area of 0.26 hectares and has previously been considered under the reference BLO5 for the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan 2014.

6.7 Parish Council Comments

6.8 The Parish Council do not support any of the 3 proposed sites (BELO105, BELO106 and BELO107) submitted by landowners. All of the sites are outside the Village Envelope and none of the sites would be sustainable because:

- neither mains drainage or gas are available in Belchamp Otten
- the nearest shops are between 4 and 5 miles away in Clare
- public transport is extremely limited, with the current bus service only operating 2 days each week
- the roads in and surrounding our parish are very narrow and in many places are not wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass. With no employment in the local area the increase in traffic movements would be dangerous
- there are no pavements for pedestrians in the parish

6.9 Further to this the Council wish to:

- The Council wish to designate the church and churchyard.
- The Council wish Church Green to be designated as a visually important open space.

6.10 Officer Comments

6.11 Belchamp Otten is not deemed a sustainable location for substantial growth. All three sites submitted are outside the development boundary and the development would be deemed to be an encroachment into open countryside. This is regarded as unwarranted predominately due to the lack of sustainability that the sites would offer. The village is located within the Belchamp Farmland Plateau in the Landscape Character Assessment for the District which regards the area as moderately to highly sensitive to change. The document notes a particular concern with regards to the conservation of the panoramic views.

- 6.12 BELO105 is the largest of the three sites proposed within the village and as it is located directly opposite Fowes Lane. Whilst there is development on the other side of the road, the site is particularly prominent and would change the character of the village adversely. Currently the field offers a visual break in development and long panoramic views across farmland.
- 6.13 BELO106 abuts the conservation area to the north and is currently open countryside. The site is particularly sensitive to change visually as it is opposite the old rectory and the church yard. Therefore, it is suggested the site is not included within the development boundary.
- 6.14 BELO107 is located beyond the current village envelope and wholly within the conservation area. The site is highly prominent and would have very little relationship with the current built form of Belchamp St Otten. The SA suggested that the site would have a negative impact upon the historic value of the area.
- 6.15 In conclusion, there is a general issue with the sustainability of further development within Belchamp St Otten. With the area being particularly sensitive to change no site within the village should be allocated.
- 6.16 However it is agreed that the open land between the church wall and the road be allocated as visually important open space as it makes a positive contribution to the character of the village and the setting of historic assets.

## **Recommendation**

- 3. That the inset map for Belchamp Otten set out in Appendix 4 be approved and that no sites are allocated for development.**

## **7 Belchamp St Paul**

- 7.1 Belchamp St Paul is located within the Stour Valley. The majority of development is based along 'the Street'. The village is close to the Essex/Suffolk border. The village has a limited number of facilities including a village hall, public house and primary school.
- 7.2 Current policy position - The village is recognised as an 'other village' in the Core Strategy 2011. The village has a development boundary and conservation area in place. The linear central greens are allocated as visually important open space, with the playing field protected as open space and a local wildlife site adjacent to the development boundary at the eastern side of the village.
- 7.3 Sites that have not been previously assessed
- 7.4 BELP108 is a relatively large site in relation to current built form of Belchamp St Paul and has an area of 2.53 hectares. The site is located to the north of Vicarage Road and abuts the conservation area on two sides.

- 7.5 BELP109 is located to the northern side of Church Street and has an area of 1.31 hectares. The site is in open countryside.
- 7.6 Both sites have been put forward for residential development.
- 7.7 Parish Council Comments
- 7.8 The Parish Council wish to keep the Village Envelope unchanged as extension of the Village Envelope could encourage infill development. The Parish Council do not support either of the 2 proposed sites (BEP 108 and BEP 109) submitted by landowners. Both sites are outside the Village Envelope and both are deemed unsustainable sites for development because the nearest shops are between 3 and 4 miles away in Clare.
- 7.9 Site BEP 108 is adjacent to the village Conservation Area and has two Grade II Listed Buildings in the immediate vicinity, one with a separately listed Grade II 'crinkle crinkle' wall. The site is on a raised plateau and any development would dominate the area and have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and setting of these Listed buildings and the Conservation Area. There are currently around 100 houses in the village of Belchamp St Paul, spread over an area of several square miles. To build a further 50 houses on a site of only 2.5 hectares would be completely out of character for the area and introduce a housing density hitherto unknown in this rural area. It would also increase the population of the village by around 50% which would result in a major increase in demand on utility services, school places and traffic. Such dramatic growth would have a serious impact on such a small community.
- 7.10 Officer Comments
- 7.11 Though Belchamp St Paul has a primary school and a pub, there are limited other facilities. Any further development would encourage the occupants to rely significantly on the use of private transport.
- 7.12 Looking at the specific context of BEP108, the site is currently agricultural farmland and is of significant size in relation to the village. The site is located adjacent on the south and west to the conservation area. As drawn it has no natural boundaries to the north and is located on a relatively narrow lane.
- 7.13 BEP109 is significantly outside the development boundary and would be considered further coalescence of the cluster of dwellings. The development would also constitute ribbon development into the countryside.
- 7.14 In conclusion further development within Belchamp St Paul is considered unsustainable and there is no requirement for such development within the village. Both sites are outside the current development boundary and would be unsustainable extensions into the countryside.

## **Recommendation**

- 4. To approve the Belchamp St Paul inset map as set out in Appendix 5 and to not allocate sites for development**

## **8 Birdbrook**

- 8.1 Birdbrook is a Parish in the northern area of the District. It is located approximately 4 miles southeast of Haverhill and half way between Steeple Bumpstead and Ridgewell. The main Birdbrook village and conservation area can be seen in **Appendix 6**.
- 8.2 Current policy position - Birdbrook has no development boundary, or allocations, however it does have a conservation area. The village therefore is considered as countryside. The village has few local services and residents primarily rely on private vehicles to access services in larger villages.
- 8.3 Sites Proposed for Development
- 8.4 No sites have been submitted for development within the Parish
- 8.5 Parish Council Comments
- 8.6 The village has insufficient infrastructure to support even just one more house.
- 8.7 Officer Comments
- 8.8 Birdbrook is a small Parish with no development boundary and is therefore located within the countryside. No development boundary or allocations are proposed for the village.

## **Recommendation**

- 5. That there is no development boundary for Birdbrook**

## **9 Borley**

- 9.1 Borley is a small dispersed settlement located less than 1 mile northwest of Sudbury. It comprises the hamlets of Borley and Borley Green.
- 9.2 Current policy position - Borley does not have a development boundary and is considered to be a countryside location. A possible route for the Sudbury bypass passes through part of the area close to Sudbury. The area does not have an inset map.
- 9.3 The area has a village design statement.
- 9.4 New Sites
- 9.5 BORL403 – Land south of Borley Hall – 2.5ha, residential use 50 units or possible retirement housing.
- 9.6 BORL404 – Land NW of Borley Hall Borley – 0.5ha, residential use 5 units.

- 9.7 These sites can be seen on the map in **Appendix 7**
- 9.8 Parish Council Comments
- 9.9 Following the Council's call for sites, a submission was made by a local for 55 houses on land to the immediate west of Borley Hall and running alongside the Valley Walk near the River Stour. Such a development would more than double the size of the village, currently 49 dwellings, and is a cause of concern for people in the community. Attendees at a parish meeting made clear their view that the proposal should be rejected as far as the new Local Plan is concerned.
- 9.10 Further to the above, there are other factors that militate against the submission by the applicant and these include:-
- 9.11 The Village Design Statement recently submitted to Braintree makes it clear that there is little scope for additional dwellings in the Village
- 9.12 The site is part of a field which is in the flood plain of the River Stour.
- 9.13 Access would be over the well used Valley Walk public right of way and accessed from a sharp bend in the lane which is an accident black spot
- 9.14 The area is part of the Stour Valley Project and sensitive to significant change (it is notable that the applicant has recently had an environmental survey of part of the Valley Walk which advocates careful and limited maintenance along the route in order to preserve valuable flora, fauna and wildlife).
- 9.15 Officer Comments
- 9.16 Borley is in close proximity to Sudbury which has a full range of services and access to a railway station. However, Borley and Borley Green are a very small collection of homes, with little if any in the way of services. It would therefore not be appropriate location for sustainable new development.
- 9.17 BORL3 and BORL4 are located away from the two main hamlets and are located either side of a cluster of Grade II listed buildings at Borley Hall.
- 9.18 BORL3 is within a major gas pipeline zone, and is partly within the flood plain. The access to the site is entirely within flood zones 2 and 3.
- 9.19 BORL4 is the smaller of the two sites, and would not be allocated as it is under the allocation threshold of 10 units. The site is also constrained in that it is within a local wildlife site, archaeological site and within a buffer zone for a major gas pipeline.
- 9.20 There is a safeguarded road proposal in the south east corner of the Parish between Sudbury and Borley Hall. No changes are proposed to its extent or route, and any future discussion regarding the route will be dealt with through the duty to cooperate with Suffolk County Council.

## Recommendation

### **6. That there is no development boundary within Borley Parish and that no sites are allocated for development**

#### **10 Lamarsh**

10.1 Lamarsh is a small village located close to the larger village of Bures and the small village of Alphamstone. The village is west of the River Stour.

10.2 Current policy position - The village has a logical development boundary that closely follows the built form. The village is also partially in an area at risk of flooding and is identified in the Core Strategy as an 'other village'

#### 10.3 Sites

10.4 No sites have been submitted.

#### 10.5 Parish Council Comments

10.6 The comments were specific to the sites submitted within Alphamstone and no comment was made in regards Lamarsh

#### 10.7 Officer Comments

10.8 Lamarsh has a clearly defined development boundary, has a protected lane leading to the village and is largely within the flood zone. With regards to the former and the lack of facilities in close proximity to Lamarsh it is deemed an unsustainable location for further development.

## Recommendation

### **7. The inset map for Lamarsh set out in Appendix 8 should be approved**

#### **11 Middleton**

11.1 Middleton is to the north of the Braintree District and within the Stour Valley. The village is approximately 1.5 miles away from Sudbury and 8 miles to Halstead.

11.2 Current policy position - Middleton has no village envelope and is situated within the countryside. Middleton is situated close to the border with Suffolk, and lacks key services and facilities required for sustainable growth. Furthermore, the village is situated in the Stour River Valley, where the Landscape Character Assessment defines the region as having a relatively high sensitivity to change. The main area of housing within Middleton is shown on the map in **Appendix 9**

11.3 Middleton has a village design statement

#### 11.4 Sites

11.5 No sites have been submitted.

11.6 Parish Council Comments

11.7 No comment put forward.

11.8 Officer Comments

11.9 Middleton is a small settlement located in the countryside which looks predominantly to the neighbouring town of Sudbury for local services, as such it is not considered a suitable site for new development.

**Recommendation**

**8. That there is no development boundary within Middleton**

**12 Ovington**

12.1 Ovington is a small village in the north of the District. The village is situated about 5 kilometres from the village of Clare. It has several houses and St. Mary's Church.

12.2 Current policy position - The village does not have a defined settlement boundary and is therefore located within the countryside. The main area of homes in Ovington can be seen in the map in **Appendix 10**

12.3 Sites that have not been previously assessed

12.4 No new sites submitted.

12.5 Submitted and Assessed Previously

12.6 OVIN402 is the only site submitted within Ovington. It is situated on land north of Church Lane and has previously been submitted under the reference OVI1. The site has an area of 0.31 hectares and is proposed for residential development.

12.7 Parish Council Comments

12.8 OVIN 402 – Land north of Church Lane – opposed on grounds of inadequate and narrow road access and the failure of Essex County Council Highways Department to properly maintain the narrow and poor vehicular access to this site.

12.9 Officer Comments

12.10 The principle of development in Ovington is deemed unsustainable due to the significant extent that any development would lead to the use of private modes of transport for any new residents. Though there is speculation and to an extent a record of the site previously being used for residential use, this was over 50 years ago. Therefore this would indicate that the site has returned to nature.



- 12.11 The nature and characteristic of Ovington is particularly rural and hence it does not have a defined settlement boundary. It is recommended that OVIN402 is not allocated.

## **Recommendation**

- 9. That there is no development boundary for Ovington and no sites are allocated for development.**

## **13 Pentlow**

- 13.1 Pentlow is a village and civil parish in the north of the District. Pentlow is approximately 13 miles away from Halstead and 5.5 miles from Sudbury.
- 13.2 Currently policy position - Pentlow has no development boundary and is therefore is considered as 'the countryside' in the Core Strategy 2011.
- 13.3 Sites that have not been previously assessed
- 13.4 PENT 353 is located on land adjacent to Paine's Manor Cottages. The site has an area of 0.24 hectares.
- 13.5 PENT 354 is located on land to the north of School Road, specifically adjacent to Clare Cottage. The area of the site is 1 hectare.
- 13.6 Both sites are considered for residential development and can be seen on the map in **Appendix 11**
- 13.7 Parish Council Comments
- 13.8 Pentlow has little infrastructure to support development, no mains sewage capacity, no shop, no natural gas, street lighting or pavements, little public transport and a "commute" for hospitals, doctors, police and fire services. There is a village pub and a good primary school in the next village. All development would need to take this lack of infrastructure into account. The local plan "call for sites" identified two areas in the Parish (PENT 353, PENT 354). Both of these do provide an opportunity to meet the small amount of development needed, if the actual proposal is within the size and style to add to rather than detract from the current dwellings.
- 13.9 Officer Comments
- Though the Parish Council is not necessarily adverse to small scale development, in principle Pentlow is not regarded as a sustainable location for further development. The village has little in terms of services within the village. There is also limited public transport and this suggests that any new residents would have a significant reliance on private modes of transport. This amount to a lack of sustainability and therefore in principle Pentlow is not regarded as a suitable location for further development.

Looking at the submissions in their specific contexts;

PENT 353 – The site is located to the west of Paine’s Manor Cottages. The built form in the immediate vicinity of the site is rather dispersed and further coalescence of clusters would be unfavourable. There is also no footpath for safe pedestrian access.

PENT 354 is currently part of an open field and there is no natural boundary to the site proposed. The site currently offers panoramic views over open countryside and the development proposed could be seen to amount to an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside.

## **Recommendation**

- 10. That there is no development boundary for Pentlow and no sites are allocated for development.**

## **14 Stambourne Chapel End Way and Stambourne Dyers End**

- 14.1 Stambourne Chapel End Way and Stambourne Dyers End are identified as other villages in the Core Strategy (2011). They are located 4 miles south west of Haverhill and 2 miles west of Great Yeldham. Stambourne has a post office which operates limited opening hours and a village hall.

- 14.2 Current policy position - Dyers End has a development boundary. Stambourne Chapel End Way shows a development boundary and a Cemetery/church yard.

### **14.3 Sites Submitted and Assessed Previously**

STA1 – Old House Farm, Stambourne (0.8ha) – Residential use. This site has not been resubmitted.

### **14.4 New Sites**

No new sites have been submitted.

### **14.5 Parish Council Comments**

The previous parish comments made reference to site STA1 which has not been re-submitted. The parish council have had no further comments to make.

### **14.6 Officer Comments**

No sites have been proposed, and it would not be appropriate to identify any due to the very limited number of services available in the villages.

## **Recommendation**

- 11. That the inset map for Stambourne Chapel End Way and Stambourne Dyers End as set out in Appendix 12 be approved.**

## **15 The Hennys**

- 15.1 The Hennys comprises predominately of Great Henny and Little Henny. The rural area is close to the Babergh District and comprises of small clusters of dispersed housing.
- 15.2 Current policy position - Great and Little Henny do not have development boundaries and are therefore regarded in policy terms as being located within the countryside. The main settlement areas of Great and Little Henny are set out in the map in **Appendix 13**
- 15.3 Sites Submitted and Assessed Previously
- No sites have been submitted for consideration for development within the Parish.
- 15.4 Parish Council Comments
- No comment.
- 15.5 Officer Comments
- In principle due to the recognition of the area as open countryside and the lack of services; the area is considered unsustainable for further development. Any development would be considered as an unwarranted encroachment into the countryside.

## **Recommendation**

- 12. That there is no development boundary for Great and Little Henny.**

## **16 Tilbury Juxta Clare**

- 16.1 Tilbury Juxta Clare is a village and parish the north of the Braintree District. It is part of the Stour Valley North parish cluster and has a church dates back to the 15th century.
- 16.2 Currently policy position - Tilbury Juxta Clare is currently recognised by the Core Strategy 2011 as an 'other village'. There are no other allocations within the development boundary.
- 16.3 Sites
- No sites have been submitted for consideration of development within the Parish
- 16.4 Parish Council Comments
- There are no sites to consider. In common with the 2011/2012 consultation, the Parish Council desires that the existing village envelope remains.

#### 16.5 Officer Comments

The Parish has a scattering of homes, in a rural setting. The largest cluster of which are enclosed by a development boundary. Access to services and facilities is generally by private vehicle to larger villages, as such it is not considered a sustainable place for substantial new growth.

#### **Recommendation**

#### **13. To approve the inset map for Tilbury Juxta Clare as set out in Appendix 14**

#### **17 Twinstead**

17.1 Twinstead is a village in the Braintree District. The village is approximately 4 miles south of Sudbury and 5.5 miles north of Halstead. A map of the main housing area in Twinstead is included in **Appendix15**.

#### 17.2 Current Policy Position

Twinstead has no development boundary and as such is treated as open countryside. The village has very little in terms of daily services and a lack of public transport suggesting the village is not favourable for development.

#### 17.3 Sites

No sites have been submitted for development in the Parish.

#### 17.4 Parish Council Comments

No comments to note.

#### 17.5 Officer Comments

Twinstead is a small rural area with few local facilities, as such it is not considered an appropriate location for growth.

#### **Recommendation**

#### **14. That there is no development boundary for Twinstead**

#### **18 Wickham St Paul**

18.1 Wickham St Paul is a village and civil parish located five miles north of Halstead, predominately based around a central triangular green.

18.2 Current policy position - The Core Strategy identifies Wickham St Paul as an 'other village'. The village green and land adjoining is allocated as visually important space and the churchyard is protected as such. The village has limited services including a village hall, The Victory Inn public house and Post Office that is open 9am to 1pm on Mondays and Tuesdays. There is also a small farm shop.

### 18.3 Sites Submitted and Assessed Previously

WISP420 is a site to the north of the village green on the west side of Church Road beyond the current extent of the settlement boundary on this side of the road. There is built development on the other side of the road in this location. It has previously been submitted as two separate yet adjacent plots under the references WIC1A and WIC1B and has a recorded area of 0.4 hectares. The site can be seen on a map of the main Wickham St Paul village located in **Appendix 16**

### 18.4 New Sites

No new sites have been submitted for Wickham St Paul.

### 18.5 Parish Council Comments

Do not support extension or amendment of the village envelope.

In addition, the Village Green is currently identified as an informal open space. The Parish Council wish to have the Village Green registered as a public amenity/play space (which provides a play area for children, a football goal and net and the pitch for the Wickham St Pauls cricket team).

### 18.6 Officer Comments

18.7 Wickham St Paul is an area of relatively high sensitivity to change as identified in the landscape assessment 2006. Though Wickham St Paul has several good services the range of services within the village is particularly limited and would lead to any development requiring the occupant to be car dependant to a significant extent as there is an infrequent bus service. Furthermore there is limited opportunity for employment within the village and on balance it is considered an unsustainable location for further development.

18.8 With regards to the sites specific context; the site is unfavourable due to the continuation of housing development to the west of Church Road being deemed as ribbon development and detrimental to the character of the village, particularly on the approach travelling south from Church Road.

18.9 The Parish Council have indicated their desire for the main green to be allocated as informal recreation space, rather than the visually important open space that it is currently protected as. The site does make a significant contribution to the character of Wickham St Paul and hence its designation, however the site would also be protected as informal open space if that more accurately reflects its current use.

## **Recommendation**

- 15. To approve the inset map for Wickham St Paul set out in Appendix 16 and to not allocate a site for development.**

## **19 Great Bardfield**

19.1 Great Bardfield is located approximately 6 miles north west of Braintree and is within the Three Fields Ward. It has had a rural exception site permitted which is now known as Castle Shot. Local services include a primary school, village hall, pub, post office, and grocery store. The Bardfield Centre provides local employment opportunities.

19.2 The area has a Village Design Statement which provides general guidance for development within the village. It also seeks to avoid the development of large executive houses, in preference to smaller sites for starter type homes for young people.

### **19.3 Current Policy Position**

Great Bardfield is identified as an “other village” in the Core Strategy (2011). It has a development boundary, conservation area, formal recreation, education, Local Wildlife Sites, visually important space, cemetery, and protected lane.

### **19.4 Sites Submitted and Assessed Previously**

GRB1Halt – Not re-submitted.

### **New Sites**

19.5 GRBA254 – The Bardfield Centre, approximately 0.40ha in size, proposed for the refurbishment of the existing units to provide 17 residential units. A planning application for the conversion of the remaining buildings was refused under reference 15/00323/FUL.

19.6 GRBA255 – Proposed for residential use, the site is approximately 5.4 ha in size. A planning application is outstanding on part of the site under reference 15/01354/OUT.

### **Parish Council Comments**

19.7 GRBA254 Bardfield Centre, Great Bardfield – supported the application for small housing units on this brownfield site but it was refused by the Planning Committee.

19.8 GRBA255 Braintree Road Great Bardfield – object to proposed use of this site for development and it is outside the village envelope/development line.

### **Officer Comments**

19.9 Great Bardfield has a number of local services available, however the village is still of a relatively small scale, and would be difficult to expand naturally without causing ribbon development or unnatural extension into the countryside.

- 19.10 GRBA254 does still provide an element of employment despite a number of the units changing to residential through permitted development rights. Retention of these units would help Great Bardfield continue to be a sustainable smaller village. Potential impacts of redevelopment include impacts on the historic environment and heritage assets.
- 19.11 GRBA255 is an unnatural extension to the development boundary of the village and would be difficult to contain within the wider countryside as it has no natural boundary features. The site is located on grade 1 agricultural land which is a significant negative effect. The site does score well in terms of the SA/SEA with a number of positive effects including provision of community services, distance to health, contribution toward affordable housing, proximity to schools and services. Negative impact includes the distance from secondary schools, reliability of public transport, landscape sensitivity, loss of agricultural land, and that it is greenfield development.

## **Recommendation**

- 16. To approve the inset map for Great Bardfield set out in Appendix 17 and to not allocate sites for development**

## **20 Finchingfield and Cornish Hall End**

- 20.1 Finchingfield is located north west of Braintree it has a number of local services including primary school, community facilities, and shops. Cornish Hall End is north of Finchingfield, and has limited services and accessibility.

### Current Policy Position

- 20.2 Finchingfield is identified as an 'other village' in the Core Strategy (2011). It has a development boundary, conservation area, Flood Zones, Cemetery/Church, visually important space, formal recreation, and protected lanes.

### 20.3 Sites Submitted and Assessed Previously

- 20.4 Finchingfield  
 FIN1 (FINC234) - The site is approximately 0.10ha in size and has been proposed for one two bedroom thatched cottage.  
 FIN3 – Not re-submitted.  
 FIN4 – Not re-submitted.  
 FIN5 (FINC235) – The site is approximately 1 ha in size and have been proposed for up to 20 dwellings and some open space.  
 FIN6 – Not re-submitted.  
 Cornish Hall End  
 FIN2 – Not resubmitted.

#### New Sites

- 20.5 None - Sites FIN1 has been resubmitted under reference FINC234, and FIN5 has been submitted under reference FINC235.

#### Parish Council Comments

- 20.6 FINC 234: Prospect Cottage, The Green, Finchingfield.  
The Parish Council felt that the proposal to build one or two dwellings in the property's rear garden should be subject to a normal planning application rather than inclusion within the District Site Allocation Plan.
- 20.7 FINC235 Land adj Great Wincey Farm, Brent Hall Road, Finchingfield.  
The proposal to build on this site has received considerable local opposition in the past. The Parish Council do not believe there is need for development of this site given its proximity to a narrow part of the highway and as it falls outside the village envelope.

#### Officer Comments

- 20.8 FINC234 – This site has been considered previously. It is part located outside the development boundary and is within the conservation area. Development of the part of the site within the boundary could be considered through the normal planning process. However, altering the development boundary to include the whole area would be an unnatural extension to the development boundary.
- 20.9 FINC235 – This site has been considered previously. It is being proposed for residential use of up to 20 dwellings. The site would be accessed from the B1053 Brent Hall Road. This is a single lane between the village centre and the site, but increases in size to a single carriage at the site entrance. The site is within the Conservation Area but some distance from the historic centre of the village, and would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the wider historic area. The site is currently well screened. Given the size of the village, its overall historic character, and the local road network, a larger scale development may not be appropriate. The SA report also considered that the site would have a potential negative impact on the historical environment and heritage assets within the vicinity.
- 20.10 A minor alteration is proposed at Cornish Hall End to more accurately reflect built development in the village.

#### **Recommendation**

- 17. To approve the inset map for Finchingfield as set out in Appendix 18 and do not allocate sites for development**
- 18. To approve the inset map for Cornish Hall End as set out in Appendix 19, including a minor amendment to the development boundary to include Willow Tree House.**



## **21 Panfield**

- 21.1 Panfield is located 1km to the north west of Braintree and is within the Three Fields Ward. In terms of local services it has a pub, a village hall and a bus service.

### Current Policy Position

- 21.2 Panfield is identified as an “Other village” in the Core Strategy (2011). Due to its proximity to Braintree residents most likely get services from the town. The inset map shows a development boundary, cemetery/church yard, allotments, and formal recreation. No sites were allocated for residential development in the Site Allocations and Development Management document.
- 21.3 Panfield has a village design statement. It seeks to discourage street lighting, large scale developments of high density buildings, and new development or land usage within the village which would cause noise or light pollution.

### Sites Submitted and Assessed Previously

PAN1 -Resubmitted under PANF347.  
PAN2 – Not resubmitted.

### New Sites

BOCN137 (Part) – Part of the Towerlands site is within Panfield Parish. This site will be discussed alongside the other strategic growth locations around Braintree.

PANF136 – 7.9ha proposed for employment uses, adjacent to, and accessed from, Springwood Drive Braintree. This site will be discussed alongside the other strategic growth locations around Braintree.

PANF345 – 8.81 ha part previously developed and greenfield land. Proposed for residential uses (238 homes) with potential mixed use development.

PANF346 – 2.54 ha, greenfield, proposed for residential use (Circa 76 homes).

PANF347 – 1.32ha proposed for residential uses (Circa 39 homes).

PANF516 – 0.37ha redundant agricultural buildings and fringe land. Proposed for residential use, in the region of 5 to 10 dwellings.

PANF517 – 3ha of agricultural land proposed for residential use (Circa 75 homes)

PANF518 – 2.98ha agricultural land proposed for residential use (Circa 75 homes)

PANF519 – 5.65ha agricultural land proposed for residential use (Circa 140 homes)

### Parish Council Comments

All these development sites are in direct contravention of Panfield’s Village Design Statement.

The development of the Towerlands site especially erodes the green margin division between Braintree and Panfield, which the Chairman and Members of Panfield Parish Council had been told that Braintree District Council wishes to maintain.

Current highways infrastructure will not cope with the additional traffic.

#### Officer Comments

- 21.7 Local services are limited most likely due to the village's proximity to Braintree. The majority of main services and employment opportunities are further than 800m away which would score negatively in the SA/SEA but the village is within 8km of Braintree town centre, and is 4.8km of Tabor Science Academy.
- 21.8 The village does benefit from a community hall and public house, and regular bus service. However, large scale development is unlikely to be appropriate due to the character and appearance of the village. A small scale development such as at PANF516 could potentially have some local benefit, as it could enhance and improve the setting of the adjacent grade II listed building and vicinity by the removal of some dilapidated former piggeries.
- 21.9 The sites to the west of the village would provide a significant number of dwellings which would be out of scale with the services available in the village. And when considering the likely level of development in Braintree, significant development in Panfield is unnecessary. PANF518 would be an extension of linear development along Kynaston Road. PANF519, would be accessed off Hall Road if development separately but would not be a logical extension to Panfield. PANF517, while better related to the village, would still be a sizable extension and would be dependent on the development of PANF516/518 or 519 for its access.
- 21.10 PANF347 would have access problems unless developed with the adjacent site PANF346. However neither site would be a natural extension of development in Panfield. Finally PANF345 is not a natural extension to the development boundary for Panfield, and would be a large development located away from the main built up area.

#### **Recommendation**

- 19. To approve the inset map for Panfield as set out in Appendix 20 and do not allocate sites for development adjacent to the village**

#### **22 Ridgewell**

- 22.1 Ridgewell is a village in the north of Braintree District. The village is on the main road between Haverhill and Braintree. The village has currently approximately 240 homes, a church and primary school and a number of other small facilities.

#### Current Policy Position

- 22.2 Ridgewell is classed in the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations Plan as an 'Other Village'. This means that it is not one of the six largest Key Service Villages in the District, but it does have a development boundary. Much of the

village is covered by a conservation area and the numerous central greens are protected as visually important space. Churches and the school are protected as such and there is a local wildlife site which abuts the village to the east.

#### Sites that have not been previously assessed

- 22.3 RIDG 357 is located north of Drury Lane and South of Chapel Road. The site has an area of 2.30 hectares.
- 22.4 RIDG 359 is located to the southeast side Ashen Road, opposite Bowles Farm. The site has an area of 0.79 hectares.

#### Submitted and Assessed Previously

- 22.5 RIDG 356 is located at Pineside, Ashen Road and has previously been considered in the last call for sites under the reference RID5X the area if the site is 0.18 hectares.
- 22.6 RIDG 358 is located in Hall Lane and has previously been considered by the council under in the last call for sites under the reference RID6X. The site has an area of 1.35 hectares.
- 22.7 RIDG 520 is located to the rear of 8 Colne Springs and has an area of 0.24 hectares.

#### Parish Council Comments

- 22.8 The Parish Council has the following comments on the sites proposed by individual landowners/developers:-
- 22.9 RIDG356 (formerly RID5X) – Pineside, Ashen Road (0.18 hectare)  
The Parish Council does not support development of this site. There is no development/building line on that side of the road at present and to develop both sides of the road would lead to a more urban, dense feel in a predominantly rural area thus depriving existing properties of amenity. It would be more appropriate to develop RIDG359.
- 22.10 RIDG357 – Land north of Drury Lane, South of Chapel Road (2.31 hectare)  
The Parish Council does not support development of this site. This site, together with RIDG520 which adjoins it, could accommodate over 60 houses and is therefore outside our preferred criteria. The other main concerns are that development behind development is not a feature to be encouraged as traditionally villages tend to be linear in nature and secondly access to this site, as we know it, is along a private single track road with no passing places and adding additional vehicle traffic for this number of homes is not practical or desirable.
- 22.11 RIDG358 (formerly RID6X) – Land off Hall Lane (1.35 hectare)  
Hall Lane is a narrow road which provides access to Ridgewell Hall Farm and three other properties. It is the only access route for heavy farm machinery which takes up the whole width of the lane. The entrance to the lane is

confined by the location of Lantern House and The Old Bakery on either side which would make it impossible to widen the road at its entrance. Hall Lane adjoins Church Lane, a no-through road leading to the church and the school and a small number of homes. We have concerns regarding the drainage/flood risk in this area.

22.12 The Parish Council does not support development of this site. Development of this site could create a large housing estate which would not be in keeping with the rural nature of the village. The only access is via Hall Lane which is a narrow road essentially providing access to the farm. The point at which it joins Church Lane is already congested with parked vehicles and becomes even more so at school times. There is no footway to the school which necessitates children walking in Church Lane itself and more traffic would increase their safety risk. The land in question is used by residents for walking and is a beautiful area adjoining the curtilage of the church and should be preserved as an area of natural beauty.

22.13 RIDG359 – Land SE side of Ashen Road, junction Tilbury Road (0.8 hectare)  
The Parish Council supports the development of this piece of land as infill between existing homes in Ashen Road and Tilbury Road.

22.14 RIDG 520 (formerly RID3) – Land rear of 8 Colne Springs

The Parish Council does not support development of this site which adjoins RIDG357. Together these sites could accommodate over 60 houses and is therefore outside our preferred criteria. The other main concerns are that development behind development is not a feature to be encouraged as traditionally villages tend to be linear in nature and secondly access to this site, as we know it, is along a private single track road with no passing places and then across RIDG357. Adding additional vehicle traffic for this number of homes is not practical or desirable.

22.15 The Parish also reiterated their views on sites that have been previously submitted, however, they were not resubmitted in the latest call for sites.

#### Officer Comments

22.15 Ridgewell is recognised in the Core Strategy 2011 as an 'other village'. It has a small range of day to day facilities including a school and the Parish Council are supportive of a small amount of growth to ensure that these services are maintained.

22.16 Having regard for the Parish Council's comments it is firstly suggested that site RIDG 359 is included within the development boundary as was proposed during the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. No evidence suggests any change in circumstances as to why the site should not be carried forward. The site may be able to accommodate somewhere in the region of 10 new homes and as such it should be allocated for new residential development.

- 22.17 RIDG356 is situated to the northern side of Ashen Road to the rear of Pineside. The site is currently outside the development boundary and in close proximity of the conservation area. The development of this site would amount an unwarranted extension into the countryside; requiring a pedestrian route to the north side of the road and would be seen as further urbanisation of the countryside.
- 22.18 RIDG357 is a site that has particular issues with regard to access. The narrow access means, as stated, by the Parish Council, there would be no room to accommodate a pedestrian route and vehicular access. This is one factor that leads to the conclusion that the proposal would amount to inappropriate backland development along with the concern of the sites proximity to the conservation area. The SA found no particular merit to the site.
- 22.19 RIDG358 is north western side of Hall Lane. The approach to the site is particular narrow and cannot accommodate a pedestrian route. Second to this it would be unfavourable to increase traffic movement considerably as there are two way access issues. The site abuts the conservation area to the west of the perimeter being directly adjacent to the Grade I listed church and surrounding churchyard and the grade II listed Rectory. Ridgewell Hall Meadow and Church are also recognised as a grassland habitat. Considering the number of complex site specific concerns it is recommended that the site is not allocated. The SA found that the development of the site could have a potentially have a significant negative effect on the Ridgewell Hall Meadow and Church site.
- 22.20 RIDG520 has very similar considerations as the comments of RIDG357. The site is viewed as inappropriate backland development and is deemed as an unwarrantable encroachment into open countryside. The site is outside the development boundary and in close proximity of the conservation area.
- 22.21 A development boundary extension was proposed in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan document for land adjacent to the Cottage on Stambourne Road. This site was not resubmitted in the Local Plan process, but a planning application is currently being considered on the site. There are no changes in circumstances and so it is considered that this development boundary extension be retained.
- 22.22 The site to the rear of the Kings Head public house was proposed to be allocated as a B1 employment or residential site in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. However an application for employment units is currently being considered on the site. It is therefore proposed to continue to keep the site within the development boundary, but as white land with no specific allocation. If employment uses on the site were to cease in the future it may be suitable to be reused as a site for new homes.

## **Recommendation**

- 20. To approve the Ridgewell Inset map set out in Appendix 21 including the allocation of site RIDG359 for residential development, and the**

**extension of the development boundary on Stambourne Road and to the rear of the Kings Head Public House.**

## **23 Steeple Bumpstead**

- 23.1 Steeple Bumpstead is a village 3 miles south of Haverhill within the Braintree District. New England is a small collection of homes located northwest of Steeple Bumpstead. The village has numerous facilities including a school, church, recreation ground, hall, pub and petrol station. A well designed rural business park, Blois Meadow, is located to the east of the village.

### Current Policy Position

- 23.2 Steeple Bumpstead is recognised as 'other village' by the Core Strategy adopted 2011. The village is partially within a flood plain and also has a conservation area around the central historic core. The recreation ground, school, church and business areas are allocated as such. A large number of areas, particularly around the river edge are located as visually important open space.
- 23.3 New England has no development boundary and is recognised as 'The Countryside' within the Core Strategy.

### Sites that have not been previously assessed

- 23.4 STEB 391 is located on land adjacent to Pitt House, New England. The site has an area of 2.30 hectares.
- 23.5 STEB 392 is located at 15 The Endway and has an area of 0.68 hectares.
- 23.6 STEB 393 is located on land to the rear of 48-50 North Street and has an area of 0.24 hectares.

### Submitted and Assessed Previously

- 23.7 STEB 394 is located on land adjacent Freezes Barns, North Street. The site has previously been submitted and assessed under the reference STE2. The site has an area of 0.62 hectares.
- 23.8 STEB 395 is located on land South of Freezes Barns, North Street. The site has previously been assessed under the reference STE1H and has an area of 1.21 hectares. The site was proposed to be allocated for new homes.

### Parish Council Comments

- 23.9 Steeple Bumpstead Parish Council's thoughts are as follows:

STEB 395 (the old STE1 site) – definitely to be included.

STEB 393 – land to the rear of 40-58 North Street – definitely to be included.

STEB 391 – land adjacent to Pitt House, New England – not to be included

STEB 392 – land beside 15 The Endway – not to be included.

STEB 394 – land adjacent to Freezes Barns, North Street – not to be included

- 23.10 Sturmer Parish Council commented upon the allocation STEB391 suggesting that the site is in open countryside and they do not recommend allocation.

#### Officer Comments

- 23.11 Steeple Bumpstead was classed as an “Other Village” in the 2011 Core Strategy. The village has some good services however the services provided are limited. Similarly the village has some public transport provision however this is limited in nature.  
With specific regard to each site and the context in which they are situated;
- 23.12 STEB 395 has previously been assessed and deemed satisfactory for allocation. The Parish council also supports the inclusion of the site. Subject to there being no increase in risk of flooding from the development it is suggested that the site is retained for residential allocation.
- 23.13 STEB 394 is located northwest of Freezes Barns. The site is effectively a break in the built form to the north side of North Street and the infill of the site would amount to the coalescence of the development clusters. With regard to this it is suggested this would negatively impact on the visual characteristic of the street scene and could be seen as an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. The conservation runs through the middle of the site.
- 23.14 STEB 391 is situated to the northern end of New England. The site has an area of 2.30 hectares. The site is not in close proximity to any service and is not of significant scale to provide significant services on site. The site is currently an arable field and any development on the site could be seen as an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. This site was assessed by the SA and deemed to have a negative impact on the historic environment.
- 23.15 STEB 392 is currently outside the development boundary but is located between two existing homes, one of which is grade 2\* listed. The extension to the development boundary proposed is limited to a plot for a single dwelling. Given the proximity of significant heritage assets and a large mature tree on the site it is not considered appropriate at this time to extend the development boundary.
- 23.16 STEB 393 is located to the rear of properties on North Street. Though the site is within the development boundary the site is located entirely within the flood zone. Therefore it is recommended that the site is not allocated for residential use.

#### **Recommendation**

- 21. To approve the inset map for Steeple Bumpstead as set out in Appendix 22 including the allocation of site STEB395 for residential development.**

## **24 White Notley**

- 24.1 White Notley is located north of Witham. It has station which is about 500m away from the main body of the village. Local services include a primary school, village hall and a pub.

### Current Policy Position

- 24.2 White Notley is designated as an “other village” in the Core Strategy (2011). It has a village envelope, conservation area, cemetery/church yard, primary school, visually important space, and allotments. It also has flood zones to the north.

### Sites

- 24.3 WHN1Halt – Site not re-submitted.

### Parish Council Comments

- 24.4 No Parish Council comments have been received.

### Officer Comments

- 24.5 White Notley does have some good sustainability features such as the local school and access to the railway network. But no sites have been submitted for consideration through the new Local Plan. Access to the station on foot is not ideal as there is no footpath and the road narrows as at the river crossing.
- 24.6 Development to the north of the village would be constrained by the presence of the Flood Zone. Development east of White Notley is also constrained as the Conservation Area extends to a large part to include the vicarage. Development here could have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area. Development south east of the village would intrude into open countryside and would not have any natural boundary.

## **Recommendation**

- 22. To approve the inset map for White Colne as set out in Appendix 23 and to allocate no sites for development**