

Local Plan Sub-Committee AGENDA



THE PUBLIC MAY ATTEND THIS MEETING

Please note this meeting will be webcast and audio recorded.

Date: Wednesday, 25 May 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

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Local Plan Sub-Committee held on 9th May 2016 (copy to follow).

4 Public Question Time

(See paragraph below)

5 Braintree District Draft Local Plan - Draft Site Allocation Maps 4 - 84

7 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.

8 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

9 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.

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

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 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:

Braintree Draft Local Plan – Proposed Allocations		Agenda No: 5
Portfolio: Planning and Housing Corporate Outcome: Securing appropriate infrastructure and housing growth Report Presented by: Emma Goodings Report Prepared by: Sean Tofts, Julie O'Hara, Emma Goodings		
Background Papers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Practise Guidance (NPPG) Localism Act (2011) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) Local Plan Review (2005) Core Strategy (2011) Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (2015) 		Public Report: Yes Key Decision: No
Executive Summary: <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 is 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>		
Decision: <u>Halstead Town</u> Recommendation 1 – That GGHR281 Land north of Halstead, adjacent to A131 not be allocated. Recommendation 2 – That GGHR285 Field Rear Star Style Cottages, Colne		

Engaine Lane, Halstead, is not allocated for development.

Recommendation 3 - That site HASA293 Land east of Sudbury Road (The Sleights) adj Churchill Ave, Halstead is not allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 4 – That GGHR283 Land adjoining the cricket ground, Sudbury Road, Halstead is not allocated for residential development. That designation for formal recreation is retained.

Recommendation 5 – That site HATR291 - Land North of Sloe Hill is not allocated for development.

Recommendation 6 – That HASA289 Land at Cherry Tree Close, Halstead be allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 7 – That HASA295 Land off corner of Fenn Road and Brook Street, Halstead be allocated for housing.

Recommendation 8 – That HASA288 Land adjoining the west of Bluebridge Industrial Estate is not allocated for employment development

Recommendation 9 – That COLE188 Land east of Bluebridge Industrial Estate is allocated for industrial use.

Recommendation 10 – That GGHR282 – Land adjoining the east side of Bluebridge Industrial Estate is not allocated for industrial development.

Recommendation 11 – That HASA513 Central Park Colchester Road is allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 12 – that HASA286 Greenways, Balls Chase, Halstead be allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 13 – GGHR284A Proposed School Site, Ravens Avenue, Halstead be allocated for educational uses.

Recommendation 14– GGHR284 Land at Ravens Avenue and GGHR430 Land at Tidings Hill are not allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 15 – That HATR 306 Land at Oak Road & Tidings Hill not be allocated for residential or recreational uses.

Recommendation 16 – That HATR297 Conies Field, Oak Road, Halstead not be allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 17 – That GGHR307 Land Off Oak Road, Halstead is allocated for Housing.

Recommendation 18 - That HATR308, Blamsters, Mount Hill not be allocated for

non-specialist housing.

Recommendation 19 - That HATR309, Blamsters, Mount Hill be allocated for specialist housing,

Recommendation 20 - That HATR304 Land west of Mount Hill, Halstead not be allocated for development.

Recommendation 21 – That site HASA287 Land East of the High Street, Halstead is allocated for comprehensive redevelopment with a supporting policy outlined below.

Recommendation 22 – That HATR298 Halstead Business Centre, Factory Lane West and HATR299 Harrison Works, Kings Road are allocated as a mixed use redevelopment site with accompanying policy.

Recommendation 23 – That site HATR305 Land at 83 Chapel Hill, Halstead is not allocated for development.

Recommendation 24 – That site HATR301 Crowbridge Farm, Chapel Hill, Halstead is not allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 25 – That site HATR303 Land South of Sloe Hill Halstead is not allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 26 – That site HATR296 Land North of Sloe Hill Halstead is not allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 27 – That HATR302 land north of Slough Farm Road, Halstead not be allocated for residential.

Recommendation 28 – That HATR300 Halstead Football Club is not allocated for housing and is retained as an Employment Policy Area.

Recommendation 29 – That HASA292 Land south of Box Mill Lane, Halstead not be allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 30 – That HASA294 Wash Farm, Hedingham Road, Halstead is not allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 31 – That HASA290 Land between Mill Chase and Sudbury Road is not allocated for residential development.

Greenstead Village

Recommendation 32 – That site GGHR279 is not allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 33 – That site GGHR280 is not allocated for residential

development.

Recommendation 34 – That the Inset Map for Greenstead village as set out in the Appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

Kelvedon and Feering

Recommendation 35 - That site KELV331 Land at St Dominics Care Home is allocated for specialist care uses. To not allocate KEL332 for specialist care.

Recommendation 36 - To not allocate site KELV333, land at Park Farm for residential development.

Recommendation 37 – To allocate site KELV334, the former Polish Camp, for employment uses with an industrial development boundary as set out on the Inset Map.

Recommendation 38 - To allocate site KELV335, Monks Farm, for residential development as set out on the Inset Map.

Recommendation 39 – That site KELV336 land off Coggeshall Road is not allocated for residential development

Recommendation 40 – That sites KELV337 and KELV338 at London Road are not allocated for residential development.

Recommendation 41 – That the Deals site and is surrounding is allocated as an area for employment and car parking.

Recommendation 42 – That the site FEER227, The Feering Triangle, is not allocated for residential development

Recommendation 43 – That FEER229 the land adjacent to the service station at London Road is not allocated for development

Recommendation 44 - It is proposed that sites FEER232, FEER233 and FEER230 are allocated as a strategic growth location with the following supporting policy.

Recommendation 45 – That site FEER228 land at Wills Green is not allocated for residential development.

Earls Colne and Earls Colne Airfield

Recommendation 46 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne be approved and that sites EAR3H, EARC225 and EARC221 are allocated for residential development with areas of open space allocated outside of the development boundary. All other sites are not recommended for allocation.

Recommendation 47 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne Airfield be approved with

the addition of site EARC226 as an employment site and within the industrial development limit as set out in the Appendix.

White Colne

Recommendation 48 - That the Inset Map for White Colne, as set out in the appendix is approved, with no sites allocated for development.

Ashen

Recommendation 49 - That the Inset Map for Ashen, as set out in the Appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for development in the village.

Bulmer and Bulmer Tye

Recommendation 50 - That the Inset Maps for Bulmer and Bulmer Tye are approved, as set out in the Appendix are approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

Colne Engaine

Recommendation 51 - To approve the Inset Map for Colne Engaine, as set out in the Appendix and allocate no sites for development.

Gosfield

Recommendation 52 - To approve the Inset Map for Gosfield, as set out in the Appendix and to not allocate any sites for development.

Silver End

Recommendation 53 - That the Inset Map for Silver End, as set out in the Appendix is approved and that only sites SILV388, SILV385 and SIL7H are allocated for residential development.

Great Yeldham

Recommendation 54 - The inset map for Great Yeldham as set out in the appendix be approved and that sites GRY274 and GRY275 allocated for development.

Terling and Fairstead

Recommendation 55 - The Inset Map for Terling as set out in the Appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for development. That Fairstead remains a village within the countryside.

Foxearth

Recommendation 56 - That the Inset Map for Foxearth, as set out in the Appendix,

be approved and that no sites are allocated for development.

Liston

Recommendation 57 - That Liston remain as a village within the countryside and that the site LIST339 continues to be determined through the planning application process.

Hatfield Peverel

Recommendation 58 – That site HATF314 Land off Stonepath Drive is allocated as a site for residential development and open space. That site HATF312 The Vineyards is not allocated for residential development

Toppesfield

Recommendation 59 - To approve the development boundary for Toppesfield as set out in the Appendix including the amendment to include the land area of TOPP412 and TOPP413

Pebmarsh

Recommendation 60 – To approve the development boundary for Pebmarsh as set out in the Appendix and not to make a development boundary change at PEB348

Great Maplestead

Recommendation 61– To approve the development boundary for Great Maplestead as shown in the Appendix with an amendment to the rear of GRMA259.

Stisted

Recommendation 62 – That site STIS396 – land east of Baytree Farm, Stisted is not allocated for residential use.

Recommendation 63 – That site STIS397 – Land at DC Cottage and The Leys adj A120 Stisted is not allocated for development.

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

Corporate Implications

Financial:	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.
Legal:	To comply with Governments legislation and guidance.
Equalities/Diversity:	The Councils policies should take account of equalities and diversity.
Safeguarding:	None

Customer Impact:	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
Environment and Climate Change:	This will form part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and will inform policies and allocations.
Consultation/Community Engagement:	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
Risks:	The Local Plan examination may not take place. The Local Plan could be found unsound. Risk of High Court challenge.
Officer Contact:	Emma Goodings
Designation:	Planning Policy Manager
Ext. No.	2511
E-mail:	emma.goodings@braintree.gov.uk

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.
- 1.4 At the Local Plan subcommittee on the 14th March, Members agreed a recommendation that the Local Plan should deliver 845 new homes between 2016 and 2033 to meet the objectively assessed need for new homes. This requires the Council to allocate around 10,000 new homes within the Local Plan, given the sites that are already within the pipeline.
- 1.5 Members also agreed a spatial hierarchy which is set out in the table below and the broad spatial strategy which proposes that the most suitable locations in the District for growth are therefore considered to be Braintree, Witham and the A12 corridor, planned new garden communities and Halstead.

Towns	Braintree, Witham, Halstead
Service Villages	Sible Hedingham, Hatfield Peverel, Coggeshall, Earls Colne and Kelvedon with Feering
Villages	All other settlements in the District enclosed by a development boundary.
Countryside	All areas of the District outside a development boundary

- 1.6 There is no specific housing target for each area and all sites will be assessed on their merits. If, when all towns and villages have been through Local Plan sub-committee, not enough sites have been chosen for development, then additional sites will need to be considered and added to the proposed list of allocations.

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 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 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.
- 2.8 It should also be strongly noted that Essex County Council is currently undertaking a study to assess the opportunities to improve the A120 between Braintree and Marks Tey. The location, route and land needed to support this scheme are not yet known, and this could have implications for a number of sites being proposed for development in the Plan. This is also the case for a scheme that Highways England is currently developing to widen the A12 to 3 lanes. The officer recommendations in this report are based on the information available at this time, but may be subject to change or amendment as further information on the A12 and A120 schemes are released, prior to the submission of the Local Plan to the government.

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 are contained within the Appendix booklet.
- 3.2 A separate recommendation relating to each village or settlement is included at the end of each section. In larger areas a recommendation is included after each site.

4. Halstead

- 4.1 **Introduction** - Halstead is the main service centre for the north of the district and is identified in the Core Strategy (2011) as a Main Town. The plan allocated growth of 300 dwellings within its existing urban area. The expansion of existing employment locations and community service has been supported and town centre regeneration promoted and supported.

- 4.2 Current policy position** - Protective allocations are shown for formal and informal recreation areas, existing employment areas, cemeteries, and education provision among others.
- 4.3 Halstead has two maps, showing Halstead Town Centre Inset Map and Halstead Town. Greenstead Green has one inset map showing a settlement boundary, visually important Open Space, Protected Lane and area at risk of flooding.
- 4.4 The Halstead Town Inset Map shows a line of search for a road bypass and this was shown on the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. Whilst identified on the map, there are no immediate plans by the Highway Authority to implement the road and it has no identified funding. This bypass runs through several Wildlife Sites. If the road were to be progressed it is likely that it would not follow the exact line shown on the plan. This road remains an aspiration for the Town Council.
- 4.5 Local Plan Sub Committee at its meeting of the 14th March 2016 agreed the broad Spatial Hierarchy for settlements within the district. Halstead was classed within the highest settlement category as a town.
- 4.6 Halstead's relatively remote location from rail links and distance from other larger settlements mean that the settlement is less attractive for large scale growth than other settlements in the south of the district. Reliance on road for transport together with the road layout within its historic core make congestion a problem. This area is covered by a Conservation Area and there are many attractive and listed buildings. Opportunities for Highway improvements here are limited and there is heavy congestion. Halstead has retained its attractive market town character and has an attractive landscape setting. The protection of this character should guide allocations as far as practicable. Whilst is undesirable therefore to allocate large scale sites, within the town, it is desirable to allow for some smaller scale growth to prevent stagnation and allow regeneration to occur.
- 4.7 Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council** - As a general comment Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council express disappointment that a portion of the S106 contributions will not be secured for Greenstead Green parish. A portion of the contributions raised as a result of developing sites on the edge of Halstead but within Greenstead Green should be spent on improving Greenstead Green amenities. Some of the financial contributions secured from major development sites between the A131 and Colchester Road should be put to the provision of a link road, to reduce congestion within Halstead.
- 4.8 Site Submissions with officer commentary** - Sites which have been considered previously by Committee during consideration of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan have been identified individually under the individual site heading. A list of sites considering in this report are set out below.

4.9 Halstead Sites

GGHR281 - Land north of Halstead, adjacent to A131
GGHR285 - Field Rear Star Style Cottages, Colne Engaine Lane
GGHR283 - Land adjoining the cricket ground, Sudbury Road
HASA293 - Land east of Sudbury Road (The Sleights) adj Churchill Ave
HASA289 Land at Cherry Tree Close, Halstead
HASA291 - Land adjoining Cherry Tree Close and Beech Ave, Halstead
HASA295 - Land off corner of Fenn Road and Brook Street, Halstead
HASA288 - Land adjoining the west of Bluebridge Ind Est, Halstead
COLE188 - Land east of Bluebridge Ind Est
GGHR282 - Land adjoining the east side of Bluebridge Industrial Estate
HASA513 - Central Park Colchester Road
HASA286 - Greenways, Balls Chase
GGHR284 - Land at Ravens Avenue
GGHR284A - Proposed School Site, Ravens Avenue
GGHR430 - Land at Tidings Hill (east Firwoods Road)
HATR 306 Land at Oak Road & Tidings Hill

HATR297 - Conies Field, Oak Road
GGHR307 - Land Off Oak Road
HATR308, Blamsters, Mount Hill
HATR309, Blamsters, Mount Hill
HATR304 - Land west of Mount Hill,
HASA287 - Land East of the High Street
HATR298 - Halstead Business Centre, Factory Lane West
HATR299 - Harrison Works Kings Road
HATR305 Land at 83 Chapel Hill, Halstead
HATR301 Crowbridge Farm, Chapel Hill, Halstead
HATR303 - South of Sloe Hill, Halstead
HATR296 - Land North of Sloe Hill Halstead. Resubmitted
HATR302 - Land north of Slough Farm Road
HATR300 - Halstead Football Club,
HASA292 Land south of Box Mill Lane, Halstead
HASA294 - Wash Farm, Hedingham Road,
HASA290 - Land between Mill Chase and Sudbury Road,

4.10 Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish

GGHR279 Land adj Waverney Grange Hill, Greenstead Green
GGHR280 Land adj Mystycroft, Burtons Green Greenstead Green

4.11 Town and Parish Council Comments with Officer Commentary

4.12 GGHR281 Land north of Halstead, adjacent to A131

The site area is 1.2ha agricultural land. The site owner has put the site forward for residential.

- 4.13 Halstead Town Council Comments - Not supported. It is not contiguous with the town boundary. There is little to prevent a progressive enlargement of the site to an inappropriately large scale.

- 4.14 Greenstead Green and Halstead Parish Council Comments - Not Supported. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is low while the scale of development is medium. Relationship to surrounding development is very poor – the site is isolated from the town and remote from existing housing
- 4.15 *Officer comment - The settlement fringe classifies this area as having low – medium landscape capacity. This site is poorly related to the existing settlement by reason of its isolated location and distance from the settlement boundary. This site lies in an open field with no existing features or vegetation which might soften its impact and it will appear prominent. The arable field is undulating with sparse boundary vegetation which allows view across and beyond. It lies in an area where the settlement gives way to countryside and its development would appear abrupt and harm the rural character and setting of the settlement.*
- 4.16 Recommendation 1 – That GGHR281 Land north of Halstead, adjacent to A131 not be allocated.**
- 4.17 GGHR285 Field Rear Star Style Cottages, Colne Engaine Lane, Halstead, The site area is 1.4ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential development.
- 4.18 Halstead Town Council Comments - Not supported
- 4.19 Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council Comments - Not supported. The capacity of the Landscape to accommodate development is low/medium while the scale of development is large. There is poor access and the site is too remote from the urban edge of Halstead.
- 4.20 *Officer comment - This site lies in an area of medium landscape capacity. Star Stile Lane becomes a protected lane further to the east. This is an isolated site, separated from the built up settlement by a substantial area of open countryside (comprising sites GGHR283, HASA293 and the cricket ground). The area is rural and tranquil in character with a thick band of trees and vegetation bounding Star Stile Lane. Inclusion of this site would be inappropriate and would harm the rural character of this area by encouraging scattered and isolated urban development.*
- 4.21 *The Essex Wildlife Trust have previously raised concern about development on this site. They would require buffer zone, mitigation measures, and protected species surveys to protect the Local Wildlife Site.*
- 4.22 Recommendation 2 – That GGHR285 Field Rear Star Style Cottages, Colne Engaine Lane, Halstead, is not allocated for development.**
- 4.23 HASA293 Land east of Sudbury Road (The Sleights) adj Churchill Ave, Halstead

- 4.24 The site is 10.3ha. The site owner has put the site forward for up to 250 dwelling. This site was considered previously as HAS5. The site was not included in the Site Allocations Plan because it would involve the loss of an area of formal recreation, or which there was a deficit. Also, that the site encroached on to an area considered as having a high sensitivity to change.
- 4.25 Halstead Town Council Comments - This site was not supported due to its visual prominence and the potential implications for the cricket club.
- 4.26 Sustainability Appraisal - Significant positive effects include that the proposal would significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing and broadband and would be within 2.4km of the Ramsey College. Other positives include proximity of part of the site to the settlement edge, hospital open space, employment, services/facilities, regular public transport services and primary school facilities.
- 4.27 That a very small portion of the site lies within a designated wildlife site is a significant negative effect.
- 4.28 *Officer comment - This site includes an area designated for formal recreational land designation in the Local Plan Review and Site Allocations Plan. It adjoins a Local Wildlife site to its south (Bra176). There is a gas pipeline and its safeguarding area close to the northern boundary of the site. The Braintree District Settlement Fringes Evaluation of Landscape Capacity describes the majority of the site as having a medium landscape capacity though the eastern boundary in the vicinity of the river valley has low capacity.*
- 4.29 *This is a large site which would have some negative impacts on landscape quality. Sufficient housing has been allocated further south within the district and a site of this scale is not required to meet the housing targets. The development of this area is likely to add to congestion within the settlement.*
- 4.30 *The recreational allocation on this site should be retained.*
- 4.31 **Recommendation 3 - That site HASA293 Land east of Sudbury Road (The Sleights) adj Churchill Ave, Halstead is not allocated for residential development.**
- 4.32 GGHR283 Land adjoining the cricket ground, Sudbury Road, Halstead
- 4.33 The site area is 11ha. It is in use for agriculture. The site owner has put the site forward for up to 400 units. This site was considered previously as GRG1. It was not included in the Site Allocations Plan because as it would represent a large area within an area of high landscape value separated from the settlement by an unallocated area of land.
- 4.34 Sustainability Appraisal - The proposal would significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing and broadband and would be within 2.4km of the Ramsey College. Other positives include proximity to hospital open space, employment, services/facilities, public transport and primary school facilities.

- 4.35 Negative impacts include that approximately 57% of the site is in an area of moderate sensitivity to change. The site lies on Greenfield land of grade 3 agricultural quality (approximately 84.6%) and would have a negative impact on soil quality. A small area lies on contaminated land (approx 10.7%)
- 4.36 Halstead Town Council Comments - Not supported
- 4.37 Greenstead Green and Halstead Parish Council Comments
- 4.38 Not Supported. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is medium (there is some screening from trees) while the scale of development is medium. There is poor access. Star Stile is a protected lane. There is potential for adverse impacts on historical buildings in Star Stile Lane. This site forms part of the wedge of undeveloped land between Star Stile and Halstead.
- 4.39 *Officer comment - This is a large area of agricultural land separated from the built up area of Halstead by rolling and flat farmland (comprising HASA293). The Landscape Analysis Study describes this land as being Low – medium landscape capacity. Constraints include a gas pipeline and safeguarding zone along the southern boundary of the site, scattered TPO protected trees and tree groups, an area of contaminated land and public footpaths bisecting the site. Part of Star Stile Lane to the north is a Protected Lane and this lane has an attractive rural appearance. There would be potential for impact on listed buildings on Star Stile Lane.*
- 4.40 *HASA293 has not been recommended for allocation therefore this site remains poorly related to the settlement edge. This is a large site which would have some negative impacts on landscape quality and sufficient housing has been allocated further south within the district. The development of this area is also likely to add to congestion within the settlement. The recreational allocation on this site should be retained.*
- 4.41 Recommendation 4 – That GGHR283 Land adjoining the cricket ground, Sudbury Road, Halstead is not allocated for residential development. That designation for formal recreation is retained.**
- 4.42 HASA291 - Land adjoining Cherry Tree Close and Beech Ave, Halstead
- 4.43 The site size is 16ha. The site owner has put forward the site for housing.
- 4.44 The site was considered previously under reference HAS4. It was not included because a development of this scale would harm the character of the area, which is identified as having a high sensitivity to change.
- 4.45 Sustainability Appraisal - The proposal would significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing and broadband and would be within 2.4km of the Ramsey College. Other positives include proximity to the settlement edge,

hospital open space, employment, public transport and primary school facilities. It is in an area of low sensitivity to change.

- 4.46 Negative impacts include distance from health facilities, being over 800m from the town centre. The site lies within 100m of a designated wildlife site. Access is uncertain but gained from a single track fast road. There would be loss of greenfield land and soil quality.
- 4.47 Town Council Comments - Not supported. Impact on Colne Road is of serious concern. There are existing highway issues.
- 4.48 *Officer comment - This is a large prominent site on one of the approach routes into Halstead and could accommodate over 400 units. The landscape analysis identifies this site as being of medium to low landscape capacity. The scale of the proposal would be apparent from Brook Street and would extend the boundaries of Halstead far into the countryside, harming the quiet rural character of its landscape setting. It is unclear where satisfactory access could be achieved. Brook Street is a fast narrow road and partly single lane.*
- 4.49 Recommendation 5 – That site HATR291 - Land North of Sloe Hill is not allocated for development.**
- 4.50 HASA289 Land at Cherry Tree Close, Halstead
- 4.51 The site area is 0.82ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential. This site has already been considered as HAS25. The site was not included as an allocation in the Site Allocations Plan following objections by the Town Council and given its impact on an area of landscape sensitivity and visual impact on nearby housing.
- 4.52 Town Council Comments - Support
- 4.53 *Officer comment - This site lies on the slopes of the Star Stile Stream river valley with its eastern boundary lying at the ridge and buffered from the wider countryside by a belt of trees and vegetation. The Settlement Fringes Landscape Assessment classes this site as included in an area of low landscape capacity and is generally described as peaceful, the site has mature tree cover and vegetation, particularly near the stream and margins of the site.*
- 4.54 *It lies adjacent to the settlement edge, being enclosed on two sides by existing development and enclosed from the wider countryside by the ridge and ridgeline trees/vegetation. These elements should be protected. The Town Council support allocation of the site.*
- 4.55 *The site lies on a hillside and will be prominent when viewed from Cherry Tree Close, but can be contained to within the settlement so that its impact on the wider landscape setting, with care will be negligible. Development can be designed to soften the impact of development from Cherry Tree Close by protecting river edge and some mature trees as landscape setting. Retaining*

and creating a landscape corridor linking the river with the vegetation on the eastern boundary is likely to be beneficial to wildlife and helpful in mitigating against the loss of habitat.

- 4.56 *Wider views can be avoided by ensuring development on the eastern end of the site should not protrude over the ridge line to avoid visual impact on the wider countryside and landscaping along this edge strengthened.*

4.57 Recommendation 6 – That HASA289 Land at Cherry Tree Close, Halstead be allocated for residential development.

4.58 HASA295 Land off corner of Fenn Road and Brook Street, Halstead

- 4.59 The site area is 2.1ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential development. The site has already been considered as HAS7 and half of the site allocated for development in the Site Allocations Plan. The area to the east of the brook was excluded from the allocation in support of the Town Council views and because it protruded into the countryside.

- 4.60 The allocation was subject to further investigations as to the feasibility of widening Fenn Road. The site is surrounded on 3 sides by development and is acceptable as infill.

- 4.61 Town Council Comments - Qualified support. Development could be supported but only if this facilitated road widening improvements. No development should occur without such improvements

- 4.62 *Officer comment - The area west of the river was allocated in the Site Allocations Plan and this allocation should remain. The main issue is whether or not the area east of the river should also be allocated. This site lies in a river valley classed as having medium – low landscape capacity in the Landscape Capacity Analysis. It lies on the settlement edge and given the slope cannot be readily seen in distance views from the east. The Highway Authority has highlighted that on street parking is a serious issue. Thus on street parking bays and passing places should be provided.*

4.63 Recommendation 7 – That HASA295 Land off corner of Fenn Road and Brook Street, Halstead be allocated for housing.

4.64 HASA288 (HAS6) Land adjoining the west of Bluebridge Ind Est

- 4.65 The site area is 16ha. The site owner has put the site forward as an extension of Bluebridge Industrial estate. This site has been considered as HAS8 and not included within the Site Allocations Plan. When previously considered as HAS8, there had been no requirement for the additional employment land which the site had then represented. Prior to consideration under the Site Allocations Plan the Industrial Estate extension had been allocated as part of the 2005 Local Plan Review. At this time it was considered that encroaching beyond the existing boundary would result in development being more prominent within the surrounding area and longer views.

- 4.66 Sustainability Appraisal - Positive impacts on broadband provision, proximity to public transport, the settlement edge, location in an area mainly in an area of low sensitivity to change.
- 4.67 Negative impacts include possible impacts on wildlife, loss of greenfield land (of grade 1 or 2 agricultural quality) and soil quality, location on a small area of contaminated land.
- 4.68 *Officer comment - This is agricultural land whose landscape is classed in the landscape assessment as having medium - low sensitivity to change. Land rises from west to east and it is possible to look down on the settlement edge from the eastern area of Brook Street. At present the Settlement Fringes Study describes this area as having a sense of separation from the settlement.*
- 4.69 *The Employment Land Needs Assessment has advised that this site (C11) could be designated for industrial uses. The site does not form part the core of best sites necessary to provide employment land in the District, but does form one of three sites which would provide employers with a choice of location. Recommendation 5 states that this site COLE188 or GGHR282 could be designated for B1c/2 and B8 uses.*
- 4.70 *This site is in a visually sensitive area and designation of the whole site would seriously harm the countryside setting of Halstead. Such a designation would dominate this entrance to Halstead. A smaller designation would be difficult to hide from Brook Street and from wider views to and from the town.*
- 4.71 *The sites allocation could conflict with the housing allocation recommended for HASA295 Fenn Road/Brook Street through their proximity.*
- 4.72 *The Highway Authority opinion will depend on adoption issues and the access. They do not raise issues over capacity.*
- 4.73 Recommendation 8 –That HASA288 Land adjoining the west of Bluebridge Industrial Estate is not allocated for employment development**
- 4.74 COLE188 Land east of Bluebridge Industrial Estate
- 4.75 The site area is 11.3ha. The site owner has put the site forward for industrial development. This site has already been considered under reference COL3+. The site was not allocated.
- 4.76 Sustainability Appraisal - Positive impacts include the availability of broadband which is planned by 2019. The site lies close to the settlement and is not in, or within 100m of a designated Wildlife Site. The site lies within 400m of a bus stop and access is possible through the industrial estate.

- 4.77 Negative impacts relate to its Greenfield location and loss of Grade 3 agricultural land. That the majority of the site lies in an area of moderate sensitivity to change is classed negatively.
- 4.78 The impacts on historic buildings and the water/sewerage issues are uncertain.
- 4.79 Town Council Comments - Do not support unless road improvements are an integral part of the proposal.
- 4.80 Colne Engaine Parish Council Comments – The Parish Council is concerned that the inclusion of this site as part of the wider proposal for the eastern extension of Halstead will cause increased traffic movement in the local area and a transference of vehicular movements into Colne Engaine. Roads between Halstead and Colne Engaine are rural and narrow with very few pavements, making it necessary for residents including children to have to walk on the roads that run through our village. Increased traffic will present an increase in environmental and safety risk if residents in Halstead seek to bypass central Halstead by coming cross country to access major routes like the A120.
- 4.81 In addition, the Parish Council expects that a buffer or Green Gap would be identified between any proposed development to the East of Halstead and Colne Engaine Parish. It is noted that one is shown on the plans between Halstead and Greenstead Green to the South. The Parish Council requests that to preserve the rural nature of Colne Engaine, a specific policy is included to this effect in the Plan.
- 4.82 The Parish Council do not consider that the parish, being small, rural and with limited infrastructure has sites that are suitable for consideration for the accommodation of gypsies or travellers.
- 4.83 *Officer comment - It is presently being used for agriculture and is bisected by the indicative line of search for the bypass which takes up much of the site. Most of the site lies in an area of medium landscape capacity with the southern area being more sensitive and of medium low capacity. This landscape assessment means that this site would be the preferred option for and employment allocation. This is one of 3 sites mentioned in the Employment Land Needs Assessment as providing a choice of locations for employers for B1/B2/B8 mixed use.*
- 4.84 *It would be inappropriate to prejudice the route of the proposed road and it is clear that much of the site is affected by this designation. It would be appropriate for an employment designation to cover the area between the industrial estate and the western road edge (allowing for appropriate landscaping).*
- 4.85 *It is recommended that the area to the east of the road as annotated on the plan is designated for employment purposes. The precise line of the*

designation should be understood as indicative and representing the inner (western) edge of the road.

4.86 Recommendation 9 –That COLE188 Land east of Bluebridge Industrial Estate is allocated for industrial use.

4.87 GGHR282 Land adjoining the east side of Bluebridge Industrial Estate

4.88 The site area is 4.7ha. The site owner has put the site forward for employment use. This site was considered previously as GRG3. Site access was considered difficult because it is separated from Bluebridge industrial estate by a disused railway line which is a footpath and used for informal recreation. The indicative area of search for the proposed bypass runs through this area and the south of the area is at risk of flooding. For all of these reasons it was not considered as a suitable site for development.

4.89 Sustainability Appraisal - A significant proportion of the site (26.69%) is located within flood zone 3 is a significant negative effect on the ability to meet Sustainability objective 13 which seeks to reduce the risk of flooding.

4.90 Halstead Town Council Comments - Not Supported

4.91 Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council - Not supported. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is very low. The relative scale of the proposed development is medium. The site has poor access and lies partly within a flood risk zone. There is a potential impact on setting of Grade II listed Bluebridge House. There is a poor relationship to its surroundings being adjacent to Bluebridge Industrial Estate.

4.92 *Officer comment - The site has a low landscape capacity, poor access, lies partly in a flood zone and might adversely impact the setting of Grade II star listed Bluebridge House. Since the site was considered for development the Employment Land Needs Assessment has mentioned this as one of 3 sites which could provide a choice of locations for employers for B1/B2/B8 mixed use. The Settlements Fringes Landscape Assessment classifies the site as having low landscape capacity. Notwithstanding the site's potential for providing some choice of location for employers it is still considered that the above environmental circumstances do not over ride these concerns and the site is considered not suitable for development.*

4.93 Recommendation 10 – That GGHR282 – Land adjoining the east side of Bluebridge Industrial Estate is not allocated for industrial development.

4.94 HASA513 Central Park Colchester Road

4.95 The site area 3.2ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential development. This site was already considered as HAS11 and was allocated for housing in the Draft Site Allocations Plan.

- 4.96 Sustainability Appraisal - As only 3.72% of the site is located within flood zone 3 the proposal will have little impact on the Council's aim to reduce the risk of flooding.
- 4.97 Town Council Comments - Planning permission has been granted for housing on this site
- 4.98 *Officer comment - Planning permission has been very recently granted for residential development on this site and it should be included as an allocation.*
- 4.99 Recommendation 11 – That HASA513 Central Park Colchester Road is allocated for residential development.**

4.100 HASA286 Greenways, Balls Chase, Halstead

- 4.101 The site area is 0.9ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential development. Part of this site has already been considered as HAS17SCHLAA where it was identified as having no major constraints to its development and it was included as a housing allocation.
- 4.102 Town Council Comments - No objection
- 4.103 *Officer comment - This is a brownfield site within the settlement boundary part of which has been previously allocated.*
- 4.104 Recommendation 12 – that HASA286 Greenways, Balls Chase, Halstead be allocated for residential development.**

4.105 GGHR284A Proposed School Site, Ravens Avenue, Halstead

- 4.106 The site area is 2.38ha. The site has been put forward for a new school with access from Raven's Avenue.
- 4.107 Halstead Town Council Comments - No comments
- 4.108 Greenstead Green and Halstead Parish Council Comments - Support. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is medium/high while the proposed scale of development is small. There is a possible impact on Grade II Listed Stansted Hall. The relationship with surrounding development is good with development in close proximity. There is support for a school on this site.
- 4.109 *Officer comment - The County Council have identified a need for an additional primary school in Halstead and wish to use this site to meet that need. This site is on agricultural land. It is within an area of medium landscape capacity and is not in an area of high risk of flooding. It is not in a flood zone. It has a public right of way along the south of the site. The main issue will be highway access. Discussions with the Highway Authority have indicated that a circulation and drop off areas will be essential to be included within the site.*

4.110 Recommendation 13 – GGHR284A Proposed School Site, Ravens Avenue, Halstead be allocated for educational uses.

4.111 GGHR284 Land at Ravens Avenue and GGHR430 Land at Tidings Hill

- 4.112 The area shown in the call for sites submission is 8.38ha agricultural land. A scheme has been submitted which combines this site with GGHR430 and additional land not covered by a call for sites representation (including land to the north and east as far as the A1124). This proposal takes inspiration from the garden settlement concept. It includes a development option to provide a road linking Tidings Hill with Colchester Road as part of the development. The gross site area is 79.9ha for up to 850 dwellings, two local centres and residential uses.
- 4.113 Other proposals on the same site include other smaller options with and without a road which could serve as a link road.
- 4.114 Sustainability Appraisal - The sustainability appraisal was conducted prior to receipt of proposals linking GGHA248 and GGHR430.
- 4.115 Positive impacts include provision of broadband access, community facilities and affordable homes. Part of the site lies within 800m of health facilities, employment and the central area. The proposal would help secure the vitality and viability of the central area. A small part of the site lies within 400m of a bus stop with regular services. Access can be gained from a residential street. The site is within 800m of a primary School and 2.4 miles from Ramsey College.
- 4.116 Negative effects include the site's location on land with moderate sensitivity to change, that the site is Greenfield land and involves loss of agricultural land.
- 4.117 Halstead Town Council Comments - Not supported. Tidings Hill is not suitable for additional traffic of this scale. Whitehall's Avenue is not suitable as an access point for a larger scheme. Proposals to develop 430, 284 and 284a were not supported. This scheme is viewed as adding pressure to the town centre particularly as its residents are likely to use their cars thereby putting pressure on central parking areas.
- 4.118 Greenstead Green and Halstead Parish Council Comments - Support GGHR284. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is medium/high while the proposed scale of development is small/medium. There is no impact on historic buildings. It relates well to existing development to the west.
- 4.119 Not support GGHR430. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is medium while the scale of development is large. There is poor access and concern about the impact on the nearby protected lane. There is possible impact on Grade II Listed Stansted Hall.

- 4.120 *Officer comment - This site lies on land classed in the Settlement Fringes Study as having a medium landscape capacity. There is a right of way through the site.*
- 4.121 *This is a large site which would have some negative impacts on landscape quality. Sufficient housing has been allocated elsewhere within the district and a site of this scale is not required to meet the housing targets. Further it is not clear that the proposals will be acceptable in highways terms.*
- 4.122 Recommendation 14 – GGHR284 Land at Ravens Avenue and GGHR430 Land at Tidings Hill, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 4.123 HATR 306 Land at Oak Road & Tidings Hill
- 4.124 The site area is 4.25ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential. This site has not been previously considered for housing.
- 4.125 Town Council Comments - Qualified support though there is a recreational allocation which would not be carried forward. Some support of a comprehensive development. The Tidings Lane junction considered dangerous.
- 4.126 *Officer comment - This site lies in an area assessed as having a medium – high landscape capacity value. There is a small area of land contamination. The Highway Authority considers that Oak Road is narrow and requires widening. There are no proposals to widen Oak Road arising from this proposal or by the Highway Authority. Inadequate access to the site could result in pressure on the Letches Farm Lane protected lane commencing immediately south east of the site.*
- 4.127 *Although part of the site has been allocated for recreational use, the site has not been used for that purpose. The site owner has no intention of using the site for this purpose and therefore the allocation is not deliverable. The allocation should be removed.*
- 4.128 *Sufficient housing has been allocated further south within the district where large scale growth is more sustainable and a site of this scale is not required to meet the housing targets.*
- 4.129 Recommendation 15 – That HATR 306 Land at Oak Road & Tidings Hill not be allocated for residential or recreational uses.**
- 4.130 HATR297 Conies Field, Oak Road, Halstead
- 4.131 The site is area is 1.56ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential including self-build units and housing association development. The site is a disused orchard. The site has been considered already as HTR2. The site was not included in the site allocations plan because its allocation would represent an intrusion into the countryside in an area identified as

having a high sensitivity to change and would result in a less defensible development boundary.

4.132 Town Council Comments - Support

4.133 *Officer comment - Since this site was last considered, planning permission has been recommended for approval (14/01580) on the neighbouring site at the Oak Road/ A131 Junction (GGHR307).*

4.134 *HATR297 would be accessed from Oak Road at a point where this is single lane. The Highway Authority have raised concerns in relation to HATR306 stating that Oak Road requires widening. This is a sizeable site and it is unlikely that access arrangements to this site are likely to be acceptable.*

4.135 *The site lies in a wider area which, as a whole, was described as sensitive to change in the 2006 Landscape Character Assessment. The more detailed Settlement Fringe Landscape Capacity Analysis classed this particular block as having medium to high landscape capacity and with good opportunity to mitigate the impact of development. The site has a strong sense of enclosure with public view of its being difficult.*

4.136 *Sufficient housing has been allocated further south within the district and a site of this scale is not required to meet the housing target.*

4.137 Recommendation 16 – That HATR297 Conies Field, Oak Road, Halstead not be allocated for residential development.

4.138 GGHR307 Land Off Oak Road, Halstead

4.139 The site is area 11.7ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential development. This site was considered under reference GRG5 and GRG2. The site was not included in the site allocations plan. It was noted that this area of Oak Road is narrow and after the junction with Three Gates has a more rural feel as it moves away from the built up area of Halstead. This area was considered to have a high sensitivity to change and not considered a suitable location for new development.

4.140 Halstead Town Council Comments - This site has already been granted permission.

4.141 Greenstead Green and Halstead Parish Council Comments - The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is medium/high while the scale of development proposed is medium/large. Planning permission has already been granted therefore there is doubt as to the need to allocate this site for development.

4.142 *Officer comment - Whilst not included in the site allocation plan the site has been the subject of a planning application 14/01580. Approval of this application has been granted subject to a S106.*

4.143 Recommendation 17 – That GGHR307 Land Off Oak Road, Halstead is allocated for Housing.

4.144 HATR308, Blamsters, Mount Hill

4.145 The site is area is 2.47ha. The site lies to the west of Mount Hill to the front of Blamsters, which provides care accommodation for adults with learning disabilities. The complex comprises of Blamsters Farm, a Grade II listed building and a number of out buildings. This greenfield area has been allocated as a site for specialist housing in the Site Allocations Plan. The owner has put this site forward for market housing and specialist housing (approx 31 units). This is the larger of two overlapping site submissions. This proposal contains land to the rear of and additional to that proposed in HATR309.

4.146 Town Council Comments - Support the existing allocation for special needs housing. Market housing is not supported.

4.147 *Officer comment - Officers have previously identified reasons for deleting this draft allocation; including its greenfield location at some distance from the town centre; the effect on the setting of a listed building and upon agricultural land and the negative impacts of concentrating specialist provision and other brownfield specialist care opportunities elsewhere in the town within the development boundary. These concerns remain. Nevertheless, committee had considered that the specialist nature of the housing provided weighed against other concerns were sufficient, subject to a satisfactory scheme, to overcome those concerns.*

4.148 *This proposal introduces market housing to provide a mixed proposal. Together with the concerns expressed previously, and that the site is not needed here to meet housing targets, weighs against this version of the scheme.*

4.149 Recommendation 18 - That HATR308, Blamsters, Mount Hill not be allocated for non-specialist housing.

4.150 HATR309 Blamsters, Mount Hill

4.151 This site is 1.7ha. The premises provides care accommodation for adults with learning disabilities. The complex comprises of Blamsters Farm, a Grade II listed building and a number of outbuildings. This greenfield site has been allocated as a site for specialist housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

4.152 Town Council Comments - Support the existing allocation for special needs housing. Market housing is not supported.

4.153 *Officer comment - This site was considered and allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (please refer to HATR308). This proposal puts forward the same site area for allocation as specialist*

housing. This issue was considered previously and considered acceptable in principle by committee. (Please refer to HATR309)

4.154 Recommendation 19 - That HATR309, Blamsters, Mount Hill be allocated for specialist housing,

4.155 HATR304 Land west of Mount Hill, Halstead

4.156 The site area is 3.7ha and has an agricultural use. The site owner has put the site forward for residential. This site has already been considered as HTR1. The site was not considered for inclusion because it was considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the area.

4.157 Town Council Comments - Not supported. Would lead to the loss of an attractive "Green Lung"

4.158 *Officer comments - The site is in a site classed as Medium sensitivity to change and on the approach to Halstead and close to a Listed Building. This is a large site whose development would be clearly apparent from this busy and important approach into Halstead. This site is still considered to make a positive contribution to the approach into Halstead.*

4.159 This is a sizable site which would have some negative impacts on landscape quality. Sufficient housing has been allocated elsewhere within the district to meet the housing requirements and a site of this scale is not required to meet the housing targets.

4.160 Recommendation 20 - That HATR304 Land west of Mount Hill, Halstead not be allocated for development.

4.161 HASA287 Land East of the High Street, Halstead

4.162 The site area is 1.64ha. This site is allocated as a comprehensive redevelopment site with an accompanying policy. An application for a large retail store on the site was refused.

4.163 Sustainability Appraisal - The proposal would have negative impact on SA objective 10 which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. Part of the site is located within a conservation area. There are also several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site. Development may lead to a more crowded appearance as per BDC site assessment form, however mitigation may be possible.

4.164 Town Council Comments - Overall support the retention of the site's existing Comprehensive Redevelopment designation however an individual member has expressed concerns about the deliverability of the site in light of the constraints on the site, including those noted in the officer comments below.

4.165 *Officer comment - The site is located to the rear of properties on Halstead High Street and as such is in a central location which is within close proximity*

to the main town facilities and is therefore considered a highly sustainable and well connected site. However the site does have a number of constraints including the proximity of the conservation area and listed buildings, the historic air raid shelters, the need to retain important views including to the church, the presence of protected trees on the site, wildlife habitats drainage, water and levels issues. The vehicle access in particular is also not straightforward.

4.166 *However, officers believe that a suitable and sympathetic scheme for the development of the site should be able to be found which could incorporate a range of uses including homes, employment, parking and open space. It is therefore proposed to continue to allocate the site as a comprehensive redevelopment area with a supporting policy.*

4.167 Recommendation 21 – That site HASA287 Land East of the High Street, Halstead is allocated for comprehensive redevelopment with a supporting policy outlined below.

4.168 *“Policy - Comprehensive Development Area - Land East of Halstead High Street*

Land east of Halstead High Street between The Centre, and Factory Terrace is allocated as a Comprehensive Redevelopment Area which could include new homes, retail and commercial space, open space and community uses.

Redevelopment of the site will need to address the following issues;

- Satisfactory vehicular, servicing and pedestrian access to the site from the adjoining streets*
- Appropriate provision of parking, open space and community space*
- Protection of the setting of listed buildings and enhancement of the Conservation Area, including the retention and refurbishment of at least 1 air raid shelter*
- Retention of protected trees and habitat for protected species*
- Protection of important views into the site, including those from across the valley.”*

4.169 HATR298 Halstead Business Centre, Factory Lane West, and HATR299 Harrison Works Kings Road

4.170 HATR298 is 0.45ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential development.

4.171 HATR289 is 0.81ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential. The 2005 Local Plan Review allocated this site for employment purposes. When considered during the draft Site Allocations Plan process (HAS9) it was recommended that the site be retained for this use.

4.172 Sustainability Appraisal - That site HATR298 is located entirely in flood zone 3 has a significant negative effect on the objective to reduce flooding. Site

HATR299 has a significant negative effect as a significant proportion of the site (73.28%) is located in flood zone 3.

4.173 Town Council Comments - Support subject to road improvements. Strong support for the retention of the boiler house on HATR289.

4.174 *Officer comment - Both sites are allocated as employment policy areas within the Local Plan 2005 and the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. However both sites are either vacant or underutilised and would benefit from regeneration. Both sites are also located within areas at risk of flooding where the local authority would not normally allocate new residential development which the land owners for both sites are requesting. The Employment Land Needs Assessment has recommended that the town centre cluster (C10) within which the sites lie should be classed as a mixed use cluster. Redevelopment proposals should be compatible with operations of existing industrial businesses in the vicinity and no housing should be located on the ground floor within the areas at risk of flooding. An accompanying policy should set out the framework for the regeneration of the site.*

4.175 Recommendation 22 – That HATR298 Halstead Business Centre, Factory Lane West and HATR299 Harrison Works, Kings Road are allocated as a mixed use redevelopment site with accompanying policy.

4.176 *“Policy – Comprehensive Redevelopment Area – Factory Lane West/Kings Road Halstead*

Land at Halstead Business Centre, Factory Lane West, and Harrison Works, Kings Road is allocated as a mixed use re-development. Proposals for re-development for the following uses will be supported;

- *Employment B1 and B2*
- *Small scale retail proposals which do not materially impact on Halstead Town Centre*
- *Residential uses which are not located on the ground floor*
- *Parking*
- *Retention of the boiler house.*

Any application for development would have to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment which demonstrates that the proposals would not significantly increase flood risk in the Halstead for the lifetime of the development, that occupiers and users of the site are at minimal risk of flooding events, and that in the event of flooding the sites can be evacuated safely.”

4.177 HATR305 Land at 83 Chapel Hill, Halstead 0.73ha

4.178 The site area is 0.7ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential. This site was considered as HTR7 but not allocated. It was considered that inclusion of this site would result in a large area of development encroaching

into the countryside and that the site was identified as having a high sensitivity to change.

4.179 Sustainability Appraisal - That a significant proportion of the site (88.19%) is located within the a designated site (Chapel Hill Meadows LoWS). would have a significant negative impact on objective 6 which seeks to conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment

4.180 Town Council Comments - Not supported

4.181 *Officer comment - This site lies on a site of medium/low landscape sensitivity. The site also lies on a Local Wildlife Site (Bra 149) and this is reflected in the Pre Submission Site Allocations and Development Management Plan which shows the site as Local Wildlife Site. Allocation of housing on an area designated on a site protected for nature would be inappropriate.*

4.182 Recommendation 23 – That site HATR305 Land at 83 Chapel Hill, Halstead is not allocated for development.

4.182 HATR301 Crowbridge Farm, Chapel Hill, Halstead

4.183 The site size is 4.2ha. The owner has put the site forward for 80 – 90 houses. The site was previously considered as HTR5. It was considered to be a large site which would harm both the setting of the listed building and surrounding countryside which is identified within the landscape character assessment (1a) as having low landscape capacity. The site lies to the north of Local Wildlife Site (Bra149).

4.184 Sustainability Appraisal - The proposal would have a significant adverse though uncertain impact on the biological diversity of the environment as a small part of the site (0.47%) lies within a designated site (Chapel Hill Meadow LoWS).

4.185 Town Council Comments - No support

4.186 *Officer comment - This is a greenfield site adjacent to Chapel Hill and Crowbridge Farm, which includes a Grade II Listed Barn. This is considered to be a large site which would harm both the setting of the listed building and wider countryside including the valley floor.*

4.187 Recommendation 24 – That site HATR301 Crowbridge Farm, Chapel Hill, Halstead is not allocated for residential development.

4.188 HATR303 - Land South of Sloe Hill Halstead

4.189 This site is 0.1ha in size and a boundary change is proposed to accommodate 2 dwellings. This site comprised a dwelling and large garden adjacent to the settlement boundary. This site was considered earlier as HAS2Halt.

- 4.190 This site is too small to be considered as an allocation. The proposal was considered previously by committee as ref HAS2 Halt on 1/3/12 and 11/4/2014. Committee agreed to extend the development boundary westwards to include part of the site within the settlement boundary but excluded the western part of the proposed site. The settlement boundary was extended to lie opposite the development boundary on the opposite side of Sloe Hill. Officers did not support a further extension to west
- 4.191 Two planning applications have since been submitted on this site 15/01476 and 16/00606 (no decision made at the time of writing this report). Application 15/01476 gave consent for 2 dwellings and these were located within the eastern area to be included within the new development boundary. The western area which LDF committee had resolved to remain outside the development boundary was identified in the plans as garden but permitted development rights were not removed and garden structures could be built on this area.
- 4.192 Town Council Comments - A planning application has been granted on this site and therefore it was supported to amend the development boundary to include the extent of built development.
- 4.193 *Officer comment - Officers previously did not consider that this site west of Sloe Hill should be extended. Officers took the view that sufficient sites had been identified within Halstead in the draft plan to ensure that housing land is available for development in the town.*
- 4.194 *The Development Boundaries Review Methodology allows boundaries to follow development in order to prevent inappropriate development although boundaries will normally follow physical features. The curtilages of dwellings are normally included unless they are functionally separate. In this case the open area in question would be closely related to the buildings recently given permission and not functionally separate. The site is at the edge of the settlement and adjacent to further frontage housing. There is no need to include further land in the settlement boundary.*
- 4.195 Recommendation 25 – That site HATR303 Land South of Sloe Hill Halstead is not allocated for residential development**
- 4.196 HATR296 - Land North of Sloe Hill Halstead
- 4.197 The site size is 2.46ha. This site is Greenfield land fronting Sloe Hill. The site owner has put the site forward for 20 – 25 houses including affordable housing and live work units. The meadow is proposed to be retained as public open space and a new footpath linking to the existing path north of the site.
- 4.198 The site was considered previously under reference HAS8. It was not allocated because of its large size in an area on the edge of the town identified within the Landscape Character Assessment as having a high sensitivity to change.

- 4.199 The site is a Local Wildlife Site (Sloe Cottage Meadow Bra 150) and there are a number of TPO protected trees and a public right of way on the north western boundaries. There is a public right of way on the northern boundary and the Landscape Analysis Study of Halstead shows this area (1e) as having medium landscape capacity.
- 4.200 Town Council Comments - Not supported. This is a Local Wildlife site and the access is dangerous.
- 4.201 *Officer comment - Allocation of housing on this site would be undermine its Local Wildlife Site status as a protected area for wildlife. Concerns have been raised by Essex Wildlife Trust relating to this proposal.*
- 4.202 *The Settlement Fringes Study classifies this site as having medium landscape capacity. It is a large site at the edge of the settlement and is not required as sufficient land has been allocated elsewhere in the district and its negative impact on landscape character.*
- 4.203 Recommendation 26 – That site HATR296 Land North of Sloe Hill Halstead is not allocated for residential development**
- 4.204 HATR302 Land north of Slough Farm Road, Halstead
- 4.205 The site area is 5.8ha of agricultural land. The site owner has put the site forward for residential (117 dwellings).
- 4.206 Sustainability Appraisal - Significant positive effects include that the proposal would significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing and broadband and would be within 2.4km of the Ramsey College. Other positives include proximity of part of the site to the settlement edge, hospital open space, employment, services/facilities, regular public transport services and primary school facilities and Ramsey College.
- 4.207 That a very small portion of the site (0.03%) lies within a designated wildlife site is a negative though uncertain effect. Access can be gained from the site though much of the natural frontage lies in floodzone 2. A small portion of the site lie s in flood zone 3. There is potential for a negative effect on a listed building opposite on Lough Farm Road though mitigation may be possible. The site lies in an area of moderate landscape capacity. The site is greenfield and would involve the loss of grade 3 agricultural land.
- 4.208 Town Council Comments - Not supported. There is a lack of suitable access.
- 4.209 *Officer comment – This site lies in an area of medium landscape capacity. The Essex Wildlife Trust are concerned that the close proximity of this site to the adjacent Local Wildlife Site (Bra150 Sloe Cottage Meadow) may harm its integrity. Wildflower meadows are fragile habitats and easily damaged. If allocated the Trust would seek robust protection for the site. This site is not required in order to meet the required housing numbers.*

4.210 *The Settlement Fringes Study classifies this site as having medium landscape capacity. It is a large site with a number of constraints at the edge of the settlement and is not required as sufficient land has been allocated elsewhere in the district and its negative impact on landscape character.*

4.211 Recommendation 27 – That HATR302 land north of Slough Farm Road, Halstead not be allocated for residential.

4.212 HATR300 (HAS13/HAS14), Halstead Football Club

4.213 The site area is 1.18ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential development.

4.214 The site is designated as an employment policy area. Most of the site lies within floodzone 2 and just under half lies within floodzone 3. Much of the site lies within a Hazardous Substance Zone and there is a small area of contaminated land to the west of the site. There is a gas pipeline to the west of the site together with its buffer zone along the western boundary of the site.

4.215 This site was considered under references HAS13 and HAS14 where the site was recommended for inclusion as an employment site.

4.216 Sustainability Assessment - As 94.11% of the site lies in flood zone 3 its development would have a negative impact on objective 13 which seeks to reduce flood risk.

4.217 Town Council Comments - Support of industrial allocation but not for housing.

4.218 *Officer comment - Land within floodzones 2 and 3 will not be allocated for housing unless the sequential and exception tests can be satisfied. In order to pass this test the development must provide wider sustainability benefits which outweigh the flood risk and there must be no reasonably available sites in Flood zone 1. There is no evidence to date that this can be achieved. The Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 has recommended that the site is retained as an Employment Area.*

4.219 Recommendation 28 – That HATR300 Halstead Football Club is not allocated for housing and is retained as an Employment Policy Area.

4.220 HASA292 Land south of Box Mill Lane, Halstead

4.221 The site area is 2.13ha of agricultural land. The site owner has put the site forward for residential.

4.222 Town Council Comments - Not supported. Development would seriously detract from a particularly attractive area.

4.223 *Officer comment - This site lies outside but adjacent to the development boundary at the edge of Halstead. If included, this proposal would leave a complicated settlement boundary which would leave more land vulnerable to*

development. It forms part of the settlement's countryside setting. The Halstead Settlement Fringes Evaluation of Landscape Analysis classified this site as having medium landscape capacity. The site lies at a far lower ground level than the nearby A1124 from where the site can be seen. It forms part of sweeping views of the river valley with pleasant woodlands and is an area used for informal recreation. This proposal would seriously harm the rural informal and rural character of its surroundings. The site is not required as sufficient housing has been allocated elsewhere within the district.

4.224 Recommendation 29 – That HASA292 Land south of Box Mill Lane, Halstead not be allocated for residential development.

4.225 HASA294 - Wash Farm, Hedingham Road, Halstead

4.226 The site area is 0.1ha. This site has been put forward for 1 -3 dwellings. This site was considered previously under reference HAS30. The site was not included within the settlement boundary to protect the character and appearance of its surroundings.

4.227 Town Council Comments - Not supported.

4.228 *Officer comment - The development boundary should not be extended, taking into account the tree preservation order and adjacent conservation area. The fact that there were previous buildings on this site, which have been demolished, does not override these objections to development here.*

4.229 Recommendation 30 – That HASA294 - Wash Farm, Hedingham Road, Halstead is not allocated for residential development.

4.231 HASA290 Land between Mill Chase and Sudbury Road

4.232 The site area is 7ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential. This site was considered under reference number (HAS3). The site was not allocated in the Site Allocations Plan as it was considered a backland site with poor access opportunities.

4.233 Sustainability Appraisal - This site would impact positively on the provision of affordable housing, proximity to doctor/hospital, Halstead central area, employment land, public transport with regular services, primary schools and the Ramsey College, availability of broadband (planned by 2016).

4.234 Access would be required to be taken through other properties and is therefore negative consideration. The site is within an area of low – medium landscape capacity. The site is greenfield land and development would involve the loss of Grade 3 agricultural land.

4.235 There is potential for a negative impact on the Conservation Area and listed buildings and it is uncertain to what extent such impacts can be avoided or mitigated.

4.236 Town Council Comments - Not supported. Poor access

4.237 *Officer comment - The site lies in an area of medium/low landscape sensitivity. It is considered a large backland development with poor access opportunities. The site is not required as sufficient housing has been allocated elsewhere within the district.*

4.238 Recommendation 31 – That HASA290 Land between Mill Chase and Sudbury Road is not allocated for residential development.

5 Greenstead Green Rural Area

5.1 Introduction - This village is approximately 1 mile to the south east of Halstead although the rural parish wraps around the east and north of the town. This section relates to those other sites which do not adjoin or are in very close proximity to Halstead and have not been listed above. The village has a hall, open space and play area. There is a small post office, farm shop and café as part of Greenstead Farm. The 1977 village plan shows the village much as it is today. The village has two distinct older areas around the former school/church in the north and around the green in the south. Over the last 100 years these areas have been conjoined by ribbon development.

5.2 Current Policy Position - This is a non-key service village with a village development boundary drawn tightly around the built up area in Church Road and Burton Green. The remaining area lies within the countryside. It has a visually important open space at the junction of Burton Green and Church Road and a protected and along part of Burton Green.

5.3 Parish Comments General - The Parish Council recognises the need for an increase in building compared with the past and the village can accommodate a small amount of growth to support local facilities, proportionate in size, in a sustainable location and which does not have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the village. The present development boundary is broadly appropriate. There may be scope to adjust the boundary slightly to include a small number of existing properties which form part of the village core, eg Greenstead Hall Farm, the Grange and Brook Cottage.

5.4 The playing field should be continued to be protected as an amenity space. There are no sites suitable for accommodating gypsy and travellers. There is a need for new and improved play equipment and village hall.

5.5 Site Submissions with Officer Comments

5.6 GGHR279 Land adj Waverney, Grange Hill, Greenstead Green

5.7 The site area is 1.46ha. The site owner has put the site forward. This site was considered as GRG6 in relation to the Site Allocations Plan. The site was not allocated as it was considered to be a sizeable Greenfield extension on the edge of the village and out of character with the surrounding pattern of development.

- 5.8 Sustainability Appraisal - Negative effect (-).The site is not within a designated site, however it is within 100m of a designated site. The site is in a SSSI impact risk zone for residential development of 100 units or more, however this development only proposes 37 housing units. The site is located on greenfield development as per BDC site assessment form.
- 5.9 Parish Council Comments - Not supported. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is low while the scale of development is large. The site has a poor relationship with neighbouring development. This is not the right site for development on the edge of the village.
- 5.10 *Officer comment - Site GGHR279 is not supported as the site would be a sizable extension in relation to the scale of the village and out of character with the surrounding pattern of development. The village has some facilities but is accessed by rural lanes. It is not considered a suitable site for major growth proposals. Opportunities for growth inside the current village boundary are limited.*
- 5.11 **Recommendation 32 – That site GGHR279 is not allocated for residential development.**
- 5.12 GGHR280 Land adj Mystycroft, Burtons Green Greenstead Green
- 5.13 This site area is 2.23ha. The site owner has put the site forward for residential development. This land is presently used for employment purposes.
- 5.14 Sustainability Appraisal - Negative effect. The site is not within a designated site, nor is it within 100m of a designated site. The site is within a SSSI impact risk zone for residential development of 100 units or more, however this development only proposes 10 housing units. The site is located on greenfield land as per BDC site assessment form.
- 5.15 Greenstead Green and Halstead Parish Council Comments - Not supported. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is low while the scale of development is large. There is poor access and the site has a poor relationship to nearby development being isolated and in a remote location.
- 5.16 *Officer comment - Although this is a sizeable brownfield site, its location isolated from the village settlement boundary and from facilities and services means that this is an inappropriate location for a housing allocation.*
- 5.17 **Recommendation 33 – That site GGHR280 is not allocated for residential development.**
- 5.18 **Other matters raised by the Parish Council** - The Parish Council have suggested that there may be scope to adjust the boundary slightly to include a small number of existing properties which form part of the village core, eg. Greenstead Hall Farm, the Grange and Brook Cottage.

- 5.19 Rose Cottage to be included in the village development boundary as agreed by council at its meeting of 7th December 2011 (as per appendix map 3) and carried forward into the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan pre submission draft.
- 5.20 The Boundary Review Methodology Statements states that farmsteads and agricultural buildings should be excluded from the development boundary, hence Greenstead Hall Farm should remain excluded. It also excludes Listed Buildings with important landscaped settings on the edge of the built up area.
- 5.21 The Parish Council was keen to ensure that the playing field should be continued to be protected as an amenity space. The Parish Council have identified that there is a need for new and improved play equipment and village hall.
- 5.22 *Officer comment – The playing field was protected as a visually important open space and there is no proposal to remove this designation. There are no allocations within the village which could secure this type of facility Nevertheless this need is noted.*
- 5.23 **Recommendation 34 – That the Inset Map for Greenstead village as set out in the Appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.**

6 Kelvedon and Feering

- 6.1 Kelvedon and Feering are two separate but adjacent villages and Parishes located along the A12 and mainline railway line corridor to the north of Witham. Whilst they are two separate villages, they functionally act as a single centre, with facilities in Kelvedon being used by Feering residents and vice versa. Kelvedon is the bigger of the two villages furthest south and was allocated as a Key Service Village within the 2011 Core Strategy. Given the functional relationship between the two villages, Members of the Local Plan Sub Committee on the 16th March agreed to a combined allocation as Service Village for Kelvedon with Feering.
- 6.2 The two villages have numerous existing allocations including for local centres, formal and informal recreation, allotments, education and visually important space amongst others. Kelvedon in particular is constrained by an area at risk of flooding which surrounds the village on 3 sides, with the railway line to the north. Feering has an area at risk of flooding to the north of the village, beyond the railway line. The A12 is located to the south of both villages, but not directly adjacent to the main built up areas.
- 6.3 Both Kelvedon and Feering Parish Councils are currently undertaking neighbourhood plans, which once completed would be considered the local development document from that area. The neighbourhood plan can allocate different sites for development within the Parishes as long as they provide for at least as many homes as the Local Plan is proposing. However, strategic site allocations can be excluded from this process. It is proposed to go out for consultation on the Local Plan on the basis of what is agreed here, but to

continue to work with the neighbourhood plan group and agree sustainable, deliverable sites for the Parish.

- 6.4 KELV331 and KEL332 Land at St Dominic's Care Home, London Road.
KELV331 is a site is 1.5ha in size and is being promoted for 32 self-contained apartments and 9 bungalows to be used in association with the existing care home, providing on site medical and other services through the care home as appropriate as 'extra care' units.
- 6.5 KELV332 is a 0.8ha site currently part of the garden/grounds of the existing care home. The landowner is proposing a 25 bed unit for specialist and end of life care, linked with the current care home.
- 6.6 Parish Comments - There was no immediate objection to this site, however, the Parish Council would not wish to see the loss of this facility, both as a care home or as a place of employment within the parish.
- 6.7 *Officer Comments - In the 2014 Site Allocations and Development Management Plan it was proposed to allocate a small part of this land for specialist housing to facilitate an extension to the existing care home. The full extent of the site is a long, narrow field, separated from the wider landscape by good screening. However, due to the linear nature of the site, development would be some distance from the care home and would be located behind existing properties in 'The Cloisters'. These properties have rear access and parking courts, separated from the field behind by substantial planting. As such the full extent of the site the landowner is suggesting may not be suitable and would appear separate from the built development of Kelvedon. Access to the current site is also constrained although there is potential that a larger site could be accessed from 'The Cloisters', however as already stated there are rear parking courts here which an access would have to go through which are not an attractive entrance to the site. In conclusion it is proposed to allocate part of the site for specialist housing.*
- 6.8 *The SA notes the potential for implications on the historic environment and that a small portion of the site is in an area at risk of flooding.*
- 6.9 KELV333 Land at Park Farm, Hollow Road This is a large presently agricultural site which is around 60ha in total. The landowner is suggesting around 40ha for residential development which could accommodate around 1000 homes with access on to Hollow Road.
- 6.10 Parish Comments - This site is objected to as it is felt that it is very removed from the existing village and would be a settlement apart from Kelvedon, rather than being part of the existing community. Access and egress to and from this site is also a concern
- 6.11 *Officer Comments - The site is a large, separated from the village by the railway line. It is proposed to take access to the site from Hollow Road, however this is a rural country lane and is a protected lane around the point at which this site would access the road and then continuing west away from the village. As such officers would not wish to put additional traffic onto this part of*

the road. In addition when travelling east into the village, traffic along this road must cross the railway line via a level crossing before entering the village.

- 6.12 *Whilst a site of this size would be expected to provide some level of facilities on site, it is distant from the main facilities in the village and with only three potential crossing points of the railway line, it is not very convenient for walking access into the village. The site is situated in a medium to low landscape capacity area to accommodate development and there are some open views to be gained from the site from Hollow Road and other points. As such it is not proposed to allocate the site for development.*
- 6.13 *In the SA the site scores positively in terms of its location adjacent a local centre, railway station and close to health facilities as well as to provide new housing although scores negatively in loss of employment land.*
- 6.14 **Recommendation 35- That site KELV331 Land at St Dominics Care Home is allocated for specialist care uses. To not allocate KEL332 for specialist care.**
- 6.15 **Recommendation 36 – To not allocate site KELV333, land at Park Farm for residential development.**
- 6.16 KELV334 Site known as ‘The Former Polish Camp’, Woodhouse Lane, Kelvedon - The site is 2.06ha and is proposed for an employment allocation to reflect the nature and current uses of the site.
- 6.17 Parish Comment - The former comment made (numbered KEL5) still stands – there is support for the formal designation of an employment boundary around this site, being tightly drawn to contain development within it.
- 6.18 *Officer Comment - The site was proposed to be allocated as an employment policy area and an industrial development limit drawn around the site in the 2014 Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. This continues to be the allocation sought by the landowner/operator and there is no new evidence that would preclude this site being allocated as such.*
- 6.19 **Recommendation 37 – To allocate site KELV334, the former Polish Camp, for employment uses with an industrial development boundary as set out on the Inset Map.**
- 6.20 KELV335 Monks Farm, land south east of Coggeshall Road. The site is a 9ha site currently in use as farmland which is being proposed for residential development of up to 300 new dwellings and associated uses. As drawn the site has no road frontage but we understand negotiations are advanced with a landowner of properties to the front of the site to provide a suitable access onto Coggeshall Road.
- 6.21 Parish Comments - It is felt that this site is very ‘trapped’ behind the railway and the bridge and there are strong concerns regarding access and egress due to it not being a very good route for traffic to be coming out onto Station Road.

- 6.22 *Officer Comments - The site is located within a medium landscape area to accommodate change and as such is one of the more suitable sites on the edges of Kelvedon and Feering. It is a single very large field located behind existing properties on one edge and the railway line and the main Kelvedon village to the other. The remaining 2 sides are agricultural fields and although some screening exists, this would benefit from strengthening. The site is located in close proximity to the railway station and some of the main facilities in the village. However as it is located on the other side of the railway line there may be permeability issues. The road access between the site and the village is along Coggeshall Road, which has a number of tight bends and then narrows to almost single carriageway as it goes underneath the railway line. It then widens back out to its junction with the High Street. We understand that the applicant has agreed with the owners of properties to the front of the site to demolish a small number of them to create an access for the site onto Coggeshall Road which must be in a location agreed by the highway authority.*
- 6.23 *Overall given the landscape character, distance to facilities and the lack of constraints, it is recommended that the site is allocated for development.*
- 6.24 Recommendation 38 - To allocate site KELV335, Monks Farm, for residential development as set out on the Inset Map.**
- 6.25 KELV336 Land off Coggeshall Road, Kelvedon
This is a small site of 0.198ha which is currently occupied by a business. It is proposed to relocate the business and build around 4 homes or live work homes on the land. The brownfield land to the rear of the site where the business is currently located is within the flood zone and is therefore being excluded from the site. The land being considered is therefore a relatively narrow strip of access road and green space adjacent to it.
- 6.26 *Parish Comments - This site is not objected to, however, there are concerns about access and egress.*
- 6.27 *Officer Comments - The site is situated within an area of medium landscape capacity to accommodate change and is well screened from the wider landscape. However, the site is on the opposite side of the road from any other residential development and would lead to an unnatural extension of the development boundary into the countryside. The brownfield element of the property is excluded from the site boundary due to its position within an area at risk of flooding. As such it is not recommended to include this site within an extended development boundary for Kelvedon.*
- 6.28 Recommendation 39 – That site KELV336 land off Coggeshall Road is not allocated for residential development**
- 6.29 KELV337 and KELV338 Land at London Road, Kelvedon - Submitted as a single site, together land to the north and south of London Road is proposed for residential development of 269 homes on a site of just over 35ha. Employment, education and open space are also being proposed, including

6.2ha on the site to the south of London Road which sits almost entirely within an area at risk of flooding.

- 6.30 Parish Comments - KELV337 – Land at London Road, between Crabb's Lane and Church Street: There is concern about access onto London Road and also about development going right up to the boundary of the current properties along London Road, especially as there is a height difference in the land, which could result in houses at the rear of the current properties being higher up and oppressive.
- 6.31 KELV338 – Land south of London Road, rear of numbers 61-95: This site is strongly objected to as it is in the flood plain.
- 6.32 *Officer View - The site is currently agricultural land and is within an area with a low landscape capacity to accommodate change. To London Road the site is screened by high hedges. Between the village and the site is an area at risk of flooding, as such there is a green space between the village and the site which means this development would feel slightly separate from the village. It should also be noted that, whilst not fundamental to the site, officers have been made aware of a covenant issue relating to a small part of the land. The site is more convenient for the A12, however is still separate from the rest of the village by the river. Crabbs Barn located adjacent to and bordered by the site on 3 sides is a popular wedding venue and may be ill suited to close residential neighbours.*
- 6.33 *The site scores well in the sustainability appraisal in relation to its location close to a local centre and health centre, as well the potential housing supply, but scores less well on loss of greenfield and agricultural land. However because of its landscape character, risk of flooding and distance to the railway station, it is not proposed to allocate the site for residential development.*
- 6.34 Recommendation 40 – That sites KELV337 and KELV338 at London Road are not allocated for residential development.**
- 6.35 'Deals' and land surrounding, adjacent to Kelvedon railway station
The site is currently allocated as a comprehensive redevelopment area in the Site Allocations and Development Management plan. It is currently a site for a new and used cars sale centre, adjacent to the main car park for Kelvedon station. The site offers very good potential for redevelopment including substantial additional car parking and public transport access, which would help to stop cars parking on Kelvedon High Street and causing congestion. If the employment use on the site was to end then it would be a very suitable site for a car park expansion.
- 6.36 Parish comments - No Parish comments have been received specifically on this site.
- 6.37 Recommendation 41 – That the Deals site and is surrounding is allocated as an area for employment and car parking.**

Feering

6.38 Parish Comments

Officers met with representatives from the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan groups and discussed the sites which had been submitted. No written comments have been subsequently submitted but at the meeting the Parish Council raised strong concerns about the infrastructure and facilities in the village, including roads and congestion, school capacity and the local doctor's surgery capacity. They also made reference to the neighbourhood plan as the key document that they wish to use to determine the best places for development within the village. The parish council will also be submitting comments following their next parish council meeting. These comments will be reported to Members at the meeting.

6.39 FEER227 The Feering Triangle - The site is just under 1ha and is vacant land, bordered on all sides by the A12 and its slip roads. It was previously a storage site for works carried out on the A12. It is proposed for employment uses of up to 20,000sq ft of B1, B2 and B8 employment space.

6.40 *Officer Comments - Whilst the site is previously developed it is located in the middle of a busy section of the A12, slip road and local road and as such is very constrained. Given the uncertainty around the A12 and the project currently underway by Highways England to widen the A12 it is not proposed to allocate this site at this time. It may again be required as part of the A12 improvement works and would prevent a compound being opened up within the countryside.*

6.41 **Recommendation 42– That the site FEER227, The Feering Triangle, is not allocated for residential development.**

6.42 FEER229 Land adjacent to the service station, London Road The site is 2.2ha and is currently a greenfield site adjacent to the existing petrol station. The land is being proposed for employment facilities including potential for a transport yard or depot and HGV parking in connection with the service station.

6.43 *Officer Comments - The site is in open countryside adjacent to the existing service station which includes roadside restaurants, hotel and petrol station. It is some distance from the development boundary and would only be accessible by private vehicle. Given the same uncertainty around the A12 improvement works as the above, it is not proposed to allocate this site.*

6.44 **Recommendation 43 – That FEER229 the land adjacent to the service station at London Road is not allocated for development**

6.45 FEER232 and FEER233 land south of Feering, west of the A12. - This site is being promoted by Crown Estates and totals around 80ha, 60ha of which are being proposed for development with the remaining element for recreational uses by the community. The site is proposed to be a comprehensive new community with homes, 4ha of employment development and a local centre for local community and retail facilities and education uses. A new road is also

being proposed through the site linking Inworth Road directly with the A12 junction. An outline application for up to 165 homes on part of the site is currently awaiting determination.

- 6.46 *Officer Comment - The site is a large site in a single ownership adjacent to Feering which is now considered with Kelvedon to be a service village. Proposed development of this scale will undoubtedly have an impact on the village, however Kelvedon and Feering are both incredibly popular villages with excellent public transport and road links to the wider network with a good range of day to day facilities. Alongside housing, including up to 30% affordable housing and starter homes as per policy requirements the site must include a link road between Inworth Road and the A12 junction. This would help to relieve congestion at the Inworth Road junction with London Road including traffic travelling from further afield to access the A12. In conjunction with the A12 scheme widening scheme improvements to the junctions with the A12 in the vicinity of this site will also be sought and could bring wider benefits.*
- 6.47 *The site circles a successful employment centre and further employment uses either adjacent to this site or along the A12 will be required from the site to facilitate local job opportunities which could be accessed by foot or cycle.*
- 6.48 *The site will be expected to provide a new site for a primary school or community hall as required and land for a new or enlarged doctor's surgery if requested. It would also provide other small scale local facilities which would be available within walking distance of the new and existing residents. High quality walking and cycling connections between this site and the existing village will be sought, including to Kelvedon railway station.*
- 6.49 *As well as open space, play space and allotments on the site, there is the opportunity for two major areas of open space to be passed to the village for community uses, with appropriate maintenance agreements in place.*
- 6.50 *Given its proximity to the A12, careful siting and design will be required to ensure that noise and pollution levels are within acceptable levels. As noted in the introduction to this report, there is a scheme currently being worked on by Highways England to widen the A12 including the section that passes this site. Highways England are not yet at a stage where they are able to provide us with any information on where or how this might happen in this vicinity (particularly with the A12 on stilts in this location) and therefore the eventual allocation could be subject to amendment.*
- 6.51 *The SA notes that the site has positive effects in terms of provision of affordable housing, education and community facilities as well as positive effects in relation to distance to public transport. However it scored less well in relation to landscape amenity and loss of agricultural land.*
- 6.52 FEE230 Land off Inworth Road, Feering - The site is around 2ha and is being proposed for a residential development of around 40 units on a currently greenfield site.

6.53 *Officer Comment - The site is a relatively small field located to the rear of modern properties on Kings Gardens. The site had been considered for allocation within the Site Allocations and Development Management but safe pedestrian access from the site to the village could not be secured and so it was not allocated. This site therefore can only come forward if it is included within the strategic growth location at FEER232/3 which will provide new pedestrian access routes into the village.*

6.54 Recommendation 44 - It is proposed that sites FEER232, FEER233 and FEER230 are allocated as a strategic growth location with the following supporting policy

6.55 *"Policy – Growth Location – Land to the south of Feering*

A Strategic Growth Location has been identified at land south of Feering and is shown on the Proposals Map. It is expected that this location will provide up to 1,000 new homes. Development would also expect to provide;

- Up to 1000 new homes of a mixed size and type appropriate to the area*
- Affordable housing as per the Councils requirement*
- Appropriate employment uses to support the new community*
- Location for a new primary school or community centre*
- Community facilities including a contribution to or location for new NHS facilities*
- Public open space and informal and formal recreation including a new county park to the south of the A12.*
- Safe cycle and pedestrian access between all parts of the development and the village.*
- Provision for a Gypsy and Traveller site*

A new link road between Inworth Road and the A12 junction, improvements to the A12 junction and local road improvements as required by Essex County Council.

The delivery of each facility shall coincide with the completion of different phases of development to ensure that local services are in place when they are needed.

Development proposals which would compromise the delivery of an identified strategic growth location will be resisted".

6.56 FEER228 Land at Wills Green, Feering - The site is 1.7ha and is being promoted for residential development of around 50 homes.

6.57 *Officer Comment - The site is a greenfield site which is located adjacent to and to the rear of properties off Wills Green. It is well screened from the wider landscape by a strong line of vegetation. However the site is located at a substantial distance from the main village and facilities and is separated by the railway line. The road is relatively narrow and becomes a national speed limit rural single lane road in the vicinity of the site. As such it is not proposed to allocate the site for residential development.*

6.58 Recommendation 45 – That site FEER228 land at Wills Green is not allocated for residential development

7 Earls Colne and Earls Colne Airfield

7.1 Earls Colne is a village named after the River Colne, on which it stands and is approximately 3 miles east of Halstead and 11 miles north east of Colchester.

7.2 Earls Colne Airfield was a World War II airfield approximately 1¼ miles from the village. It has been developed in the last 30 years with a number of uses that include a retained airstrip, industrial and business uses.

7.3 Current policy position - Earls Colne is recognised as a Key Service Village in the Core Strategy. The village has a good level of services and amenity provision including frequent public transport, a primary school and local shopping facilities. The village has a clearly defined development boundary that closely follows the built form.

7.4 Sites submitted and assessed previously - EARC 215 is located at Peek's Corner on Tey Road and has been previously assessed under the reference EAR16. The site has an area of 0.34 hectares.
EARC 217 is located on Halstead Road and has previously been assessed under the reference EAR4 and has an area of approximately 1 hectare.
EARC 218 is situated between Coggeshall Road and Tey Road and has previously been assessed under the reference EAR17 and EAR22X. The site has an area of 3.17 hectares.
EARC 221 is located on the land east of Monks Road and has previously been assessed under the reference EAR18. The site has an area of approximately 2.26 hectares.
EARC 222 has been previously assessed as part of EAR2 in the previous call for sites. The site is located in Station Road and has an area of 0.53 hectares.
EARC 223 has also been previously assessed as EAR2 and is located on land to the South of Riverside Business Park. The site has an area of 5.3 hectares.
EARC 224, previously assessed as part of EAR6 is located to the rear of Upper Holt Street and has an area of 0.98 hectares.
EARC 225 has previously been assessed under the reference EAR1. The site is located on the land south of Halstead Road and west of Nonancourt Way. The site has an area of 3.52 hectares.
EARC 226 has been previously assessed under the references EAR5 and EAR13. The site is located on land on Earls Colne Business Park and has an area of 6.66 hectares.
EARC 215 is located on a site at Peaks Corner, Tey Road and has previously been assessed as EAR16. The site has an area of 0.34 hectares.

7.5 New Sites

EARC 216 is situated on land adjacent to Lowefields, Tey Road. The site has an area of approximately 0.96 hectares.

EARC 219 is located on land to the rear of De Vere Road and currently forms part of Colne Green Farm. The area of the site is approximately 3.97 hectares.

EARC 220 is located on Burrows Road and has an area of 0.30 hectares.

Previously assessed sites

EAR3H – The site has been given outline planning permission and is located at the southern end of Station Road.

7.6 Parish Council comments

Support EAR3H (outline planning permission granted) and EARC225 but do not support any other suggested sites.

- 7.7 *Officer comments - Earls Colne is a Key Service Village as stated in the Core Strategy and this suggests that further development could be permissible. The village offers a range of facilities including shops, a library, and a primary school. Each sites specific context and merit is considered below;*
- 7.8 *EARC215 is located on Peek's Corner. It is a small site that is in open countryside. There is a suggestion that the site had a property upon the site until 1964 however the site has evidentially returned to nature. The development of the site would be highly visible from many aspects and there are no pedestrian paths along the single lane to Earls Colne. It is recommended that the site is not allocated.*
- 7.9 *EAR216 is located to the south side of Tey Road beyond the development boundary of Earls Colne. The site is a small front section of a large flat greenfield location. Development of this site would be highly visible from distance and could be seen to have a significant negative effect upon the visual character of Earls Colne and be detrimental to the approach from Tey Road. The proposed development of the site could be seen to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside and is not recommended for allocation. The SA found similarly that the development of the site could have a negative impact upon the conservation of environment.*
- 7.10 *EARC217 beyond the development boundary of Earls Colne is a prominent position of the entrance when arriving from Halstead. Adjacent to the site is a large green space and to the side the dwellings are set back a considerable distance which amounts to a pleasant open to the entry of the village. The development of the site is viewed to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside and specifically the visual impact of development upon the site could have a significantly detrimental effect upon the character of the locality. Similarly the site abuts the conservation area and the development of the site could negatively impact the locality. There is also a concern with the sites viability with regards to the roads network. The SA report also considered that the development of EARC217 may have an impact upon the historic environment.*
- 7.11 *EARC218 is located outside the development boundary to the rear of Upper Holt Street. The site contains a significant amount of tree preservation orders and adjoins the conservation area. The SA report suggested that there would*

be a negative effect upon Tilekiln Farm, a designated wildlife site. It is recommended that the development of the site would be considered backland development and an unwarranted encroachment into the countryside.

- 7.12 *EARC510 is located directly to the west of 218 and similar considerations lead to a recommendation for the site to not be allocated. The site also has particularly limited scope for improving access to the standard that would be required to facilitate development of any size. The SA report also suggested that the development of the site could have a significant negative effect upon Tilekiln Farm (a designated wildlife site).*
- 7.13 *EARC219 is outside the development boundary of Earls Colne. The site is particularly prominent on the approach to Earls Colne along Station Road and the development of the site would ultimately change the visual character of the area. It is suggested that the development of the site is an unwarranted encroachment into the open countryside and that the visual impact could have a detrimental effect upon the locality. It is therefore considered that the site should not be allocated.*
- 7.14 *EARC220 is located to the north of Burrow Road and is adjacent to the development boundary. The site is accessed by a single lane track and there is little scope for improvements to the road way to adequately facilitate development. The site is a greenfield site and the development of the site could be seen to be an unwarranted encroachment into the countryside. The SA found that EARC220 could have a negative effect upon a designated site.*
- 7.15 *EARC221 is site to the east of Monks Road and Hillie Bunnies and is predominately a greenfield site with a small element of previously developed land. The site could be seen to be an appropriate extension with well-established existing boundaries to the sites perimeters. The submission seeks to develop the site with approximately 50 homes. There has been concern expressed about the local road network, not directly adjacent to the site, but along Queens Road and Burrows Road which would be used to access the site from the High Street. These roads are relatively narrow with parking along both sides, however information submitted from the agent and discussions with Essex County Council have set out that the increase in traffic from the additional homes would be relatively small. The SA report stated that there could be an uncertain effect upon the conservation area and was highlighted the greenfield element of the site however it is likely that the impact upon the conservation area will be negligible and could be mitigated through an appropriate design. With the existing mature hedging that is in place it is also suggested that the development of the site will have an insignificant impact upon the wider Landscape Character of Earls Colne. Though the site does have a greenfield element the site is a logical extension to Earls Colne beyond the two sites with active planning permissions. The site has the least impact upon the wider landscape character and is located in close proximity to many of the village's services and facilities. It is recommended that the site is allocated for development of circa 50 homes.*

- 7.16 *EARC222 is a small a 0.53 hectare portion of a 5.3 hectare field to the north of Station Road. The site is not previously developed and outside the development boundary. There is no logical natural boundary to the site. The development of the site could be seen to have a potentially negative effect upon the character of the approach to the village and to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. This part of the village is also not particularly close to the amenities, services and facilities the village offers. The site is also adjacent to the conservation area. It is recommended that the site is not allocated.*
- 7.17 *EARC223 includes the entire field on which EARC222 is situated. The greenfield location is entirely outside the development boundary and is abuts the conservation area on two sides. Similarly to EARC222 there is a concern regarding the sites proximity to facilities and services and the development of this site could be seen to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. The development of this site could have a significantly negative effect upon the visual character of the village.*
- 7.18 *EARC224 is a greenfield site that abuts the village boundary. Located to the rear of the properties to the north of Upper Holt Road, the access to the site is problematic and located particularly close to a very sharp corner. The site is also entirely within the conservation area of Earls Colne and abuts the curtilage of several listed buildings. This site can be seen to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside and the impact upon the historic setting and conservation area more generally could be detrimental. It is recommended that the site is not allocated.*
- 7.19 *EARC225 is a site beyond to the south of Halstead Road is currently under the consideration of an outline planning application with the reference 15/01580/OUT. The site has been previously viewed favourably by the Council (previously referenced as EAR1). No new evidence has been brought forward to suggest that the site is not suitable for development and as previously suggested the site could benefit the village with a significant amount of secured open space. it is noted that the Parish Council also support the site and it is recommended that the site is retained for residential allocation with open space.*
- 7.20 *EARC226 is located on the eastern edge of Earls Colne Airfield. The site has previously been considered under the references EAR5 and EAR13. No new evidence has been brought forward to suggest the site is not appropriate for employment use therefore it is recommended that the site allocation is retained.*
- 7.21 *EAR3H is located on the north side of Station Road and currently subject to an outline planning permission reference 15/00934/OUT. Though the site was not resubmitted the Parish Council and officers still support the allocation of the site with the proviso that sufficient open space is considered. No new evidence has been brought forward to suggest that the site is not appropriate for development and the Parish Council is also in support of the site therefore it is recommended that the site is allocated for residential usage.*

- 7.22 Recommendation 46 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne be approved and that sites EAR3H, EARC225 and EARC221 are allocated for residential development with areas of open space allocated outside of the development boundary. All other sites are not recommended for allocation.**
- 7.23 Recommendation 47 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne Airfield be approved with the addition of site EARC226 as an employment site and within the industrial development limit as set out in the Appendix.**

8 White Colne

- 8.1** White Colne is a village and parish towards the north of the district and located on the north side of the River Colne, adjacent to Earls Colne. The village is located approximately 4 miles from Halstead.
- 8.2** **Current policy position**
White Colne is recognised as an ‘other village’ within the Core Strategy. The village has very little in terms of services and a lack of public transport but is located in close proximity to the facilities of Earls Colne.
- 8.3** **Sites that have not been previously assessed**
WHIC 418 is located on land at 102 Colchester Road and has a site area of 0.05 hectares. The site is proposed for housing.
- 8.4** **Submitted and assessed previously**
WHIC 419 is located to the south of Colchester Road, White Colne and has an area of 0.49 hectares. The site is proposed for housing. The site was previously assessed under the reference WHC3HALT.
- 8.5** **Parish Council comments**
Following a questionnaire to the parishioners of White Colne seeking views on the extension of the village development, we have had an overwhelming response stating that they do not wish to see any further development. Therefore the Parish Council does not recommend any sites for development and that the village envelope remains unchanged.
- 8.6** *Officer comments - White Colne is recognised as an ‘other village’ in the Core Strategy 2011. The village has very limited facilities and services. The sites submitted are considered on their individual site context below.*
- 8.7** *WHIC 418 is located on land at 102 Colchester Road and has a site area of 0.05 hectares. The site is outside the development boundary of White Colne and fronts onto Colchester Road. The site has no pedestrian access to the front of the site and the development of the site would undoubtedly alter the character of the entry to White Colne from Colchester. A development boundary change to this side of the road is not recommended.*

- 8.8 *WHIC 419 is located to the south of Colchester Road, White Colne and has an area of 0.49 hectares. The site does about the development boundary of White Colne however this could be seen to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. The development of the site would also lead to the coalescence of White Cone with a small cluster of properties further to the south side of Colchester Road to the west which is unfavourable.*
- 8.9 *The stretch of road has no pedestrian way and though, in this case, it is feasible that this could be incorporated into a scheme the site is not located in proximity to any services or facilities. The open nature of the site currently leads to a semi-rural characteristic to the vicinity and this could be affected detrimentally. The site is not recommended for allocation.*
- 8.10 **Recommendation 48 - That the Inset Map for White Colne, as set out in the appendix is approved, with no sites allocated for development.**

9 Ashen

- 9.1 Ashen is a village and civil parish in Essex. It is located about 5 miles east-southeast of Haverhill. The village lies to the south of the River Stour, which here forms the county boundary with Suffolk.
- 9.2 **Current policy position**
Ashen is classed as an 'Other Village'. This means that it is not one of the six largest Key Service Villages in the District. It has a development boundary, conservation area, formal recreation, and cemetery/churchyard. A protected lane is to the north.
- 9.3 **Sites submitted and assessed previously**
ASHE 102 – The site is fronting Foxes Road, Ashen and has previously been submitted with the reference ASH1 in 2014.
- 9.4 ASHE 103 – The site is south of Foxes Lane, Ashen. The site was submitted previously and had the reference ASH2.
- 9.5 ASHE 104 – Is the site to the west of Street Farm, Ashen Previously submitted under ASH3HALT and ASH5HALT and is with in the development boundary. The site has now been refused planning permission under the reference 15/01260/FUL as considered on the 26th of April 2016 by the Planning Committee.
- 9.6 **New sites**
ASHE 500 - This site is to the rear of New Bungalows, The Street, Ashen and currently outside the development boundary of Ashen.
- 9.7 **Parish Council comments - Principle and General Position regarding development at Ashen;**
Ashen is a small village and in planning terms lacks the normal requirements for sustainability, including employment, retail facilities, a school or a good

level of public transport. It would therefore not be an obvious candidate for growth to meet the general needs in the District.

- 9.8 There is also concern that before or as part of any additional development there is specific improvement made to the infrastructure serving the village. That would include the sewage treatment plant and parts of the surface water drainage system.
- 9.9 However, it is an attractive village with good amenities in the general area and a significant number of younger families. Over the plan period there is likely to be a local need in the village for those with particular ties to the village and its community to be housed. The Council believes that there is a case for identifying a site where affordable housing to meet the needs of the village could be provided. Whether that is by adjusting the village envelope or by simply identifying a site with a specific notation as potentially suitable for release to meet those needs, it is essential in our view that any residential development should be specifically committed to meeting those local needs, at least so far as the affordable element is concerned.
- 9.10 ASHE104 - The Council is very concerned by the proposed extension of the village envelope not only to include the immediate area of the two proposed dwellings but to encompass a much larger area including the rear of the listed Bishops Hall and the remaining garden of the grade 2* listed farmhouse.
- 9.11 The Council would object to the balance of the site being included in the village envelope, having regard to its relationship to the Street and the listed buildings and for the other reasons in its objection. In the Council's view, if permission is granted for the two new dwellings, the approach should be adopted as in other sectors of the village of drawing the boundary so that it is closely related to the built fabric in order to protect the openness and contribution of the larger gardens to the character of the village and the setting of the listed buildings.
- 9.12 Specific Response on Sites Ashe 102, 103 and 500:
Against that background our response on the specific sites is as follows. The Council considers that site Ashe 500 is unsuitable, whether considered on its own or in conjunction with the adjoining land in this part of the immediate village surrounds. It is exposed to view from within the village and from outside, particularly approaching from the north and east. Its development would seriously detract from the character and setting of the village and its amenity. There is no identified means of access to this backland site.
- 9.13 The Council considers that Ashe 103 is at an important gateway to the village and is exposed to view. Its development, whether in part or as a whole, would detract from the character and amenity of the village and its setting. It is therefore unsuitable for release to meet any identified needs.
- 9.14 Overall the Council has concluded that the preferred site to provide for the local needs of the village over the plan period would be site Ashe 102. While

it would undoubtedly change this part of the entrance to the village and involve the loss of greenfield land, the site is better enclosed and would broadly fit with the overall village pattern so that the effect on the character and setting of the village would be significantly less than in the case of the other sites. As set out above, if the village envelope is to be changed to include site Ashe 102, its development should be expressly contingent on the identification of local need specific to the village and effective provision made restricting any affordable housing element to meet that need.

- 9.15 *Officer comments - Ashen has a Village hall and church, but the village lacks core key services and facilities.*
- 9.16 *ASHE102 and ASHE103 are particularly visually significant sites within the street scene and would be seen as unwanted ribbon development expanding the village into the countryside.*
- 9.17 *ASHE 104 was approved by Members as a development boundary amendment to Ashen during the Site Allocations and Development Management document. However a subsequent planning application on the site was refused planning permission on the 26th of April 2016 by the Planning Committee, in line the recommendation of officers. The issues involved included the impact on the Conservation area and nearby listed buildings and a strong objection to development on this site was put forward by officers from Heritage England. Given this decision it is proposed to not include site ASHE4 within the development boundary, but return the boundary to that which is set out in the Local Plan 2005. If a planning appeal is submitted and development is subsequently approved on the site then this recommendation would be reviewed.*
- 9.18 *ASHE500 would constitute backland development in an area of the village that is largely linear in layout. The access to the site is also difficult and therefore planning policies view would be to not allocate the site.*
- 9.19 **Recommendation 49 - That the Inset Map for Ashen, as set out in the Appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for development in the village.**

10 Bulmer and Bulmer Tye

- 10.1 Bulmer is a village approximately 4 miles south west of Sudbury. Bulmer Tye is the southerly area of the parish located on the main A131 between Halstead and Sudbury whilst Bulmer itself is located at a cross roads of more rural roads.

10.2 **Current policy position**

Bulmer is considered an 'other village' in the Core Strategy. The majority of Bulmer village including The Street, Andrews Road and Vicars Orchard is within a conservation area. The cemetery/churchyard, informal recreation and the historic lane south of Sarecroft is also identified on the proposals map.

Bulmer has a hall and post office. Bulmer has a Village Design Statement and Parish Plan.

- 10.3 Bulmer Tye has two distinct parts. To the north is a development boundary which incorporates approximately 30 dwellings and the school. To the south the development boundary incorporates slightly more dwellings, allotment gardens and a public house. St Andrews Church of England Primary School (located off Old Church Lane) which includes part of the adjacent field identified as a nursery. Bulmer Tye is an 'other village' within the core strategy.

10.4 Sites that have not been previously assessed

BULM 156 is located north of 20 Church Road and has an area of 0.48 hectares.

BULM 157 is situated north of Hill crest, Church Road and has an area of 0.92 hectares.

BULM 158 is opposite the pond on the north side of Church road. The site has an area of 0.3 hectares.

BULM 159 is east of Church Road and has an area of 0.62 hectares.

BULM 161 is a site west of Smeetham Hall Lane and adjacent to Bulmer Cottage and has an area of 0.31 hectares.

BULM 162 is a located to the east of Smeethams Hall Lane, adjacent to Ridgcroft, and has an area of 0.34 hectares.

BULM 163 is located to directly to the south east of the Church Road and Sudbury Road intersection. The site covers an area of 1.9 hectares.

BULM 504 is located at Griggs Farm on Bulmer Street has an area of 0.87 hectares.

Submitted and assessed previously

BULM 155 has previously been assessed in the call for sites under the reference BUL1 The site is 1.17 hectares and east of St Andrews Rise.

10.5 Parish Council comments

Comments from Bulmer Parish Council to the District Local Plan - Bulmer
We would initially refer you to the Bulmer Village Design Statement (VDS) Approved in 2011 by Braintree District Council. Pages 11 to 15 are most relevant. This is followed by comments to each specific site.

- 10.6 Your attention is drawn to the VDS statements –
'Open spaces such as Church Meadow, Coe's Meadow, Plough Green, Lt. Dean Spinney, Allotments (Turnpike Piece) at Park Lane and the paddocks at Almshouse Field, Lower Houses and those behind the south side of Bulmer Street, should be protected and maintained.'
'Development outside the village envelopes should be resisted.'
'The two most popular comments, way above all others, were that "All views are important" and "Views including the Church". The latter was mostly general, but occasionally specific, such as "View of the church from the footpath behind Upper Houses".'
'Residents indicated in their responses to the questionnaire that the development of villages open space would be strongly resisted.'

‘Existing trees are a significant and valued feature of the parish. They should be protected as far as good sense and safety allow.’

‘A small development of residential development may be supported in the parish, but should be limited to 10 in one place to avoid damaging the character of the Parish.’

‘In-fill sites for new builds are preferred, but should wherever possible retain views to the open countryside, and where possible retain views to the open countryside, and where possible open up new vistas to the country side.’

10.7 Proposed site allocations

BULM 155 – Land East of St. Andrews Rise

Our previous response in 2012 was as follows and remains the same.

Do not support development of this site. This area has an important open space that provides views from many locations to the Grade I listed church of St Andrew’s at the heart of Bulmer. Comments during the Parish Council consultation have included, “it should be made an area of outstanding natural beauty”. Access to the site is poor. The site was proposed for affordable housing some time ago and was strongly opposed by local residents.

10.8 This although outside the village envelope & conservation area it has POSITIVE VISTA VIEWS from the Grade I listed church which is in the conservation area.

10.9 BULM 156 – Land North of 20 Church Road

This site is outside the village envelope and although it does not meet VDS recommendations, it is one of the preferred sites. More street parking could add to current issue of parking.

10.10 BULM 157 – Land North of Hillcrest

This site is outside the village envelope and does not meet VDS recommendations in that the views from BULM156 would be blocked to the east. Highway Issues – This currently has issues with off road parking near the bend and Bulmer School. Not a suitable site.

10.11 BULM 158 - Land North of Church Road (opp.pond)

Highway Issues – Around the blind corner with access to the Aubries Estate, street parking makes negotiation around corner dangerous. The corner has suffered from flooding in recent years. Potential drainage issues/sewage and surface water.

10.12 Objection of houses as they would be overlooking bungalows – Lack of light would be of concern and privacy and blocking view from outside village envelope to the bungalows. It is noted an outline Planning Application has been submitted for this site. Not a recommended site.

10.13 BULM 159 – Land east of Church Road (opp. Nos. 1-10)

Outside the Village envelope and does not meet the VDS recommendations Highway Issues – Around the blind corner with access to the Aubries Estate, street parking makes negotiation around corner dangerous. The corner has

suffered from flooding in recent years. Potential drainage issues/sewage and surface water. Not a suitable site.

- 10.14 BULM 160 – Land rear east no.s 1- 4 Ryes Lane
This site is outside the village envelope. Highway Issues – Access would be a concern, A131 accident black spot.
Not a suitable site.
- 10.15 BULM 161 – Land west of Smeetham Hall Lane (adj. Bulmer Cottage)
Outside the village envelope. Prime agricultural land. There are ancient oak trees near this site. Although it does not meet the VDS guidelines, this would extend the extent of the Village – but would be a potential favourable site as the potential owners would not be used to an open view to the east if BULM 162 is adopted.
- 10.16 BULM 162 – Land east of Smeetham Hall Lane (adj. Ridgecroft)
Outside the village envelope. Prime agricultural land. There are ancient oak trees near this site. Although it does not meet the VDS guidelines, this would extend the extent of the Village – but would be a potential favourable site as the potential owners would not be used to an open view to the west if BULM 161 is adopted.
- 10.17 Site 161 and 162 would be of the least obtrusive, of all the proposed sites.
Site 163 – Land east of Church Road/Sudbury Road (south of the Old Vicarage)
- 10.18 Outside the village envelope and does not comply with the VDS recommendations. Fronts onto the conservation area which describes this stretch along Church Rd as “POSITIVE VIEWS WEST”. Views of natural beauty to Sudbury and beyond. Potential highway Issues due to the crossroads with Sudbury Road, also many ancient trees. Not a recommended site.
- 10.19 BULM 164 – Land at junction of Church Road and A131
Our previous response in 2012 was as follows and remains the same.
The Parish Council stated that the „Village Design Statement (VDS) gives strong guidelines and views on how the village should be developed and the landscape of open fields and the trees retained. Parishioners” most frequent response was that they wished to stick to the VDS, and therefore objected to all four areas being developed.
- 10.20 Do not support development of this site. Concern about access issues. The site is thought to contain an earth work of ancient origins. The woodlands are also visually important. Highway Issues, accident black spot dangerous corner. Not a recommended site.
- 10.21 BULM 504 – Griggs Farm, Bulmer Street
The proposed site, half is inside the village envelope and the entire site is inside the conservation area. The site includes a “Buildings Townscape Merit” property, Highway Issues, access would be on a blind corner. This site meets

the criteria of the VDS by being an “infill” however access would be a potential danger. Not a suitable site.

10.22 BULM 551 Bulmer Tye – North of A131

The only Brown field site although outside the village envelope put forward and is noted it has recently put on the market for let.

Bulmer would welcome further industrial Business opportunities in Bulmer, rather than residential development. Does not meet the criteria of the VDS. Not a suitable site.

10.23 The Hennys', Middleton & Twinstead Parish Council have also commented upon the sites submitted within Bulmer:

10.24 We hereby submit that any further development of land to the South East of the A131 (BULM160) is highly ill advised. The junction and bends towards Halstead and Sudbury have suffered numerous accidents over the past years, many of which have caused injuries, some serious. In light of this history a number of traffic calming measures have been implemented, including signs warning of an “accident black spot” but haven’t succeeded in eradicating the problem.

10.25 The Parish Council considers that any additional development that would possibly involve children crossing the A131 to attend the village school brings an unacceptable risk of accident or injury in a known place of huge concern.

The Parish Council understands that a number of sites have been submitted to the North West of the A131 within the village area which would enable children to attend school in reasonable safety. We contend that any proposed development off Ryes Lane is inappropriate and totally unnecessary.

10.26 We also argue that additional vehicles egressing from the development would add to the hazards on an already dangerous part of the A131.

10.27 *Officer comments - Although Bulmer has several facilities it does not provide a grocery store or local employment and is not identified as a key service village. Any further proposed development would likely lead to a significant reliance on private transport. The village is in the Wickham Farmland Plateau which is characterised by hills and valleys which suggests the area is visually sensitive. However some additional housing could help support the local school.*

10.28 *BULM155 has been assessed previously and the planning officer and Parish Council had a general concern over the sensitivity to the site with regards to character of the village. The Landscape Character Assessment refers to features such as church towers as being distinctive in this area and the skyline of the valley slopes as visually sensitive, with potential new development being highly visible within views across and along the valley floor. There is reason why this concern would not still be relevant. The SA also stated that there could be a negative effect on historic environment. Whilst St Andrews Rise is a relatively modern development the views of the*

Church from the properties and in the wider landscape are clear. Given the importance of the setting of the Church and the importance which the community place on the historic views in the village, it is not proposed to allocate this site for development.

- 10.29 BULM156 abuts the edge of the southern development cluster of Bulmer Tye. If the site was to be developed this would be considered ribbon development and negatively impact the approach to the cluster from the north. The development would also lead to a further coalescence between the cluster and the cluster to the north.*
- 10.30 BULM157 is to the northern side of Church Road and adjacent to the development boundary. The site is outside the current development boundary and would amount to ribbon development.*
- 10.31 BULM158 is to the north of Church Road and to the west of the approach to the Auberries. This development would be considered to amount to ribbon development.*
- 10.32 BULM159 is to the west of Church Road and to the south east of the approach to the Auberries. The development of this site would amount to ribbon development along the northern side of Church Lane.*
- 10.33 BULM160 is located to the south of the A131 and to the rear of the built block to the east of Ryes Lane. The site is currently open agricultural land. The site is currently outside of the development boundary and would have a considerable impact on the approach to the cluster from the approach travelling east into the village. The site is currently open agricultural land. This site was deemed to potentially have a significantly negative effect on the proposed Dedham Vale extension. The proposal was also deemed to have a negative impact on a greenfield site.*
- 10.34 BULM164 is directly to the north of the A131 and to the east of Church Lane. The site has the constraint of currently including a Viking burial site within the grounds. Another concern is that the site is heavily wooded and the development of the site would potentially amount to a change in the character of the area that could be considered averse.*
- 10.35 BULM504 is on Bulmer Street and 0.87 of a hectare. The site is predominately outside the development boundary and this would amount to the site being inappropriate back land development. The proposed site is within the curtilage of a listed building. The SA report suggests that the appropriate development of the site could enhance the setting within the conservation area.*
- 10.36 It can be concluded that in principle, development of the area would to a significant extent be considered unsustainable due to the limited facilities within the Parish and the likely reliance on private modes of transport. The villages are situated on the border of the Wickham Farmland Plateau and the Stour river Valley border in the Braintree District Landscape Character*

Assessment. The document states 'The open skyline of the hilltops is sensitive to potential new development'.

10.37 Recommendation 50 - That the Inset Maps for Bulmer and Bulmer Tye are approved, as set out in the Appendix are approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

11 Colne Engaine

11.1 Colne Engaine is a village and a civil parish situated just north of the River Colne and of the larger village of Earls Colne. The village is approximately ten miles north-west of Colchester and 2.5 miles east of Halstead.

11.2 Current policy position - Colne Engaine is recognised as an 'other village' and has a development boundary that follows closely the built form of the village. The village has a church, school and playing field and a village hall. The central green is allocated as visually important open space and there is a linear local wildlife to the east of Shellcroft.

11.3 Sites that have not been previously assessed - COLE 184 is situated on the land south of St Andrews Cemetery and has an area of 0.33 hectares. COLE 185 is located on the land adjacent to The Grove, Pebmarsh Road and has an area of 0.06 hectares.

11.4 Submitted and assessed previously - COLE 186 is located on land at Brook Street between numbers 25 and 39 and has previously been assessed under the reference COL1. The site has an area of 0.56 hectares. COLE 187 is located on land at Brook Farm and has previously been assessed under the reference COL2. The site has an area of 0.80 hectares. COLE 507 is situated on Pebmarsh Road and has an area of 0.58 hectares. The site has previously been assessed under the reference COL4. COLE 188 has been previously assessed under the reference COL3 and is situated on the land to the east of Bluebridge Industrial estate. The site is going to be considered within the Halstead report due to the site effectively being a proposal for an urban extension to Halstead. This site will be assessed within the report pertaining to Halstead.

11.5 Parish Council comments - After very careful and detailed consideration the Parish Council respond as follows:
Colne Engaine is a rural parish of 394 dwellings with limited social infrastructure and restricted road communications. In considering future allocation of sites for residential development the Parish Council considers it appropriate to take into account the Braintree Landscape Character Assessment (as part of the new local Plan evidence base) which states that the Landscape Planning Guidelines for the Colne River Valley (which includes Colne Engaine) suggests the following planning guidelines are applied:
1. Consider the visual impact of new residential development and farm buildings on the open arable landscape.
2. Ensure that any new development is small scale, responding to historic settlement pattern, landscape setting and locally distinctive building styles.

3. Conserve and enhance the landscape setting of settlements.

Planning permission was granted in 2008 for the development of the former Bones Yard site to provide 13 additional dwellings. In 2015, 8 of these were developed and all except 1 have subsequently been sold. The 13 properties consented represent a greater than 3% increase. The 8 completed dwellings have been accommodated without unacceptable pressure on social infrastructure, albeit the full impact on surface water drainage from the site and street parking has yet to be seen.

- 11.6 The Parish Council recognises that Colne Engaine lacks housing that is accessible to younger residents and families. In order to ensure a balanced demography and the future vitality and sustainability of the Parish, the Council recognises the need for development that is suitable for younger residents and families.
- 11.7 The Parish Council requests that the new Plan should allocate the 5 unbuilt units at Bones Yard and would support further development of sites for smaller (2/3 bedroom) housing of a design standard consistent with the character of the Village. The Parish Council believes that development of up to a maximum of 10 dwellings of this type would be acceptable given the restrictions on social infrastructure and rural nature of the Parish. Combining this scale of development with the 5 properties on Bones Yard that are still to be delivered would represent an increase of 3.8% in the Plan period.
- 11.8 With specific reference to proposed sites the Parish Council would comment as follows:
COLE184 – The Parish Council have been made aware by the PCC of a need to extend the existing churchyard. The Parish Council acknowledges this requirement and would only support the allocation of this site on the basis it is for an extension to the Churchyard and would not support the site for housing or any other use.
- 11.9 COLE 187 – The Parish Council objects to sites that are proposed as suitable for development in areas at risk of flooding. The Parish Council expects that any assessment of flood risk should include an allowance for climate change (NPPF paragraph 99). In addition it is difficult to see how access to the site would be obtained and it would also appear that any development would be divorced from the settlement boundary.
- 11.10 COLE188 – The Parish Council is concerned that the inclusion of this site as part of the wider proposal for the Eastern extension of Halstead will cause increased traffic movement in the local area and a transference of vehicular movements into Colne Engaine. Roads between Halstead and Colne Engaine are rural and narrow with very few pavements, making it necessary for residents including children to have to walk on the roads that run through our village. Increased traffic will present an increase in environmental and safety risk if residents in Halstead seek to bypass central Halstead by coming across country to access major routes like the A120.

- 11.11 In addition, the Parish Council expects that a buffer or Green Gap would be identified between any proposed development to the East of Halstead and the Colne Engaine Parish. It is noted that one is shown on the plans between Halstead and Greenstead Green to the South. The Parish Council requests that to preserve the rural nature of Colne Engaine, a specific policy is included to this effect in the Plan.
- 11.12 The Parish Council do not consider that the parish, being small, rural and with limited infrastructure has sites that are suitable for consideration for the accommodation of gypsies or travellers.
- 11.13 *Officer comments - Colne Engaine is recognised as an other village by the Core Strategy 2011. The village has some facilities and services including a primary school, village shop and public house. However the facilities on offer would likely lead to new residents being highly reliant on personal modes of transport. Notwithstanding this each site has been considered upon the site specific context below;*
- 11.14 *COLE 184 is situated on the land south of the grade I listed St Andrews Church. The site is outside the development boundary and is part of a larger agricultural field. The development of the site would potentially have a significant negative impact upon the setting of the Church. The site submitted has no natural boundary to the south and could be seen to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. The site is not recommended for allocation.*
- 11.15 *COLE 185 is located on the land adjacent to The Grove, Pebmarsh Road and is located in open countryside. There is a small amount of dispersed development at this location. The Grove and the Orchard House are both grade II listed and the setting of the buildings could be compromised by further development. The site has no footpath access to any facilities. This could be seen to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside and is not recommended to be allocated.*
- 11.16 *COLE 186 is located on land at Brook Street between numbers 25 and 39 and has previously been assessed under the reference COL1. The site is greenfield and has no natural boundary to the south of the site. From Brook Field the site is arguably particularly prominent and the development of the site could be seen negatively impact upon the visual characteristic of the site and of this part of Colne Engaine. The site would lead to a coalescence of the built clusters to the south of Brook Street. The site is not recommended for allocation.*
- 11.17 *COLE 187 is located on land at Brook Farm and has previously been assessed under the reference COL2. The site is located within flood zone 2 and outside the development boundary of Colne Engaine. Development outside of the area at risk of flooding would mean development was isolated from the built development in the rest of the village. The site has no pedestrian access though it is close to existing pedestrian routes. The site is not recommended for allocation.*

11.18 *COLE 507 is situated on Pebmarsh Road the site is located outside the development boundary and has no natural boundary to the southwest perimeter. The development of this greenfield site would lead to a coalescence of Colne Engaine with a small cluster of dwellings to the north. The site is in a prominent position that is visible from across the valley and it is suggested that the development of the site could be detrimental to the landscape character of the locality and wider context.*

11.19 *COLE188 as it is located on the edge of Halstead was considered in that report.*

11.20 Recommendation 51- To approve the Inset Map for Colne Engaine, as set out in the Appendix and allocate no sites for development.

12 Gosfield

12.1 Gosfield is a village and parish located approximately 4 miles from Braintree, 2 miles from Halstead and within easy reach of the main towns of Colchester and Chelmsford. The village offers some facilities including public transport links to Halstead and Braintree. The village benefits from a number of local community facilities including a primary school, pub, community run shop and playing field.

12.2 Current policy position -Gosfield is recognised as an 'other village' within the Core Strategy. The village has a development boundary in place that closely relates to the built form. The central area of the village and land to the south are also covered by a conservation area. A local nature reserve sits adjacent to part of the village to the east and a large historic park and garden associated with Gosfield Hall abuts much of the west of the village.

12.3 Gosfield Airfield was proposed to be allocated for employment development in the 2014 Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. As part of that allocation structural landscaping was also proposed to isolate the site from the wider landscape.

12.4 Sites that have not been previously assessed

GOSF 242 is located on land adjacent to Canberra on Hedingham Road, Gosfield. The site has an area of 0.08 hectares.

GOSF 243 is located on the land between numbers 5 and 7 on Braintree Road, Gosfield and has an area of 0.22 hectares.

GOSF 247 is located on the land south of Hall Drive (adjacent to the playing field), Gosfield. The site has an area of 4.33 hectares.

GOSF 248 is located on land off of Nun's Meadow, Gosfield and has an area of 0.95 hectares.

12.5 Submitted and assessed previously

GOSF 217 is located at 10 New Road, Gosfield and has previously been considered under the reference GOS8X. The site has an area of 0.48 hectares.

GOSF 244 is located to the rear of 13 and 14 Park Cottages, Gosfield. The site has previously been assessed under the reference GOS9X and has an area of 0.68 hectares.

GOSF 246 is the site of the former Shell Oil Depot on Hedingham Road, Gosfield. The site has been previously assessed under the reference GOS10X. The site has an area of 1.65 hectares.

GOSF 249 is located on land at Gosfield Airfield. The site has been previously been assessed under the references GOS1/6E and GOS1EAlt. The site has an area of 21.3637 hectares.

GOSF 251 is located at The Limes, Gosfield and has been previously assessed under the reference GOS2. The site has an area of 1.00 hectares.

GOSF 252 is located on land to the north of Meadway (option A), west of the Hedingham Road, Gosfield. The site has been previously assessed under the reference GOS5 and has an area of 3.29 hectares.

GOSF 253 is located on the land to the north of Meadway (option B), west of the Hedingham Road, Gosfield. The site has been considered under the reference GOS5 and has a site area of 1.7320 hectares.

GOSF 554 is located to the north of Highlands, between Halstead and Hedingham Road. The site has an area of approximately 8 hectares and incorporates Shardlowes Farm and the land to the south.

12.6 Parish Council comments

Extracts from the Village Questionnaire conducted as part of the 2010 Parish Plan state;

- 12.7 Most of Gosfield residents have stated a preference for preserving the village feel and environment and new development not welcome. However, nearly one in five replies would like to see some development, with owner occupied houses, and bungalows for the elderly receiving the most support.

There does not appear to be strong support for social housing, but not massive opposition either. 100 people in favour should not be ignored.

Gosfield should remain a village environment, and if any development is agreed it should reflect the size and rural nature of the community.

There were also concerns expressed about the village infrastructure being able to cope with new development.

Only 18% of the replies were in favour of more housing in the village, just under 10% had 'no opinion' and 67% against.

- 12.8 Gosfield Parish Council has a development policy, agreed in October 2014, - The Council will look favourably at development schemes which
- Are limited in size
 - Incorporate a good mix of housing, with a possible bias towards starter and
 - affordable properties
 - Are more or less within the main body of the village
 - Come with tangible and significant benefits for the village infrastructure (footpaths, road crossing, amenity land, finance etc)

- 12.9 Gosfield Parish Council held meetings on the 17th Feb 2016, 21st March and the 4th of May to discuss the Parish Council's response to the BDC consultation. To summarise the council's response, it was decided that there were two sites that could potentially accommodate residential development in line with the Parish Council's policy. These were GOSF251, land south of the Limes, and GOSF253, land north of Meadway. There were, however some specific and some general concerns about each of the sites submitted which are set out below;
- 12.10 GOSF251 – any development would have to be mindful of the historic Lime trees which must remain.
- 12.11 GOSF253- access to any new development would be via Hedingham Road in view of the strong local opposition to any extra traffic worsening the congestion at the Meadway/Hall Drive and Hall Drive/The Street junctions.
- 12.12 Both these sites have two 'hard' boundaries and two 'soft' boundaries. The Parish Council would want to ensure control over the 'soft' boundaries to prevent further, possibly unwelcome, development. This could be by achieved in a variety of ways – eg. placing neighbouring land in trust for residents, neighbouring land to be held by the Parish Council, s106 agreements.
- 12.13 If approval is given, the Parish Council would insist the Parish Council policy is fundamental to any consideration of subsequent planning application(s).
- 12.14 The Parish Council policy would dictate that only one site is required.
- 12.15 GOSF246, former Shell depot. The Parish Council would be in favour of the site for industrial use only. It would be unsuitable for residential development – detailed response below.
- 12.16 The Parish Council's responses for each site are as follows:
- 12.17 GOSF217, 10 New Road. Not in favour. The site is not more or less in the main body of the village. Too small to offer the mix of accommodation required.
- 12.18 GOSF243, 5-7 Braintree Road. Not in favour. The site is not more or less in the main body of the village. Would constitute ribbon development. Too small to offer the mix of accommodation required.
- 12.19 GOSF 244, 13-14 Park Cottages. Not in favour. Although in the main body of the village, the site is too small to meet the requirements of our development policy. Would constitute backland development. Difficult to see how satisfactory access could be achieved.
- 12.20 GOSF246, former Shell depot. In favour of industrial use only. Residential development would be outside the village with no pedestrian access to the village. Would create a separate hamlet.
- 12.21 GOSF 247, land south of Hall Drive. Not in favour. The site is too large for our development policy and would adversely affect the green heart of the village. It would also impact on a sensitive area with views of two Grade I listed

buildings (the church and Gosfield Hall), a conservation area, historic park and gardens, and an area of special landscape interest.

- 12.22 GOSF 248, land off Nun's Meadow. Not in favour. Site too small to meet our policy and would constitute backland development.
- 12.23 GOSF 249, land at Gosfield airfield. Not in favour. The Parish Council are against any further development in open countryside. Serious concerns over potential increases in extra traffic and noise.
- 12.24 GOSF 251, land south of The Limes. This site could accommodate the Parish Council's development policy, but the historic Lime trees must be preserved. There are traffic concerns which would need to be addressed. There would need to be some mechanism in place to control the 'soft' borders of the site to deal with potential future, unwanted, development.
- 12.25 GOSF 253, land north of Meadway. This site could accommodate the Parish Council's development policy, but the Parish Council would want the access to be from Hedingham Road. There are serious concerns about traffic and congestion already at the junctions between Meadway/Hall Drive and Hall Drive/The Street and access through Meadway would make this worse. There would need to be some mechanism in place to control the 'soft' borders of the site to deal with potential future, unwanted, development.
- 12.26 GOSF 554, Shardlow's Farm. Not in favour. The site is not in the main body of the village and is too large for the Parish Council's development policy.
- 12.27 GOSF 242, land adjacent to Canberra Cottage, Hedingham Road. Not in favour. The site is outside the main body of the village and would constitute ribbon development. It is too small to accommodate Parish Council development policy.
- 12.28 *Officer comments - Gosfield is recognised by the Core Strategy as an 'other village'. The village has a clear and logical development boundary that closely follows the built form of the village. Gosfield includes several services and facilities including a primary school, village shop and church. There are several bus routes that run through the village however the service is arguably intermittent. Notwithstanding this in agreeance with the Parish Council any development put forward would likely need to be proportionate to the size of the existing village and not detrimental to the unique character of the Gosfield. All the sites have been assessed however on their own site specific context below:*
- 12.29 *GOSF 217 is located at 10 New Road site is located outside the development boundary and is not located near any of the village facilities. The site is enclosed by properties to the west on Braintree Road and a cul-de-sac configuration to the south on New Road. The site currently is being used for B2 business use. The site is not viewed favourably for residential redevelopment as the site sits outside the development boundary and would be considered to be a backland development. The access to the site is also not favourable along Braintree Road with limited visibility splays. The site is not recommended for allocation.*

- 12.30 GOSF 242 is located on land adjacent to Canberra on Hedingham Road the site is currently a residential garden. The site is located outside the development boundary which is some distance from the site on this side of the road and is therefore considered to be countryside. The extension of the urban block is deemed to be ribbon development and unfavourable. The development of the site could have a potentially detrimental effect upon the character of the area. The site is not recommended for allocation.
- 12.31 GOSF 243 is located on the land between numbers 5 and 7 on Braintree Road. The site is beyond the development boundary of Gosfield and is a not previously developed. The site is a natural break in the linearity of the built form to the east side of Braintree Road and the infill of the site would lead to potential coalescence of urban blocks. The development of the site can be considered to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. The site is not recommended for allocation.
- 12.32 GOSF 247 is located on the land south of Hall Drive, adjacent to the playing field, and borders the north side of Church Road. The site is located outside the development boundary of the village and entirely within the conservation area and the area of registered historic park and garden. The site is in close proximity to several listed buildings including Gosfield Hall. The development of the site would likely affect the setting of Gosfield Hall and have a significantly negative effect upon the visual characteristic and setting of the village. The SA report considered that the site would have a negative effect upon the biological and geological environment as the site is greenfield and the report suggested the development of the site could have a negative effect upon the conservation area and the listed buildings within the vicinity. It is visually isolated from the rest of the village by the playing fields. The site is not recommended for allocation.
- 12.33 GOSF 248 is located on land off of Nun's Meadow. The site is outside the development boundary and located to the rear of the properties along Church Road. The site is also in close proximity to the conservation area. The SA considered the development of the site to be potentially negative due to the greenfield location. It is recommended that the site is not allocated for due to the reasons aforementioned and a concurrence that the development of the site would amount to an inappropriate backland development into open countryside.
- 12.34 GOSF 244 is located to the rear of 13 and 14 Park Cottages, Gosfield. The site is also located close next to the allotments. The site is located outside the development boundary down a small track. The access to the site is not favourable with particularly limited visual splays. The SA report was uncertain if the site would have a negative effect upon the historic environment and heritage assets. The site is located within the conservation area and due to the limitations with regard to the access and potential for the site to be viewed as a backland development; it is recommended the site is not approved for allocation.
- 12.35 GOSF 246 is the site of the former Shell Oil Depot on Hedingham Road, Gosfield. The site has been previously assessed under the reference

GOS10X. The site previously developed but is located beyond the development boundary and there is no access by footpath to the village. The site is currently well screened from the road by a mature hedge. Whilst the site is not proposed for allocation due to its distance from the development boundary, due to its brownfield nature it may be come forward separately.

- 12.36 GOSF 251 is located on the south side of the Limes and is outside the development boundary. The site is entirely within the conservation area and includes a large group of trees that are subject to tree preservation orders. The SA report considers that the development of the site is unfavourable due to the greenfield location. Though the site is located in an area adjacent to the development boundary it is unlikely that any development of the site would not have a detrimental effect upon the visual characteristic and the large group of TPOs on site would severely limit any opportunity for development to the site. It is suggested that if the site was to be developed; the north east section of the site would not be feasible for development and that the strip of Lime Trees should be left with as currently therefore only allowing a smaller portion of the site to be developed to the south end of the site. This would likely have very little relationship with the current built form of the village and it is further suggested that it would likely negatively impact upon the setting of the Lime Trees which once lined the Road to Gosfield Hall. Though the Parish Councils views have been taken into account with regards to the site it is suggested that the site should not be allocated.
- 12.37 GOSF 252 is located on land to the north of Meadway (option A), west of the Hedingham Road, Gosfield. The site has been previously assessed under the reference GOS5 and has an area of 3.29 hectares. The southerly portion of the site is also being proposed with an area of 1.73 hectares under the reference GOSF253. The site is relatively well contained to the northern perimeters with thick wooded areas however the perimeters shown to where the development would end (in both sites submitted) have no natural boundary to the rest of the field and there is a concern similar to that of the Parish that there could be further unwanted development coming forward.
- 12.38 The existing boundary to the site along Hedingham Road includes a substantial hedge that when an access of the sort needed to facilitate such development would require large amounts of the hedging to be removed for the access and likely a significant amount more for the visual splays required. It is therefore suggested that access from Hedingham Road would not be recommended. The site is also adjacent to a listed building and there is a concern that development of the site would detrimentally affect the setting of the building. The site is not recommended for allocation.
- 12.39 GOSF 554 is located to the north of Highlands, between Halstead and Hedingham Road. The site is outside the development boundary however abuts the boundary to the south and east sides. The site is particularly prominent from the entry point to Gosfield from the north side of Hedingham Road and the development of the site could be seen to be an unwanted encroachment into open countryside. The site is predominately green field and also contains a listed barn. The visual character of the entry to the village would be significantly changed and the coalescence between Shardlowes

Farm and Gosfield is recommended to be resisted. The site is not recommended for allocation.

- 12.40 *GOSF 249 is located on land at Gosfield Airfield. Part of Gosfield Airfield was proposed to be enclosed by an industrial development limit for the first time in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. The site is located in open countryside and the effect upon the visual characteristic of the site could be considered to be detrimental. The SA report found the found the site to have a negative effect with regards to the greenfield location and sustainability issue generally. The report considered the site to have a significantly negative effect upon the Landscape Character of the area. The recommendation is in concurrence with the consideration of the Parish and the SA. The site could have a detrimentally negative effect upon the landscape character and the development of a greenfield location in open countryside is unfavourable. The site is not recommended for allocation.*

12.41 Recommendation 52 - To approve the Inset Map for Gosfield, as set out in the Appendix and to not allocate any sites for development.

13 Silver End

- 13.1 Silver End is a village located approximately 5 miles to the southeast of Braintree and 5 miles to the north of Witham. The village includes some prime examples of modernist architecture and is the former location of Crittall windows, historically a larger employer within the District.
- 13.2 Current policy position** - Silver End is recognised within the Cores Strategy as a Key Service Village. However as per the Local Plan sub-committee meeting on the 14th of March 2016, it is proposed that Silver End is no longer to be viewed as a key service village, due to its more limited facilities, lack of employment and more limited public transport. The village has a clearly defined development boundary that closely follows the curtilage of the perimeter properties of the village. The village also includes a conservation area that covers the majority of the central area of the village and this is subject to a further Article 4 direction. There is a small section of the village that is within the flood zone to the south of Temple Lane.
- 13.3 Sites submitted and assessed previously** - SILV383 is a site previously assessed under the reference SIL5. The site is located to the west of the properties on the south side of Western Road and incorporates the land to the rear of the properties on the eastern side of Western Close. The site has an area of 2.81 hectares.
SILV388 has previously assessed under the reference SIL6. The site has an area of 3.54 hectares and has been proposed for mixed usage across residential, employment and community use.
SILV524 is a site situated on the land southeast of Magdalene Crescent and has an area of 2.39 hectares.

13.4 New Sites

SILV384 is located at White Heads Farm, Cressing Road. The site has an area of 5.05 hectares.

SILV385 is a site located on land to the west of Boars Tye Road. The site has previously been submitted under the reference SIL1 and has an area of 2.27 hectares.

SILV 386 is a site located to the east of Boar Tye Road, between Rolphs Cottages and Bretton. The site has an area of 2.24 hectares.

SILV387 is located on Boars Tye Road, adjacent to the allotments. The site has an area of 0.17 hectares.

SILV389 is located on the northern side of Western Road. The site has an area of 16.81 hectares.

SILV390 is located at Egypts Farm on Boars Farm Road. The site has an area of 8.34 hectares.

- 13.5 Parish Council comments - The Parish Council seek for the village envelope to remain unaltered with no further development beyond the perimeter. This is particularly important as Silver End is a conservation area and needs to be protected. Full support is given to brownfield sites that are still to be developed.

- 13.6 *Officer comments - Silver End is now considered as an 'other village' which correctly represents the limited facilities and services available within the village. As the village is recognised as an 'other village' there is no specific requirement for further development within Silver End. Site specific considerations are made below;*

- 13.7 *SILV383 is a site previously assessed under the reference SIL5. The site is located to the west of the properties on the south side of Western Road and incorporates the land to the rear of the properties on the eastern side of Western Close. The site has an area of 2.81 hectares. The site is effectively a backland development of the properties on Western Road and the development of the site could be seen to be an inappropriate extension into open countryside, distant from the main village facilities. It is recommended that the site is not allocated for housing.*

- 13.8 *SILV384 is located at White Heads Farm, Cressing Road. The SA report suggested that there were some advantages to the site with regard to proximity to some facilities such as the GP surgery and within walking distance of several bus stops. The assessment also found that there would be a negative effect on the highways with regard to access. Western Lane is a single track narrow road, completely unsuitable for additional traffic. The site was also found that the site could have a potentially negative effect upon the conservation area. 9.1% of the site is also within flood zone 3. The site was also not favoured within the report with regards to the site being greenfield and was found to have a significant negative effect on the loss of good quality agricultural land as the site is entirely grade 1 and 2 quality agricultural land. The site is located outside the current development boundary of the village and it could be considered that the development of the site could be viewed*

as an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. It is recommended that the site is not allocated for development.

- 13.9 *SILV385 is a site located on land to the west of Boars Tye Road. The site has an outline planning permission permitted under the reference 15/01004/OUT. It is suggested that as the site has an active outline planning permission the site has been considered to be suitable for the development sought and should be allocated as such.*
- 13.10 *SILV 386 is a site located to the east of Boar Tye Road, between Rolphs Cottages and Bretton. The site has an area of 2.24 hectares. The site is outside the development boundary and is part of a large field. The site is in a particularly prominent position on the entrance to Silver End, and the development of the site would have a negative impact upon the character of the village; particularly the rural nature of this northern part of the village. The site has not been previously developed and it is suggested that the development of this site would amount to an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside with a negative effect upon the visual character of the village.*
- 13.11 *SILV387 is located on Boars Tye Road, adjacent to the allotments. The site has an area of 0.17 hectares. The site is within the conservation area of Silver End and currently being used as amenity land. Though the site is within the development boundary there are concerns over the impact upon the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings that surround the site to the eastern and southern sides. The access to the site is also not deemed to be sufficient. However the site is within the development boundary and though it is not recommended for allocation the site could come forward for development through the normal planning process.*
- 13.12 *SILV388 has previously assessed under the reference SIL6 and allocated previously as a regeneration area. The SA report found that development could have a positive effect upon the appearance of the site. No additional evidence has come forward to suggest that the site is now not viable and therefore considering the aforementioned and the Parish Council's commentary, it is suggested that the site is retained as an allocation. The site has stood vacant for a number of years and is very important in Silver End, as being the site of the formal Critical works and its position within the centre of the Conservation area. Redevelopment of the site continues to be strongly encouraged and the Council continues to do everything it can to work with the landowner and bring this site forward. Given the work that has been carried out to date, the scheme is likely to be a residential led development and as such it is proposed to amend the allocation from regeneration to residential. It is expected that appropriate community facilities would be provided as part of the development.*
- 13.13 *SILV389 is located on the northern side of Western Road. The site has an area of 16.81 hectares. The site is currently subject to a live planning application with the reference 15/00280/OUT. The Outline application is for residential development of approximately 350 dwellings. The site is being*

taken to appeal by the applicant for none determination and the decision whether to grant planning permission will now be made by the planning inspectorate. Notwithstanding this the application was considered by the planning committee and the councillors decided that if they were to be making the decision they would have refused the application in line with the considerations of the development management officer and Parish Council. Planning policy also concurs wholly with the findings of the report and would suggest that the site is an unsustainable and unwarranted encroachment into open countryside. It is recommended that the site is not allocated.

- 13.14 *SILV390 is located at Egypts Farm on Boars Farm Road. The site has an area of 8.34 hectares. The SA report found that the site could have some positive attributes such as the proximity to some local services and to the bus routes to Braintree. However the report also found that the site was not located in proximity to any major employment areas and not within a close distance to a primary school. The SA also suggested that the development of the site would have a significant negative effect with regards to the loss of good quality agricultural land.*
- 13.15 *SILV524 is a site situated on the land southeast of Magdalene Crescent and has an area of 2.39 hectares. The SA report suggests that the site could have a significantly high risk of flooding, with 33% of the site being located within flood zone 3. It was also considered that the site is adjacent to the conservation area and that the development of the site could be viewed positively with regard to this aspect. The landowner is suggesting two points of access for the site, both of which are very narrow and constrained, unsuitable for the development being proposed.*
- 13.16 *Though the Carpark at Sheepcotes Lane has not been resubmitted as the site was previously assessed and allocated within the last call for sites under the reference SIL7H and there is an active planning application on the site, it is suggested that the site is carried forward as a residential allocation.*
- 13.17 Recommendation 53 - That the Inset Map for Silver End, as set out in the Appendix, is approved and that only sites SILV388, SILV385 and SIL7H are allocated for residential development.**

14 Great Yeldham

- 14.1 Great Yeldham is a village in north of the district approximately 6 miles from the Suffolk border. The village is in close proximity to Little Yeldham, Tilbury Juxta Clare, Toppesfield, Stambourne, Ridgewell, Sible Hedingham, Castle Hedingham, Halstead and Sudbury.
- 14.2 Current policy position** - Great Yeldham is recognised by the Core Strategy as an 'other village'. The village has a development boundary that follows the perimeter of the built form logically. Some of the village is also within the flood plain and there is a conservation area that relates to the historic core. The village has a good range of facilities including a small shop, takeaway, playing field and pubs.

14.3 Sites Considered;

GRYE 275 is situated on the land at the Hunnable Industrial Estate. The site has been previously assessed under the reference GRY5X and has an area of 2.19 hectares.

GRYE 278 is located on the land to the north of Highfields (Beards Field). The site has an area of 2.45 hectares and has been previously assessed under the reference GRY2.

GRYE 271 is located at Plants That Grow, Ridgewell Road and has an area of 0.69 hectares.

GRYE 272 is situated on land at Newcombes, Poole Street. The site has an area of 1.15 hectares.

GRYE 273 is located on land at Leeway and Windermere Cottages, Poole Street and has an area of 0.75

GRYE 274 is located on land at Nuns Walk Field and has an area of 2.06 hectares.

GRYE 276 is located on land west of Nuns Walk Field and has an area of 3.53 hectares.

GRYE 277 is located on the land to the north of Little Hyde Road (Blackberry Field and has an area of 5.79 hectares.

14.4 Parish Council Comments

The Parish Council does not support GRYE271, GRYE272, GRYE273, GRYE276, GRYE277, GRYE278 nor GRYE505. The Parish also stated they do not support CASH505 which is the site submitted at Colne Valley Railway. The Parish council also stated that GRYE274 and GRYE 275 have received outline planning and will create up to an additional 90 dwellings for the village.

- 14.5 The Parish Council **does not want** any other dwellings within the village envelope. In addition, to the 90 dwellings already approved, the Parish Council is concerned that the rapid development and expansion on the character of the village through large housing estates with a standardised design approach will impact on the character of the village that has developed slowly and organically over time. Any additional dwellings will have a severe impact on the physical and social infrastructure to meet the demand arising from large number of new residential developments.

- 14.6 The Parish Council does not consider any sites in Great Yeldham suitable for gypsy and traveller pitches. A travellers site is already located a mile away from the village.

- 14.7 *Officer comments - Great Yeldham is recognised as an 'other village within the Core Strategy 2011 and is no under no specific requirement for growth. Planning officers concur with the views of the Parish council that the services and facilities within the village are limited and that further development beyond that previously allocated would not be favoured. The village also has limited public transport provision to key service villages and main towns within the district. Notwithstanding this the specific merit of each site submitted has been considered on their own contextual merit below.*

- 14.8 *GRYE 275 has been previously assessed and was approved for inclusion in the Site allocations and Development Management Plan. The site has been given outline planning application with the reference 14/01254/OUT.*
- 14.9 *GRYE 274 has been previously assessed and was approved for inclusion in the Site allocations and Development Management Plan. The site currently has an active planning application with the reference 15/01040/FUL. No new evidence has been brought forward to suggest any reason why the site should not be retained.*
- 14.10 *GRYE 271 is the site of 'Plants That Grow' on Ridgewell Road. The site is not within the development boundary of Great Yeldham. The site is situated in a prominent position in open countryside and development of the site would undoubtedly have an effect upon the rural characteristic of the area. The site is also located upon a stretch of the road that is subject to 50 miles per hour speed limit closely followed by the national speed limit which is not favourable for increased movements on and off of the A1017. The site also lacks pedestrian access. It is recommended that the site is not allocated.*
- 14.11 *GRYE 272 is situated on land at Newcombes, Poole Street (opposite Cooksferry Farm). The site is outside the development boundary of Great Yeldham and therefore open countryside policy applies. The site is located some distance from any services within Great Yeldham and there is no pedestrian way to this side of the road which would require the prospective occupants to cross in a 40 mph zone. The site currently is heavily screened from the road with a mature belt of trees running the perimeter to the road any development upon the site would likely have a detrimental impact upon landscape character of the locality. There is also a concern that any development upon the site would detract from the setting of Cooksferry Farm which is a grade II listed building. It is recommended for the reasons set out above that the site is not allocated. A number of planning applications have been refused for development on the site.*
- 14.12 *GRYE 273 is the land attached to Leeway and Windermere Cottages which are located on Poole Street / Dicketts Hill. The site is located beyond the development boundary of Great Yeldham and open countryside policy would apply. The site is currently accessed via a small private access that is not sufficient to support further development. The site is not located in close proximity to any of the services and facilities the village offers and there is no pedestrian way linking the site to those in Great Yeldham.*
- 14.13 *GRYE 276 is located on land west of Nuns Walk Field and abuts the village envelope. The site is disproportionately large for the level of development that the Parish Council would like within the village could put substantial strain upon the existing services within the village. There is also a concern of how the site would impact upon the character of the area. The site would appear to be a section of a much larger field with no natural boundary to the development proposed. Access to the site is suggested by the submission to presumed to be from an extension of the Nuns Walk development that has already been allocated. There is a significant concern with this proposal as the access is suggested to come from the new Nuns Walk site that is currently*

pending an application and the conclusion is that the site is not recommended for allocation.

- 14.14 *GRYE 277 is located on the land to the north of Little Hyde Road and is known as the Blackberry field. The site is a greenfield site that abuts the village envelope. The site is a portion of a field that has no natural boundary to the eastern side. The site is also located some distance from the limited services and facilities on offer in Great Yeldham. The site is not recommended for allocation as it is deemed to be an unwarranted encroachment into the open countryside.*
- 14.15 *GRYE278 is located on the land to the north of Highfields (Beards Field). The site is greenfield and abuts the development boundary. Though the site offers some containment, the development of the site would lead to coalescence between Great Yeldham and a small cluster to the north of the village along Tilbury Road. The development of the site could also lead to a change in character on the approach to the village from Tilbury Road and this is unfavourable. In conclusion the development of this site could be seen to be an unwarranted encroachment into the open countryside and therefore the site is not recommended for allocation.*
- 14.16 Recommendation 54 - The Inset Map for Great Yeldam as set out in the Appendix be approved and that sites GRY274 and GRY275 allocated for development.**

15 Terling and Fairstead

- 15.1 Terling is a village approximately 5 miles to the west of Witham. The village has the River Ter running north to south and some key facilities. Fairstead is approximately 2.8 miles from Terling and contains around 15 houses and some agricultural buildings.
- 15.2 Current policy position** - Terling was designated as an 'other village' in the 2011 Core Strategy and has two development boundaries and a conservation area that incorporates both of the clusters of development either side of the river. There are numerous sports facilities and open spaces which are protected as such along with the school, allotments and 2 churchyards. Several key areas of green are protected as visually important open space. A local wildlife site abuts the development boundary alongside a large area of historic park and gardens associated with Terling Place. Four of the roads into the village are protected lanes.
- 15.3 Fairstead is considered by the Core Strategy as 'open countryside'. Development within the countryside is to be severely limited.
- 15.4 The villages are within the Terling Farm Plateau is stated in the Landscape Character Assessment to be sensitive to change and that the landscape in particular is sensitive to the increased traffic flow associated with new development.

15.5 Sites

Two sites were submitted previously for consideration but neither site has been resubmitted in the latest Call for Sites.

15.6 Parish Council Comments - No Parish Comments have been received – if they are received prior to the committee a verbal update has been recorded.

15.7 Officer comments - *Terling is a relatively large village with a fair range of day to day facilities, however its relatively isolated rural position and many narrow access lanes make it an unsuitable location for major development.*

15.8 Recommendation 55 - The Inset Map for Terling as set out in the Appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for development.

That Fairstead remains a village within the countryside.

16 Foxearth

16.1 Foxearth is a village on the Essex side of the Border with Suffolk. It is located between Long Melford and Cavendish.

16.2 Current policy position

Foxearth is identified as an 'other village' within the Core Strategy. The village has a development boundary that closely follows the built form and the majority of the village is within a conservation area. Central to the village is an area of visually important open space, with the churchyard and playing fields being protected as such.

16.3 Submitted and assessed previously

FOX 236 is located on the land adjacent to Glebeside on School Street. The site has an area of 0.11 hectares and is currently agricultural land looking for potential residential development.

16.4 Parish Council Comments - No Parish Comments have been received. If any are received prior to committee these will be verbally reported by officers.

16.5 Officer comments - *Foxearth is a small village with limited facilities and significant reliance on private transport is required for access to the key facilities needed for day to day living. The site is also located in the Stour River Valley character assessment area which recognises the adjacent area as sensitive to change. The development proposed is outside but adjacent to the current development boundary and is relatively self-contained, it would be deemed an unwarranted expansion into open countryside and detrimental to the character and approach to the village.*

16.6 Recommendation 56 - That the Inset Map for Foxearth, as set out in the Appendix, be approved and that no sites are allocated for development.

17 Liston

17.1 Liston is a Parish on the Essex side of the Border with Suffolk. There is a church but no other community facilities. The Parish is one of the smallest in Essex and shares a Parish Council with the neighbouring Foxearth.

17.2 Current policy position

Liston does not have a development boundary and is therefore located within the countryside.

17.3 Sites that have not been previously assessed

LIST 339 is a site known as Stafford Park, Liston. The site has been previously assessed under the reference LIS1. The area of the site is approximately 30.8 hectares.

17.4 Parish Council comments

No Parish Council comments have been submitted. If any are received prior to committee these will be reported verbally by officers.

17.5 *Officer comments - In principle the further development of Liston is unsustainable due to the significant reliance on private transport that would be required for access to the key facilities needed for day to day living. The site is also located in the Stour River Valley landscape character assessment area which is visually sensitive to change.*

17.6 *Site LIST339 is a large site which is situated across the boundary between Essex and Suffolk. It sits in a relatively isolated rural position with poor quality roads and virtually no access to facilities or public transport. The site had been the home of chemical and fragrance works for at least 100 years. A number of buildings associated with that use remain on the site and there is some low level occupation of some of the better preserved buildings. The site is contaminated due to its previous uses and a large landfill site is located to the Suffolk side of the boundary. The River Stour runs through the site and therefore much of the site is also at risk of flooding. A triple SSSI is also present in close proximity to the site and would be sensitive to changes in the water course and development here.*

17.7 *The site is currently pending consideration of a planning application and due to the complex nature of issues related to the site including contamination, it is recommended that the site continues to be dealt with in that way; taking advantage of more detailed consultations with statutory and non-statutory consultees.*

17.8 Recommendation 57 - That Liston remain as a village within the countryside and that the site LIST339 continues to be determined through the planning application process.

18 Hatfield Peverel

- 18.1 At their meeting on the 13th April, Members asked for the consideration of HATF314 land of Stonepath Drive and HATF312 the Vineyards to allow additional time for the neighbourhood plan group to consider the sites in the village.
- 18.2 The officer recommendation at the 13th April meeting was to allocate approximately 4.6ha of land off Stonepath drive for residential development, providing that the majority of the site be passed to the community for an open space/wildlife area. Officers did not recommend the inclusion of the Vineyards site because of the uncertainty around potential access to the site and whether that is suitable.
- 18.3 A meeting was held between officers and the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan group to discuss potential allocations around Hatfield Peverel. The primary discussion took place regarding the suitability of the Vineyard site, and the future widening of the A12 featured heavily in the conversation, with concerns about its route and what impact it may have on the site, as well as allocation at Sorrells Field.
- 18.4 The future of the Arla Dairy site was also discussed and the group and Parish Council were supportive of development but felt that if it were to come forward then other allocations would not be necessary. The site has not been submitted for consideration for alternative uses and was proposed to be 'white land' within the development boundary.
- 18.5 Following this meeting a further response from Hatfield Peverel Parish Council has been received and this is set out below;
- 18.6 *At the meeting on the 11th it was recommended that an up to date traffic assessment be submitted if The Vineyards was put forward, the brief for such to include the A12 widening,*
- 18.7 *Unfortunately, due to the time constraints imposed which do not allow a proper valid assessment to be carried out, the promoter of site and indeed the Parish Council, have been unable to commission an up to date Highway Review.*
- 18.8 *However, Intermodal have provided a letter of affirmation dated 13th May 2016 that their Highway Review undertaken in 2013 still stands, and which is attached together with their original Highway Review dated 19th February 2013.*
- 18.9 *The promoter of the site has advised there is absolutely no difficulty in being able to move any development at The Vineyards further back from the A12 to take account of any road widening and the increase of noise/pollution as the company owns the whole site. They are happy to consider any part of the site.*

Stonepath Drive HATF314

- 18.10 *The Parish Council continue not to support the allocation of this site in the Call for Sites for the reasons previously given. The Parish Council would urge the Sub Committee to consider residents representations in relation to this meadow, and the fact that it is an area identified in the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan to be protected.*

Arla Dairy

- 18.11 *The Parish Council acknowledge that this site is not within the Call for Sites, and therefore cannot be considered on the 25th May. However, we understand that following the public consultation period of the Local Plan, landowners and developers will have the opportunity to put forward alternative sites.*
- 18.12 *The Parish Council would therefore request that if this site is put forward following the public consultation period, the Sub Committee consider and substitute this site for the sites previously agreed upon which is essential for the village long term to ensure there is no over development. A brownfield site must take priority over any greenfield site for development within the Parish.*
- 18.13 Officers have also received a number of comments directly from members of the public regarding the site highlighting their concerns over access and parking, loss of views and rural character, loss of walking routes and the habitats and wildlife on the site. At present the site is in private ownership with a single public right of way across it. The proposal would retain that right of way and propose much of the site for public use. Detailed wildlife and tree surveys will be required to be carried out with any planning application.
- 18.14 Officers remain of the opinion that the uncertainty around the A12 and future junction arrangements mean that it would be unwise at this time to allocate a residential site for development whose only vehicular access is from the A12 slip road. The site at Stonepath Drive therefore remains the least landscape sensitive site which has been submitted in the village and which offers the potential for a large amount of open space to be passed to the village. The officer recommendation with regards to these two sites therefore remains unchanged.

- 18.15 Recommendation 58 – That site HATF314 Land off Stonepath Drive is allocated as a site for residential development and open space. That site HATF312 The Vineyards is not allocated for residential development**

19 Toppesfield

- 19.1 Toppesfield is a small village to the north of the Braintree District. The village has a clearly defined built form and the village has some key facilities including a village pub and a church.

- 19.2 Current policy position - Toppesfield is a small village that is recognised by the Core Strategy as an 'other village'. The village has a clearly defined development boundary and the central area based around the historic core which is a conservation area. The school and churchyard are protected as such. At the meeting of the 13th April 2016, Members deferred the decisions of 2 small backland sites for further Parish comments. These were;
- 19.3 TOPP 412 is located at Church Farm Barn on Church Lane. The site has an area of 0.03 hectares.
- 19.4 TOPP 413 is located on Church Farm Barn and includes the store on Church Lane. The area of the site is approximately 0.15 hectares.
- 19.5 Parish Council comments - The Parish Council held a public consultation regarding the sites submitted and the feedback was reflected in the Parish Council's comments. There were general concerns over the infrastructure and amenities within the village and the ability to sustain further growth.
- 19.6 Though there were mixed views regarding each site it would seem that some sites are more preferable to others. However no site was unanimously supported. The TOPP411, TOPP412 and TOPP413 were viewed more favourably as a whole than other sites submitted during the call for sites process.
- 19.7 A further commentary was submitted relating to TOPP412 and TOPP413 after the meeting on the 13th of April stating;
'Toppesfield Parish Council would support a change in the development boundary as proposed with the proviso that affordable housing is planned in line with the RCCE housing needs survey and the results of our listening event evidence held on November 7th 2015.'
- 19.8 Officer comments - Toppesfield is a village with limited services and is recognised as an 'other village' in the Core Strategy 2011.
- 19.9 Due to the considerations of councillors on the 13th of April and the views expressed by the Parish Council it could be suggested that a boundary amendment should be made to enable residential development upon TOPP412 and TOPP413. Together the sites are 0.2ha and could potential accommodate up to 5 new homes. The site is constrained by its environment and careful design would be necessary to ensure that any development proposed is of an appropriate design and layout that will have no detrimental effect upon the amenity of neighbouring properties, the conservation area and the neighbouring listed building, and suitable landscaping is implemented to boundaries with the open countryside to as to limit the potential effect upon the landscape character of the locality. Affordable housing on site would be provided in accordance with the adopted policy, which currently requires 40% affordable housing on sites of 5 or more or 0.16ha within locations such as this.

Recommendation 59 - To approve the development boundary for Toppesfield as set out in the Appendix including the amendment to include the land area of TOPP412 and TOPP413.

20 Pebmarsh

20.1 Pebmarsh is a small village in the north of the Braintree district. It has a primary school, village hall, a children's park and a small skate park. It also has a village pub, the Kings Head.

20.2 Current Policy Position

The village is identified as an 'other village in the Core Strategy. The village has three development envelopes that closely relate to the dwelling clusters. The village also has a conservation area that is predominately formed around Pebmarsh Road, The Street and Mill Lane within the same region as the central development boundary. Site PEBM348 was deferred from committee on the 13th April to allow the Parish Council to submit further comments on the site.

20.3 PEBM348 is located to the rear of the properties on the south side of Cross End. The site has been previously assessed under the reference PEB8 on the last call for sites. The area of the site is 0.36 hectares.

20.4 Parish Council comments

The Parish Council had commented prior to the Local Plan Sub-Committee on the 13th of April stating:

20.5 *"PEBM 348: We previously gave qualified support to a house being built here. Since then a full planning application has been made by the owner which was turned down."*

20.6 Since the meeting on the 13th of April the Parish Council the council has received further correspondence:

20.7 *"Further to recent conversations, I can set out the Parish Council's reply with regard to their views on a change to the development boundary below:*

20.8 *The Parish Council has now had an opportunity to discuss your email of 15th April in some detail. They have also received representations from Andy Stimpson who we understand attended the Committee meeting on 13th April. The Parish Council's position is as follows:*

(1) Whist remaining sympathetic to Mr Stimpson's wish to build on PEB 348 (and as the Council stated in its letter of 17th December 2015 they have given him qualified support in the past), the Council does not agree to the extension of the Development Boundary to include all (or part) of PEB 348. The reason for this is that it would in the Council's view set an unacceptable precedent for 'backland' development, which others may want to make use of in the future (and if this occurred, the Parish Council would have difficulty in raising objections).

(2) Councillors who inspected the property in 2013 with Mr Stimpson were told by him that part of this plot belongs to his brother, who would no doubt also wish to build on his part, if the plot was included in the development boundary. The whole of the plot backs onto no less than 4 houses.

(3) On the Council's position generally, they have consistently stated that they would not object to a reasonable amount of 'infilling' (to be distinguished from

'backfilling')- such as PEB 350 (subject to sorting out the points we make in our letter referred to above). Equally consistently these suggestions have been rejected by Braintree District Council, for reasons the Council are unclear about (lack of facilities in the village perhaps). More houses are urgently needed, so surely every little helps?

20.9 *We trust this reply is helpful and we look forward to receiving details of the decision made by BDC".*

20.10 Officer comments

In principal, the officer recommendation remains the same as formerly stated upon the 13th of April "PEB348 is considered in principle as inappropriate back land development. The access to the site is particularly narrow and difficult. Planning permission has been refused and dismissed on appeal in 2002. The site is also outside the development boundary.

Recommendation 60 – To approve the development boundary for Pebmarsh as set out in the Appendix and not to make a development boundary change at PEB348

21 Great Maplestead

21.1 At the meeting on the 13th April, Members agreed to defer the consideration of a minor boundary amendment at Great Maplestead for further written comments from the Parish Council. These comments have now been received and are set out in full below;

21.2 *Further to your meeting of 13th April 2016, the Parish Council wish to thank those Members who took time to listen and understand why we had asked for the proposals for GRMA259 to be withdrawn from the agenda.*

21.3 *We have repeatedly expressed our concerns about the Local Plan process and this latest episode confirms that our anxieties are well founded.*

21.4 *The behaviour of certain Councillors at the meeting and their response to our request was quite frankly appalling, but this is a matter being dealt with via the appropriate channels.*

21.5 *In terms of the further amendments to the development boundary at GRMA259 the panel seem to lack understanding and/or is unable to empathise with the concerns of a small rural parish.*

21.6 *On paper the amendments, we concur, are minor in relation to plans for development sites elsewhere but this does not make them any less important.*

21.7 *The proposed amendments move the boundary line out to run along the old hedgerow boundary. This hedgerow was removed at site GRMA259 but it continues to run across the back of all remaining properties bordering countryside. If the development boundary is moved it allows the developer to not only build closer to an additional piece of countryside land they have*

acquired, but also to potentially erect structures which impact on the natural features of this area.

- 21.8 *Additionally, the statement by Planning Officers that it makes sense to “straighten the line”, is not a policy justification. It does not make any sense at all, rather it opens the opportunity for all other residential sites to apply to move the development boundary out further to continue that “straightened line”.*
- 21.9 *This is development creep as opposed to well considered and justifiable development planning. We remind the District Council that it has a responsibility to protect villages and countryside from over development.*
- 21.10 *Site GRMA259 continues to conflict with national and local planning policy. BDC’s own policies reviewed as part of the Local Plan process are quite clear:-*
- Policy RLP2 of the Local Plan Review states that new development will be confined to areas within Town Development Boundaries & Village envelopes. Outside of these areas countryside policies apply.*
 - Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy specifies that development outside of Village Envelopes will be strictly controlled to uses appropriate within the countryside in order to protect and enhance the landscape character.*
 - Policy RLP2 states that boundaries are intended to protect the countryside. BDC Planning Officers in recent application decisions have acknowledged that boundaries in villages have been drawn in such a way as to prevent the sprawl of development into the countryside and ensure that housing is located in sustainable locations.*
 - Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the natural environment and requires all development to have regard to the character of the landscape and sensitivity to change.*
- 21.11 *Furthermore, reference was made by Officers at the 13th April meeting that the proposed additional boundary changes were acceptable within the BDC Development Boundary Review Methodology. We challenge this statement in the strongest terms. Within the Methodology it states that “some development boundaries may follow along the rear of built development rather than physical features to prevent inappropriate backland development, for instance where dwellings have large back gardens.” This statement applies categorically to site GRMA259.*
- 21.12 *Why are the Local Plan Sub Committee seemingly ignoring the basis of their own policies?*
- 21.13 *As we have repeatedly said throughout this process, the existing development boundary in Great Maplestead, particularly in this area of the village, is the shape it is to avoid backland development.*
- 21.14 *Cllr. Lady Newton made reference to having visited this site early in the LDF process, and recalls the applicants request that the realignment of the*

development boundary was to allow the rebuild of their “much beloved home” that had been destroyed by fire.

21.15 *As the records now show planning has since been approved at this site for 3 houses to be built. The continued extension of the development boundary undoubtedly opens the opportunity for continued development in this area as there are already borders with land and property also owned by the same applicant.*

21.16 *The visual impact is already noticeable with a close board wooden fence being erected across one border, just this week, which takes away the countryside character and instead reflects a more urbanised scene.*

21.17 *The Parish Council would welcome a further visit by members of the panel so that they may improve their understanding of the site.*

21.18 *In summary, and it will be unsurprising to Members, the Parish Council continues to reject all proposed changes to the existing development boundary. To date there has been no policy justification for any amendments, including the original proposition to extend the boundary at GRMA259, as approved by BDC in 2012, and for which we still await a sound and justifiable explanation.*

21.19 *We implore Members to take a step back and reconsider their original decision, and at the very least these latest amendments should be rejected. Please listen to the views of parishioners who take great pride in their village. One which remains very much alive without the need for continued development.*

21.20 *We trust that our further representations are recognised as our democratic right to respond rather than just being “troublesome”!*

21.21 **Officer Comments**

The Parish boundary in Great Maplestead was proposed for a development boundary amendment in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and subsequently to that a planning application has been approved on the site for the replacement of 1 dwelling and the erection of 2 new dwellings.

21.22 Maps in the appendix illustrate on an overhead view the extent of the planning application on that site and how it relates to the development boundary which is proposed for the site. Officers continue to recommend this as a recognition of the full extent of the development site and is in line with the development boundary methodology. Whilst we note the Parishes concerns regarding further development for the village, the boundary change proposed is on an existing hedge line which delineates the village from the surrounding wider countryside landscape. This is a strong and logical boundary for the village of Great Maplestead.

Recommendation 61– To approve the development boundary for Great Maplestead as shown in the Appendix with an amendment to the rear of GRMA259.

22 Stisted

- 22.1 Two sites adjacent to the A120 were not specifically referenced in the committee report at Stisted received by the Local Plan Sub-Committee on the 9th May and for the avoidance of doubt are therefore set out below.

STIS396 – Land east of Baytree Farm, Stisted – 5.6ha, proposed for residential use, and could accommodate up to 140 homes.

- 22.2 Parish Council Comment - STIS 396, STIS 397 and CRESS 212 are still being considered by the Council in conjunction with Cressing and Bradwell Parish Council. We will write back to you in regards to these sites as soon as possible.
- 22.3 *Officer comment - This site is current part used as paddocks, with the remainder lying fallow. It is classified as a greenfield site. Constraints include proximity to the trunk road, and an archaeological site. In addition having a significant level of development access on the A120 is unlikely to be supported by Highways England. The site is not a natural extension to development as it is located away from any settlement. It could have had potential is the adjacent site CRESS212 – Temple Border were to be developed, however this site was not selected.*

Recommendation 62 – That site STIS396 – land east of Baytree Farm, Stisted is not allocated for residential use.

22.4 STIS397 – Land at DC Cottage and The Leys adj A120, Stisted - 7ha, proposed for residential use.

- 22.5 Parish Council Comment - STIS 396, STIS 397 and CRESS 212 are still being considered by the Council in conjunction with Cressing and Bradwell Parish Council. We will write back to you in regards to these sites as soon as possible.
- 22.6 *Officer comment – The site is currently used for agricultural land and is considered to be a greenfield site. Constraints include proximity to the trunk road, an ancient woodland and local wildlife site are adjacent at Temple Border Wood. The site is not adjacent to Braintree, and would not be a natural extension to development. But it could have been included within CRESS212 – Temple Border if it were to be developed, however that site was not selected.*

Recommendation 63 – That site STIS397 – Land at DC Cottage and The Leys adj A120 Stisted is not allocated for development.

Braintree Draft Local Plan – Garden Communities		Agenda No: 6
Portfolio: Planning and Housing Corporate Outcome: Securing appropriate infrastructure and housing growth Report Presented by: Emma Goodings Report Prepared by: Emma Goodings		
Background Papers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Practise Guidance (NPPG) Localism Act (2011) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) 		Public Report: Yes Key Decision: No
Executive Summary: <p>Housing growth required for the District to meet the objectively assessed need is at a historically unprecedented level, and stand-alone garden communities are being recommended by officers as a way of meeting that need which by being locally driven will ensure that infrastructure, facilities and services will be put in place when they are needed and that the local authority can control how quickly land is released for housing, employment, retail and other uses.</p> <p>Officers are recommending that areas of search are contained within the draft Braintree District Local Plan for two new settlements to the west of Braintree (which could be cross border with Uttlesford) and to the west of Colchester (shared with Colchester Borough). If approved, work on the potential Garden Communities in these areas will continue to be progressed, both through the draft Local Plan and through additional Masterplan Frameworks which will be developed.</p>		
Decision: <p>1 Recommendation – To include an area of search within the draft Local Plan for a new garden community West of Braintree and approve the policy wording set out in this report for inclusion within the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>2 Recommendation – To include an area of search within the draft Local Plan for a new garden community at Marks Tey, to be shared with Colchester Borough and approve the policy wording set out in this report for inclusion within the draft Local Plan.</p>		

Purpose of Decision: To agree draft areas of search for new garden communities for inclusion within the draft Braintree District Local Plan	
Corporate Implications	
Financial:	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.
Legal:	To comply with Governments legislation and guidance.
Equalities/Diversity:	The Councils policies should take account of equalities and diversity.
Safeguarding:	None
Customer Impact:	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
Environment and Climate Change:	This will form part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and will inform policies and allocations.
Consultation/Community Engagement:	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
Risks:	The Local Plan examination may not take place. The Local Plan could be found unsound. Risk of High Court challenge.
Officer Contact:	Emma Goodings
Designation:	Planning Policy Manager
Ext. No.	2511
E-mail:	emma.goodings@braintree.gov.uk

1 Background

- 1.1 As part of the new Local Plan, Members will be aware that officers have been considering the possibility of standalone new settlements to be part of the picture to deliver growth in this Plan period and beyond. The Issues and Options consultation set out the potential for standalone garden settlements and this had support in the comments received to that consultation.
- 1.2 New stand-alone communities are being considered only where they can meet garden city principles. Garden communities (cities) as described by the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) as; *“holistically planned new settlements which enhance the natural environment and offer high quality affordable housing and locally accessible work in beautiful, healthy and sociable communities.”* If proposals do not meet these standards then officers do not believe that they can properly be supported.
- 1.3 Together with Colchester Borough Council and Tendring District Council who are at similar stages of their Plan making and the County Council, officers have been considering new settlements from a planning, financial and legal perspective, to meet the needs of future residents in this Plan period and beyond.

- 1.4 Standalone settlements must have a critical mass of new homes to ensure that all the facilities necessary can be provided within the new community. This would include education facilities, including a secondary school, health, retail facilities and other 'town centre' type uses such as restaurants and banks, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities, community buildings and facilities such as halls and doctor's surgeries and significant employment opportunities. The design of a new community is intended to prioritise walking and cycling journeys within the community, and public transport options for journeys further afield, (although it is noted of course that some people will still use their cars to travel to work in other areas or high order shopping areas etc). The new community buildings must meet high standards of design, enhance and inhabit the local landscape and environment and deliver an inclusive community.
- 1.5 It is intended that any garden community taken forward would be a partnership between the local authorities, county council, and the private sector, with the public sector taking the lead. This is intended to provide confidence that the infrastructure and social and community facilities that are needed to support the new development from the very start of the community and that housing and employment can be released more quickly to ensure that there are homes and jobs available for people when they need them.
- 1.6 The garden community approach is strongly supported by central government. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) have awarded the four authorities funding to support this work and officer time through ATLAS (Advisory Team for Large Allocations).

2 Braintree District Context

- 2.1 The housing target to which BDC is working, is a substantial increase on that which was set out in the Core Strategy and that which has been consistently achieved in previous periods of high growth. It is a challenging target and therefore new ways of meeting that target must be explored.
- 2.2 The main urban areas of the District at the moment, Braintree, Witham and Halstead are sustainable areas for new growth as they have the most facilities, services and employment opportunities for residents, as well as public transport, road and some walking and cycling infrastructure. However all three towns have constraints and infrastructure and services are stretched. The Local Plan spatial strategy has proposed a number of urban extensions on the edge of these towns to make the best use of their facilities and connections.

- 2.3 Villages in the District, particularly those larger villages that have a good range of day to day facilities are also proposed for varying levels of growth, depending on the facilities, accessibility and sustainability. Many of the smaller, more isolated villages have not been proposed for growth of any substantial nature, given their lack of facilities, services and public transport, however opportunities have been taken where appropriate to allocate new sites for development, particularly on sites that have been previously developed or in villages that may have some facilities.
- 2.4 New stand-alone garden communities therefore are considered the best way to meet some of the need for new homes. At this stage it is considered that new garden communities will not complete their first homes until after the first 5 years of the Local Plan, due to the time taken to properly plan and engage on such a large site. However this does not mean that work would not start on site until that time, with work to lay out infrastructure such as roads, electricity, gas, phone/broadband and water/waste water services potentially taking place earlier. One of the aims of the proposed partnership mentioned above is to shorten the time taken to start the delivery of new homes and community facilities.
- 2.5 A broad policy for the development of new garden communities is proposed in the Strategic Part 1 of the Local Plan which will be shared with Tendring and Colchester and is set out below;
- 2.6 ***“Development and delivery of new garden communities in North Essex***

Each of these will be an holistically and comprehensively planned new community with a distinct identity that responds directly to its context and is of sufficient scale to incorporate a range of homes, employment, green space and other uses to enable residents to meet the majority of their day-to-day needs, reducing the need for outward commuting. Delivery of each new community will be underpinned by a comprehensive package of infrastructure. Unallocated proposals in the borough and districts will not be permitted if it would prejudice the development of these garden communities, regardless of the eventual capacity and phasing of the developments or the status of the 5 year supply in each local authority.

The design, development and delivery of each new garden community will conform with the following principles.

- (i) *Community and stakeholder empowerment in the design and delivery of each garden community from the outset and a long term community engagement and activation strategy.*

- (ii) *The public sector working pro-actively and collaboratively with the private sector to design, develop and deliver these new garden communities using appropriate mechanisms including land value capture to ensure that the cost of achieving the following is borne by those promoting the developments: (i) securing a high quality of place-making, (ii) ensuring the timely delivery of both on-site and off-site infrastructure required to address the impact of these new communities, and (iii) providing a mechanism for future stewardship, management, maintenance and renewal of community infrastructure and assets.*
- (iii) *Promotion and execution of the highest quality of planning, design and management of the built and public realm so that the Garden Communities are characterised as distinctive places that capitalise on local assets and establish environments that promote health, happiness and well-being. This will involve having detailed masterplans and design guidance in place to inform and guide development proposals and planning applications. Planning applications for the garden communities will be expected to be consistent with approved masterplans and design guidance.*
- (iv) *Sequencing of development and infrastructure provision (both on-site and off-site) to ensure that the latter is provided in tandem with or ahead of the development it supports to address the impacts of the new garden communities and meet the needs of residents.*
- (v) *Development that provides for a truly balanced and inclusive community and meets the housing needs of local people including a mix of dwelling sizes, tenures and types including provision for self- and custom-built homes to meet the requirements of those most in need including an appropriate level of affordable housing.*
- (vi) *Provide opportunities for employment within each new community and within sustainable commuting distance of it.*
- (vii) *Plan the new communities around a step change in integrated and sustainable transport systems for the North Essex area that put walking, cycling and rapid public transit systems at the heart of growth in the area, encouraging and incentivising more sustainable active travel patterns.*
- (viii) *Structure the new communities to create sociable, vibrant and walkable neighbourhoods with equality of access for all to a range of community services and facilities including health, education, shopping, culture, community meeting spaces, multi-functional open space, sports and leisure facilities.*
- (ix) *Specific garden community parking approach and standards will be developed that help promote the use of sustainable transport and make efficient use of land.*
- (x) *Create distinctive environments which relate to the surrounding environment and that celebrate natural environments and systems, utilise a multi-functional green-grid to create significant networks of new green infrastructure including*

- new country parks at each garden community, provide a high degree of connectivity to existing corridors and networks and enhance biodiversity.*
- (xi) Secure a smart and sustainable approach that fosters climate resilience and a 21st century environment in the design and construction of each garden community to secure net gains in local biodiversity, highest standards of innovation in technology to reduce impact of climate change, water efficiency (with the aim of being water neutral in areas of serious water stress), and sustainable waste and mineral management.*
- (xii) Put in place appropriate and sustainable long term governance and stewardship arrangements for the new communities as well as long term community engagement”*

3 Site Specifics

- 3.1 A number of sites were submitted when the Council carried out a ‘Call for Sites’ in 2014, which together would be of sufficient scale to deliver a stand-alone new settlement and this was the starting point for site consideration. Within Braintree District they are in two broad locations, although other sites have been submitted across North Essex. The first is to the west of Braintree and Rayne and includes some land within Uttlesford District. The second is to the east of Coggeshall and Feering at Marks Tey, much of which is situated within Colchester Borough.
- 3.2 **West of Braintree**
Three sites have been submitted in this vicinity.
- 3.3 The first is a small site GRSA 268 which is 1.5ha and is being put forward for residential development by a single landowner. The site is at the junction of the B1256 (old A120) and Blake End Road. It is separated by two residential properties from the other areas which are being proposed, but given its position at the road junction could become a key part of the site.
- 3.4 GRSA269 is a very large site of 910ha which is being proposed by the Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium, a group of landowners in the area. Approximately 72ha are located in Uttlesford which is around the WW2 airfield and there is further land to the south side of the A120 in Uttlesford would could also be included. Part of the site adjacent to the B1256 was included within the Essex Minerals Local Plan as a mineral extraction site and we understand work to progress this to a planning application is just beginning. Large areas of the site to the east, including the minerals site have been proposed for public open space and a country park.
- 3.5 GRSA 270 is known as Bosted Wood and is being promoted by Galliard Homes. This part of the site is 135ha, primarily to the west of the Andrewsfield

site. Of the 'core site' only around 22ha is located within Braintree District with a further 47ha located in the vicinity, including almost 35ha at Blake Farm. Boxted Wood itself is located within Uttlesford and is ancient woodland that would need to be protected from development.

3.6 Parish Council Views

Great Saling Parish Council - The Parish Council feel that, we need to protect the village from a large development, the village has 1 historical park and 1 list garden in the village which needs protecting. These are two of only eight such sites in Braintree District.

What we would ideally like is no large development at all as we do not believe the wider infrastructure is or can be put in place. If that is not the case the Parish Council and development is proposed we would like to put some safe guards in place so that the village doesn't get swallowed up by the development.

What the Parish Council would like to see in this case is a 1-mile green buffer zone (controlled by the Parish) around the village, with a relief road at the buffer edge keeping traffic away from the central area and safeguarding the village from heavy lorries and any increase in vehicle movements.

3.7 *Rayne Parish Council - There is discussion on the whole concept of Garden Cities/New Towns and the cross District Boundary site at Andrewsfield is being put forward as a key site within this concept.*

3.8 *Many numbers have been proffered in terms of how many dwellings may be proffered but taking the minimum of 12,000 dwellings would have a significant impact on Rayne and other adjoining Parishes. This is unacceptable without cast-iron evidence that all aspects of the infrastructure affecting these Parishes are to be addressed physically before the first foundation trench is even dug.*

3.9 *It is critical on all aspects of the local infrastructure is physically addressed before building/development begins. Belief in promises has been stretched beyond its elastic limit and only sufficient physical activity will satisfy residents.*

3.10 *Another factor here is the fact that this proposed development crosses the District Boundary with Uttlesford and the Local Plan timetables are not aligned which will only serve to exacerbate the already difficult situation.*

3.11 *In addition to this the funded initiative to investigate Garden Cities/New Towns does not include Uttlesford, another potential problem, about which little is being said.*

- 3.12 *Shalford Parish Council - We are also grateful for the opportunity to comment on the proposed inclusion of Andrewsfield and Boxted Wood in the Local Plan as a Garden Village. We believe that if this were to go ahead it would have a severe impact on the rural nature of our village. There are obviously issues around loss of the amenity of the airfield for private planes and the loss of viable agricultural land along with inadequacies of local roads but our biggest concern is the additional traffic it would bring through our village. We are currently blighted by the volumes of commercial and private traffic that use the road through our village as an alternative route to the employment areas of Haverhill and Cambridge avoiding the M11. We believe that if this development were to go ahead it would make this situation far worse and would bring immeasurable harm to our village. So we strongly oppose the proposal to develop a Garden Village on this site.*
- 3.13 **Officer Comments**
There are no overriding environmental or other constraints which would make the area not suitable for development, although obviously there are elements of environmental and historic interest across and in close proximity to the site which would require protection. Green buffers would also be required to the settlements in proximity of the site, most notably Great Saling, Stebbing Green and Rayne, to ensure that they preserve their unique characters. More detailed environmental studies would need to be carried out if the area of search was progressed.
- 3.14 Early indications are that the sites could accommodate up to 13,000 new homes as well as substantial elements of employment, retail and major open space, although if the area of search is to be progressed then these figures would be refined. The garden community would be expected to meet all the day to day needs for local residents within it, prioritising public transport and walking and cycling over private vehicle use. To this end a secondary school would also be required from the site as well as early years and primary schools. However there will be high quality public transport links to nearby centres such as Braintree, Chelmsford and London Stansted Airport, with rail services for wider journeys being available in those centres. The use of the Flitch Way as an existing link close to the site and the centre of Braintree would also be maximised. Road improvements would of course still need to be made particularly to the B1256/A120 junction within close proximity to the site.
- 3.15 It should be noted that some of the area considered as part of this option includes that put forward within the Uttlesford District in its Issues and Options document (Area of Search 9). Development of land within neighbouring Districts is not essential to the allocation of this area of search and the decision to allocate land within Uttlesford rests of course with Uttlesford

District Council. Ongoing discussions continue to take place between the two authorities based on the options identified in the UDC 2015 Issues and Options document and emerging supporting evidence.

- 3.16 Officers are therefore recommending that an area of search to the west of Braintree is included within the draft Local Plan. A draft policy for the site is set out below;

3.17 “West of Braintree new garden community

The broad area of search, as shown on the adopted policies map, is identified as a strategic area for development of a new garden community of which the details and final number of homes will be set out in a Masterplan Framework to be prepared jointly between Braintree DC and Uttlesford DC if applicable and which will incorporate the following;

- (i) housing for around 2,500 homes within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 10,000 – 13,000 homes)*
- (ii) Provision for Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople*
- (iii) Appropriate provision of B1 and/or employment generating development,*
- (iv) Neighbourhood centres incorporating provision for convenience shopping, community, health and cultural provision,*
- (v) Primary schools, a secondary school and other community facilities as appropriate,*
- (vi) At high proportion of the garden community will comprise green infrastructure including a new country park to the east of site.*

The Masterplan framework setting out the nature, form and boundary of the new community. The masterplan will be produced in partnership with the development interests and will provide a layout showing the disposition and quantity of future land-uses, and give a three dimensional indication of the urban design parameters which will be incorporated into any future planning applications; together with a phasing and implementation strategy which sets out how the rate of development will be linked to the provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure to ensure that the respective phases of the development do not come forward until the necessary infrastructure has been secured. The masterplan will incorporate mechanisms for regular review and updating over the course of the implementation of this garden community.

A. Place-making and design quality

- 1. The new garden community will be developed to high standards of design and layout drawing on its context and the assets within its boundaries including Boxted Wood, Golden Grove, Rumley Wood, Pods Brook and the historic airfield. The gently sloping topography to the south of the site also affords opportunities for long distance views. These key assets will provide a context to build a new green space grid upon to provide an*

attractive setting for the new community and linking to the wider countryside. The new community will also address the relationship with existing communities close to its boundaries including Great Saling, Stebbing and Stebbing Green. The garden community will be designed and developed to have its own identity be as self-sustaining as possible. A separation will be maintained between the new garden community and the nearby village of Great Saling.

- 2. Detailed masterplans and design guidance will be put in place to inform and guide development proposals and planning applications. Planning applications for this garden community will be expected to be consistent with approved masterplans and design guidance.*

B. Housing

- 3. A mix of housing types and tenures including self- and custom-build and starter homes will be provided on the site, including a minimum of 30% affordable housing. The affordable housing will be phased through the development;*
- 4. New residential development will seek to achieve an average net density of at least 30 dwellings to the hectare. Higher densities will be located close to the neighbourhood centres and along the strategic public transport corridors;*

C. Employment

- 5. Provision for B1, B2 and B8 businesses in the southern part of the community close to the A120 to provide for a wide range of local employment opportunities*

D. Transportation

- 6. A package of measures will be introduced to encourage smarter transport choices to meet the needs of the new community and maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel including the provision of a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways to enhance permeability within the site and to access the adjoining area; development of an effective public transport system; development of opportunities to improve accessibility to local rail station; and effective measures to mitigate the transport impacts of the proposed development on the strategic and local road network. Longer term transport interventions will need to be carefully designed to minimise the impacts on the strategic road network and fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts.*
- 7. Primary vehicular access to the site will be provided via the A120 and B1256.*
- 8. Improvements to the local road infrastructure will be necessary to mitigate adverse traffic impacts and serve the new development. These shall include bus priority measures between the site, Braintree town centre, rail*

- station and employment areas including the 120 Skyline business park, Witham rail station and London Stansted Airport;*
- 9. Foot and cycle ways shall be provided throughout the development, linking the site to Braintree town through the existing Flitch Way linear country park;*
 - 10. Other specific infrastructure requirements identified as work on the area of search progresses*

E. Community Infrastructure

- 11. Neighbourhood centres of an appropriate scale will be provided to serve the proposed new community. The centres will be located where they will be easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transit to the majority of residents in the garden community.*
- 12. A health facility and community meeting places will be provided within the district and local centres.*
- 13. A secondary school, primary schools and early years facilities will be provided to serve the new development;*
- 14. A network of green infrastructure will be provided within the garden community including a community park, allotments, a new country park provided at the east side of the community, the provision of sports areas with associated facilities and play facilities;*
- 15. Provision of or contribution to indoor leisure facilities*

F Other Requirements

- 16. Provision of improvements to waste water treatment and off-site drainage improvements;*
- 17. Provision, management and on-going maintenance of sustainable surface water drainage measures to control the risk of flooding on site and which will reduce the risk of flooding to areas downstream or upstream of the development;*
- 18. Landscape buffers between the site and Great Saling, Stebbing, Stebbing Green and Rayne;*
- 19. Protection and/or enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets within and surrounding the site including Great Saling Hall conservation area and areas of deciduous woodland within and adjoining the site.*
- 20. Provision of appropriate buffers along strategic road to protect new development*
- 21. Provision of appropriate design and infrastructure that incorporates the highest standards of innovation of technology to reduce impact of climate change, water efficiency (with the aim of being water neutral in areas of serious water stress), and sustainable waste / recycling management facilities.*

- 22. *Measures to assist the development of a new community including provision of community development workers for a minimum of eight years from initial occupation of the first homes.*
- 23. *Appropriate and sustainable long term governance and stewardship arrangements for the new garden community including provision for management and maintenance of the public realm and community assets”.*

3.18 **Marks Tey**

Two major sites have been submitted in the Call for Sites for Colchester and Braintree in this location, although exploration continues on the most appropriate and logical boundary for this site, which may include land which was not submitted at the initial Call for Sites.

- 3.19 FEER231 is being promoted by Gateway 120, a consortium of local landowners. A total of 854ha was submitted for consideration but this includes land at Temple Border on the edge of Braintree. The Council has made clear that it sees these two sites as very separate and as such the Temple Border site was considered during the Braintree committee on the 9th May and not allocated for development. The site as presently submitted according to the developer could deliver between 11,000 to 14,000 homes of which perhaps 4,000 would be in Braintree District.

- 3.20 Further sites have been submitted in this area, which include land wholly within Colchester borough. These could include part of a garden community but this may or may not impact on Braintree District

3.21 Parish Council Comments

Bradwell Parish Council - CRESS212 – Land east of Braintree (Temple Border) 854ha including land near Marks Tey

This site requires combined response from Cressing, Stisted and Bradwell Parish Council. The only land in Bradwell Parish is a small existing light industrial site close to the Parish Boundary. It would not be inappropriate to develop this site to provide local employment whether or not the Temple border development goes ahead.

3.22 Cressing Parish Council

CPC note that BDC has deemed this site as Y (Suitable). This site would have to be treated like a separate village/town with clear boundaries. Concerns regarding agricultural land, scale, infrastructure. Expanding Braintree and potentially encompassing the surrounding villages. Concerns regarding the preservation of the two ancient and semi-natural woodland areas and wildlife sites. Although Cressing Parish Council would support garden villages, this site has no green space surrounding it and would massively increase the strain on already stretched local resources such as

roads, doctors surgeries, schools, work places etc and these would have to be factored into any design

3.23 *Coggeshall Parish Council*
FEER231 – Marks Tey

The larger capacity sites on the perimeter of the village and bounded by the A120 are currently productive agricultural land (COGG177, 178, 180, 181, 182/183 and FEER231) and have landscape character overlooking the village centre and/or the river valleys. Their distance from the central amenities (shops, schools, doctor's surgery) would inevitably increase motor traffic in the village centre and potentially create safety issues in local roads with no pavements. It is also uncertain what effect the loss of open space would have on drainage in the village centre, for example the area around Bridge Street is already categorized as "likelihood of flooding – significant" by the Environment Agency. The ability of the primary school and GP practice to cope with a substantial increase in population is a real concern.

3.24 *Officer Comments*

Various different parcels of land have been assessed within this area which could accommodate a range of scale of new community. In all options and in line with garden city principles substantial elements of the land would be open space, including country parks and green buffers to nearby settlements, in particular for Braintree District, Coggeshall and Feering. The site would also include substantial retail and employment offers, the amounts depending on the size of the overall settlement. Due to the size of some of the options being considered major off and onsite infrastructure will be required to support the site. Major new public transport routes, some involving the improvement and enlargement of Marks Tey railway station are being investigated and bridges over the A120 and A12 would be required. Due to the scale of development major upgrades to the A12 and A120 would be required in the vicinity of the site in order to facilitate development.

3.25 *Officers are therefore recommending the inclusion of the site at Marks Tey within an area of search for the new Local Plan with the accompanying policy*

3.26 ***"West of Colchester / East Braintree new garden community***

The broad area of search shown on the adopted policies map, is identified as a strategic area for development of a new garden community of which the details and final number of homes will be set out in a Masterplan Framework to be prepared jointly between Colchester BC and Braintree DC and which will incorporate the following;

- (i) housing for around 2,500 dwellings within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 15,000 to 20,000 homes)*
- (ii) Provision for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling showpeople,*

- (iii) *Land for B1 and/or employment generating development,*
- (iv) *A district centre and neighbourhood centres incorporating provision for convenience shopping, community, health and cultural provision,*
- (v) *Primary schools, a secondary school and other community facilities as appropriate,*
- (vi) *A high proportion of the garden community will comprise green infrastructure including a new country park.*

The Masterplan Framework will set out the nature, form and boundary of the new community. The masterplan will be produced in partnership with the development interests and will provide a layout showing the disposition and quantity of future land-uses, and give a three dimensional indication of the urban design parameters which will be incorporated into any future planning applications; together with a phasing and implementation strategy which sets out how the rate of development will be linked to the provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure to ensure that the respective phases of the development do not come forward until the necessary infrastructure has been secured. The masterplan will incorporate mechanisms for regular review and updating over the course of the implementation of this garden community.

A. Place-making and design quality

- 1. The development of a new garden community to high standards of design and layout drawing on its context and the assets within its boundaries including streams, land drains and ditches, mature hedgerows and field boundaries, woodland and historic buildings. A mixed use district centre will provide a vibrant heart to this new community supplemented by neighbourhood centres to form foci for new neighbourhoods. The design of the community will also address the challenges offered by other features in particular the severance created by the A12 and A120 and maximise the opportunities afforded through integration with the existing community of Marks Tey, and the presence of the railway station, all underpinned by a strong green grid of connected green space that provides great recreational opportunities for residents and connection to the wider countryside.. The garden community will be designed and developed to have its own identity be as self-sustaining as possible. A separation will be maintained between the new garden community and the nearby settlements of Coggeshall and Stanway.*
- 2. Detailed masterplans and design guidance will be put in place to inform and guide development proposals and planning applications. Planning applications for this garden community will be expected to be consistent with approved masterplans and design guidance.*

B. Housing

- 3. A mix of housing types and tenures including self- and custom-build will be provided on the site, including a minimum of 30% affordable housing. The affordable housing will be phased through the development;*
- 4. New residential development will seek to achieve an average net density of at least 30 dwellings to the hectare. Higher densities will be located close to the district and neighbourhood centres, the rail station and along the strategic public transport corridors;*

C. Employment

- 5. Provision for B1 and/or non B class employment generating uses around the rail station as part of mixed use urban development to provide for a wide range of local employment opportunities where appropriate;*

D. Transportation

- 6. A package of measures will be introduced to encourage smarter transport choices to meet the needs of the new community and maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel including the provision of a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways to enhance permeability within the site and to access the adjoining area; development of a rapid transit system connecting this new garden community to the wider Colchester context; development of opportunities to improve accessibility to Marks Tey rail station; and effective measures to mitigate the transport impacts of the proposed development on the strategic and local road network. Longer term transport interventions will need to be carefully designed to minimise the impacts on the strategic road network and fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts.*
- 7. Primary vehicular access to the site will be provided via a reconfigured A120.*
- 8. Improvements to the local road infrastructure will be necessary to mitigate adverse traffic impacts and serve the new development. These shall include bus priority measures between the site, Colchester and Braintree town centres, employment areas and rail stations;*
- 9. Foot and cycle ways shall be provided throughout the development and linking the site to the wider network*
- 10. Marks Tey rail station is an important asset located in the northern eastern section of the new garden community. Opportunities will be explored to establish how it can be made more accessible to residents of the new community including relocation of the station to a more central location and improvement of walking, cycling and public transport links to the station.*
- 11. Other detailed infrastructure requirements may be added as work in the site progresses.*

E. Community Infrastructure

- 12. A new district centre and neighbourhood centres of an appropriate scale will be provided to serve the proposed development. The centres will be located where they will be easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transit to the majority of residents in the garden community including residents of the existing Marks Tey village.*
- 13. A health facility and community meeting places will be provided within the district and local centres.*
- 14. A secondary school, primary schools and early years facilities will be provided to serve the new development;*
- 15. A network of green infrastructure will be provided within the garden community including a community park, allotments, a new country park, the provision of sports areas with associated facilities and play facilities;*
- 16. Provision of or contribution to indoor leisure facilities*

F. Other Requirements

- 17. Provision of improvements to waste water treatment including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plant and off-site drainage improvements;*
- 18. Provision, management and on-going maintenance of sustainable surface water drainage measures to control the risk of flooding on site and which will reduce the risk of flooding to areas downstream or upstream of the development;*
- 19. Landscape buffers between the site and Coggeshall, Stanway and Easthorpe;*
- 20. Protection and/or enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets within and surrounding the site including Marks Tey Hall, Easthorpe Hall Farm, Easthorpe Hall and the habitats along and adjoining the Domsey Brook and Roman River corridors.*
- 21. Provision of appropriate buffers along strategic road and rail infrastructure to protect new development*
- 22. Provision of appropriate design and infrastructure that incorporates the highest standards of technology to reduce impact of climate change, water efficiency (with the aim of being water neutral in areas of serious water stress), and sustainable waste / recycling management facilities.*
- 23. Measures to assist the development of a new community including provision of community development workers for a minimum of ten years from initial occupation of the first homes.*
- 24. Appropriate and sustainable long term governance and stewardship arrangements for the new garden community including provision for management and maintenance of the public realm and community assets”.*

4 Conclusion

- 4.1 Locally led new garden communities offer a new and innovative way of delivering major new towns that meet the needs of existing and new residents through the provision of homes, infrastructure, green space and community facilities and services in a beautifully planned setting. In order to deliver the growth that is required a solution which involves more than continued urban extensions is required. The garden communities offer that opportunity. Due to the size and scale of the garden communities they would offer a long term solution to housing delivery in the District and would take at least 30 to 40 years to complete, providing a secure and continuous supply of housing, within local authority control which can help to safeguard other parts of the District from unsuitable and unsustainable growth.
- 4.2 It should be noted that the proposed areas of search remain provisional and need to be tested further. At a high level the Council will continue to review both deliverability and viability with the landowners and developers. The Council will need to be satisfied that those interested in the areas of search will adopt a delivery model that offers the Council adequate control over the quality, nature and timing of development, including the early provision of supporting infrastructure.
- 4.3 At a more detailed level the boundaries of the proposals and an indicative masterplan will need to be developed. If the review and masterplan development raise any substantive doubts about the proposals then alternatives will need to be considered, possibly including a rebalancing between the sites or the substitution of other sites or, potentially, investment to make sure that delivery takes place at an appropriate time.

Recommendation 1 – To include an area of search within the draft Local Plan for a new garden community West of Braintree, and approve the policy wording set out in this report for inclusion within the draft Local Plan.

Recommendation 2 – To include an area of search within the draft Local Plan for a new garden community at Marks Tey, to be shared with Colchester Borough, and approve the policy wording set out in this report for inclusion within the draft Local Plan.

