

Local Plan Sub-Committee AGENDA



THE PUBLIC MAY ATTEND THIS MEETING

Please note this meeting will be webcast and audio recorded.

Date: Monday, 09 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 P Newton

Councillor 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 13th April 2016 (copy to follow).

4 Public Question Time

(See paragraph below)

5 Braintree District Draft Local Plan - Draft Site Allocation Maps 4 - 90

6 Urgent Business - Public Session

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

7 Exclusion of the Public and Press

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

At the time of compiling this Agenda there were none.

PRIVATE SESSION

8 Urgent Business - Private Session

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

Cont'd

E WISBEY
Governance and Member Manager

Contact Details

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

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: Alan Massow, Emma Goodings Report Prepared by: Alan Massow, Julie O'Hara		
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: <p>1 To approve the Inset Map for Braintree, Great Notley, Black Notley, Tye Green Cressing, and Cressing, as shown in Appendix 2 and that the following recommendations are agreed in relation to the individual sites;</p> <p>a) That BOCN124 – Land rear of 61 Broad Road Bocking is not allocated for</p>		

development

- b) That the site BOCN125 – Land rear of 282/288 Broad Road Braintree is not allocated for development.**
- c) That the site BOCN126 – Land East of Dorewards Hall, Bocking, is not allocated as a residential growth location.**
- d) That the site BOCN128 – Land at High Garret is not allocated for residential development.**
- e) That the site BOCN129 Unit 1 Bovingdon Road, The bake house, is not allocated for residential development and that the existing employment allocation is removed.**
- f) That the site BOCN130 – Land between 90 – 92 High Garrett Road is allocated for residential development.**
- g) That the site BOCN131 - Land at Bovingdon Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- h) That the site BOCN132 - Land East of Broad Road is allocated as a strategic growth location.**
- i) That the site BOCN123 – Land rear of Highfield Stile Road is allocated as part of a strategic growth location**
- j) That the site BOCN127 - Land east of Elizabeth Lockhart Way is allocated as part of a strategic growth location**
- k) That the site BOCN133 - Land at Deanery Hill is not allocated for residential development.**
- l) That the site BOCN134 – Polly’s Field retains its allocation for specialist housing.**
- m) That the site BOCN135 – Land at Church Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- n) That part of the site BOCN137 Towerlands Park as shown in the appendix is allocated as a strategic growth location.**
- o) That the site BOCN502 Land at Monken Hadley is not allocated for residential development.**
- p) That the site BOCS138 – Land west of Springwood Drive retains its employment and structural landscape designation.**
- q) That the site BOCS139 – Land forming part of Fair Acres, Church Lane, is not**

allocated for residential development.

- r) That site BOCS140 site at Rayne Lodge Farm is allocated for residential development.**
- s) That site BOCS141 Unit 1 Springwood Industrial Estate is retained for employment purposes.**
- t) That the site BCBG144 Land off East Street Braintree is not allocated for residential development, and retains its employment allocation**
- u) That site BCBG145 Land at Albert Road/Manor Road is not allocated for residential development, and that its employment allocation is retained.**
- v) That site BCBG146 – Car park and land north of Freeport Braintree is allocated for comparison goods retail.**
- w) That site BCBG147 - The Mazes East Street Braintree is not allocated for residential and its current employment allocation is retained.**
- x) That site BCBG148 – 33 Notley Road Braintree is not allocated for residential development.**
- y) That site BCBG149 – Football Club, Clockhouse Way retains its residential allocation.**
- z) That site BCBG150 Stubbs Lane, is allocated for residential development**
- aa) That site BCBG151 – Land at Trotters Field is not allocated for residential development, but is allocated for informal recreation.**
- bb) That site BCBG550 - Land of Millennium Way Braintree retains its residential allocation.**
- cc) That site BRAW153 – Broomhills Estate Pod's Brook Road, is allocated for residential development.**
- dd) That site BRAW154, GNBC265, and GNBC266 land south west of Braintree are not allocated for residential development.**
- ee) That site BRSO152 – Land adj Braintree Railway Station is allocated for residential development.**
- ff) GRNO260 land to the west of the A131 at Great Notley is not allocated for residential development and retains its employment growth location allocation.**
- gg) GNBC261 land adj to 119 London Road Black Notley is not allocated for residential development. And that GNBC262 land adj to 106 London Road is**

not allocated for residential development.

- hh) That site GNBC264 – Land at London Road retains its residential allocation, informal recreation and cycleway designations, and that the formal recreation designation is removed.**
- ii) That site BLAN111 Hill House, Witham Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- jj) That site BLAN112 – The Stable, London Road/Bakers Lane is not allocated for residential development.**
- kk) That site BLAN113 – Lynderswood Farm, Lynderswood Lane, is allocated for employment use and vehicle storage, and that an industrial development limit is drawn round the site.**
- ll) That sites BLAN110, BLAN114, BLAN115, BLAN116, and BLAN117 – Land east of Great Notley, south Braintree, are allocated as a strategic growth location.**
- mm) That site BLAN118 – Land opposite 65 – 96 Brain Valley Avenue, is not allocated for residential development.**
- nn) That site BLAN119 Land to the rear of Brain Valley Avenue is not allocated for residential development.**
- oo) That site BLAN120 – Troys Farm, 97 The Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- pp) That site BLAN121 – Troys Farm 97 The Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- qq) That site BLAN122 – Troys Farm 97 The Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- rr) That site BLAN501 – Land to the south of Black Notley is not allocated for residential development.**
- ss) That site PANF136 land adjacent Springwood Drive is not allocated for employment use.**
- tt) That site CRESS189 – Braintree Garden Centre is not allocated for retail use.**
- uu) That site CRESS190 – Shardloe’s Crossing, that the site is not allocated for residential development of 10+ units.**
- vv) That site CRESS191 – Land on the west side of Mill Lane Crossing, is not allocated for residential development.**

- ww) That site CRESS192 – Land on the east side of Mill Lane Cressing, is not allocated for residential development.**
- xx) That site CRESS193 – Land between Braintree Road and Mill Lane is not allocated for residential development.**
- yy) That site CRESS194 Birds Barn, Polecat Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- zz) That site CRESS195 – Ivy Cottage, Long Green, is not allocated for residential development.**
- aaa) That site CRESS196 land at Rook Hall, is not allocated for residential development.**
- bbb) That site CRESS197 – Site at Holders Farmstead, Hawbush Green, is not allocated for residential development.**
- ccc) That site CRESS198 – Site of Holders Field, Hawbush Green, is not allocated for residential development.**
- ddd) That site CRESS199 – Land between Leyfield and Derrygowna, Braintree Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- eee) That site CRESS200 Leyfield Braintree Road, Tye Green, is not allocated for residential development.**
- fff) That site CRESS201 – Land at Appletree Farm, Polecat Road is not allocated for residential development or employment.**
- ggg) That sites CRESS202, CRESS203, CRESS204, CRESS205, CRESS206, CRESS207, CRESS208, CRESS209 – land to the south of the A120 and land between Black Notley and Cressing are not allocated as residential growth locations.**
- hhh) That site CRESS210 – Land at Ashes Farm, is not allocated for residential development.**
- iii) That site CRESS211 – Land north of Braintree Road, is not allocated for residential development.**
- jjj) That site CRESS212 – Land east of Braintree, is not allocated for residential development.**
- kkk) That site CRESS213 – Land to the south of Ashes Road, is not allocated for residential development.**
- III) That site CRESS214 – Land to the south of Ashes Road is not allocated for**

residential development.

mmm) That site CRESS508 – Ashes Farm north adj to Ashes Road is not allocated for residential development.

nnn) That site CRESS509 – Ashes Farm south adj Ashes Road is not allocated as a residential growth location.

2) That the site RAYN355 land east of School Road Rayne is not allocated for residential development.

3) The site RAYN512OUT is not allocated and that officers should respond to any proposals within Uttlesford District for the site to that effect.

4) That site RAYN555 – Land rear of The Swan PH Rayne is not allocated for residential development.

5) That the inset map for Rayne as set out in the appendix be approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

6) That site WETH414 – Land at Silver Street is not allocated for residential development.

7) That sites WETH415 area to the north of Blackmore End, WETH416 land at Blackmore End, and WETH417 are not included in the development boundary.

8) That the Inset Map for Wethersfield as set out in the appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

9) That the inset map for Blackmore End as set out in Appendix 5 is approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

10) That site BRAD142 – Land east of Playing Field and Allotment Gardens, Church Lane is not allocated for residential development.

11) That site BRAD143 Land at Chaldercott and Alanwey Coggeshall Road is not allocated for residential development.

12) That site BRAD503 – Rectory Meadow, Bradwell is not allocated for residential or tourist development.

13) That the Inset Map for Bradwell, as set out in the appendix be approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development. That Pattiswick does not have a development boundary and remains within the countryside.

14) The sites SIBH376 – Land adj 14 Swan Street, Sible Hedingham is not

allocated for residential development.

- 15) That site SIBH377 Tanners Dairy, Prayors Hill is allocated for residential development**
- 16) That site SIBH378, south of Wethersfield Road, Sible Hedingham is not allocated for residential development.**
- 17) That site SIBH380 – Land at Queen Street (Between No's 16 and 42 is not allocated for residential development.**
- 18) That site SIBH381 – Land at Alderford Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- 19) That site SIBH379 38-40 Alderford Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- 20) That site SIBH382, The Old Coal Yard, 61 Alderford Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- 21) That site SIBH522 Land at Rippers Court is retained as an employment site.**
- 22) That the Inset Map for Sible Hedingham as set out in the appendix should be approved with site SIBH377 allocated for residential development.**
- 23) That site CASH167 – Land rear 108-132 Nunnery Street, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 24) That site CASH169 – Land at Nunnery Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- 25) That site CASH505 – Colne Valley Railway Yeldham Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- 26) That site CASH553 – Land at Sudbury Hill, Bailey Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- 27) That site CASH168 – Land adj to Sudbury Road, opposite Coppingdown Farm is not allocated for residential development.**
- 28) That site CASH170 – Land adj De Vere Primary School, Kirby Hall Road is not allocated for residential development**
- 29) That the inset map for Castle Hedingham as set out in the appendix is approved and that no site is allocated for residential development**
- 30) That site STIS398 site off Rectory Road is not allocated for residential development.**

- 31) That site STIS399 – Land off Back Lane is not allocated for residential development.**
- 32) That site STIS400 – 37 The Street and land to rear is not allocated for residential development.**
- 33) That site STIS401 37 The Street and land to rear is not allocated for residential development.**
- 34) That the Inset Map for Stisted and the Inset Map for Stisted Twinoaks as set out in the appendix are approved.**
- 35) That site SHAL371 - land west of Braintree Road, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 36) That site SHAL372 – Grubbs Cottage, Church End, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 37) That site SHAL373 – Land to rear of Pent House, The Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- 38) That site SHAL374 – Adj “Gables” Braintree Road, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 39) That site SHAL375 – Land at White Courts Shalford development boundary amendment is carried forward.**
- 40) That the Inset Map for Shalford as set out in the appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for development.**
- 41) That the Inset Map for Shalford Church End as set out in Appendix be approved**
- 42) That site COGG506 Dutch Nursery on West Street is allocated for a comprehensive development area comprising residential, employment, retail, and community access.**
- 43) That site COGG171 land rear of 100-146 Tilkey Road is not allocated for development.**
- 44) That site COGG172 land at The Vineyard on West Street is not allocated for development.**
- 45) That site COGG173 land to the north of Abbey Lane is not allocated for development.**
- 46) That site COGG174 Cook Field East Street is retained for residential development.**

That site COGG175 Coggeshall Glebe to the rear of 32 – 78 West Street is allocated as a Local Green Space.

48) That site COGG176 land south of West Street, north of the football club is not allocated for development and retains its formal recreation designation.

49) That site COGG177 land north of Robinsbridge Road is not allocated for development.

50) That site COGG178 site adj to Colne Road and the A120 is not allocated for residential development.

51) That site land off Colne Road south of the A120 is not allocated for residential development and retains its employment designation.

52) That site COGG180 land at West Street is not allocated for residential development.

53) That the site COGG181 land at Honeywood School and land north and south of the A120 bypass is not allocated for residential development. But that the part of the site located between the A120 and Tey Road is allocated for residential development as set out in the appendix.

54) That site COGG182 and COGG183 are not allocated for residential development.

55) That a development boundary is drawn around Surrex Hamlet as shown in the appendix.

56) That the inset map for Coggeshall and Surrex Hamlet be approved.

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	There will be public consultation during various stages of

Engagement:	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 the settlement boundary would be extended around the site. The key to maps is located in **Appendix 1**.

- 2.7 It should be noted that rural exception sites to facilitate affordable housing do not need to be specifically allocated but would be assessed against the policy within the Local Plan. As such there is an opportunity for small sites to meet local need to come forward in addition to those which are set out here.
- 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 is contained within the Appendix booklet and the relevant appendix number to find maps related to that area is highlighted in bold in the text.
- 3.2 A separate recommendation relating to each village or settlement is included at the end of each section. In larger areas a recommendation is included after each site.

4 Braintree and Great Notley (With Black Notley and Cressing Parishes.)

- 4.1 Braintree is the largest town in the District, and is identified as a main town in the 2011 Core Strategy. It is centrally located with good transport links, and acts as a service centre for much of the rest of the District, providing shopping, employment, recreation, and community facilities. It has a railway service to London and easy access to Stanstead Airport to the west. Great Notley is located to the south west of Braintree and benefits from access to local services, and the strategic road network. It is located next to the A131 which provides direct access to Chelmsford and Stansted Airport. It has the Skyline industrial estate, and a country park, as well as a District centre

anchored by a large supermarket. Additional employment provision is provided to the south west of Great Notley.

- 4.2 Cressing and Tye Green, and Black Notley are identified as other villages in the Core Strategy (2011). The available services they have are more limited. Tye Green Cressing does have a railway station, albeit with poor pedestrian access, it also has a primary school. Cressing village has much more limited services other than a pub and bus service.
- 4.3 Cressing is working toward a neighbourhood plan, however no information is as yet available. Once completed, the Cressing Neighbourhood Plan will provide the local development plan policies and allocations for the Parish. The neighbourhood plan can allocate different sites for development within the Parish 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.

4.4 Current policy position

Braintree is identified in the Core Strategy (2011) as a main town. The Plan allocated two major growth locations, one at North West Braintree for housing and employment, and one to the south west of Great Notley for employment. Other allocations include for residential, care home employment, and retail uses. The town centre is also defined as are primary and secondary retail frontages.

- 4.5 Protective allocations are shown for formal and informal recreation areas, existing employment areas, cemeteries, and education provision among others.
- 4.6 The town has three inset maps, one showing the whole town, including the area around Galley's corner in Cressing Parish. A small inset map is shown for the town centre, and the Bradford Street area. Great Notley's inset map shows a development boundary, employment allocations, employment sites, country park, structural landscaping, education, visually important space, informal recreation, allotments, and a district centre.
- 4.7 The inset map for Black Notley shows a development boundary, informal recreation, visually important space, and allotments. A flood zone is also present to the east of the village.
- 4.8 Cressing has a development boundary and a conservation area and a small area of flood zone is to the south east.

- 4.9 Tye Green Cressing has a development boundary, education, formal recreation, and areas of visually important space.

4.10 SA/SEA

- 4.11 Sites within Braintree and Great Notley generally score well in terms of SA/SEA. Positives include the distance to primary and secondary schools, employment opportunities, distance to health care services such as GP's and the hospitals, broadband availability, proximity to bus services, and proximity to accessible natural greenspace.
- 4.12 Where the SA/SEA results are more negative that is because of issues such as a site being a greenfield site, being in an area with a vulnerable landscape, or higher quality agricultural land, or having an uncertain effect on conservation areas, listed buildings or other heritage assets.
- 4.13 Black Notley sites scored well in relation to proximity to the railway line. The majority of sites put forward are greenfield sites which would score less well in terms of sustainable development.
- 4.14 Cressing scores less well in sustainability terms, as it is further away from the railway station and has limited services. Tye green has a good proximity to the railway, and scores well in terms of access to primary education. The majority of sites were greenfield sites which would not score well in terms of sustainable development. The majority of land around Cressing and Tye Green is identified as grade 2 agricultural land.

4.15 Ward Member Comments

- 4.16 There is no town council for Braintree, so a meeting was held with ward members. Officers discussed the sites put forward for in the Call for Sites with ward Members in November. The following is a summary of comments made at that meeting.

BOCN 132 – Good site provided it has access from the A131

BOCN126 – The site is not a natural extension of development

BOCN130 – Site has planning permission.

BOCN129 – Houses would have to be on stilts due to flood risk. Expressed concerns about contamination. BOCN131 – Site is too open in the landscape.

BOCN137 – Site links to Panfield, development could be supported up to the boundary of the parish but not further.

BOCN133 – Issues of landscape impact.

PANF136 – No access to site.

BRAW153 – Site could be allocated for residential uses.

GNGN266/265 – Part of site adjacent to Pod's Brook could be considered, but not further.

BCBG144 – Site has a current application. Leave as employment.

BLAN114 – Subject to highways, close proximity to the secondary school. Reservation about southern extent of the site and how Bakers Lane would be dealt with.

4.17 Site Submissions with officer commentary

4.18 Bocking North

4.19 BOCN124 – Land rear of 61 Broad Road Bocking.

4.20 Site size is 1.3ha, the site is proposed for residential use and could accommodate up to 30 homes.

4.21 *Officer comment – The site is a private garden area for number 61 Broad Road, it has no public access. The site is shown as being of low landscape capacity (14d) along with the wider area between Broad Road and Bocking Church Street. The site has two public rights of way adjacent on the north-east and north-west boundary. Development of the site would be difficult as it is exposed within the wider landscape.*

4.22 Recommendation 1a – That site BOCN124 – Land rear of 61 Broad Road Bocking, is not allocated for residential development.

4.23 BOCN125 – Land to the rear of 282/288 Broad Road Braintree, known as Broadfield nursery.

4.24 Site size is approximately 1.7ha. The site could accommodate up to 40 homes.

4.25 *Officer comment – The site comprises a nursery which has a number of structures and hardstanding used as parking, the northern part of the site is overgrown and likely has wildlife potential. The part of the site with structures and parking is likely to be considered as previously developed land, with the remainder of the site being greenfield. Some residential units are also included within the site boundary. The site is of low-medium landscape capacity (12a). The site has a public right of way running along its access road. The access is currently narrow, and would require widening if the site were to be developed. The character of development in the area is linear along Broad Road, and development of the whole of the site would be inappropriate back land development. A development on the previously*

developed part of the site may be acceptable but whether that part of the site and the access could accommodate 10+ dwellings is uncertain.

4.26 Recommendation 1b – That site BOCN125 – Land rear of 282/288 Broad Road Braintree is not allocated for residential development.

4.27 BOCN126 – Land east of Dorewards Hall, Bocking.

4.28 The site is approximately 25.5ha in size. The site could accommodate about 638 homes, with a neighbourhood food retail store, and community facilities. The developer has indicated of a larger site area and numbers could be available.

4.29 *Officer Comment – The area is within a low landscape capacity area (14b). The site has a TPO woodland (Round wood), a public right of way linking Broad Road and Church Street runs along the southern boundary. Access is proposed from the roundabout at Broad Road/A131. Whilst being adjacent to the development boundary, the site is some distance from health services, local centres, and is a greenfield site. It is also classified as best and most versatile agricultural land. Positives include proximity to local bus services, and schools. The site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as areas are available elsewhere for development which would have a much lower impact on the landscape.*

4.30 Recommendation 1c – That site BOCN126 Land east of Dorewards Hall, Bocking is not allocated as a residential growth location.

4.31 BOCN128 – Land at High Garret.

4.32 The site is 0.99ha in size and is proposed for 1 house.

4.33 *Officer Comment – The site is below the threshold for allocation which is 10+ dwellings and is also identified as a TPO woodland, as such it is not suitable for redevelopment.*

4.34 Recommendation 1d – That the site BOCN128 – Land at High Garret is not allocated for residential development.

4.35 BOCN129 – Unit 1 Bovingdon Road, The Bakehouse, Braintree.

4.36 The site is 0.9ha in size and proposed for residential use. No specific number of houses has been provided.

4.37 *Officer Comment – The site is currently identified as an employment area, and has a number of derelict buildings, it is a brownfield site. The site is identified as being within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and is within 250m of a historic landfill. It would be inappropriate to allocate the site for residential uses as it is within the identified Flood Zone, and other sites are available which are at lower risk*

of flooding. The draft Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates that the site is within Flood Zone 3b. The employment site is underutilised, and away from the main road network and therefore the employment allocation should be removed.

4.38 Recommendation 1e – That the site BOCN129 Unit 1 Bovingdon Road, The Bakehouse, is not allocated for residential development, and that the existing employment allocation is removed.

4.39 BOCN130 - Land between 90 -92 High Garrett Road, High Garrett, Braintree.

4.40 The site is 0.42ha in size, and proposed for 14 homes.

4.41 *Officer Comment – this site has been granted planning permission subject to s106 (15/00901/FUL) for 10 homes. It will therefore be allocated as a residential development site.*

4.42 Recommendation 1f – That site BOCN130 – Land between 90 – 92 High Garrett Road, High Garrett is allocated as a residential site.

4.43 BOCN131 – Land at Bovingdon Road.

4.44 The site is approximately 4.1ha in size and is proposed for a minimum of 66 homes.

4.45 *Officer Comment – The site is within a low landscape capacity area (13f), and is identified as being contaminated land. Development of the site would be inappropriate in terms of landscape capacity and would be an unnatural extension of development out of Braintree and Bocking along Bovingdon Road, which would intrude into the countryside.*

4.46 Recommendation 1g – The the site BOCN131 Land at Bovingdon Road is not allocated for residential development.

4.47 BOCN132 – Land east of Broad Road.

4.48 The site is 65.6 ha and is proposed for in the region of 1000 homes, care home, employment, small scale local retail, education provision, and community facilities.

4.49 *Officer comment – The site is primarily low-medium landscape capacity (15c and 15e), with areas of medium to medium high capacity toward Broad Road (5b and 15d). Low landscape capacity is toward the river (15a) but the built development will not encroach onto the river valley.*

4.50 *The southern and parts of the eastern section of the site is shown as being contaminated land, which would need to be remediated if the site were to be developed. The site has some existing employment at Straits Mill, and this*

area is considered to be previously developed land. A number of public rights of way run through the site which would have to be retained and enhanced. The site has some TPO woodlands which should also be retained.

- 4.51 *Access from Broad Road would be difficult considering the size of the development, and it would be more appropriate for the access to be primarily accessed from the A131, albeit a smaller access may be needed from Broad Road. The development provides the opportunity to relocate the employment and sewerage access away from Convent Lane which would be of benefit to the residents and the grade II listed convent building which is located very close to the road at the junction of Convent Lane and Broad Road.*
- 4.52 *The site is located away from shops and services; however it is adjacent to the development boundary for Braintree and is of a scale which could provide a primary school, convenience shop, and informal and formal recreation areas. The site will also be expected to re-provide employment. The site will also be able to provide enhancement of the river walk, cycleway provision and open space.*
- 4.53 *Given the increased requirement for housing, the landscape capacity of the site, and that it is partly previously developed, the site should be allocated as a mixed use growth location comprising residential development (In the region of 1000 new homes), employment, open space, primary school and recreation, with a primary access from the A131.*
- 4.54 Recommendation 1h – That site BOCN132 Land East of Broad Road is allocated as a mixed use growth location.**
- 4.55 Policy – Strategic Growth Location – Land East of Broad Road, Braintree**

“A Strategic Growth Location has been identified at Land East of Broad Road and is shown on the proposals map. It is expected that this location will provide 1000 new homes.

Development on the site will also provide for;

- Up to 1000 new homes of a mixed size and type appropriate to the area
- Affordable housing as per the Councils requirement
- Employment development
- A new primary school, local retail facilities and contributions to other community facilities as appropriate, including local health facilities
- Public Open Space, formal and Informal recreation, this would include improvements to the River Walk to the south of the site and pedestrian and cycleway links to the town centre.
- Provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site.

The main access to the site will be from A131, with an additional minor vehicle access from Broad Road. All access points will have to be agreed with Essex County Council Highways. The provision of facility shall coincide with the completion of different phases of development to ensure that local services and in place when they are needed”.

4.56 **BOCN123 – Land to the rear of Highfield Stile Road Braintree.**

4.57 Site size is 1ha, the site is proposed for residential use and could accommodate up to 20 homes.

4.58 *Officer comment – The site is located adjacent to the development boundary rear of Broad Road. It is within an archaeological site which covers an area wider than that of the site. Any development would need to be supported by an archaeological assessment. A bridleway is to the north leading to Highfield Stile Farm. The landscape character assessment identifies the area as being of medium landscape capacity (Area 15b). Access to the site could potentially be an issue, and may restrict the number of dwellings it could deliver unless the site was developed in conjunction with an adjacent site. Further highways work would be required to ensure a safe access.*

4.59 *However, when considering the site in the wider context of potential development in this area, it would likely be included within the development boundary if BOCN132 (Land east of Broad Road), were to be allocated.*

4.60 **Recommendation 1i - That the site BOCN123 – Land rear of Highfield Stile Road is included as part of the strategic growth location**

4.61 **BOCN127 – Land east of Elizabeth Lockhart Way, north of Convent Lane.**

4.62 The site size is approximately 0.48ha in size and could accommodate 9 homes.

4.63 *Officer comment – The site is located next to the development boundary and would be accessed from Elizabeth Lockhart Way. A public right of way runs along the south eastern boundary. The site while below the allocation threshold, would be included within the development boundary if the adjacent development site east of Broad Road were to be included within the development boundary. Highways access should not present a problem and could be access through Elizabeth Lockhart Way.*

4.64 **Recommendation 1j – That the site BOCN127 Land east of Elizabeth Lockhart Way is included as part of the strategic growth location**

- 4.65 BOCN133 – Land at Deanery Hill, Bocking.
- 4.66 The site is 9.45ha and is proposed for 180 to 240 homes, care home, possible small office development, and local convenience shop.
- 4.67 *Officer comment – This site is located within an area of low landscape capacity and is visually prominent in the River Pant valley (13f). The site is part within 250m of a historic landfill. The site has had a planning permission for a golf driving range which did make a technical start, but has never been fully implemented. Considering the exposed nature of the site and the low landscape capacity, it is not considered suitable to allocate the site for development.*
- 4.68 Recommendation 1k – That site BOCN133 Land at Deanery Hill is not allocated for residential development.**
- 4.69 BOCN134 – Polly’s Field, Poly’s Hill Church Lane, Bocking.
- 4.70 The site is 2.7ha in size, and is proposed for a care home.
- 4.71 *Officer comment – This site is allocated in the Pre-Submission Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2014). It is proposed to carry forward this allocation.*
- 4.72 Recommendation 1l – The site BOCN134 – Polly’s Field retains its allocation as specialist housing.**
- 4.73 BOCN135 – Land at Church Street, High Garrett.
- 4.74 The site is proposed for 1.44ha and it is proposed for between 30 to 40 dwellings.
- 4.75 *Officer Comment – It would not be appropriate to development as it would significantly reduce the gap between development in Church Street and development along Broad Road.*
- 4.76 Recommendation 1m – That site BOCN135 – Land at Church Street is not allocated for residential development.**
- 4.77 BOCN137 – Towerlands Park, land between Panfield Lane and Deanery Hill.
- 4.78 The site is approximately 42.79 ha and is proposed for up to 1150 homes, B1 employment and commercial use, education provision, and community facilities.
- 4.79 *Officer comment – The site is considered to be of between Medium-Low (16a) capacity and Medium landscape capacity (16b). The western part of the site is located within Panfield Parish, and the Parish Council have expressed concern that development on this site would reduce the gap between*

Braintree and Panfield. The site is partly previously developed, but the golf course and field to the west would be considered greenfield sites. The site has a gas pipe line running through it which may limit the extent of built development on the western edge. A public right of way runs along the boundary to the south and cuts through the lower south west area of the site. It is adjacent to the Core Strategy growth location at North West Braintree. Having the site wholly accessed from Panfield Lane would be difficult, and it would be better if the site were also accessible from the existing North West Braintree as well. The capacity of Springwood Drive roundabout is of potential concern and proposals for the improvement of that roundabout in the context of higher growth levels in the wider Braintree area are being considered. A road link between the proposal and the North West Braintree growth location should also be sought.

4.80 *Considering the site is a partly previously developed site, and has limited landscape impact, it is considered to appropriate to allocate the part of the site which is contained within Bocking North ward. Officers estimate the capacity of this to be in the region of 600 dwellings, however further information will be required from the landowner as to the likely capacity of a reduced site area.*

4.81 Recommendation 1n – That part of the site BOCN137 Towerlands Park as shown in the appendix is allocated as a strategic growth location.

4.82 Policy – Growth Location Former Towerlands Park site

“A Strategic Growth Location has been identified at Towerlands Park and is shown on the proposals map. It is expected that this location will provide 600 new homes. Development on the site will also provide;

- Up to 600 new homes
- Primary school
- Community facilities, including a contribution to local NHS facilities
- Local retail
- Public open space and formal and informal recreation, including landscaping to the rural edge

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.

The main access to the site will be from Deanery Hill/Panfield Lane, an additional vehicle access will be sought from the growth location to the south at North West Braintree. All access points will have to be agreed to the satisfaction of Essex County Council Highways.

The development will be expected to integrate with existing development and the wider area through provision of public footpaths, cycle ways, and where opportunities exist to Bridalways. This could be done through the enhancement of existing public rights of way, or by the creation of new rights of way.

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

4.83 BOCN502 – Land at Monken Hadley, Broad Road, Braintree.

4.84 The site is 0.65ha in size and could accommodate 6 residential units.

4.85 *Officer comment – The site is within a are of low landscape capacity (14b). A large number of TPO’s and group TPO’s surround the site. As the site is for less than 10 dwellings it would not be allocated within the new Local Plan and it would not be a natural extension to the development boundary.*

4.86 Recommendation 1o– That site BOCN502 Land at Monken Hadley, is not allocated for residential development.

4.87 Bocking South

4.88 BOCS138 – Land west of Springwood Drive.

4.89 The site is approximately 8.3ha and is proposed for employment uses.

4.90 *Officer Comment – This site was allocated for employment and structural landscaping in the 2014 Plan. It is not proposed to change the allocation.*

4.91 Recommendation 1p– That the site BOCS138 – Land west of Springwood Drive retains its employment and structural landscape designation.

4.92 BOCS139 – Land forming part Fair Acres, Church Lane Braintree

4.93 It is approximately 0.43ha. It is proposed for 5 dwellings.

4.94 *Officer comment – The site is below the local plan allocation of 10+ dwellings and would therefore not be allocated. Extending the development boundary in this location would not be a natural extension to the development boundary at Church Lane.*

4.95 Recommendation 1q– That site BOCS139 Land forming part of Fair Acres Church Lane, is not allocated for residential development.

4.96 BOCS140 – Site at Rayne Lodge Farm.

4.97 The site is approximately 11.4 ha and is proposed for 264 dwellings.

4.98 *Officer comment – The site has a current planning application awaiting determination (15/01458/OUT) for up to 136 dwellings. The site is within an area of medium landscape capacity (17e), and is grade 3 agricultural land. The site has a public right of way running through it. There is a grade 2 listed building at Rayne Lodge. It is proposed to allocate the site as it would have a limited landscape impact and is located in close proximity to local employment opportunities and services. Public rights of way would be retained.*

4.99 Recommendation 1r – That site BOCS140 Site at Rayne Lodge Farm is allocated for residential development.

4.100 BOCS141 – Unit 1 Springwood Industrial Estate Braintree.

4.101 The site is approximately 3.64ha in size and proposed for residential and employment as part of a mixed use scheme.

4.102 *Officer Comment – The site is currently identified for employment uses under the 2014 Pre-Submission Plan. The sites only access would be the existing employment area at Springwood Drive. It would therefore be inappropriate to allow residential development with its only access through a side road in an industrial area.*

4.103 *It is not proposed to change this allocation.*

4.104 Recommendation 1s – That site BOCS141 Unit 1 Springwood Industrial Estate is retained for employment purposes.

4.105 Bocking Blackwater

4.106 No sites submitted.

4.107 Braintree Central and Beckers Green

4.108 BCBG144 – Land off East Street Braintree.

4.109 The site is approximately 2ha in size, and is proposed for residential (64 units) and employment uses (9 units).

4.110 *Officer comment – This site is identified in the 2014 as an employment site. The site is previously developed, and has had a number of units demolished on site, however the Council's employment evidence base indicates that the site should be retained for employment purposes at this time.*

4.111 Recommendation 1t – That site BCBG144 Land off East Street Braintree is not allocated for residential development, and that the employment allocation currently on site is retained.

- 4.112 BCBG145 – Land at Albert Road/Manor Street, Braintree.
- 4.113 The site is approximately 0.2ha and is proposed for residential use (Approximately 5 units).
- 4.114 *Officer Comment – The site is below the site allocation threshold for the Local Plan. It is within the development boundary for Braintree and allocated for employment uses, and is within the Braintree employment cluster C19 as shown in the employment land needs assessment. It was recommended in that report that the site should remain for employment uses.*
- 4.115 Recommendation 1u – That site BCBG145 Land at Albert Road/Manor Road is not allocated for residential development, and that its employment allocation is retained.**
- 4.116 BCBG146 – Car park and land north of Freeport Braintree.
- 4.117 The site is approximately 3.7ha and proposed for retail and associated car parking.
- 4.118 *Officer Comment – The site is allocated in the 2014 Plan for employment/retail warehousing purposes. It is proposed to change the allocation to comparison retail goods/retail warehousing in order to meet the identified need for comparison goods retailing identified within the Council evidence base.*
- 4.119 Recommendation 1v – That site BCBG146 – Car park and land north of Freeport Braintree is allocated for comparison goods retailing.**
- 4.120 BCBG147 – 1 – 6 The Mazes. East Street, Braintree.
- 4.121 The site is approximately 0.27ha in size and could accommodate approximately 5 dwellings.
- 4.122 *Officer comment – The site is below the threshold for allocation in the new Local Plan and is an allocated employment site. It is not proposed to change that allocation.*
- 4.123 Recommendation 1w – That site BCBG147 The Mazes East Street Braintree is not allocated for residential development, and its current employment allocation retained.**
- 4.124 BCBG148 – 33 Notley Road Braintree.
- 4.125 The site is approximately 0.05ha in size. It may be able to accommodate up to 2 homes.
- 4.126 *Officer comment – The site is below the threshold for allocation in the new Local Plan.*

4.127 Recommendation 1x – that BCBG148 33 Notley Road Braintree is not allocated for residential development.

4.128 BCBG149 – Football Club, Clockhouse Way, Braintree.

4.129 The site size is 1.8ha. It could accommodate up to 75 homes.

4.130 *Officer comment – The site is allocated for residential use in the 2014 Plan. It is not proposed to change this allocation as we understand it is still the intention of the football club to move grounds within the Plan period.*

4.131 Recommendation 1y – BCBG149 – Football Club Clockhouse Way retains its residential allocation.

4.132 BCBG150 – Stubbs Lane, Braintree.

4.133 The site is approximately 0.34ha. It could accommodate approximately 10 homes.

4.134 *Officer comment – This site is located within the development boundary for Braintree and has good access to the local road network. It is proposed to allocate the site for residential development in this consultation draft document, but that the landowner will need to carry out additional work on tree and wildlife assessments to prove that the site is deliverable.*

4.135 Recommendation 1z - BCBG150 Stubbs Lane, is allocated for residential development.

4.136 BCBG151 – Land at Trotters Field, Braintree.

4.137 The site is approximately 1ha. It could accommodate up to 25 dwellings.

4.138 *Officer comment – this site is located within the development boundary for Braintree. However, it serves the function of an informal recreation area which separates residential development at Trotters Field from employment uses off Benfield Way. It is important that this buffer remains to help protect the amenity of residents in Trotters Field. A cycle route connects Trotters Field with Benfield Way. The site should therefore be identified as informal recreation.*

4.139 Recommendation 1aa - BCBG151 Land at Trotters Field is not allocated for residential development, but is allocated for informal recreation.

4.140 BCBG550 – Land off Millennium Way, Braintree.

4.141 The site is 4.36 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 100 homes.

4.142 *Officer comment – The site is allocated in the 2014 Plan for residential development. It is not proposed to change this designation. It can come*

forward separately or as part of a comprehensive development involving the adjacent tennis and football club grounds.

4.143 Recommendation 1bb - BCBG550 Land off Millennium Way Braintree retains its residential allocation.

4.144 Braintree West Ward/Great Notley Black Notley Ward

4.145 BRAW153 – Broomhills Estate, Pods Brook Road, Braintree.

4.146 The site is approximately 2.85ha in size. It was originally put forward for retail use, but was now being promoted for residential use. It could accommodate approximately 70 dwellings.

4.147 *Officer comment – The site is allocated in the 2014 Plan as a regeneration site under policy ADM37a – Broomhills Regeneration Site for uses including employment, vehicle related sales, indoor sport and recreation, and sale of non-food retail products. However, the employment land review has recommended that the site no longer be identified for employment uses. The site is rundown, and is also a brownfield site which would benefit from redevelopment. As such it is recommended that the allocation be changed to a residential site.*

4.148 Recommendation 1cc - BRAW153 – Broomhills Estate Pod's Brook Road, is allocated for residential development

4.149 GNBN265, GNBN266 and BRAW154 – land south west of Braintree - the three sites are being put forward for residential development of up to 1600 homes, local centre, primary school, employment land and public open space

4.150 Parish Council Comment – Rayne Parish Council - Brook Green is a proposed development between Rayne and Braintree and has been the cause of significant adverse reaction across from the vast majority of the residents. The prime concerns are:

- a. The risk to the integrity of the Village. The risk of coalescence is too high and the BDC Strategic intent to avoid coalescence with three major development areas, namely, Braintree, Halstead and Witham.
- b. The significant threat to Flitch Way, a much loved, used and appreciated Linear Country Park that would be annihilated, has already been made.
- c. There are existing and grave traffic problems at and around the junction between Rayne Road and Springwood Drive. The addition of an estimated 2,500 to 3,000 extra vehicles close by is more than a step too far. The knock-on effect of this is unthinkable.
- d. There are many other objections from the residents of Rayne and other residents impacted by this proposal. The amount of documentation, including petitions, are evidence of the unsuitability of the Brook Green proposal and are all registered on the BDC Planning Site.

- e. The developer has made it clear that he intends by-passing the Local Plan procedure and the data compiled in the "No to Brook Green" campaign. The objections will be raised against this proposal no matter what course of action the developer elects to take.

- 4.151 *Officer comment – A planning application has been submitted for this site under reference 15/01538/FUL which includes land under reference GNBC265 and GNBC266. It has been put forward for up to 1600 dwellings a local centre primary school, employment and public open space. The site would be accessed from Gilda Terrace, and Pod's Brook. This is to be determined.*
- 4.152 *BRAW154 is located south of Gilda Terrace and Sun Lido Square, north of the Flitchway. Gilda Terrace and Sun Lido Square had a development boundary drawn round them in the 2014 Plan. In terms of landscape capacity the site is mixed low capacity (17b), with medium capacity (17a) at its eastern end. The Flitchway is identified as a Local Wildlife site and as an accessible natural greenspace, development around the Flitchway would likely have a significant impact on its character and appearance. The sites eastern boundary has a public right of way and is also adjacent but not within a flood zone. Several TPO's are on the boundary as well as a TPO group. The site is a greenfield site, and is identified as being grade 3 agricultural land.*
- 4.153 *GNBN265 and 266 are shown as being of Low Landscape Capacity (20a and 20c). A small part of the site is within the flood zone but this would be unlikely to impact on the wider development. Several public rights of way go through the site which would either have to be retained or diverted. A listed building and archaeological site is present adjacent this area at Naylinghurst. The southern part of the site is adjacent to the A120 trunk road. The site has a number of positive benefits in terms of its location, proximity to employment and services, and the A120; however it is a greenfield site, with a low landscape capacity for development.*
- 4.154 Recommendation 1dd – BRAW154, GNBC265, GNBC266, and GNBC267 land south west of Braintree are not allocated for residential development.**
- 4.155 Braintree South Ward**
- 4.156 BRSO152 – Land adj Braintree railway station, Station Road, Braintree.
- 4.157 The site is approximately 0.7ha in size. It has been put forward for 100 apartments.
- 4.158 *Officer Comment – The site is within the development boundary for Braintree. The site is a former builder's yard which is identified as being contaminated*

land. The site is very well located as it is close to the town centre and railway line, however, access is difficult, and it would be necessary to demonstrate that a suitable access could be achieved. The site is currently identified as informal recreation; however it is not accessible to the public.

4.159 The site should be allocated for residential development within the draft Local Plan, but the landowner needs to provide additional evidence on the access arrangements for the site, or it cannot be included in the final version.

4.160 Recommendation 1ee – BRSO152 Land adj Braintree Railway Station, Station Road is allocated for residential development.

5 Great Notley and Black Notley Ward

5.1 GRNO260 – Land to the west of the A131 at Great Notley.

5.2 The site is approximately 40ha in size. It has been put forward for residential (344-649 homes), employment, and hotel use.

5.3 Great Notley Parish Council Comment - Councillors appreciate that this area has been earmarked for some time for economic development. However it is noted that there is now the potential, in addition to business use, for some 500 houses to be built. Great Notley Parish Council opposes the construction of 500 houses at the site as it would not be in keeping with business use and in addition those houses would be completely isolated from the existing community of Great Notley.

5.4 *Officer Comment – This site is identified in the Core Strategy (2011) as an employment growth location, and a Master Plan has been adopted. The new proposal is a larger area but reduces the level of employment and includes some residential uses. It would not be appropriate to include residential uses on this site as it would be isolated from residential development at Great Notley. It is not proposed to add additional areas for employment to the site allocation at this stage as the boundary as currently drawn is along a strong field boundary, providing a strong edge to the development. It is therefore not proposed to change the allocation of the site.*

5.5 Recommendation 1ff - GRNO260 land to the west of the A131 at Great Notley is not allocated for residential development and retains its employment growth location allocation.

5.6 GNBN261 – Land adjacent to 119 London Road, Black Notley and GNBN262 – Land adj to 106 London Road Braintree

5.7 GNBN261 is 0.1376 ha in size and is proposed for 1 or 2 homes. GNBN262 is also 0.137 ha in size and proposed for residential development.

- 5.8 *Officer Comment – GNBC261 and 262 are below the allocation threshold for the new Local Plan. Intensification of development is not considered suitable in this location as it contributes toward a low density gap in development between Braintree and Great Notley, which helps retain the setting of each of these settlements.*
- 5.9 **Recommendation 1gg – GNBC261 land adj to 119 London Road Black Notley is not allocated for residential development. And that GNBC262 land adj to 106 London Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- 5.10 GNBC263 – Land between 114 and 126 London Road, Great Notley.
- 5.11 The site is 0.98ha in size. It could accommodate approximately 20 homes.
- 5.12 *Officer Comment – The site has a group TPO and is adjacent to a grade 2 listed building. The front part of the site is included within the development boundary in the 2014 Local Plan and it is not proposed to change that extent. Development further back would be considered in appropriate back land development as it is not a natural extension to development in that location, and encroaches on a less developed green area which separates Great Notley from the A120 and Braintree.*
- 5.13 **Recommendation 1hh – GNBC263 Land between 114 and 126 London Road, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 5.14 GNBC264 – Land at London Road Braintree.
- 5.15 Proposed for residential use.
- 5.16 *Officer comment – This site is allocated in the 2014 Plan. It is not proposed to change the allocation, other than to remove the formal recreation designation which is unlikely to be undeliverable.*
- 5.17 **Recommendation 1ii – GNBC264 Land at London Road retains its residential, informal and cycleway allocation, and that the formal recreation designation is removed.**
- 5.18 BLAN111 – Hill House, Witham Road, Black Notley.
- 5.19 The site is approximately 0.7ha in size. It is proposed for residential uses and could accommodate up to 17 residential units.
- 5.20 Black Notley Parish Comment - No information but this site is in the open countryside exiting onto an area of overburdened roads to Chelmsford and Stansted via Bakers Lane, therefore this is an unsuitable site.

- 5.21 *Officer comment – This site is located to the south of the A120 west of Notley Road. It is within an area of low-medium landscape capacity (1a). It would not be a logical extension to development in Braintree, and would be a relatively large scale residential development, in an area whose character is predominantly rural with scattered isolated dwellings. It would be separated from the built area by the A120, and if development on the other side of the road were permitted it would not be a logical extension to that site either.*
- 5.22 Recommendation 1jj – BLAN111 Hill House, Witham Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- 5.23 BLAN112 – The Stables, London Road/Bakers Lane, Black Notley.
- 5.24 The site is approximately 0.4ha in size. The site could accommodate up to 8 dwellings.
- 5.25 Black Notley Parish Comment - An isolated site in the open countryside abutting good agricultural land and exiting onto an area of overburdened rural roads. It is next to a listed building and there is no local school or green open space. Therefore this is not a suitable site for development.
- 5.26 Great Notley Parish Comment - Although a potential small development of ten houses, Councillors were concerned to note comments that referring to such development being a 'meaningful gateway approach' into Braintree. It was considered erroneous to describe the area in that way and that it would be misconceived to design it in that manner. It is the understanding of the Parish Council that London Road is a local road and that through traffic should use the A131 bypass to access Braintree and beyond. To design the area in a contrary fashion would encourage a dramatic increase of through traffic to the detriment of residents.
- 5.27 *Officer comment – This site has not been assessed for landscape character as the site is isolated from the wider countryside by adjacent development. The site is adjacent to a grade II listed building. An application was refused under (15/01124/OUT) for 8 market and affordable houses, an appeal on this decision is in progress. As the site is under 10 dwellings it would be below the allocation threshold for the new Local Plan.*
- 5.28 Recommendation 1kk – BLAN112 – The Stables, London Road/Bakers Lane is not allocated for residential development.**
- 5.29 BLAN113 – Lynderswood Farm, Lynderswood Lane, Upper London Road, Braintree. The site is approximately 8.26 ha in size. It is proposed for identification and extension of the employment area.
- 5.30 Black Notley Parish Comment – No comment has been received on this site.

- 5.31 *Officer comment – This site is an existing but unallocated employment area located to the south of Great Notley. The site has a number of positive benefits including providing employment and is accessible by public transport which operates along London Road. The site has no overriding constraints, and it is also well screened from the surrounding area, other than the requirement for visibility splays at the main access. It is proposed to identify an industrial development limit around the site and areas for the existing employment use, and vehicle storage (To reflect the current use of the site). An additional area of employment is proposed along the access road. This part of the site is well landscaped and development would not have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape.*
- 5.32 **Recommendation 1II - BLAN113 – Lynderswood Farm, Lynderswood Lane, is allocated for employment use and vehicle storage as shown on the appendix, and that an industrial development limit is drawn round the site.**
- 5.33 BLAN114 – Land east of Great Notley, south of Braintree.
- 5.34 The site is approximately 100ha. It could accommodate up to 2000 homes, care home, employment, retail, and education and community facilities.
- 5.35 Black Notley Parish Comment - Black Notley Parish Council does not wish to lose more of its Parish to development and urbanisation. At the village end of Bakers Lane from the Duck Pond to Buck Hill the road reaches a pinch point and is single file with a requested 30 mph limit. The cottages are only feet from the road and some are also several feet below the level of the road. John Rae cottage which lies opposite these cottages only has a few feet of frontage and the listed Hay Loft recently received extensive damage when a speeding vehicle smashed into it. The road continues down Buck Hill which is also too narrow for passing cars let alone the numerous HGVs that are tearing up the verges. This lane is a Rat Run.
- 5.36 Great Notley Parish Comment - Although this land is within the Parish of Black Notley it is in very close proximity to the Parish of Great Notley. It is noted that the proposal would be for 2,000 houses in that location. Councillors are of the view that the location is unsuitable and unsustainable. The main access would be from the London Road which is struggling to cope with existing traffic and thus would certainly struggle to cope with the traffic generated by an extra 2,000 homes with a resultant detriment to existing residents. In addition due to its proximity to the Parish such a large concentration of housing would put a substantial strain on the existing facilities within this Parish such as schools, shops, GP surgery etc. It should be noted that when Great Notley Garden Village was planned and constructed studies were carried out in relation to services required for the expected

population of the area. It therefore follows that by dramatically increasing the number of users of existing facilities it may overload those services. The Parish Council also wish to point out that if such a development were to go ahead the section 106 money would be paid to the Parish of Black Notley whereas in reality it would be the Parish of Great Notley that would bear the burden of additional development and this should be reflected in any Section 106 settlement.

- 5.37 This is a huge site also encompassing individual applications and would be a long term project, 5 years in the planning for up to 2000 houses and a new community with no boundary between Black Notley and the town.
- 5.38 It would cover good Agricultural Land Grade 2 and 3a when tested for a previous planning application.
- 5.39 Bakers Lane / Witham Road area is covered in very mature specimen trees ponds and small fields and hedgerows a haven for all forms of wildlife and the river valley is crossed by the John Ray Walk leading to his Historic Grade II Listed Cottage on Bakers Lane. John Ray is regarded as the Father of Natural History. Born in Black Notley, in the cottage which still bears his name on Bakers Lane. He was the son of the local Black Smith. Educated at St. Michaels Church he studied and lectured at Trinity College Cambridge. He developed a system naming species of plants as well as studying mammals reptiles fish bird and insects. His most famous book Historic Plantorium celebrated its 300th anniversary in 1986. His cottage is much visited by tourists.
- 5.40 There are also other character and Listed Buildings surrounding this site on Notley Road Buck Hill and Bakers Lane. It would be sacrilege to develop this area and its character should be retained as there is very little of the old Black Notley remaining and it gives a beautiful vista from the bypass bridge.
- 5.41 This area is used as an open space amenity by the population of South Braintree for walking in the countryside and is very popular, it is the only wide open space in the area and should be retained.
- 5.42 The site is susceptible to drainage problems hence all the ponds and is crisis crossed by High Voltage Pylons and power cables which will make it expensive to develop.
- 5.43 The infrastructure of Bakers Lane and London Road is overburdened by traffic avoiding Galleys Corner Roundabout and cutting through the town exiting via these inadequate routes. At peak times the traffic queue from Chapel Hill traffic lights is almost back to the Co-op in Masefield Road, and traffic queues to enter Masefield Road which is unacceptable. Access onto the bypass and redevelopment at Galleys Corner would solve the problem and future housing

needs using land which is of lesser quality. Other developments would be preferable for future development of the town and would solve the housing and infrastructure needs, e.g. the Brownfield Site on the airfield at Saling accessed by a western route to the bypass north of the town.

- 5.44 Additional Small Sites London Road Bakers Lane also included under BLAN114.
- 5.45 *Officer comment – This site is identified as being of mixed landscape character. The area to the south west of the site is Medium capacity (5a), the central and northern area is low-medium capacity, and the eastern side toward Notley Road is low capacity (5c). The site has several public rights of way running through it as well as grade II listed buildings, Hayeswood Farm, Ratcliffs, The Friary, and grade II* Cards. The grade II listed John Ray Cottage is on the opposite side of Bakers Lane. A number of TPO's are located along its boundary with London Road at Great Notley. The northern part of the site is within the A120 trunk road corridor. An archaeological site is also present which would need surveying.*
- 5.46 *The growth location can access the A120 west of Galleys Corner which is the least congested section of that road, cycle links will have to be provided throughout the site and to link into Braintree and the wider network. Link roads will be provided through the site to provide an alternative route to Bakers Lane.*
- 5.47 *A site of this size will be expected to have its own village centre with its own facilities such as shops, dentists, etc. It will also need to have at least one primary school and potentially a new secondary school to serve residents from the site and the wider area.*
- 5.48 *The site will also have to be carefully designed because it is within close proximity to a number of listed buildings, and has listed buildings on the boundary and within the site itself.*
- 5.49 *Whilst part of the site has low landscape capacity, the majority of it would be more able to cope with development. Access should not be an issue but any allocation would be subject to demonstrating that a suitable access/s could be provided. Access from Notley Road and London Road near its junction with the A120 are likely to be necessary. The site score positively in terms of access to existing employment, proximity to Great Notley district centre, education, and it being adjacent to the main urban area, and within close proximity to bus services. The majority of the site is grade 3 agricultural land, but the area to the south of Bakers Lane is Grade 2 agricultural land. When considering sites around Braintree as a whole, this area is likely more suitable for development, particularly in landscape impact terms and proximity to jobs and services and the strategic road network.*

- 5.50 BLAN110 – Site at Bakers Lane, Black Notley.
- 5.51 The site is approximately 1ha in size. It is proposed for residential uses and could accommodate up to 20 dwellings.
- 5.52 Black Notley Parish Comment - This is a small isolated site in the open countryside with access onto Bakers Lane - Bakers Lane is an overburdened bendy country lane with bad access and visibility. There is no local school or no green open space. Therefore it is not a suitable site for development.
- 5.53 *Officer comment – The site is located within an area of Medium Landscape capacity (5a), and has no other particular constraints. Development of the site on its own would not be appropriate as it would not be a natural extension of development, and would be in an isolated countryside location. However, if the site BLAN114 were to be allocated then it would be logical to allocate this site as well.*
- 5.54 BLAN115 – Land at Bakers Lane and London Road, Great Notley.
- 5.55 The site is roughly 4 ha in size. It was proposed to accommodate up to 95 homes, however a planning application has recently been submitted with a proposed capacity of 97 residential dwellings, with a new primary vehicle access from London Road, and the provision of open space.
- 5.56 Black Notley Parish Comment - An isolated site in the open countryside, on good agricultural land and exiting onto a sensitive overburdened road system London Road and Bakers Lane. There are no local school places and no green open space and the site is next to 2 Grade II Listed buildings and other character expensive houses. Therefore it is not a suitable site for development.
- 5.57 Great Notley Parish Comment - This is understood to be a prospective development of 99 homes with no associated services. Again due to the proximity to the Parish those new residents would naturally use the facilities within the Parish of Great Notley again putting unacceptable strain on those services. Councillors were again concerned in relation to the increased traffic that would use both London Road and Baker's Lane and took the view that the location is both unsuitable and unsustainable.
- 5.58 *Officer Comment – The site is within a medium area of landscape capacity (5a). If the adjacent site BLAN114 were to be allocated it would be logical to also allocate this site as it would be included in the development boundary. The site is being pursued separately to BLAN114, so it is likely that this site would come forward independently. The site has good access to services and public transport as it is adjacent to Great Notley, and can be easily accessed from London Road.*

- 5.59 BLAN116 – Land at Bakers Lane, Black Notley.
- 5.60 The site is 2.91 ha in size. It could accommodate between 65 – 80 homes.
- 5.61 Black Notley Parish Comment - An isolated site in the open countryside behind London Road and exiting onto Bakers Lane which is a sensitive overburdened country lane. There are no local school places and no green open space. Therefore this is not a suitable site for development.
- 5.62 Great Notley Parish Comment - Again Councillors are concerned as to the impact upon services within the Parish of Great Notley and also upon the impact of traffic using Baker's Lane.
- 5.63 *Officer comment – The site is within a medium landscape capacity area (5a), and is a greenfield site. If the adjacent site BLAN114 were to be included for development, it would be logical for this site to also be included within the development boundary. The site benefits from close proximity to Great Notley which means it has good access to services, and public transport is available along London Road. The access to London Road is narrow, and it would be more appropriate to access the site from Bakers Lane.*
- 5.64 BLAN117 – Land to the rear of 215 London Road, Braintree.
- 5.65 The site is 0.38 ha in size. It could accommodate approximately 10 dwellings.
- 5.66 Black Notley Parish Comment - This application is in the open countryside and appears to be backfill. Therefore it is not a suitable site for development.
- 5.67 *Officer Comment – The site is located to the rear of London Road. If BLAN114 were to be allocated then the site could be considered for development. It is currently a greenfield site as it is a residential garden. Access from Pickpocket Lane is narrow and may not be appropriate for vehicle access. The site could be considered on its merits if the development boundary is change to encompass BLAN114.*
- 5.68 Recommendation 1mm - BLAN110, BLAN114, BLAN115, BLAN116, BLAN117 – Land east of Great Notley, south of Braintree, is allocated as a strategic growth location.**
- 5.69 Policy – Growth Location – Land east of Great Notley, south of Braintree**
- “A Strategic Growth Location has been identified at land east of Great Notley, south of the A120 and is shown on the proposals map. It is expected that this location will provide 2000 new homes. Development would also expect to provide;
- Up to 2000 new homes
 - Appropriate employment uses to support a major new community

- Primary and secondary education facilities
- Community facilities including a contribution to or location for NHS facilities
- Local retail and food outlets as part of a village centre
- Public open space, and informal and formal recreation

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.

The main access to the site will be from London Road and Notley Road, with additional minor vehicle access from Bakers Lane. All access points will have to be agreed to the satisfaction of Essex County Council Highways.

The development will be expected to integrate with existing development and the wider area through provision of public footpaths, cycle ways, and where opportunities exist to Bridalways. This could be done through the enhancement of existing public rights of way, or by the creation of new rights of way.

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

Provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site will also be sought.”

5.70 BLAN118 – Land opposite 65 – 96 Brain Valley Avenue, Black Notley.

5.71 The site is approximately 0.6ha in size. It could accommodate up to 15 homes.

5.72 Black Notley Parish Comment - Brain Valley Avenue. As previously stated we would only accept 8 bungalows with conditions, on this area, as per our previous letter see Call for Sites 2014 for this information. There is no school in the village and further development will add to the burden on the local infrastructure, traffic exiting to Chelmsford, Stansted via Bakers Lane.

5.73 There is evidence of flooding in this area as water percolates down to the river valley and properties and highways have been affected. It should also be remembered that the Brain Valley is a protected area. Therefore it is not a suitable site.

5.74 *Officer Comment – The site is identified as having medium-landscape capacity (7b). It does not have any other constraints, and is currently used for grazing. Development at this location would significantly change the character of Brain Valley Avenue from an edge of village location to a more enclosed urban environment.*

5.75 Recommendation 1nn – BLAN118 Land opposite 65 – 96 Brain Valley Avenue, is not allocated for residential development.

5.76 BLAN119 – Land to the rear of Brain Valley Avenue, Black Notley.

5.77 The site is approximately 6 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 45 homes and open space.

5.78 Black Notley Parish Comment – This is an exposed site on a gradient sloping down to the river, the surrounding land is very boggy. Houses on Witham Rd and Brain Valley Ave have experienced flooding due to water running down to the river valley both above ground and from seepage. Any further development would probably experience the same problem.

5.79 There is no school in the village and further development will add to the burden on the local infrastructure, traffic exiting to Chelmsford, Stansted via Bakers Lane. There has already been huge expansion in the village with 384 houses on the Hospital Site. Therefore it is not a suitable site.

5.80 *Officer Comment – The site is identified as having medium-landscape capacity (7b). The rear of the site is within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Development in this location would not be a natural extension or infilling of development in Black Notley. It would significantly change the character of the village edge in this location which would be visually prominent from public rights of ways, and across the river valley.*

5.81 Recommendation 1oo – BLAN119 Land to the rear of Brain Valley Avenue is not allocated for residential development.

5.82 BLAN120 – Troys Farm 97, The Street, Black Notley, Braintree.

5.83 The site is approximately 1.83 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 38 homes and community facilities.

5.84 Black Notley Parish Comment - BLAN120, 121, 122 - The Brain Valley. These sites access onto the main highway in the centre of the village at a point that could cause a problem with visibility. The gradient slopes down to the protected Brain Valley and surrounding land is very boggy. At times of heavy rain the ditches cascade with water down to the river which floods into a sizeable lake.

5.85 There is no school in the village and further development in the village will add to the burden on the local infrastructure, traffic exiting to Chelmsford, Stansted via Bakers Lane. There has already been huge expansion in the village with 384 houses on the Hospital Site. Therefore it is not a suitable site.

5.86 *Officer Comment – the site is located within an area of medium landscape capacity (7b). It has no other constraints identified. Development on this site*

would be inappropriate backland development which would significantly change the character and appearance of the village edge. Given the limited facilities in Black Notley it is not considered appropriate to allocate.

5.87 Recommendation 1pp - BLAN120 Troys Farm, 97 The Street is not allocated for residential development.

5.88 BLAN121 - Troys Farm, 97 The Street, Black Notley, Braintree.

5.89 The site is approximately 0.25 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 10 homes.

5.90 Black Notley Parish Comment – As above.

5.91 *Officer Comment – the site is located within an area of Medium Landscape Capacity (7b). This site is a small section of BLAN120. Development would however constitute inappropriate back land development as it would not be a natural extension of development in Black Notley.*

5.92 Recommendation 1qq - BLAN121 – Troys Farm, 97 The Street is not allocated for residential development.

5.93 BLAN122 - Troys Farm, 97 The Street, Black Notley, Braintree.

5.94 The site is approximately 0.275 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 10 dwellings.

5.95 Black Notley Parish Comment – As above.

5.96 *Officer Comment – The site is located within an area of Medium landscape capacity (7b), as set out above this site this site is a smaller portion of BLAN120. Increasing the density of development in this location would be out of character with the appearance of Black Notley at this location. This part of the village on the northern side of the road is characterised by low density development set back from the road. Increasing density would reduce the softening effect of low density development which is common when entering villages, with a more abrupt built form.*

5.97 Recommendation 1rr - BLAN122 – Troys Farm, 97 The Street is not allocated for residential development.

5.98 BLAN501 – Land to the south of Black Notley, adj to Stanton’s Farmhouse.

5.99 The site is approximately 3ha in size. It could accommodate between 50 to 70 dwellings.

5.100 Black Notley Parish Comment - This application is adjacent to a Grade I Listed Building and on a gradient. There is no school in the village and further

development will add to the burden on the local infrastructure, traffic exiting to Chelmsford Stansted via Bakers Lane.

5.101 There has already been huge expansion in the village with 384 houses on the Hospital Site. Therefore it is not a suitable site.

5.102 *Officer Comment – The site is located adjacent to Black Notley. It has a grade I and grade II listed building on the site, meaning that development would be significantly constrained by the setting of these buildings. The site has significant gradients which would also limit development capacity. The site would not be a natural extension to development in Black Notley and would significantly impact the setting of listed buildings.*

5.103 Recommendation 1ss - BLAN501 Land to the south of Black Notley is not allocated for residential development.

6 Panfield

6.1 PANF136 – Land at Panfield, north-west of Springwood Industrial Estate.

6.2 The site is approximately 7.9ha and is proposed for employment uses.

6.3 Panfield Parish Council Comments;

- All these development sites are in direct contravention of Panfield's Village Design Statement.
- The development of the Towerlands site especially erodes the green margin division between Braintree and Panfield, which the Chairman and Members of Panfield Parish Council had been told that Braintree District Council wishes to maintain.
- Current Highways infrastructure will not cope with the additional traffic.

6.4 *Officer comment – The site is within an area of low landscape capacity (16f), and is not accessible. The site would therefore not be deliverable until development had taken place at the North West Braintree growth location.*

6.5 Recommendation 1tt– Land at PANF136 adj Springwood Drive is not allocated for employment uses.

7 Cressing

7.1 CRESS189 – Braintree Garden Centre, Cressing Road, Braintree.

7.2 The site is approximately 1.58ha in size. It is proposed for employment and retail uses and indoor leisure.

7.3 Cressing Parish Council Comment - The site should remain as a retail area.

- 7.4 *Officer comment – This site is located at Galleys Corner and is within the area covered by the 2014 Plan policy ADM48 – Transport Related Policy Areas. This policy limits development at Galleys corner roundabout to transport related development (such as overnight accommodation, petrol gilling, motorists cafes etc), and the existing garden centre and ancillary uses, and the existing established haulage depot at Long Green. The area does not have a development boundary. Restrictions on the level of development which takes place are also in force, in order to prevent coalescence between Braintree and Tye Green. The site has been put forward for employment, retail and leisure uses. Whilst there is a need for further retail provision, this location would not be the most suitable location to provide it. Galleys corner suffers from significant levels of congestion and intensifying development would have a further detrimental impact on the area.*
- 7.5 **Recommendation 1uu- CRESS189 Braintree Garden Centre is not allocated for retail uses.**
- 7.6 CRESS190 – Shardloe’s Cressing.
- 7.7 The site is approximately 0.8 ha. It is proposed for residential use.
- 7.8 Cressing Parish Council Comment - Site is adjacent conservation area and has historical value in the village. The vicarage is building of Townscape Merit (Cressing Conservation Area Appraisal)
- 7.9 *Officer comment – This site is adjacent to Cressing village. It is partly within the conservation area, but does not have any other constraints. Development of the site would effectively join both halves of the village together which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.*
- 7.10 **Recommendation 1vv - CRESS190 – Shardloe’s Cressing, that the site is not allocated for residential development of 10+ units.**
- 7.11 CRESS191 – Land on the west side of Mill Lane, Cressing.
- 7.12 The site is 14.7ha in size. It is proposed for residential use, and could accommodate up to 350 homes.
- 7.13 Parish Council Comment - CPC note that BDC has deemed this site as N (Not Suitable) already. Most of the site falls within the Brain Valley Special Landscape area therefore unsuitable. This development would detract from the surrounding landscape. Policy CS8 Natural Environment and Biodiversity replaces RLP79 Special Landscape Areas and RLP88 Agricultural Land covered this in the past and should continue.
- 7.14 *Officer comment – The area is identified as being of low to medium landscape capacity (2b). Constraints include a gas pipeline and the site is within an*

overhead electrical cables consultation zone. It is close to a railway station, but access by foot would be difficult due to the narrow nature of Bulford Mill Lane. The site would not be a natural extension to development in Tye Green Cressing.

7.15 Recommendation 1ww – CRESS191 Land on the west side of Mill Lane Cressing, is not allocated for residential development.

7.16 CRESS192 – Land on the east side of Mill Lane, Cressing.

7.17 The site is 4.6 ha in size. It is proposed for residential use and could accommodate up to 115 homes.

7.18 Parish Council Comment - CPC note that BDC has deemed this site as N (Not Suitable) already. Site is unsuitable for a number of reasons: close proximity to Jeffrey's Farmhouse – Grade II listed building, it abuts on to the Brain Valley Special Landscape area – this development would detract from the surrounding landscape, infrastructure in terms of traffic, inadequate train station, inadequate roads, lack of facilities (e.g. school, GP) and access would be a major concern, including sewerage and drainage which are already problematic in that area. Development would be a disproportionate increase compared to the size of Tye Green.

7.19 *Officer comment – The site has a medium landscape capacity (4a). The site has no overriding constraints identified on site. A grade II listed building is on the opposite side of the road, and a public right of way is on part of the northern boundary. Access would be from Mill Lane and it would be necessary to demonstrate that this could be achieved safely. The site is relatively well contained. Tye Green has the benefit of some local services such as the primary school, and local shop, but lacks the comprehensive range of services found in larger villages and the main town. The site could be allocated, if further sites were required, however at this time, sufficient sites are available in more sustainable locations.*

7.20 Recommendation 1xx – CRESS192 land on the east side of Mill Lane Cressing, is not allocated for residential development.

7.21 CRESS193 – Land between Braintree Road and Mill Lane, Tye Green Cressing.

7.22 The site is 13.56 ha in size and could accommodate up to 300 dwellings.

7.23 Parish Council Comment - CPC note that BDC has deemed this site as Y (Suitable). Site is unsuitable for a number of reasons: site is a historical asset – Hawbush Old House (Grade II listed) lies adjacent to this site. Stubble's Farm, which is believed to be the site of the stables of Cressing Temple, lies on the opposite side of the road, along with its Grade II listed barn. The site

abuts on to the Brain Valley Special Landscape area – this development would detract from the surrounding landscape, infrastructure in terms of traffic, inadequate train station, inadequate roads, lack of facilities (e.g. school, GP) and access would be a major concern, including sewerage and drainage which are already problematic in that area. Development would be a disproportionate increase compared to the size of Tye Green. The cost of developing small plots attached to existing villages such as this are disproportionately large in terms of infrastructure than building a whole new village/town. This site is agricultural land which contributes to the village. The pollution to Tye Green would be a concern and it would change the character of the village.

7.24 *Officer comment – the site is identified as being of medium capacity (4a) in the landscape capacity assessment. Listed buildings are adjacent to the site at Hawbush Old house and Stubbles Farm. The development of a strategic sized allocation in Tye Green Cressing is not appropriate at this time, as large strategic development is being concentrated toward the main urban areas in the district such as Braintree.*

7.25 Recommendation 1yy – CRESS193 Land between Braintree Road and Mill Lane is not allocated for residential development.

7.26 CRESS194 – Birds Barn, Polecat Road, Cressing.

7.27 The site is approximately 0.47 ha. It has been proposed for between 6 and 8 homes.

7.28 Parish Council Comment - Site is adjacent conservation area. Development would significantly alter the view into and out of the conservation area. There is also a public footpath running through it and any road access to Polecat Lane could potentially be dangerous due to limited sight lines in accessing Polecat Lane at corner.

7.29 *Officer comment – The site is identified as being of low to medium landscape capacity (3d) in the landscape character assessment. It is located adjacent to Cressing Conservation Area and has some grade II listed buildings opposite. A public right of way runs down the western edge of the site. The site is not considered to be a natural extension to development in Cressing which has a more linear character and limited development in depth.*

7.30 Recommendation 1zz – CRESS194 Birds Barn, Polecat Road is not allocated for residential development

7.31 CRESS195 – Ivy Cottage, Long Green.

7.32 The site is approximately 0.34 ha in size. It has been put forward for 10 homes.

- 7.33 Parish Council Comment - Cressing Parish Council would support the development of this site.
- 7.34 *Officer comment – This site is located at Galleys Corner and is within the area covered by the 2014 Plan policy ADM48 – Transport Related Policy Areas. This policy limits development at Galleys corner roundabout to transport related development (such as overnight accommodation, petrol gilling, motorists cafes etc), and the existing garden centre and ancillary uses, and the existing established haulage depot at Long Green. The area does not have a development boundary. Restrictions on the level of development which takes place are also in force, in order to prevent coalescence between Braintree and Tye Green.*
- 7.35 *The site is proposed for 10 dwellings, however there are no other residential uses in this area. The site does have planning permission for the erection of a 42 bedroom hotel, which would accord with policy ADM48. Given the more permanent nature of residential occupation, it may not be appropriate to encourage residential development in this location, as the site is close to Galleys Corner, and the area has a number of unneighbourly uses such as the haulage yard and waste management facility. Future schemes to improve Galleys Corner and the B1018 may have an impact on the area.*
- 7.36 Recommendation 1aaa – CRESS195 Ivy Cottage, Long Green, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 7.37 CRESS196 – Land at Rook Hall, Cressing.
- 7.38 The site is approximately 0.47 ha. It has been put forward for 2 homes.
- 7.39 Parish Council Comment - Site is a historic asset, adjacent conservation area and in close proximity of a significant number of listed buildings. Development would change the character of that part of the village.
- 7.40 *Officer comment – The site is below the allocation threshold for the new Local Plan. It would not be considered a natural extension to development in Cressing.*
- 7.41 Recommendation 1bbb – CRESS196 Land at Rook Hall, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 7.42 CRESS197 – Site at Holders Farmstead, Hawbush Green, Braintree Road (B1018). The site is approximately 0.54 ha in size. It has been put forward for residential use and could accommodate 1 home.
- 7.43 Parish Council Comment - Site previously had a house situated on it. Cressing Parish Council would support development of this site providing it

was low density, proportional development and fitting with the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan.

7.44 *Officer comment – The site has previously had an agricultural workers dwelling and was granted permission for a replacement workers dwelling in the 1960's (ENW/BRD/340/61), this permission was tied to a local farm and never built. The site has since returned to nature and is considered a greenfield site as per the definition of previously developed land contained in the NPPF. Allowing a regular dwelling on the basis that it previously had permission for a, now removed, agricultural workers dwellings, would set a precedent for the replacement of demolished agricultural workers dwellings in the countryside. In any case the site is proposed for 1 dwelling, which is below the allocation threshold for the new Local Plan.*

7.45 Recommendation 1ccc – CRESS197 Site at Holders Farmstead, Hawbush Green, is not allocated for residential development.

7.46 CRESS198 – Site of Holders Field, Hawbush Green, Polecat Road, Cressing.

7.47 The site is approximately 4.65 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 100 dwellings.

7.48 Parish Council Comment - Site should remain agricultural. Development would affect the aspect of Hawbush Green. Close proximity of listed buildings. Development would have significant impact on traffic on Polecat Road trying to exit onto the B1018 and going through the village.

7.49 *Officer comment – The site is located in a medium- low landscape capacity area (3d). It has no other onsite constraints. Two listed buildings are opposite the site but separated by garden, and Polecat Road. Another listed building is at is on the opposite side of the B1018 but again this is set away from the road and would unlikely be impacted by development on the site. Development would not be appropriate because the area around Hawbush Green does not have an existing development boundary, and this site would not be a natural extension to Tye Green. The site would also significantly reduce the separation between Tye Green and Hawbush Green.*

7.50 Recommendation 1ddd – CRESS198 – Site of Holders Field, Hawbush Green, is not allocated for residential development.

7.51 CRESS199 – Land between Leyfield and Derrygowna, Braintree Road, Tye Green, Cressing.

7.52 The site is approximately 0.4 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 12 dwellings.

- 7.53 Parish Council Comment - Cressing Parish Council might support housing development here providing it was low density and in keeping with the surrounding houses.
- 7.54 *Officer comment – Development in depth may not be appropriate in this location as other residential developments in the area are of a linear character adjacent to the road. The main consideration would be whether a safe access could be achieved, and what an appropriate level of development would be. If a linear layout were to be used it's likely that the development would provide between 4 and 8 dwellings, which would be below the allocation threshold in the new local plan. A development boundary alteration would not be considered appropriate as it would cross the B1018. The site could be considered through the Neighbourhood Plan.*
- 7.55 Recommendation 1eee - CRESS199 Land between Leyfield and Derrygowna, Braintree Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- 7.56 CRESS200 – Leyfield, Braintree Road, Tye Green, Cressing.
- 7.57 The site is approximately 0.25 ha in size. It is proposed for 4 bungalows.
- 7.58 Parish Council Comment - Site is agricultural. Development would confuse the identity of the village and would spoil outlook from the surrounding houses and any that were built under CRESS199. Access would be an issue.
- 7.59 *Officer comment – The site would not be a natural extension of development at Tye Green, as it would be inappropriate development in depth were the predominant character of development is linear development along the B1018. The site is also below the threshold of allocation in the new Local Plan. It would not be a natural extension to the development boundary of Tye Green.*
- 7.60 Recommendation 1fff – CRESS200 Leyfield Braintree Road, Tye Green, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 7.61 CRESS201 – Land at Appletree Farm, Polecat Road, Cressing, Braintree.
- 7.62 The site is approximately 2.95 ha in size. It has been proposed for residential use, and employment.
- 7.63 Parish Council Comment - Cressing Parish Council might support a low density housing development on this site however there would be concerns re infrastructure (access from Polecat Road onto B1018 and traffic through the village). Access should be somewhere other than Polecat Road e.g. the line of the Essex Way. Speed limit should be reduced. However, we do not feel the stated capacity of 100 houses would be appropriate for this site. Housing

development to 12 per hectare maximum. Noted that Essex Way runs to the east of the site.

7.64 *Officer Comment – The Essex Way runs adjacent to the south eastern boundary. 2 listed buildings are adjacent to the site. The site has various permissions for employment related uses, and for construction training. The site is not adjacent to any development boundary, and is therefore within a countryside location. It would not be a logical extension for development at Cressing or Tye Green. Defining and development boundary and allocated this site would significantly change the character and appearance of Hawbush Green.*

7.65 Recommendation 1ggg - CRESS201 – Land at Appletree Farm, Polecat Road is not allocated for residential development or employment.

CRESS202/CRESS203/CRESS204/CRESS205/CRESS206/CRESS207/CRESS208/ CRESS209 – Land to the south of the A120 and land between Black Notley and Cressing.

7.66 These sites have been submitted as part of a wider proposal for an urban extension to Braintree and should be considered as a whole. The total site area is 91.2 ha. It is proposed for residential, retail, employment, leisure, new station, town centre shuttle service, and associated open space and landscaping. It could accommodate approximately 2000 homes.

7.67 Parish Council Comments;

7.68 CRESS202 Land South of Millennium Way, Braintree - Unsuitable site due Cressing becoming joined with Braintree and major concerns regarding traffic at this already very busy corner.

7.69 CRESS203 Land South of Fowlers Farm Roundabout - Unsuitable site due Cressing becoming joined with Braintree and major concerns regarding traffic at this already very busy corner.

7.70 CRESS204 Land South of A120, West of Railway, Braintree - Development would be disproportionate compared with the size of Tye Green. Access, traffic and flood problems would be major concerns. Site falls within the Brain Valley Special Landscape area– development would detract from the surrounding landscape. Development would merge Cressing and Black Notley.

7.71 CRESS205 Land South of A120 East of Railway, Braintree - Development would be disproportionate compared with the size of Tye Green. Access, traffic and flood problems would be major concerns. Site falls within the Brain Valley Special Landscape area – development would detract from the

surrounding landscape. Development would merge Cressing and Black Notley.

- 7.72 CRESS206 Land North of Tye Green, Braintree - Site is agricultural land. Access onto B1018 and traffic queues are already an issue. Regular accidents on this stretch of road. Size of development would be disproportionate to Tye Green. Not in keeping with the village.
- 7.73 CRESS207 Lane East Braintree Road, Tye Green - CPC note that BDC has deemed this site as Y (Suitable). In terms of size, this would fit in with the village development, but in terms of location, because of the way traffic behaves in that area Cressing Parish Council would regard it as a problem - it is opposite Jeffrey's Road junction and on a bend with poor sight lines – access onto B1018 which would be a major issue/hazard.
- 7.74 CRESS208 Land at End Shelley Road [correct name is Shelley's Lane (Track)], Tye Green - CPC note that BDC has deemed this site as Y (Suitable). This site is unsuitable since it was a nature reserve and is now a woodland area which provides natural drainage and wildlife. It is an isolated site landlocked by other ownership.
- 7.75 CRESS209 Land South Of Fowlers Farm, Braintree - CPC note that BDC has deemed this site as Y (Suitable). Unsuitable site due Cressing becoming joined with Braintree and major concerns regarding traffic at this already very busy corner. Site is agricultural land. Access onto B1018 and traffic queues are already an issue. Regular accidents on this stretch of road. Size of development would be disproportionate to Tye Green – 50% of Tye Green. Not in keeping with the village - development would confuse the identity of the village and would spoil outlook from the surrounding houses.
- 7.76 *Officer comment – Various sites which comprise a proposed urban extension to Braintree. Some elements would not be included such as CRESS208 which is separate from the other areas proposed.*
- 7.77 *In terms of landscape capacity, CRESS202 – Not assessed, CRESS203/CRESS206/CRESS209 Low-medium capacity (3a), CRESS204, Low (7a) and Low-medium (1c) capacity, CRESS205 low (2a) and low-medium (1e), CRESS207 medium (3c), CRESS208 low-medium capacity (3b).*
- 7.78 *Land to the south of Millennium way, CRESS202 has an application which is to be determined (13/01476/FUL - Erection of DIY retail warehouse with associated access, car parking and landscaping and improvement works to the A120/B1018.) This application would provide approximately 5894 sqm gross of comparison goods retail floor space. This site is discussed under the retail section of this report.*

- 7.79 *As the sites put forward are large, they have a number of potential constraints as would any other comparable size site. Key considerations would be impact on landscape character, coalescence, and the local road network. Development would significantly reduce the gap between Braintree, and Tye Green Cressing. It is unclear as to whether the development would be able to deliver all the infrastructure improvements proposed given the level of development proposed.*
- 7.80 *As set out above, development in the proximity of the A120 Galleys Corner is difficult at this stage given the uncertainty over the potential schemes to be put forward to improve the A120 between Braintree and Colchester. However, the Freeport and Retail Park locations on the other side of the roundabout are considered to deliver significant benefit to the District and attract visitors from the wider area. The retail study sets out that there is not a major requirement for new retail but this is only based on the increases in the population of the District and does not take into account visitors which come from further afield. It is therefore proposed to not allocate the site at this time, but that when more detailed information is forthcoming on the improvement scheme to the A120 and Galleys Corner, part of this area may be suitable for potential new retail and commercial development in this location. This could build on the success of Freeport and Braintree Retail Park and create a better gateway into Braintree town in this location, providing development does not coalesce with Tye Green Cressing.*
- 7.81 Recommendation 1 hhh - CRESS202/CRESS203/CRESS204/CRESS205/CRESS206/CRESS207/CRESS208/CRESS209 – Land to the south of the A120 and land between Black Notley and Cressing is not allocated as a residential growth location.**
- 7.82 CRESS210 – Land at Ashes Farm, Cressing.
- 7.83 The site is approximately 2.5 ha in size. It has been proposed for between 15 and 30 dwellings.
- 7.84 Parish Council Comment - Site is unsuitable since it is agricultural land. Access would be a concern. Size of development would be disproportionate to Cressing village.
- 7.85 *Officer comment – The site is located within a low-medium landscape capacity area (10b). The site has several listed buildings adjacent at Ashes Farm. The site would not be a natural extension to development at Cressing village, where development is primarily of a linear nature running along The Street and Lanham Green Road. The site would extend into open countryside and join the village with Ashes Farm which would be detrimental to the character of the area.*

- 7.86 Recommendation 1iii – CRESS210 Land at Ashes Farm, is not allocated for residential development.**
- 7.87 CRESS211 – Land north of Braintree Road and south of Ashes Road, Cressing.
- 7.88 It is approximately 13 ha in size. It has been put forward for residential use and could accommodate in the region of 200 dwellings.
- 7.89 Parish Council Comment - Site is unsuitable since it is agricultural land, open countryside and a recreational area. Size of development would be disproportionate to Tye Green. Development would spoil the rural nature of the village and footpaths. Infrastructure in terms of traffic, inadequate train station, inadequate roads, lack of facilities (e.g. school, GP) and access would be a major concern. The cost of developing small plots attached to existing villages such as this are disproportionately large in terms of infrastructure than building a whole new village/town. The pollution to Tye Green would be a concern and it would change the character of the village.
- 7.90 *Officer comment – The area has a medium landscape capacity (3c). The site comprises of grazing a paddocks, as well as employment uses. The site would not be a natural extension to Tye Green. Elements of the site could be considered as previously developed. The site does not relate well to existing built development and would be separated from the main village by the B1018.*
- 7.91 Recommendation 1jjj – CRESS211 Land north of Braintree Road, is not allocated for residential development**
- 7.92 CRESS212 – Land east of Braintree (Temple Border)
- 7.93 Strategic growth location 184ha mixed development 4000 residential units plus associated facilities and employment.
- 7.94 Cressing Parish Council Comment - 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.
- 7.95 *Officer comment – In terms of landscape capacity the majority of the site is low to medium capacity (10b, 10c, 10d, 10e, and 10f), the area toward the*

A120 is medium capacity (10a). The whole area is classified as grade 2 agricultural land, and has ancient wood land and local wildlife sites as well as an archaeological site. Several public rights of way run through the site including a bridal way. The site is not well linked to Braintree town as it is located outside of the A120 and opposite the site in Braintree is well screened with green space around the Braintree Rugby Club, considered to be a strong town edge. The proposed site is substantial and would create a new village on the edge of Braintree. Given the uncertainty over the future location of the A120 in this vicinity and the traffic implications for this site, it is not considered appropriate for development.

7.96 Recommendation 1kkk - CRESS212 – Land east of Braintree- is not allocated as a residential growth location.

7.97 CRESS213 – Land to the south of Ashes Road, Cressing.

7.98 The site is approximately 1.9 ha, and has been put forward for residential uses. It could accommodate approximately 50 dwellings.

7.99 Parish Council Comment - Unsuitable site. Disproportionately large. Access would be an issue and the impact on the character of the village.

7.100 *Officer comment – The site is located within a low-medium landscape capacity area (3d). The site has no other constraints other than a public right of way running along the southern border. Cressing village has had recent development such as at the former garage and public house site. Services in the village are limited. The development site is large and not proportionate to the size of the village, as such other sites are available, of a similar size, in more sustainable locations such as at Braintree.*

7.101 Recommendation 1lll – CRESS213 Land to the south of Ashes Road, is not allocated for residential development.

7.102 CRESS214 - Land to the south of Ashes Road.

7.103 The site is approximately 0.5 ha in size. It has been proposed for residential use, and could accommodate up to 15 dwellings.

7.104 Parish Council Comment - Unsuitable. There has been a long standing agreement that this site should be turned back into green land when the John Pease garage went.

7.105 *Officer comment – This is a smaller portion of site CRESS213. It consists of former parking for the redeveloped public house and and John Pease garage. Additional development is not proposed at Cressing due to the limited nature of services, and as sites in more sustainable locations such as Braintree are available.*

7.106 Recommendation 1mmm - CRESS214 – Land to the south of Ashes Road is not allocated for residential development.

7.107 CRESS508 – Ashes Farm North, adj Ashes Road.

7.108 The site is approximately 24 ha in size. It is proposed for residential use, and could accommodate up to 600 dwellings.

7.109 Parish Council Comment - Unsuitable site. Currently agricultural land with a stream and recreational since footpaths cross it. Disproportionately large. Infrastructure a major concern. Development here would be out of character with the rest of the village and surrounding landscape.

7.110 *Officer comment – The site is located within a low-medium area of landscape capacity (10b). It would not be considered as a natural extension to Braintree, and it would be too large a development for Cressing, and is also grade 2 agricultural land.*

7.111 Recommendation 1nnn - CRESS508 – Ashes Farm North adj Ashes Road is not allocated for residential development.

7.112 CRESS509 – Ashes Farm South, adj Ashes Road.

7.113 The site is approximately 40 ha is size. It is proposed for residential use, and could accommodate up to 1000 dwellings.

7.114 Parish Council Comment - Unsuitable site. Currently agricultural land and recreational since footpaths cross it. Disproportionately large. Infrastructure a major concern. Development here would be out of character with the rest of the village.

7.115 *Officer comment – The site is located within a low-medium are of landscape capacity. The site would not be a natural extension of development to either Braintree or Cressing. The site would effectively be a standalone development which has no relation to existing built form in the area. The site is also grade 2 agricultural land.*

7.116 Recommendation 1ooo - CRESS509 – Ashes Farm south adj Ashes Road is not allocated as a residential growth location.

8 Rayne

8.1 Rayne is located west of Braintree. The village has a number of local services including pubs, restaurants/takeaways, a primary school, local shops and businesses but does not have a doctor surgery.

8.2 Current policy position

- 8.3 The site is identified as an “other village” in the Core Strategy (2011). The inset map for Rayne identifies a development boundary, education, allotments, flood zones, and conservation area. Areas of formal and informal recreation were added in the 2014 Plan at the village hall and recreation ground. The Flitchway is also shown as an informal recreation area and Local Wildlife site. A flood zone is to the north east of the village.

8.4 SA/SEA

- 8.5 The village scores negatively for proximity to health services, and that development options are on greenfield sites. The area has a primary school, and is within 4.8km of secondary schools.
- 8.6 Significant positives include proximity to employment (Skyline), and availability of broadband.

8.7 Sites submitted and assessed previously

RAY1 – Allotment site Shalford Road. Not re-submitted

RAY3 – Land to the rear of Shalford Road. Not re-submitted

RAY4 – Land btw Shalford Road & Rayne Primary School. Not re-submitted

RAY5 – Land at Gore Road. Not re-submitted

RAY6 – Land at Dunmow Road. (Part of RAYN512OUT)

8.8 New Sites

RAYN355 – Land east of School Road Rayne – 8ha Residential

RAYN512OUT - Out of district (Site access in district) – 4.6ha employment.

RAYN555 – Land R/O The Swan PH Rayne – 0.5ha residential.

GRSA269 – Andrewsfield – New community. This will be dealt with in a separate report.

- 8.9 Rayne Parish Council comments** - Below are the comments of Rayne Parish Council in respect of the Local Plan and its impact on Rayne, its environs and its residents.

“The direct impact on Rayne is not significant but the overall concerns are multiple and relate to the impact on the Village and its environs. The comments are:

1. There are two sites defined against Rayne, although one site is, and it is noted, outside of the Parish and the Development Area.

- a. One site designated RAYN355 and relates to a piece of land just over 8K sq. m and is being promoted by Gladman Developments
- b. The second site is RAYN512 OUT and lies south of Dunmow Road at Blake End. It comprises 46K sq. m and is defined as for use as EMPLOYMENT B8
- c. We have no more detail at present but would expect to comment only on RAYN355 as being in the Village Envelope.

2. Infrastructure

- a. The impact on the infrastructure is of a major concern and includes a lot more factors rather than just that of Brook Green as above.
- b. There are other developments being put forward all of which will have an impact on Rayne and its residents.
- c. These include the development being proposed for
 1. the site north of Rayne Road which will also adversely impact the Rayne Road/Springwood Drive junction and spoil the view.
 2. A site is being proposed at the junction of Pods Brook Lane and the A120 which will add to the existing infrastructure problem.
 3. Other sites at Panfield could add to the existing problems.
 4. 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.
 1. Many numbers have been proffered in terms of how many dwellings may be proffered but taking the minimum of 1200 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.
 2. 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. 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.
 4. In addition to this the HMG funded initiative to investigate Garden Cities/New Towns does not include Uttlesford, another potential problem, about which little is being said.
 5. The current Local Plan for the Uttlesford District shows a large amount of proposed development in the south of the District, around both Great Dunmow and the A120. This will only serve to place a greater load and dependence on this road which already has significant issues, such as a lack of funding, and the extra load will exacerbate the problems for both Rayne and Braintree.

6. The proposed Chelmsford Local Plan also shows a significant development north of Great Leighs, just on the border with Braintree. This again will add to the load on all aspects of infrastructure for Braintree and Rayne.
 7. The situation at Andrewsfield could be further aggravated by the proposal for Boxted Wood which is a further concern, although the concept has been rejected previously.
3. Minerals and Waste Planning
- a. In addition to the developments listed in the Local Plan it should be noted that Rayne is impacted by ECC's decision to include Broadfield Farm in their overall County-Wide Minerals Plan. This 225-acre site was approved two years ago, but no action has been taken as yet, and further, no information on plans or intent has been made available.
 - b. It is believed that the "safeguarding" of Mineral Supplies in the area could be a major consideration but owing to a lack of further information there is no compelling argument for or against the case.
4. Conclusions and Recommendations
- a. Rayne Parish Council appreciates that there is a need to build new additional homes but there is a need to spread that need across the whole of the District.
 - b. Infrastructure is a major concern in all "Local Plans" that have been viewed and it is critical that the infrastructure shortcomings are fully and completely addressed before any building commences. BDC has a current list of applications still open and this provides a window to undertake corrective work on these infrastructure problems.
 - c. Maintaining control through one agreed plan is critical to the success of the whole 17 year programme, and developers trying to by-pass the plans should not be encouraged in any way. Their plans are most often or not, not for the benefit of the whole community and should be resisted.
 - d. Consideration of the needs emanating from the whole Braintree District are the major consideration but the impact from adjoining Districts and County Councils need serious consideration and appropriate mitigation.
 - e. Communication will be a paramount factor in the success of the overall plan and it is hoped that the recent issues with BDC IT are properly resolved at the earliest opportunity so as to facilitate that effective communication.
 - f. In conclusion we support the Local Plan concept and hope that the points made above are properly considered and taken into account."

8.10 Officer comments/conclusions

8.11 RAYN355 – Land east of School Road Rayne

8.12 The site is 8ha and is being proposed for residential development

8.13 Parish Council comment – Set out above.

- 8.14 *Officer comment – The site is located to the south west of Rayne on School Road. It is a greenfield sites which is identified as being grade 3 agricultural land. A public right of way crosses the site between School Road and Fairy Hall Lane. A grade II listed building is adjacent to the site at Fairy Hall.*
- 8.15 *The area is considered to be of medium to low landscape capacity (19b). The area is considered to act as a buffer between between Rayne, the A120, and Great Notley.*
- 8.16 *The site could accommodate approximately 200 dwellings. Development of this scale is not necessary for Rayne and would be out of scale with the existing village. If a smaller development was considered necessary, then the northern area may be appropriate, as it would not encroach significantly into the separation between the village and the A120 as it would still be north of development off School Road.*
- 8.17 Recommendation 2 – That the site RAYN355 land east of School Road Rayne is not allocated for residential development.**
- 8.18 RAYN512OUT – Out of district
- 8.19 The site is 4.6ha and is being promoted for employment development.
- 8.20 Parish Council comment – No comments received as yet. If any are received they will be reported verbally.
- 8.21 *Officer comment – This site is largely outside of the District however the access would be in the district onto Rayne Road. Officers would object to an allocation, as there is not a direct west bound access to the A120, without going through Great Dunmow or joining the A120 east bound.*
- 8.22 Recommendation 3 – That site RAYN512OUT is not allocated and that officers should respond to any proposals within Uttlesford District for the site to that effect.**
- 8.23 RAYN555 – Land R/O The Swan PH Rayne**
- 8.24 The site is 0.5ha and is being proposed for residential development.
- 8.25 *Officer comment – The site is located within the Rayne conservation area, and is adjacent to several grade II listed buildings. A small part of the site is previously developed as it includes the public house car park, but the majority would be considered as a greenfield site.*
- 8.26 *Development would be inappropriate as it would be an unnatural extension of the village. The character of the village in this location is one of very low density development, which a higher density development would not fit well within.*

8.27 Recommendation 4 – That site RAYN555 – Land rear of The Swan PH Rayne is not allocated for residential development.

8.28 Recommendation 5 - That the inset map for Rayne as set out in the appendix be approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

9 Retail

9.1 The Braintree Retail Study update 2015 identified the retail requirement for Braintree.

9.2 For convenience (food) goods 8028sq.m gross is required up to 2033, and 7030 sq.m gross for comparison (white goods, clothing etc). 7058sq.m of comparison is required at Freeport/Braintree Retail Park, and 3661 sq.m gross food/drink provision for Braintree, and 1230sq.m gross for Freeport/Braintree Retail Park. These figures include longer term projects which are less accurate and would need to be reviewed over the plan period.

9.3 Braintree town centre has two existing allocations within the town centre at Manor Street and Land West of George Yard. The Manor Street development is likely to provide food/drink provision and a doctor's surgery. Development at land west of George Yard, is however uncertain and the site has not been re-submitted through the Call for Site. It should be noted that it is within the town centre and with the departure of Morrison's would be available for retail uses, and may prompt the site to come forward. It is also in a sequentially preferable location.

9.4 The following areas will be expected to provide convenience goods provision;

BOCN132 – Land East of Broad Road

- Convenience food provision 500 sq.m gross

BOCN137 – Towerlands site

- Convenience food provision 500 sq.m gross

BLAN114 – Land east of London Road

- Convenience food provision 1250 sq.m gross

Braintree North West Growth Location

- Convenience food provision 1500 sq.m gross (1250 sq.m net)

In total this would leave a requirement of 4278 sq.m gross of convenience goods provision which will be provided in other locations within the District close to new homes, to create sustainable walkable communities.

9.5 If the garden communities' development option is not selected, then additional retail provision would need to be found within the main towns, then if no sites were available, sequentially preferable locations.

9.6 Comparison goods provision

- 9.7 Between Braintree and Freeport/Braintree Retail Park the total comparison good requirement up to 2033 is 14,088 sq.m gross of comparison retail. Land north of Freeport up to 10,256 sq.m gross of comparison floor provision. This would exceed the requirement for comparison goods provision at Freeport. However, limited options for comparison retail development are available within Braintree Town Centre, and this site would be considered as a sequentially preferable location due to its good links with the town centre. The other option for comparison good retail is at Land south of Millennium Way CRESS202 (5894 sq.m gross). The site is not considered to be part of the wider landscape and was not assessed under the landscape capacity assessment. There would be minimal coalescence as a result of this development as the site does not extend significantly further south than the existing Galleys Corner policy area. The site also provides the opportunity to improve the local transport network.
- 9.8 It is recommended that both Land north of Freeport and CRESS202 are allocated for comparison goods retail provision. This could provide up to 16,150 sq.m gross of comparison floor space which would meet the comparison retail requirement for both Braintree town and Freeport/Braintree Retail Park. While this does exceed the requirement by 2062sq.m gross this over provision could potentially be changed to food/drink provision to meet the requirement for 1230 sq.m of food/drink provision at Freeport and the retail park, discussed below. Also as the Braintree District losses comparison goods trade to surrounding higher order centres, this extra floor space could allow for some additional claw back of lost trade.

9.9 Food and Drink Provision

- 9.10 Braintree and Freeport/Braintree Retail Park should provide up to 4591 sqm gross, of food and drink provision. Land in Braintree town centre on land at Manor Street is expected to provide 1251 sq.m of food/drink provision. This leaves 2410 sq.m gross of floor space to be provided in the town centre. Other proposals for food and drink provision should be dealt with under the sequential approach. Additional provision could be provided at Freeport and Braintree Retail Park as part of wider development proposals or again through the application of the sequential approach.

10 Wethersfield and Blackmore End

- 10.1 Wethersfield is located to the south east of Finchingfield, approximately 9 miles north of Braintree. It has a primary school, village hall, doctors, and post office. Blackmore End which is to the east of Wethersfield, it has a pub and village hall.

10.2 Current policy position

- 10.3 Wethersfield is identified in the Core Strategy as an “other village”. It currently has a development boundary, conservation area, visually important space, cemetery, and formal recreation. Blackmore End is also currently identified as an “other village” and was given a development boundary in the 2014 SADMP, which shows the development boundary, formal recreation and visually important space.

10.4 Sites submitted and assessed previously

WET1 – Land between West Drive and Braintree Road (1.35ha Residential use)

WET2 – Land between playing field and Parsonage Farm, High Street, (0.96ha Residential use).

WET3 – (WETH416 - Part) Land at Owls Hall, Blackmore End, (0.49 ha Residential use)

WET4 – (WETH414) Land near Russells Farm, adjacent to Silver Street, (Residential use 0.24ha)

WET5 – (WETH414) Land at Silver Street, (Residential use 0.45ha)

10.5 New Sites

WETH414 – Land at Silver Street, (0.24ha Residential)

WETH415 - Land at The Bull, Daisy Cottage, The Smithy, Barbary Green, Mill House, Blackmore End

WETH416 – Land at Owls Hall Farm, Blackmore End

WETH417 – Courtenham Four Ashes Blackmore End

10.6 Parish Council comments

- 10.7 The Parish Council are happy with development of WETH414, WETH415, WETH416 and 417 with the proviso that due consideration is given to off-street parking in the villages for new and existing residents. The Parish Council would wish Braintree District Council to look sympathetically on residents who apply for planning permission within WETH414, WETH415, WETH416 and WETH417. The Parish Council have no alternative sites for development. Wethersfield and Blackmore End each have a playing field as a defined recreation area. With regard to Gypsy and Traveller pitches, the Parish Council would not wish to nominate any small sites for such use.

10.8 Officer comments

- 10.9 As Wethersfield is a smaller village with limited services it would be inappropriate to allocate significant levels of development.

10.10 WETH414 would provide approximately 11 dwellings. The site is lower than the level of the road, and would not be a natural extension to development in the village, and does not have a natural boundary to contain the site. The site access is a narrow lane which would need significant improvement to serve the development.

10.11 Recommendation 6 – That site WETH414 – Land at Silver Street is not allocated for residential development

10.12 The two proposals in Blackmore End are to re-draw development boundaries around the village to include areas to the north and an area between the two main groups of dwellings. The northern extension (WETH415), would be inappropriate as the area has a number of grade II listed buildings with gaps between them, which are part of their setting. The character of the village is that of buildings in larger plots separated by garden. Having a boundary would mean that these gaps could more easily be filled with development, which could be to the detriment to the setting of these listed buildings and the character of the area.

10.13 If a boundary were designated covering WETH416, it would enable the infilling of development between the two distinct housing groups which comprise the character of the village at this location. Two sites would become developable, one to the front of Owls Hall Farm (0.48ha – 11 dwellings), and another opposite the green (0.28ha – 7 dwellings). Neither site is considered suitable for development due to the limited number of services available in the village. WETH417 Courtenham Four Ashes, Blackmore End, is located to the south of Blackmore End. It is a previously developed site. However, it is not located in close proximity to an existing development boundary and would not be a natural extension to development at Blackmore End.

10.14 Recommendation 7 – That sites WETH415 area to the north of Blackmore End, WETH416 land at Blackmore End, and WETH417 are not included in the development boundary.

10.15 Recommendation 8 - That the Inset Map for Wethersfield as set out in the appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

10.16 Recommendation 9 - That the Inset Map for Blackmore End as set out in Appendix X is approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development.

11 Bradwell and Pattiswick

11.1 Bradwell is located adjacent to the A120 between Braintree and Coggeshall. It, along with Pattiswick is within Coggeshall Ward.

11.2 Pattiswick is located north of Bradwell and the A120. It does not have a development boundary. No sites have been submitted in Pattiswick.

11.3 Current policy position

11.4 Bradwell is identified as another village in the 2011 Core Strategy. The 2014 Plan shows a village envelope, Formal Recreation Area, Allotments, two Local Wildlife Sites, and Flood Zones. The village has no site allocations for residential or other uses. Pattiswick does not have a development boundary and is considered to be a countryside location.

11.5 Sites

BRAD142 – The site is 7.4ha and has been proposed for residential development in the range of 15 – 20 dwellings, and increased community allotment and public open space provision.

BRAD143 – The area proposed for inclusion is 0.46ha, but the site in question would only accommodate 1 residential dwelling.

BRAD503 – The site is 12ha in size and currently comprises commercial garage/commercial fishing lake and agriculture. The development proposed is for a low density residential scheme of 29 homes in conjunction with the provision of formal and informal public open space.

CRESS212 partly sits within the Parish and is considered as part of the Braintree report.

11.6 Parish Council comments

11.7 Parish comments have not been received. If any are received prior to the committee these will be verbally reported at the meeting.

11.8 Officer comments

11.9 The existing development boundary for Bradwell is contained south of Coggeshall Road. Whilst Bradwell does have a public hall, it lacks most other key facilities and services necessary to support further development. The village as a whole, scores poorly in terms of the SA/SEA primarily due to its distance from schools, employment and health provision. This makes it unlikely to be suitable for large scale development.

- 11.10 The development proposal BRAD142 would not be considered a natural extension to the existing development in the village, as it is separated from the main body of the village by allotments and a recreation ground. Development in depth would also not be appropriate as the character of existing development is linear/ribbon development. It would also isolate the existing recreation area and allotment from the wider countryside meaning that the village edge would be harsher than it currently is. The site is also a greenfield site and the majority of site is located on grade 3 agricultural land.
- 11.11 Recommendation 10 – That site BRAD142 – Land east of Playing Field and Allotment Gardens, Church Lane is not allocated for residential development.**
- 11.12 Site BRAD143 is too small to be considered suitable for a residential allocation, and a development boundary modification would not be appropriate as it would open up other areas for development which could only be access directly onto the A120 which would cause potential traffic and safety issues, and increase the density of development in this location which would impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- 11.13 Recommendation 11 – That site BRAD143 Land at Chaldercott and Alanweye, Coggeshall Road is not allocated for residential development.**
- 11.14 Site BRAD503 would not be a natural extension of development in Bradwell. It would be served by its own access. Tourist uses are also proposed which could be considered through the planning application process.
- 11.15 Recommendation 12 – That site BRAD503 – Rectory Meadow, Bradwell is not allocated for residential or tourist development.**
- 11.16 Development in Pattiswick is sporadic, and it would therefore be difficult to draw a meaningful development boundary without including large areas of open countryside, which would result in large infill development.
- 11.17 Recommendation 13 - That the Inset Map for Bradwell be approved and that no sites are allocated for residential development. That Pattiswick does not have a development boundary and remains within the countryside.**

12 Sible Hedingham

- 12.1 This settlement lies north west of Halstead and just south of Castle Hedingham in the Colne River Valley area. The village has a village Hall, library, primary and secondary schools, post office, 3 grocery stores, a pub, doctor's surgery and a cash machine.

12.2 Current policy position

12.3 Sible Hedingham has been designated as a Key Service Village in the Core Strategy (2011) and is now classed in the draft emerging plan as a “Service Village”. The village has a conservation area at its western boundary including the church and the area to its south and another covering the southernmost area of the village. There are extensive tracts of land in the flood zone along the eastern side of the village and its northern area and there are local wildlife sites within this vicinity. There are two recreation areas and a football ground shown and there is a large local network of public rights of way through the countryside.

12.4 The Village Design Statement was approved in October 2010.

12.5 The former Premdor site and adjoining Rockways premises were designated as a redevelopment site in the 2011 Core Strategy. Redevelopment proposals received planning permission and development has commenced. Nevertheless the bulk of the homes are expected to be built within the plan period of the emerging local plan.

12.6 Sites submitted and assessed previously

12.7 Some sites now proposed have been considered for inclusion within the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. These are listed below.

SIBH 376 (formerly SIB4), Land Adj 14 Swan Street, Sible Hedingham 0.27ha

SIBH 377 (formerly SIB3), Former Tanners Dairy, Prayors Hill, Sible Hedingham (SIB377 has a slightly larger site but includes SIB3)

SIBH 378 (formerly SIB6), South of Wethersfield Road, Sible Hedingham

SIBH 380 (formerly SIB1), Land at Queen Street (between nos. 16 and 42), Sible Hedingham

SIBH 381 (formerly SIB10X), Land at Alderford Maltings, Alderford Street, Sible Hedingham

12.8 New sites

12.9 New sites not previously considered, have been proposed:

SIBH 382 The Old Coal Yard, 61 Alderford Street, Sible Hedingham

SIBH 379 38-40 Alderford Street, Sible Hedingham

SIBH 522 Land at Rippers Court, Sible Hedingham

12.10 Parish Comments

12.11 The Parish Council strongly objects to the following sites: SIBH376, SIBH 378, SIBH 379, SIBH 380, SIBH 381, SIBH 382 and SIBH 522. They consider these to be outside the Village Development Boundary, within a Conservation Area and would have a harmful impact on traffic flow through the village.

12.12 There are no objections to SIBH377 but would prefer inclusion of a business use.

12.13 SA/SEA

12.14 5 Sites were assessed for their impact on primarily the historic environment.

SIBH 376, Land Adj 14 Swan Street

No effect on the Conservation Area.

SIBH 377 Former Tanners Dairy, Prayors Hill

The site lies adjacent to the Conservation Area but the sites have not been assessed.

SIBH 380 (formerly SIB1), Land at Queen Street (between nos 16 and 42)

Uncertain effect. The site lies within the Conservation Area with Listed Buildings nearby. The site impacts/mitigation has not been assessed by site visit.

SIBH 381 (formerly SIB10X), Land at Alderford Maltings, Alderford Street,

Uncertain effect. The site lies within the Conservation Area with Listed Buildings nearby. The site impacts/mitigation has not been assessed by site visit.

SIBH 382 The Old Coal Yard, 61 Alderford Street,

No impacts. The site lies within the Conservation Area with Listed Buildings nearby. The site makes no impacts on the significance of the heritage assets. The majority of the site (97.77%) is located in Flood Zone 3 therefore significant negative effect.

12.15 Officer Comments

12.16 This is a Service Village within the Settlement Hierarchy and has a good range of services and facilities. The village is a sustainable location for housing development. The 2011 Core Strategy allocated the former Premdor employment site for redevelopment, as well as the Rockways site and Coopers Yard. Together with the Rockways site and Coopers Yard, 227

dwellings were allocated. Planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the Premdor site for 193 dwellings and these are presently being built.

- 12.17 Coopers yard has now been developed and another, Premdor is under construction and will contribute to housing growth within this plan period. The third previously allocated site known as “Rockways”(34 dwellings) has yet to be developed and will also contribute to growth within the plan period.

12.18 SIBH 376 (SIB4), Land Adj 14 Swan Street, Sible Hedingham, 0.27ha

- 12.19 The Landscape Capacity Analysis 2015 shows this site as outside the landscape areas and part of the settlement although land adjacent is described as having low to medium landscape capacity. The site lies immediately south of the existing local plan review settlement boundary on predominately open land. It lies within the Conservation Area and adjacent to a listed building to the south.

- 12.20 The Sible Hedingham Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2011 classes this site as an important open space/agricultural gap. Such gaps are described as having expansive views which bring the countryside into the village. There is an important view shown through the site at its northern end. Development of this site is likely to harm the appearance and character of the conservation area and its allocation is therefore inappropriate.

12.21 Recommendation 14 – That site SIBH376 – Land adj 14 Swan Street, Sible Hedingham is not allocated for residential development.

12.22 SIBH 377 (SIB377 has a slightly larger site but includes SIB3) Former Tanners Dairy, Prayors Hill, Sible Hedingham, 2.2 ha

- 12.23 This site lies in the open countryside with a public footpath bounding its southern side. It is a brownfield site comprising of vacant former dairy buildings and hardstanding. There is a telecommunications mast on the site. The site is bounded to the north by an area of trees.

- 12.24 The site was presented for development as part of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and was allocated for employment and leisure purposes. It was rejected for housing development because the level of housing growth allocated elsewhere in the village was considered sufficient and the closure of two big employers, one of which was the occupier of this site had represented a considerable loss of employment land. The Village Design Statement 2010 also states in its guidelines that the site should be retained for employment and leisure use.

- 12.25 The Settlement Fringes Landscape Evaluation classes this site as lying within the settlement and not within the landscape analysis areas. However, area to

the west is classed as having low/medium capacity and the area to the north is of medium capacity.

12.26 The site has not been redeveloped or reused. The Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 recommends that this site be deallocated for employment as it is classed as not performing well /is less suitable as an industrial location.

12.27 This is a brown field site adjacent to the village and as such provides an opportunity for accommodating residential development without losing agricultural land and in a Service Village which represents a sustainable location with a number of services and facilities.

12.28 Recommendation 15 – That site SIBH377 Former Tanners Dairy, Prayers Hill is allocated residential development.

12.29 SIBH 378 (formerly SIB6), South of Wethersfield Road, Sible Hedingham

12.30 This site lies outside the development boundary within open countryside and adjacent to the Conservation Area and the site is categorised as low to medium capacity in the Settlement Fringes Landscape Area Evaluation (site SH2 2e).

12.31 A planning application has been rejected on this site for allotments and parking (15/01199/FUL). An area for a future housing application was identified in the application. English Nature made comments in response to the application which are relevant. They consider this site to be very sensitive. They consider that the openness of the field is important to the appreciation of the Conservation area and Grade II*listed St Peter's church (this area is also a scheduled ancient monument). The openness of the field contributes to the rural character of the church's setting and this part of the conservation area. In view of the extent of modern development elsewhere in the village, the direct connection between the church and its environs and the wider countryside is particularly important to the character of the place.

12.32 Given the sensitivity of the site, the importance of its open rural character, that housing growth will be provided elsewhere within the village this site will not be recommended as a housing allocation.

12.33 Recommendation 16 – That site SIBH378, south of Wethersfield Road, Sible Hedingham is not allocated for residential development.

12.34 SIBH 380 (This site was formerly SIB1) Land at Queen Street (between Nos 16 and 42), Sible Hedingham

12.35 This site lies outside of and some distance from the village development boundary though part of it does lie within the Conservation Area. The

inclusion of an isolated area of land for housing so far from the development boundary would be contrary to the principles contained in the Development Boundaries Review Methodology. It would require the inclusion of an excessive amount of undeveloped land within the development boundary. It would represent backland development within an area of frontage ribbon development away from the consolidated built up area of the village where services and facilities are located.

12.36 Given also that housing growth has been accommodated elsewhere within the village and the district, the allocation of this site for housing is not necessary.

12.37 Recommendation 17 – That site SIBH380 – Land at Queen Street (Between No's 16 and 42 is not allocated for residential development.

12.38 SIBH381 (SIB10X) Land at Alderford Street, 1.6ha. 26 dwellings proposed.

12.39 This site was not allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan because a large housing allocation had been made elsewhere in the village and given the site constraints comprising nearby Listed Buildings, Conservation Area Location and the presence of a substantially treed area.

12.40 The front area of the site lies within the Conservation Area. The Sible Hedingham Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan shows this area as an important view and an important open space/gap to be protected. The site lies in an area characterised by frontage development and has a number of trees in the vicinity. Given the visual importance and of the site for the Conservation Area, and that growth has been accommodated elsewhere with fewer constraints this site is not needed as a housing allocation.

12.41 Recommendation 18 – That site SIBH381 – Land at Alderford Street is not allocated for residential development.

12.42 SIBH 379, 38-40 Alderford Street, Sible Hedingham

12.43 This site lies outside but adjacent to the existing development boundary. It lies at the village edge with countryside to the east. It lies within flood zone 2 and 3, the Conservation Area and adjacent to the listed Alderford Mill.

12.44 This site lies almost entirely within the flood zone, including a substantial area within flood zone 3. The draft Local Plan seeks to follow National Planning Policy Framework and planning policy guidance by taking a sequential approach to making housing allocations to avoid the locating of housing within areas at risk of flooding unless the site can pass the exception test. In this case, housing can be accommodated elsewhere, and allocation of the site for housing would be inappropriate. It has not been demonstrated that the

proposal would pass the exception test and a housing allocation is inappropriate.

- 12.45 The site frames an important view identified in the Sible Hedingham Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. This site is identified in the appraisal as a detracting element and discussions with the landowner are recommended as to its future. The site also frames an important view looking west from Alderford Mill. Whilst the site is unattractive, its replacement with additional housing is not considered an appropriate solution.

12.46 Recommendation 19 – That site SIBH379 38-40 Alderford Street is not allocated for residential development.

12.47 SIBH 382 The Old Coal Yard, 61 Alderford Street, Sible Hedingham

- 12.48 The site lies outside but adjacent to the development boundary and within the conservation area.

- 12.49 This site lies almost entirely within the flood zone, including a substantial area within flood zone 3. The draft Local Plan seeks to follow National Planning Policy Framework and planning policy guidance in seeking to avoid the locating of housing within areas at risk of flooding unless the site can pass the exception test. In this case, sufficient housing can be accommodated elsewhere, and allocation of the site for housing would be inappropriate.

12.50 Recommendation 20 – That site SIBH382, The Old Coal Yard, 61 Alderford Street is not allocated for residential development

12.51 SIBH 522 Land at Rippers Court, Sible Hedingham

- 12.52 This site lies within the development boundary. It is an area of scrubland within an industrial estate allocated as an Employment Policy Area. This site is covered by the allocation. It lies close to the Premdor site residential allocation SIB2H and immediately north of SIB2E (Business use and core strategy growth Location).

- 12.53 The Employment Land Needs Assessment recommends that this estate is retained as an Employment Policy Site to help meet the employment needs of the District and of the village. Following: (i) losses of employment land (Premdor/Rockways and Tanners Dairy) and increase in housing represented by the Premdor redevelopment, and (ii) recommendation of the Employment Land needs Assessment for retention of this site as an employment policy area the site should not be allocated for housing. It is recommended that this site remains as an employment policy area.

12.54 Recommendation 21 – That site SIBH522 – is retained as an employment site.

12.55 Other Proposed Changes - No changes proposed.

12.56 Recommendation 22- That the Inset Map for Sible Hedingham as set out in the appendix should be approved with site SIBH377 allocated for residential development.

13 Castle Hedingham

13.1 Castle Hedingham lies approximately 4.5m north west of Halstead. It has a hall, primary school, doctors, grocery store, post office and 2 pubs as well as tourism facilities (Castle and Colne Valley Railway) and includes recreational land.

13.2 Current policy position

13.3 The village is classed as an “Other Village” in the 2011 Core Strategy 2011. Heritage features importantly in this village and the Historic Characterisation Project 2010 describes the archaeological character of the village as outstanding. The castle area is designated as an ancient monument and further archaeological discoveries are considered likely. The eastern part of the village lies within a conservation area and there are many listed buildings particularly in the village centre. A large Local Wildlife Site (Hedingham Station Marsh) lies to the south west. An extensive area of the western village lies in flood zones 2 and 3.

13.4 A Village Design Statement was approved in May 2008.

13.5 Site Submitted and Assessed Previously

13.6 CASH167, Land rear 108 – 132 Nunnery Street Proposed development of land for housing.0.46 Ha, former piggeries now derelict (CASH167 includes part of the area covered by sites CAS1Dalt and CAS6 Halt which were previously proposed)

13.7 CASH169, Land at Nunnery Street, Proposed development of land for housing (2 dwellings). 0.11ha, (Previously submitted as part of CAS6)

13.8 CASH505 (Colne Valley Railway, Yeldham Road, Castle Hedingham) 0.89ha. (Previously submitted as CAS3 but with some boundary differences)

13.9 CASH553 (formerly CASA4A), Land at Sudbury Hill, Bailey Street 0.96ha.

13.10 New Sites

13.11 Two new site have been submitted which have not previously been considered.

CASH168 - Land adjacent to Sudbury Road, opposite Coppingdown Farm, Castle Hedingham 0.77 ha

CASH170 Land adj De Vere Primary School, Kirby Hall Rd, Castle
Hedingham 0.6Ha

13.12 Parish Comments

- 13.13 The Parish Council do not support any of the proposed sites:
- 13.14 CASH 167: Outside the village envelope; previous application rejected on appeal; abuts flood plain; development, backfield development; access difficulties
- 13.15 CASH 168: In open countryside outside the village envelope; dangerous access; would create a precedent for linear development and would have a high impact on the landscape, particularly on views of the castle
- 13.16 CASH 169: Outside the village envelope; backfield development, adjoining flood plain; difficult access; previous applications have been rejected
- 13.17 CASH 170: Outside village envelope; access will compound existing traffic problems to neighbouring school site; development on agricultural land (59% disagreed/strongly disagreed)
- 13.18 CASH 505: Outside village envelope; not suitable within flood zone/flood plain; tourist attraction and provider of local employment; area for wildlife conservation; would extend ribbon development, merging Castle Hedingham and Great Yeldham; important to safeguard the separation of the two rural communities; impact on existing landscape sensitivity and visual sensitivity
- 13.19 CASH 553: community open space; children's' play park & recreation field; historically significant piece of land (location of St James' Well, mediaeval hospital, St James Chapel). One of only two open spaces left in the village; designated as a "visually important open space" Village Design Statement
- 13.20 There is no public support for alteration/expansion of the village boundary and proposals would harm the visual/landscape character and historic significance.
- 13.21 Castle Hedingham's historical significance is important in supporting the local economy. The parish has experienced significant expansion in the 20th century and has not been against more recent brown field development. The parish has been affected by a 200 house development at the Sible Hedingham boundary. The village has poor public transport, parking, traffic problems with little local employment.
- 13.22 Great Yeldham Parish Council also commented upon CASH505 stating that they do not support the development of the site.

13.23 Officer comments

13.24 CASH167, Land rear 108 – 132 Nunnery Street, Proposed development of land for housing.0.46 Ha, former piggeries now derelict. Proposed single dwelling.

13.25 This site was previously put forward for residential development and its inclusion was considered inappropriate backland development. The Village Design Statement (2008) states in its guidance for Nunnery Street that the village boundary should be drawn to prevent backland development and maintained on its existing line.

13.26 A planning application for one house on the site was dismissed at appeal (05/01514). The inspector highlighted the rural character of the site as “part of the attractive setting of this delightful, historic village” and the lawful land use to be agricultural. The proposal would result in a pronounced and damaging incursion into the attractive rural surroundings. Whilst the secluded nature of the site would prevent all but glimpses of the dwelling, he gave more weight to the actual presence of the building. Development here would harm the character of the village setting contrary to RLP3 which seeks to prevent inappropriate backland development. He also considered the access to be inadequate.

13.27 The Sible Hedingham Settlement Fringes Landscape Evaluation classes the area west of the site as having low landscape capacity.

13.28 The existing boundary already complies with the Development Boundaries Review Methodology. This document indicates that farmsteads/farm buildings on the edge of built up areas and undeveloped areas in flood risk areas should be excluded. This site comprises derelict farm buildings and its western and southern edges lie in flood zone 2.

13.29 Recommendation 23 – That site CASH167 - Land rear 108 – 132 Nunnery Street, is not allocated for residential development.

13.30 CASH169, Land at Nunnery Street, Proposed development of land for housing (2 dwellings). 0.11ha, (Previously submitted as part of CAS6)

13.31 This site was previously considered inappropriate backland development. The Village Design Statement (2008) considers that the village boundary should be drawn to prevent backland development and maintained on its existing line.

13.32 The Development Boundaries Review Methodology indicates that development boundaries may not always follow existing physical features such as rear boundaries particularly where dwellings have large rear gardens.

13.33 Inclusion result in a protrusion of open land into the “countryside” beyond the boundaries on either side. This proposal would permit inappropriate back land development contrary to the Village Design Statement Guidelines for Nunnery Street and protrudes into the countryside.

13.34 Recommendation 24 – CASH169 – Land at Nunnery Street is not allocated for residential development.

13.35 CASH505 (Colne Valley Railway, Yeldham Road, Castle Hedingham) 0.89ha. (Previously submitted as CAS3 but with some boundary differences)

13.36 This is a large, highly visible site outside the village and partly within the flood zone. Such a development would represent a large scale intrusion into the countryside to the detriment of its rural character and exceeding the scale of development appropriate for a village of this size on the settlement hierarchy. The Development Boundaries Review Methodology seeks to exclude proposals which are poorly related to the settlement. This site includes areas within Flood Zone 2 and 3 which area at risk of flooding. Current advice seeks to guide flood sensitive development away from areas of greatest flood risk.

13.37 Recommendation 25 – That site CASH505 – Colne Valley Railway, Yeldham Road, is not allocated for residential development.

13.38 CASH553 (formerly CASA4A), Land at Sudbury Hill, Bailey Street 0.96ha.

13.39 This site was put forward by the owner for housing use and considered by Committee as part of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. It was also considered as a possible recreation designation but rejected as undeliverable. As part of these considerations it was noted that Castle Hedingham lies in close proximity to Sible Hedingham Key Service Village where a large number of new dwellings had been allocated. Coupled with the historic character of Castle Hedingham, and with areas at risk of flooding which constrains development it was considered unnecessary to allocate new sites for housing within the village as sufficient had been allocated elsewhere to meet requirements. It was considered that the Council should not be actively promoting the site for residential development by specifically allocating it for housing as the Parish Council had previously leased the site for recreation and had not identified a replacement site. However, as the site lay within the development boundary, residential development is an appropriate land use in principle providing appropriate open space provision being found and hence the site was not allocated. The view of officers is unaltered.

13.40 Recommendation 26 – That site CASH553 – Land at Sudbury Hill, Bailey Street is not allocated for residential development.

13.41 New Sites

13.42 Two sites have been submitted which have not previously been considered.

13.43 CASH168 - Land adjacent to Sudbury Road, opposite Coppingdown Farm, Castle Hedingham 0.77 ha

13.44 The site's isolated position away from services and facilities would encourage increased car use and represents unsustainable development. Its isolated location would represent a scattered form of development which would erode the rural character of the countryside. The proposal would run contrary to the Development Boundaries Review Methodology which seeks to exclude isolated and sporadic development from the settlement boundary. This site lies within an area of Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land.

13.45 Recommendation 27 – That site CASH168 – Land adj to Sudbury Road, opposite Coppingdown Farm is not allocated for residential development.

13.46 CASH170 Land adj De Vere Primary School, Kirby Hall Rd, Castle Hedingham 0.6Ha

13.47 This site represents an inappropriate scale of development by reason of its large size and given Castle Hedingham's size and status as an "Other Village" in the settlement hierarchy. This site is open in character and slopes uphill from the single track road fronting the plot. Development in this location would be highly prominent and out of character with its surroundings. The site is part of a much larger field and without natural features to separate it visually. The site is close to the boundary between Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land and may be grade 2 quality land.

13.48 Recommendation 28 – That site CASH170 – Land adj De Vere Primary School, Kirby Hall Road is not allocated for residential development.

13.49 SA/SEA

13.50 One site, CASH 505 was suitable for assessment as part of the SA. The proposal would contribute positively to the provisions of housing, proximity to health facilities sufficient to mitigate/reduce health inequalities. Positive impacts include the benefits brought about by open space and shop provision and it is close to a bus stop served by regular services. It is close to a primary and secondary school.

13.51 Recommendation 29 - That the Inset Map for Castle Hedingham as set out in the Appendix is approved and that no site is allocated to residential development.

14 Stisted (Including the Twin Oaks Gypsy and Traveller Site)

- 14.1 Stisted is located approximately 1 mile north of the A120 within Coggeshall Ward. It has a number of local services and facilities including a primary school, pub, allotments, and formal and informal recreation opportunities. Permission for a Gypsy and Traveller site at Twin Oaks was granted in 2014 under permission 14/00891/FUL.

14.2 Current policy position

- 14.3 Stisted is identified as a “other village” in the in the Core Strategy (2011). The 2014 shows a development boundary, allotments, conservation area, cemetery/churchyard, education, formal recreation, and visually important space. No sites were allocated in the village for residential or employment uses. The village has recently had an affordable housing rural exception site, and some infill affordable housing development of a garage court by Greenfields.

14.4 Sites

STIS398 – 0.64ha in size proposed for 20 dwellings and affordable housing, accessed from Rectory Road.

STIS399 – 0.75ha proposed for 20 dwellings and affordable housing, accessed from Back Lane.

STIS400 – 0.35ha – Previously considered under the 2014 Plan. Proposed for 4 residential dwellings.

STIS401 – 0.86ha – Residential development between 4 and 6 dwellings.

14.5 Parish Council comments

STIS 400- Land adj Stisted Lodge, Rectory Road - No Objection

STIS 398- Site off Rectory Road (Opp no.63) - Objection – Overdevelopment of Village envelope, Detrimental to physical aspect adjacent to Community Orchards and allotment.

STIS 399- Land off Back Lane (r/o Brickwall farm) - Objection – Overdevelopment of Village envelope, physical height of site, access issues/visibility splay and aspect.

STIS 401- 37 The Street and land to rear - Objection – Alteration of physical aspect of Playing Field and The Street, alteration of street scene as in Conservation area, access issues.

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. (Officer note site CRESS212 Temple Border is considered as part of the Braintree report)

14.6 Officer comments

14.7 The existing development boundary for Stisted is logically drawn as it reflects the existing built up character of the village, apart from the rural expectation site, which is located outside of the envelope. In terms of the development options for the village, none of the sites put forward would be considered a logical extension to the development boundary.

14.8 STIS396, STIS397, CRESS212 are located along the A120 and will be discussed under garden communities.

14.9 STIS398 Site off Rectory Road (Opp no.63)

14.10 This site would be an unnatural extension which does not relate well to the existing development pattern of Rectory Road as it would constitute development in depth. Linear development is present on the opposite site of Rectory Road however the site is adjacent to the allotments meaning that it would be an unnatural extension to development in this location. The SA report suggested that the sites development could have a negative impact on a designated wildlife sites or ancient woodland.

14.11 Recommendation 30 – That site STIS398 site off Rectory Road is not allocated for residential development.

14.12 STIS399 Land off Back Lane (r/o Brickwall farm)

14.13 This site which is accessed off Back Lane would not be a natural extension to development in Stisted, as it would project into open countryside and would not have a natural boundary.

14.14 Recommendation 31 – That site STIS399 – Land off Back Lane is not allocated for residential development.

14.15 STIS400 – Land adj Stisted Lodge

14.16 This site was previously considered under reference STI1. The site would not be a natural extension to the development boundary for Stisted and would constitute an extension of ribbon development along Rectory Road. The current development boundary would be considered a logical stopping point in this location. The SA report suggested that the sites development could have a negative impact on a designated wildlife sites or ancient woodland.

14.17 Recommendation 32 – That site STIS400 – 37 The Street and land to rear is not allocated for residential development.

14.18 STIS401 – 37 The Street and land to rear

14.19 This site would not be a natural extension to development in Stisted as it would be backland development. The site has been put forward for less than 10 dwellings, and as such would be too small to allocate in the new Local Plan. The SA report suggested that the sites development could have a negative impact on a designated wildlife sites or ancient woodland. This site was also considered to have a negative impact on the historic environment.

14.20 Recommendation 33 – That site STIS401 37 The Street and land to rear is not allocated for residential development.

14.21 In terms of the Twin Oaks site it is not proposed to alter or extend the current allocation shown on the inset map.

14.22 Recommendation 34 -That the Inset Map for Stisted and the Inset Map for Stisted Twinoaks as set out in the appendix.

15 Shalford and Church End

15.1 Shalford and Church End are located approximately 5 miles due north of Braintree. The villages benefit from a hall, pub, primary school, and grocery store.

15.2 Current policy position

15.3 Shalford and Church End are designated as “other villages” in the Core Strategy (2011).

15.4 Shalford has a development boundary, visually important space, protected lane, local wildlife site, and flood zone.

15.5 Church End has a development boundary, visually important space, informal and formal recreation, education, and a local wildlife site. Church End had a development boundary extension through the 2014 SADMP to include an area for a small scale housing development. It has also recently had a rural exception site to accommodate affordable housing.

15.6 Sites submitted and assessed previously

SHA1 – Resubmitted as SHAL374 - Land at Braintree Road adj “Gables”, Shalford Church End, 1.5ha, proposed for 4 dwellings.

SHA2 - Resubmitted as SHAL373 - Land to rear of Pent House, The Street, 0.637 ha, proposed for 14 residential dwellings.

SHA3A – Land of Braintree Road, site size 4 ha, proposed for residential development.

SHA3B – Land of Braintree Road, site size 8.7 ha, proposed for residential development.

SHA4 – Not resubmitted

SHA5 – Not resubmitted

SHA6 – Resubmitted as SHAL372 - Grubbs Cottage, Church End, 0.0525ha, inclusion of site within development boundary.

SHAL7 – Resubmitted as SHAL375 - Land at White Court, Residential - Land at White Court, Braintree Road, 0.67ha proposed for 4 dwellings.

15.7 Parish Council Comment

- 15.8 We do not support any change to the Village Envelope with the exception of the land known as White Court (Shal 375). In fact our opinion has been strengthened by the fact that planning permission has been sort or approved for a further 10 houses within the village since our November 2011 response making an increase of approximately 10% in the size of our village, which we believe is more than adequate. We would ask that you reread our 2011 response as it details the reasons behind our position.

15.9 SHAL371 - Land West of Braintree Road (Levelly Field) (8.7ha Residential)

- 15.10 Officer Comment - This comprises several smaller site previously considered for development in the SADMP. The site comprises of a large open agricultural field. It would be inappropriate to allocate a site of this size in a smaller village due to the limited availability of services and public transport. It would also constitute an inappropriate extension of development into the open countryside.

15.11 Recommendation 35 – That site SHAL371 land west of Braintree Road, is not allocated for residential development.

15.12 SHAL372 – Grubbs Cottage, Church End (0.05ha Residential)

Officer Comment - The site comprises the garden of a grade II listed building, and is also part covered by a group TPO. Changing the development boundary would potentially allow for in appropriate development which could have a negative impact on the setting of a grade II listed building. Such development would also constitute back land development.

15.13 Recommendation 36 – That site SHAL372 – Grubbs Cottage, Church End, is not allocated for residential development.

15.14 SHAL373 – Land to rear of Pent House, The Street, Shalford (0.6ha Residential)

15.15 Officer Comment - This site is currently identified as visually important space due to its proximity and contribution to the setting of the adjacent grade I listed church and its access. Development could have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of adjacent heritage assets and as such it would not be appropriate to allocate the site for housing.

15.16 Recommendation 37 – That site SHAL373 – Land to rear of Pent House, The Street is not allocated for residential development.

15.17 SHAL374 – Adj “Gables” Braintree Road, Shalford Church End (0.14ha Residential)

15.18 Officer Comment - This site would only provide less than 10 dwelling and as such would not warrant an allocation. The site is located next to a grade II listed building and development could have a negative appearance on its character and appearance.

15.19 Recommendation 38 – That site SHAL374 – adj “Gables” Braintree Road, is not allocated for residential development.

15.20 SHAL375 – Land at White Courts Shalford – (0.65ha Residential development)

15.21 Officer comment – This site was included within the development boundary for Church End Shalford in the 2014 Plan. It is not proposed to make any further alterations to the development boundary at this location.

15.22 Recommendation 39 – That site SHAL375 – Land at White Courts Shalford development boundary amendment is carried forward.

15.23 Recommendation 40 - That the Inset Map for Shalford as set out in the appendix is approved and that no sites are allocated for development.

15.24 Recommendation 41 - That the Inset Map for Shalford Church End as set out in the Appendix be approved to include the development boundary change at SHAL375.

16 Coggeshall

16.1 Coggeshall is identified as a key service village in the Core Strategy (2011). It is one of the larger villages in the district and has a good provision of services and facilities including a secondary school. It is on the A120 which provides access to Braintree, Colchester and the A12.

16.2 Current policy position

- 16.3 The village has a small allocation on West Street (COG12H) for residential development through the 2014 SADMP, and another allocation at Walford Way (COG20H) which has now been completed. It has a development boundary, conservation area, formal/informal recreation, local wildlife site, cemetery, allotments, local centre, employment (COG15E), education, visually important space, and floods zones. An ancient monument is also to the south of the village. A development boundary has also been defined for Surrex Hamlet to the east of the village as set out in the 2014 plan.

16.4 Sites submitted and assessed previously

COG1 (COGG181) – Land inside bypass east of village off Tey Road.

COG2 – Proposed village envelope at Surrex Hamlet (Amended in 2014 Plan)

COG3 (Not resubmitted) – Land at Grange Farm, Kelvedon Road

COG4 (COGG181) – Land inside the bypass, north of village (13.26ha)

COG5 (Not resubmitted) – Land at Surrex

COG6 (COGG180) – Land at West Street – (27.95 ha)

COG7 (COGG178) – Land adj to Colne Road and A120 Bypass – (2.15ha)

COG8 (Not resubmitted) – Former garage West Street

COG9 (COGG177) – Land north of Robinsbridge Road – (19.7ha)

COG10 (COGG176) – Land south of West Street Coggeshall

COG11 (COGG175) – Coggeshall Glebe to the rear of 32-78 West Street (4.7ha)

COG12 (COGG174) – Cookfield, East Street – Current allocation for 10+ residential dwellings.

COG13 (COGG180 part) – Land north of West Street Between 78-98 (At Highfields)

COG14 (Not resubmitted) – Land north of A120

COG15 (COGG179) – Land off A120, Colne Road Coggeshall (1.892ha)

COG16 (Not resubmitted) – Hare Bridge (28&30 West Street)

COG17 (Not resubmitted) – 65 East Street

COG18 (Not resubmitted) - 69 and 71 East Street

COG19 (Not resubmitted) – Rear of surgery 35, 35a, 35b, 35c and 35d
Knights Road

COG20 (Site completed) – Rear of Walford Way

16.5 New Sites

COGG506 – Dutch Nursery, West Street (3.2ha) Mixed use.

COGG171 – Tilkey Road (0.57ha) Residential.

COGG172 - The Vineyard West Street (0.84ha) Residential.

COGG173 – Land at Kelvedon Road (0.815ha) Residential.

COGG181 (Part) – The Honeywood Project (20.6ha) Residential and school.

COGG182 – Land north of B1024 Colchester Road (17ha) Residential.

COGG183 – Land south of B1024 Colchester Road (13.7ha) Residential.

FEER231 (Small part) – Land west of Marks Tey (463ha) – Garden Community. This site will be considered as part of a separate committee report on new settlements.

16.6 COGG506 Dutch Nursery, West Street.

Mixed use development up to 30 units, B1/B2 employment, retail associated with garden centre, community access to river.

- 16.7 Parish Council Comment - COGG506 is a brownfield site adjacent to the current envelope, which is home to a few small business units and the recently-closed Dutch Nursery. Redevelopment as a mixed use site to protect employment in the existing businesses and provide additional residential accommodation would be supported as this would be sustainable within the existing village infrastructure.

- 16.8 *Officer comments. The site is a brownfield site, which is currently used as a garden centre, and has some retail and business units. The site is part derelict. The site has been put forward for up to 30 residential units, and B1, B2 employment use for up to 50 jobs, and retail related to the garden centre. The site is some distance away from the development boundary for Coggeshall, however a number of other buildings are in this location. Potential constraints would include the sites proximity to a number of listed buildings which are located along West Street, but no listed buildings are present on site itself. The rear portion of the site is within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and would therefore have limited development potential. The presence of the flood zone has been identified as being a negative effect in the SA/SEA. The site is also adjacent to the Blackwater Plantation Local Wildlife Site with a very small part*

in the site boundary. This would be considered a significant negative effect, and would have to be excluded from any development area.

- 16.9 *The site once the Flood Zone and LoWs has been excluded, has no overriding constraints, and it is an underutilised brownfield site in relatively close proximity to a key service village. It is also a mixed use scheme which would provide local employment opportunities. It is therefore recommended to allocate the site as a comprehensive development area in the new Local Plan with the exception of land within the Flood Zone unless it is for access to the river.*

16.10 Recommendation 42 – That site COGG506 Dutch Nursery on West Street is allocated for a comprehensive development area comprising residential, employment, retail, and community access.

- 16.11 COGG171 known as Land R/O 100 – 146 Tilkey Road,

Proposed for 13 new dwellings.

- 16.12 Parish Council Comment - COGG171 and part of COGG181 (north of Tey Road) are both located some distance from the village centre and have access difficulties that would need to be resolved were they to be allocated for development. The latter borders the A120 and development would also need to address potential issues of noise and pollution.

- 16.13 *Officer Comment - The site is approximately 0.68ha in size and has been proposed for residential development. It is current a greenfield site which is currently grassed. The site has been proposed for 8 new dwellings accessed via private drives. As the site is proposed for less than 10 units, it would not be allocated as site allocations would be for 10+ units. Tilkey Road is a narrow road which has on street parking, meaning further proposals which would increase the number of vehicles using it could be potentially detrimental to highway safety. Landscape capacity for this is area is considered to be medium, with small scale development unlikely to have a significant impact on the landscape.*

16.14 Recommendation 43 – That site COGG171 land rear of 100 – 146 Tilkey Road is not allocated for development.

- 16.15 COGG172 is land at The Vineyard on West Street.

Residential and affordable housing.

- 16.16 Parish Council Comment - COGG172 includes part of a vineyard and Victorian water garden (now overgrown), adjacent to a wildlife site and the Blackwater flood plain. There are believed to be Roman archaeological

artefacts in the vicinity and the site is quite unsuited to residential development.

16.17 *Officer comment - It is approximately 0.51ha in size and is used for the growing of vines in relation to the vineyard. It is adjacent to the existing development boundary, and conservation area, development would have a uncertain effect on heritage assets. The eastern part of the site is partly within Flood Zone 2 and 3, and has a number of tree preservation orders.*

16.18 *The site is also in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site, development of which would be a significant negative effect with uncertainty. Development in this location would impact on the character and appearance as it would be extending development along West Street, and reduce the distance between the main village and the collection of buildings to the west. The area is shown to have a medium (3a) capacity, with the eastern part of the site being low (3b) capacity.*

16.19 Recommendation 44 – That site COGG172 land at The Vineyard on West Street is not allocated for development.

16.20 COGG173 land to the north of Abbey Lane.

Residential and affordable housing, incidental open space and small scale parking could be provided to serve St. Nicholas Chapel.

16.21 **Parish Council Comment -** COGG173 lies within the village conservation area and is within easy reach of the village centre. However, it is close to a number of listed buildings and access to the site is via an unmade road. Overlooking the Blackwater and its flood plain to the east of King Stephen's bridge, the site has considerable landscape character that would be compromised by development.

16.22 *Officer comment - It is approximately 0.8ha in size and has been put forward for residential use (20-30 units). This area has been identified as having a low landscape capacity to accommodate development. Development would likely have a significant appearance on the character and appearance of the River Blackwater. The site is also located within a conservation area and has a number of listed buildings in the vicinity.*

16.23 Recommendation 45 – That site COGG173 land to the north of Abbey Lane is not allocated for development.

16.24 COGG174 – Cook Field East Street.

Residential development

16.25 **Parish Council comment -** We note that COGG174 (Land on the South Side of East Street) has previously been allocated for residential development.

16.26 *Officer comment - This site has been allocated in the 2014 Plan and it is not proposed to change this allocation. The site capacity is estimated at 12 dwellings.*

16.27 Recommendation 46 – That site COGG174 Cook Field East Street is retained for residential development

16.28 COGG175 – Coggeshall Glebe to the rear of 32 – 78 West Street.

Residential and affordable housing.

16.29 Parish Council comment - The Vicarage Field, COGG175, is a larger capacity site bordered by Robins Brook to the east and a row of houses on West Street to the south, and development would pose the same issues concerning village infrastructure as the perimeter sites (above). Access is from West Street, via a grass track between houses and also through the car park at the Vets surgery. The area has heritage impact as it is believed to be the site where Thomas Hawkes, the Protestant martyr, was burnt at the stake in 1555 and commemorated on the “blue plaque” outside Constantine’s in the village centre. The site was used for allotments and recreation from the Second World War (and probably before) until about 10 years ago. Following a very short and unsuccessful agricultural tenancy the site remained uncultivated until the current tenancy began last year. Walkers and members of the public exercise their dogs using the public footpaths that cross the site and are permitted responsible access to other areas by the current tenant, who cultivates grass for hay. The landowner has shown minimal interest in securing the site and has only recently erected a steel gate to prevent unauthorised entry. We consider Vicarage Field to be Visually Important Space and understand that it will be nominated as an “Asset of Community Value” in the Neighbourhood Plan currently being developed, with the objective of acquiring the site and returning it to Public Open Space in the future. The Vicarage Field appears in the BDC Open Spaces Action Plan 2016.

16.30 These large capacity sites have heritage, landscape and environmental profiles that along with their impact on the local infrastructure make them unsuitable for sustainable development in our opinion. Sites that have been proposed for small-scale residential development are unlikely to pose insuperable issues for the village infrastructure and are thus better suited for sustainable development phased over the planning period. However, most present challenges that need to be factored into the Local Plan evaluation of sites.

16.31 *Officer comment – The site has been proposed for residential development. It is currently shown as a formal recreation area, however this use ceased a number of years ago, and no information has been submitted showing that*

this use would ever come forward again. It is proposed to remove that allocation. The site is adjacent to the conservation area, and has a PROW running through the bottom quarter and along its eastern boundary. The SA/SEA is uncertain as to what impact development on the site would have on the historic environment as it also has some listed buildings in the vicinity.

16.32 *The site has a medium landscape capacity and could be relatively well contained by the natural features of the site. However the site is considered important to the local community due to its historic association with Thomas Hawkes, and its role as an informal recreation area which is popular with local residents, as such it may be appropriate to designate the area as a Local Green Space as per paragraph 76 and 77 of the NPPF and national guidance on the subject. The site meets the necessary criteria for designation as a Local Green Space as it is in close proximity to the community it services, is considered special to a local community and has a particular local historic significance. It also has recreational value as well as public right of way. The site is well contained and would not be considered an extensive tract of land. Designation of the area as a Local Green Space would give it protection consistent with that in respect of Green Belt.*

16.33 Recommendation 47 – That site COGG175 Coggeshall Glebe to the rear of 32 – 78 West Street is allocated as a Local Green Space.

16.34 COGG176 Land south of West Street, north of the football club. Residential and affordable housing.

16.35 Parish Council comment - COGG176 is currently rented by Coggeshall Town FC. It is used as an adult training area in mid-week and for junior teams' training and matches at the weekend (ages 7 to 16). This latter use is much valued as a sporting/recreational facility for local children and would be badly missed if the site were developed without replacement.

16.36 *Officer comment - this site is approximately 1ha in size and has been proposed for residential use. The site is currently identified as formal recreation along with the football club to the south. It is located some distance from the development boundary for Coggeshall and would not be a natural extension to development in Coggeshall. It is also a greenfield site.*

16.37 Recommendation 48 - That site COGG176 land south of West Street, north of the football club is not allocated for development and retains its formal recreation designation.

16.38 COGG177 is land north of Robinsbridge Road – Residential and affordable housing, community facilities

16.39 Parish Council comment - 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. Access to two of the sites, COGG177 and 178, would be particularly difficult. COGG180 surrounds listed buildings on three sides and would encroach upon their historic setting.

16.40 *Officer comment – The site is approximately 19.7 ha in size. It has been proposed for residential development. The site is in an area of medium-low landscape capacity, and is a greenfield site. Access to the site would be difficult considering the narrowness of Robinsbridge Road which may be make it unsuitable for any significant level of housing development. It is also unlikely that access from the A120 would be accepted by Highways England.*

16.41 Recommendation 49 – That site COGG177 land north of Robinsbridge Road is not allocated for development

16.42 COGG178 the site is adjacent to Colne Road and the A120 bypass, next to The Honeywood School. 2.1ha Residential use.

16.43 Parish Council comment – As per COGG177.

16.44 *Officer comment - It is approximately 2.1ha in size and has been proposed for residential use. The site is adjacent to the school playing field. Access to the site would be difficult without adjacent land which is in separate ownership, this is due to the sites proximity to the A120 Colne Road junction. At present the land, together with the school playing fields as a green buffer between development and the A120. The site is separated from other built development on this side of Colne Road by the school. Landscape impact would likely be minimal as it is a medium landscape capacity area separated from the wider countryside by the A120.*

16.45 Recommendation 50 – That site COGG178 site adj to Colne Road and the A120 is not allocated for residential development.

16.46 COGG179 Land off Colne Road south of the A120. 1.8ha proposed for residential use.

16.47 Parish Council comment - COGG179 is currently occupied by a large industrial unit that the landowner claims is largely unoccupied and difficult to let. It shares access to Colne Road with a number of smaller industrial units

and is effectively sandwiched between these units and the A120. It is some distance from the village centre and although having no access difficulties, any residential development would need to address noise and pollution issues similar to COGG181 (Tey Road).

16.48 *Officer comment - The site is currently identified for employment use, it is being proposed for residential uses. The Council's Employment Land Needs Assessment has recommended that the site (Ref C21) be retain for employment uses. The report states that the site is in a good condition with some vacant and available floorspace which do not appear to be currently marketed. It was also considered very suitable for small medium enterprises, and has direct access to the strategic road network.*

16.49 Recommendation 51 – That site land off Colne Road south of the A120 is not allocated for residential development and retains its employment designation.

16.50 COGG180 which is land at West Street 25.9ha proposed for residential use, employment and self-build.

16.51 Parish Council comment – As per COGG177.

16.52 *Officer comment – This site has been put forward for residential development between 120-150 dwellings, 7.3ha of employment, possible primary school provision, and landscaping. A planning application (15/01271/OUT) is currently being determined for 119 dwellings, 836 sqm employment floor space, 8 self-build plots, and associated works.*

16.53 *The site is a larger scale green field site which has Medium landscape capacity toward the front of the site and Medium Low Landscape capacity further to the northern end to its boundary with Ambridge Road and the A120.*

16.54 *In terms of the SA/SEA the site scores well for the provision of housing and affordable housing and access to services. It scored negatively on distance to primary school, but positively due to the secondary school. Coggeshall has a number of services which also mean that the sites score well in terms of access to local shops and services, and public transport.*

16.55 *The site is a greenfield site and is not considered to be a natural extension to development in Coggeshall as it would be a significant development in depth off West Street, which primarily has a linear character.*

16.56 Recommendation 52 – That site COGG180 land at West Street is not allocated for residential development.

16.57 COGG181 is land at Honeywood School and land north and south of the A120 bypass. 20ha Residential, retail, education and community facilities.

16.58 Parish Council comment – As per COGG177.

16.59 *Officer comment – The site is currently used for secondary school, playing fields, paddocks, and agricultural land. The proposal included provision of a new secondary school along with housing (Approximately 300) and other uses. This site has previously been considered through the 2014 Plan, however some additional land was added to the north of the bypass which would have been used for school playing fields. This reference number also includes the site previously known as COG1 land north of Tey Road which has a current planning application. The former COG1 site would have limited impact on the countryside as it is bounded by existing development and the A120. It could be allocated subject to environmental health considerations and a suitable access. The land no longer includes land at the secondary school owned by Essex County Council who have stated that they would not be interested in re-developing the school site.*

16.60 Recommendation 53 – That the site COGG181 land at Honeywood School and land north and south of the A120 bypass is not allocated for residential development. But that the part of the site located between the A120 and Tey Road is allocated for residential development as set out in the Map in the appendix.

16.61 COGG182 and COGG183 are located north of Colchester Road, south of Tey Road and south of Colchester Road. – 17ha and 13.7ha, proposed for residential, employment, education, community use.

16.62 Parish Council comment – As per COGG177.

16.63 *Officer comment - Both sites are being promoted in conjunction with each other however the developer would consider small scale schemes. The sites are approximately 30ha in size and are proposed for residential, care home, small scale employment, education (Up to 2 form entry primary school), and community facilities. Combined, the sites could probably provide 600 new homes. The sites could be accessed from Colchester Road. The northern site COGG182 is within a medium capacity landscape, and COGG183 is Medium Low Landscape Capacity. Both sites are greenfield. This site could be considered suitable for allocation if a larger scale allocation was necessary in Coggeshall, however this would be subject to suitable highways access.*

16.64 Recommendation 54 – That site COGG182 and COGG183 are not allocated for residential development

16.65 Surrex Hamlet

16.66 Surrex is located to the east of Coggeshall along the A120. A development boundary was proposed in the 2014 Plan due to the level of development which had taken place in the area, and to facilitate the development of the Queen Head public house site, which had been vacant for a number of years. It is proposed to carry this forward into the new Plan.

16.67 Recommendation 55 – That a development boundary is drawn around Surrex Hamlet as shown on the inset map.

16.68 Recommendation 56 – That the inset map for Coggeshall and Surrex Hamlet be approved.