

# **LOCAL PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE AGENDA**

**Monday, 28 November 2016 at 06:00 PM**

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

**THIS MEETING IS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**  
*(Please note this meeting will be webcast and audio recorded)*  
[www.braintree.gov.uk](http://www.braintree.gov.uk)

---

**Members of the Local Plan Sub-Committee are requested to attend this meeting to  
transact the business set out in the Agenda.**

**Membership:-**

Councillor D Bebb	Councillor Mrs J Money
Councillor Mrs L Bowers-Flint (Chairman)	Councillor Lady Newton
Councillor G Butland	Councillor J O'Reilly-Cicconi
Councillor T Cunningham	Councillor Mrs W Scattergood
Councillor D Hume	Councillor Miss M Thorogood

Members unable to attend the meeting are requested to forward their apologies for absence to the Governance and Members Team on 01376 552525 or email [governance@braintree.gov.uk](mailto:governance@braintree.gov.uk) by 3pm on the day of the meeting.

N BEACH  
Chief Executive

## **INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS - DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

### **Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, Other Pecuniary Interest or Non-Pecuniary Interest**

Any member with a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, other Pecuniary Interest or Non-Pecuniary Interest must declare the nature of their interest in accordance with the Code of Conduct. Members must not participate in any discussion of the matter in which they have declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or other Pecuniary Interest or participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting. In addition, the Member must withdraw from the chamber where the meeting considering the business is being held unless the Member has received a dispensation from the Monitoring Officer.

### **Question Time**

The Agenda allows for a period of up to 30 minutes when members of the public can speak. Members of the public wishing to speak are requested to register by contacting the Governance and Members Team on 01376 552525 or email [governance@braintree.gov.uk](mailto:governance@braintree.gov.uk) no later than 2 working days prior to the meeting. The Council reserves the right to decline any requests to register to speak if they are received after this time. Members of the public can remain to observe the public session of the meeting.

Please note that there is public Wi-Fi in the Council Chamber, users are required to register in order to access this. There is limited availability of printed agendas.

### **Health and Safety**

Any persons attending meetings in the Council offices 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 an alarm you must evacuate the building immediately and follow all instructions provided by officers. 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 switched to silent during the meeting in order to prevent disturbances.

### **Webcast and Audio Recording**

Please note that this meeting will be webcast and audio recorded. You can view webcasts for up to 6 months using this link: <http://braintree.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

### **Documents**

Agendas, reports and minutes for all the Council's public meetings can be accessed via [www.braintree.gov.uk](http://www.braintree.gov.uk)

We welcome comments from members of the public to make our services as efficient and effective as possible. If you have any suggestions regarding the meeting you have attended, you can send these via [governance@braintree.gov.uk](mailto:governance@braintree.gov.uk)

## **PUBLIC SESSION**

**Page**

**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 Meetings**

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings of the Local Plan Sub-Committee held on 31st October 2016 and 10th November 2016 (copies previously circulated).

**4     Public Question Time**

(See paragraph above)

**5     Braintree Draft Local Plan - Consultation Responses**

**4 - 73**

**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**

**Page**

**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.

<b>Braintree Draft Local Plan – Responses Received to the Draft Local Plan</b>		<b>Agenda No: 5</b>
<b>Portfolio:</b> Planning and Housing <b>Corporate Outcome:</b> Securing appropriate infrastructure and housing growth  <b>Report Presented by:</b> Alan Massow and Emma Goodings <b>Report Prepared by:</b> Alan Massow, Sean Tofts and Emma Goodings		
<b>Background Papers:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</li> <li>• National Planning Practise Guidance (NPPG)</li> <li>• Localism Act (2011)</li> <li>• Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)</li> <li>• Local Plan Review (2005)</li> <li>• Core Strategy (2011)</li> <li>• Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (2015)</li> <li>• New Draft Local Plan (2016)</li> </ul>		<b>Public Report:</b> Yes <b>Key Decision:</b> No
<b>Executive Summary:</b> <p>This report looks at the villages of Coggeshall, Earls Colne, White Colne, Earls Colne Airfield, Finchingfield, Cornish Hall End, Great Bardfield, Bardfield Saling, Great Notley, Black Notley, Greenstead Green, Wethersfield, Blackmore End, White Notley and Faulkbourne. It also looks at the text of the Local Plan in relation to the introduction, background and next steps, spatial strategy and the glossary.</p> <p>The report takes each area in turn and sets out the summary of comments received and considers any new sites which have been put forward. Based on this an officer recommendation for any further changes to the Plan is then set out. Maps of the sites and the proposed Inset maps for the villages with development boundaries to be contained within the Pre Submission Local Plan are contained within a separate</p> <p><b>Appendix.</b></p> <p>The report also looks at policies in relation to the introduction and background, spatial strategy and glossary. The policies and supporting text are set out in full in italics in the report with changes in text highlighted with deletions in strikethrough and additions in bold and underlined.</p>		
<b>Recommendation 1 - That the Inset Map for Coggeshall remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.</b>		
<b>Recommendation 2 – That the policy for the Former Dutch Nursery Site, West</b>		

**Street, Coggeshall is approved as set out in the text.**

**Recommendation 3 - That the Inset Map for Surrex Hamlet remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix**

**Recommendation 4 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne and White Colne West is amended to include a residential allocation at EARC221 and remove the allocation at Harold Simm Court as shown in the Appendix**

**Recommendation 5 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne and White Colne East remain unchanged from the draft Local Plan shown in the Appendix**

**Recommendation 6 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne Airfield remains unchanged from the draft Local Plan shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 7 - That the Inset Map for Finchingfield remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 8 - That the Inset Map for Cornish Hall End remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 9 - That the Inset Map for Great Bardfield is amended to include part of site GRBA255, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 10 - That Bardfield Saling does not have a development boundary and remains as a countryside location.**

**Recommendation 11 - That the Inset Map for Black Notley remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 12 – The Inset Map for Great Notley be amended to allocate site BLAN633 as a residential development site and to alter the strategic growth location boundary of site BLAN114 to include small areas along Bakers Lane, as set out in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 13 – Policy LPP17 is amended as set out in this report.**

**Recommendation 14 - That the Inset Map for Greenstead Green remains unchanged from the Draft Local Plan as shown in Appendix**

**Recommendation 15 - That site WETH624 is allocated as a residential site, and that rest of the Inset Map for Wethersfield remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 16 – That the Inset Map for Blackmore End remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown on the Inset Map.**

**Recommendation 17 - That the Inset Map for White Notley remain unchanged from**

that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.

**Recommendation 18 - That Faulkbourne remain as a hamlet in the countryside.**

**Recommendation 19 – That the text for the Introduction, Background and What Happens Next sections of the Local Plan is amended to that set out in the report**

**Recommendation 20 – To revise the spatial strategy chapter of the Local Plan as set out in this report**

**Recommendation 21 - Updated Glossary Text as set out in this report**

**Purpose of Decision:**

**To consider the responses to the Draft Local Plan consultation in relation to these villages and chapters and make any changes as a result of the comments.**

**Corporate implications**

<b>Financial:</b>	The preparation of the Plans set out within the Local Development Scheme will be a significant cost which will be met through the Local Plan budget.
<b>Legal:</b>	To comply with Governments legislation and guidance.
<b>Equalities/Diversity</b>	The Councils policies should take account of equalities and diversity.
<b>Safeguarding</b>	None
<b>Customer Impact:</b>	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
<b>Environment and Climate Change:</b>	This will form part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and will inform policies and allocations.
<b>Consultation/Community Engagement:</b>	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
<b>Risks:</b>	The Local Plan examination may not take place. The Local Plan could be found unsound. Risk of High Court challenge.

<b>Officer Contact:</b>	Emma Goodings
<b>Designation:</b>	Planning Policy Manager
<b>Ext. No.</b>	2511
<b>E-mail:</b>	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 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.
- 1.5 The Plan includes 68 strategic and non-strategic policies set around 3 key themes, A Prosperous District, Creating Better Places and The Districts Natural Environment. The Plan also includes a shared strategic section of the Plan and 10 policies (prefixed SP) which are replicated in Colchester and Tendring Local Plan. All comments received by each of the three authorities within their consultation periods are being co-ordinated and a single report will be produced on the responses to this section.
- 1.6 Full Council on the agreed the new Draft Local Plan for public consultation at its meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> June 2016.
- 1.7 The Local Plan was subject to an 8 week public consultation which started on the 27<sup>th</sup> June and concluded on the 19<sup>th</sup> August.
- 1.8 A total of 3,101 comments have been received from 1,244 individuals. These are all available in full on the website at [www.braintree.gov.uk/consultLP](http://www.braintree.gov.uk/consultLP) and we would ask all Members to read these comments.
- 1.9 An update to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been undertaken to include new sites submitted to the Local Plan. To maximise the contribution that the Local Plan makes to the achievement of sustainable development and minimise any potential adverse impacts, members should have regard to the SA and consider any reasonable alternative options to the chosen policy or allocation. The Council will need to show how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan and how the SA has been taken into account.

- 1.10 The settlements and chapters are now considered individually below, including a summary of the comments received. Policies and supporting text are set out in full in italics and changes can be seen with strikethroughs for deletions and underline for new text.

## **2 Coggeshall**

- 2.1 Coggeshall is a Key Service Village and is one of the larger villages in the District. It 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.

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 2.2 The public consultation on the Draft Local Plan elicited representations relating to exiting sites and new sites proposed for development. Coggeshall Parish Council (CPC) support the Plan as currently drafted, it being sustainable within the village's existing (limited) health, education, transport and environmental infrastructure whilst maintaining its highly valued landscape and heritage assets. CPC wish to offer specific comments on the representations and consider that there are no superior alternatives to the allocated sites or desirable, sustainable additions.
- 2.3 The owners of the Dutch Nursery (COGG172) have noted in their representation that the scheme will be a significant increase on the 30 homes indicated in the original call for sites. Their agents have begun consultation with the local community on proposals for development of the site, prior to initiating a planning application. As a consequence the total number of new homes in the three allocated sites is likely to be much higher than the figure of 53 initially proposed, which will result in the projected number of primary school-age children in the village matching or exceeding the latest ECC capacity estimates for the local school. The GP practice has suspended the admission of new patients (except babies born to existing residents). Adding further sites to those allocated in the Draft Local Plan would, in all probability, mean more families needing to find provision of these services in neighbouring communities, where availability may (or may not) be available.
- 2.4 The proposed new sites at Westland Nurseries (COGG629) and Land North of West Street (COGG640) are large capacity, green-field sites that are disconnected from the village and would dramatically change the landscape of the western entry to the village. The new site proposed at Coggeshall Football Club (COGG623) is currently classified as formal recreation and has seen major upgrades in recent years. No alternative site has been proposed in the public consultation on the Draft Local Plan and CPC have no knowledge of



any plans to relocate the facility. A local resident representing the near neighbours of the club voiced unanimous opposition to this proposal at our CPC Planning Meeting on 24th October 2016. The site is isolated from both the main settlement and the ribbon of houses on West Street. Its proximity to the River Blackwater flood plain and conservation area are further factors that make this site unsuitable for sustainable development. CPC oppose the allocation of all three sites.

- 2.5 Having studied the objections by the agents for COGG180, Land North of West Street, and COGG181, Marks Hall Estate, CPC have found no factors that have not already been considered by BDC and therefore see no reason to change the decision not to allocate these two sites. As we have already noted in our original response to the “call for sites”, these developments would seriously damage the village’s heritage, landscape and environmental profiles, with an associated detrimental impact on local infrastructure.
- 2.6 Coggeshall is a rare example of a medieval market community with valuable heritage assets that attracts visitors from far and wide. It has grown by (mainly) sympathetic development by over 8% since the turn of the century and expansion greater than that arising from the Draft Local Plan allocations could destroy the entire character and landscape of the village.
- 2.7 Comments have also been made against the Monks Wood site (COGG641) and these will be considered when that site is considered at a future meeting.

## **2.8 New Sites Submitted**

COGG623 – Land south of West Street (Existing club ground and additional land to the west) – Proposed housing and re-located football club.

COGG629 – Land at Westland Nurseries, West Street – Residential (55 units)

COGG640 – Land north of West Street Coggeshall, - Residential (100 units)

COGG641 – Land to the South of Monks Wood North of the A120 – Proposed garden community of 5000+ homes – to be considered at a future meeting.

## **Comments Received**

- 2.9 Twenty Three comments have been received on Coggeshall and its alternative Inset Map but no comments have been submitted on the Surrex Inset Map. As such the Surrex Inset Map is proposed to move forward without further change.
- 2.10 A number of letters have been received, outside of the consultation period regarding COGG641 - Monks Wood. This site will be discussed at a later meeting.

2.11 Other comments are summarised as follows;

- Support for the allocation of Dutch Nursery, and that the site can support a higher level of development than previously suggested
- Coggeshall needs more affordable housing
- More housing should be in the villages rather than towns
- Support for the Inset Map as drafted
- Support for the non-inclusion of COGG182 as scale of development is too large, and local infrastructure schools, and services could not cope
- COGG181 and COGG184 do not offer any community benefit compared to site COGG180
- Proposed new football club ground and associated facilities including artificial pitch, existing ground to be sold off for housing. The club has outgrown its current facility
- Support for new site submissions
- Objection to the identification of Cook Field due to landscape, flooding, wildlife, impact on tree preservation orders, and impact on the Essex Way.
- Support for Marks Hall proposals
- The number of homes proposed is too low and doesn't cater for local people or the young. More affordable housing is required
- Coggeshall needs more housing and employment to keep local business trading
- Coggeshall could support a higher level of development
- Objection for the non-allocation of COGG180 for up to 98 homes, self-build plots B1 business hub, and 17ha of green space. Site scores well in the SA
- The Plan as currently drafted does not represent the most appropriate strategy for development when considered against the reasonable alternatives
- Support for the development of COGG174, site has minimal traffic impact, is not at risk of flooding, and will be retaining the TPO's
- The number of housing allocated is adequate to meet the identified need for both market and affordable housing

**Officer Comment**

- 2.12 The proposed allocated sites at COGG181 (Tey Road), and COGG174 (East Street), are considered to be the most appropriate sites for development in the village. COGG174 is located adjacent to the development boundary, and does not have any overriding constraints. It is not at risk from flooding. Other sites around Coggeshall have a higher level of landscape capacity, however this site is well contained by existing trees along its front and rear boundary, although the site is visible from the adjacent footpath for about 300m of its

length, considering that the length of the Essex Way is 81 miles there should be no significant impact on its appearance.

- 2.13 Site COGG180 was refused planning permission, and was not selected for allocation. The harm that would result to the character and appearance of the countryside and the impact on heritage assets means that the proposals would fail to perform the environmental role of sustainability. An appeal has been submitted against the refusal of planning permission.
- 2.14 The remaining parts of COGG181 off Tilkey Road and to the north of the A120 are not considered suitable for development. The land north of the A120 is separated from the village by the A120, and would not be a natural extension to development in Coggeshall. Access to land off Tilkey Road would be difficult due to the narrow nature of the road and on street parking.
- 2.15 COGG182/COGG183 – both sites are being promoted in conjunction with each other, but could be developed separately. The sites could be considered suitable for development, and would be of a size potentially capable of providing a primary school if one is needed. Access issues would need to be resolved, and it would be need to be proved that a primary school could be accommodated on the site without compromising the delivery of other community benefits such as affordable housing. Coggeshall has other sites to develop which are considered more suitable as they either utilise a derelict sites, or are of a scale which is more appropriate to Coggeshall at this time.
- 2.16 The Dutch Nursery (COGG506) has been allocated as a comprehensive development area. It was envisaged that this would be a mixed use development site, comprising residential, retail, and employment uses. As with all allocations the final composition of development would be determined through the planning application process. The site is an underutilised site the majority of which was developed as a nursery, and associated uses. The proposal offers significant local benefit, including the redevelopment of a part derelict site, homes, affordable housing, employment, and recreational access to the river, as well as open space. As a new addition to the Plan it is proposed to add a site specific comprehensive development policy on the site to set out the uses which would be supported on the site.

**2.17 Former Dutch Nursery Site, West Street, Coggeshall**

*The redevelopment of the former Dutch Nursery site in Coggeshall will be supported for a mixed use regeneration scheme. The site will be expected to provide a range of uses including residential, but also commercial uses in order to off-set the loss of employment and retail uses which previously existed on the site.*

***“Policy - Former Dutch Nursery, West Street Coggeshall***

***The Dutch Nursery site has been identified on the proposals map as a comprehensive development area. Re-development proposals will be supported which could provide a mixture of uses including;***

- ***Residential***
- ***Employment and***
- ***Retail***

***Community uses will also be encouraged including, but not limited to, public access to the river, and informal recreation space.***

***Part of the site is within the Flood Zone and built development would not be supported in this area”***

- 2.18 Officers note the support for the non-allocation of other sites around Coggeshall.
- 2.19 COGG629 – Land at Westland Nurseries, West Street is located away from the main village, and currently comprises an existing nursery business, with associated land. The site is not well contained within the context of development in Coggeshall or within existing development in this specific area, and the majority of it would be considered as back land development. Whilst similar in character to the Dutch Nursery, it has several disadvantages, including that development would extend further away from existing development in the area due to the length of back gardens on West Street and is in current active employment use. If development of the front of the site were permitted this would lead to the coalescence of development on the north site of West Street, which would be detrimental to the character of the area.
- 2.20 COGG640 – Land north of West Street is located from the main area of built development in Coggeshall –It is of a medium landscape capacity; however it would not be considered a natural extension of development in the village. 100 homes here would be out of character with the current development within this part of Coggeshall.
- 2.21 COGG623 - Land south of West Street, Low medium landscape capacity. The site is being proposed for a new football ground and community facilities, in conjunction with the development of the existing football ground site for around 20 homes (COGG176). This could potentially bring a significant community benefit to Coggeshall in the form of improved sporting facilities. However, the landscape and visual impact may be too significant to justify a release of this site for a new ground. A listed building is adjacent at Griggs

Farm and the impact of development proposals would have to give careful consideration especially as it is adjacent to COGG623. No specific location within COGG623 has been indicated as the location for a ground, as such an appropriate area could exist which minimises impact on the landscape, residents and adjacent heritage assets. A number of letters from residents have been received none of which have expressed support for this proposal, and the Parish Council oppose the development of this site. The Neighbourhood Plan group could consider the site as a means of enhancing formal recreation facilities through the neighbourhood plan, if evidence suggested more formal provision was required.

- 2.22 The development of the Dutch Nursery site is considered appropriate as it is utilising an existing site. But the cumulative impact of development sites around West Street would significantly change the character and appearance of the area. Development at East Street and Tey Road, is of a small scale, and would be unlikely to have a significant impact on landscape or have any other planning constraints which could not be overcome.
- 2.23 Coggeshall has a designated neighbourhood area and a group working on producing a neighbourhood plan. Whilst the Draft Local Plan allocations are relatively modest, the group through the Neighbourhood Plan could propose allocating additional sites for development.

**Recommendation 1 - That the Inset Map for Coggeshall remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 2 – That the policy for the Former Dutch Nursery Site, West Street, Coggeshall is approved as set out in the text.**

**Recommendation 3 - That the Inset Map for Surrex Hamlet remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix**

### **3 Earls Colne and White Colne**

- 3.1 Earls Colne is a Key Service Village to the west of Halstead. The village has a development boundary and has had 2 extensions proposed since the Local Plan Review 2005. The sites proposed for inclusion were EARC225 and EAR3H; both sites are roll forwards from the SADAMP2014.
- 3.2 White Colne is a smaller village to the west of Earls Colne and has a development boundary. Though the village does not have many services and facilities it is within close proximity to the Key Service Village of Earls Colne and on the bus route from Halstead to Colchester. No sites were supported for allocation within White Colne in the Draft Local Plan and it was suggested the development boundary should remain as shown in the Local Plan Review 2005.

- 3.3 The villages are covered by 2 Inset Maps within the draft Local Plan. Inset 21 (Earls Colne and White Colne West) and 21A (Earls Colne and White Colne east). In total the Inset Maps received 87 comments and several representations by agents for supported and unsupported sites within the draft Local Plan.
- 3.4 Further commentary was submitted by the owners of EARC215. The points conveyed are summarised below:
- The development of the site would be beneficial to the community
  - The site could accommodate 5 dwellings
- 3.5 The supporting information submitted by the agent for the site EARC221 is shown below:
- The non-allocation of this site brings into dispute the soundness of the draft Local Plan
  - The site has been supported by planning policy officers
  - The site was proposed to be included by the Local Plan Sub-Committee on the 25<sup>th</sup> of May 2016
  - The site was removed contrary to the advice of officers predominantly on highways grounds.
  - The site would be deliverable within the 5 years
  - The site is currently pending a planning application
  - The site has registered support from a number of local residents
  - The development of the site would include a contribution to local infrastructure improvements
  - The site is considered favourably in landscape capacity terms
  - The site is deliverable within the short term
- 3.6 Further commentary was submitted by the owners of EARC222. The points conveyed are summarised below:
- The majority of development is being concentrated within the main towns
  - The highways network within Braintree is not capable of accommodating further development
  - Development should be balanced more towards Key Service Villages; despite the concerns of local residents
  - The site should be allocated for the aforementioned reasons and to aid the viability of the Golf Course
- 3.7 The agent for EARC225 has submitted commentary in support of the allocated site which is summarised below:

- The site remains deliverable and is subject to an outline planning application
- There are no untoward constraints upon the site
- The site is a logical extension to the village
- The delivery of 80 dwellings would contribute to the 5 year supply of the District

3.8 *General Public Comments:* All comments made by the general public were made reference to EARC221; land east of Monks Road. The points conveyed are summarised below:

- The traffic congestion generated within the locality and the wider area is not acceptable; the village already suffers from congestion
- The development of the site could be detrimental to the setting of the Grade I listed church
- The village already has a substantial amount of development in the pipeline
- Village services such as the primary school and doctors surgery are at capacity
- There are endangered species upon the site
- The development of the site would negatively impact the village character
- The development of the site would negatively impact upon the conservation area
- Development should be concentrated in areas with train stations
- There is a concern over the privacy of existing neighbours of the site

3.9 *Parish Council comments* – No further commentary has been requested beyond that relayed at the Local Plan Sub-Committee which is summarised below:

- The Parish Council support the roll forward site allocations from the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (EARC225 and EAR3H) and no other sites within the village
- No sites within White Colne are supported

3.10 *Officer Comments* – In relation to the further correspondence submitted by the owner of EARC215 though it is recognised that the site could potentially accommodate 5 dwellings the impact upon the open countryside of such a development and lack of connectivity of the site with the village is not favourable. There is no pedestrian access to the village and this would amount to an isolated development cluster within the open countryside.

3.11 In relation to the further correspondence submitted by the owner of EARC222 this greenfield site is considered to amount to an inappropriate extension to

the village and has no logical boundary. The area of the village is relatively distant from the majority services and amenities within the village. Though there is commentary stating that the redevelopment of the site could aid in the economic viability of the golf course it is suggested that having residential development upon the site could hinder the scope of the usages upon the golf course. It is suggested that the site remains unallocated.

- 3.12 In relation to EARC221, land to the east of Monks Road. The site is now subject to planning application reference 16/01475/FUL, which at the time of writing this report, was to be considered at the Planning Committee of the 22<sup>nd</sup> of November. The officer's recommendation within the Planning Committee report is for approval of the application. The Local Plan Sub-Committee had previously considered the site prior to the public consultation however it was suggested that the highways impact was unfavourable. Though much of the commentary in rebuttal to the selection of this site is related to the highways constraints the applicants have demonstrated through the transport assessment linked to the application that the traffic generation would have a negligible effect upon the highways network within the immediate vicinity and junctions onto the High Street and this has been accepted by the highways authority. Other concerns have been highlighted within the commentary of the public related to the strain upon amenities and services within the village however where appropriate contributions will be sought by the appropriate bodies.
- 3.13 The planning policy officers consider the site to be a logical extension to the village. The site is located within close proximity to the village centre and it is relatively well contained in landscape terms, being a medium – high landscape capacity to accommodate change. It is recommended that the site is allocated for 50 homes within the Pre-Submission Local Plan.
- 3.14 No new evidence has been submitted to suggest that the EARC225 is not now a suitable location for further development and it is suggested that they remain within the local Plan.
- 3.15 No further supporting information has been submitted in relation to any sites other than the aforementioned and it is recommended that they remain as shown in the draft Local Plan. However the residential allocation at Harold Simm Court has now been completed and so the residential allocation can be removed from Inset Map 21.

**Recommendation 4 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne and White Colne West is amended to include a residential allocation at EARC221 and remove the allocation at Harold Simm Court as shown in the Appendix**



**Recommendation 5 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne and White Colne East remain unchanged from the draft Local Plan shown in the Appendix**

**4 Earls Colne Airfield**

- 4.1 Earls Colne Airfield was a World War II airfield approximately 1¼ miles from the village. It has been developed in the last 30 years with a number of uses that include a retained airstrip, industrial and business uses.
- 4.2 Inset Map 22 which pertains to the airfield received several comments of objection to EARC226 and the agent for the site submitted a supporting statement.
- 4.3 The supporting statement in relation to EARC226 is summarised below:
- Significant tree belts mitigate landscape character concerns
  - The only significant change since the site was intended to be allocated within the Site Allocations and Development plan is that a substantial uplift in development is required
  - The noise assessment suggests that the site is within accepted parameters
  - All other surveys and assessments have suggested that any concerns can be mitigated
- 4.4 The comments of objection to EARC226 are summarised below:
- Intensification of uses on the site will endanger pedestrians
  - Local residents will have further obstruction ingressing and egressing their properties
  - The further development will impact upon the amenity of the local residents
  - The further development of the site does not balance the needs of residents with commercial interests
  - Lorries already degrade the verges to the roadway
  - The greater the commercial development the more the reduction in value of residents' properties
- 4.5 *Parish Council Comments* – The Parish Council has not submitted any specific commentary in relation to the site within the Local Plan Period. Qualified support for EARC226 (formerly EAR5 and EAR13) has previously been gained.
- 4.6 *Officers Comments* – Though further anecdotal commentary has been submitted in rebuttal to the proposed intensification of development. The reports and surveys submitted by the applicant substantively demonstrate that

the development will not have an untoward impact upon the locality; including the highways network and it is recommended that the proposed allocation is retained as per the draft Local Plan.

**Recommendation 6 - That the Inset Map for Earls Colne Airfield remains unchanged from the draft Local Plan shown in the Appendix.**

## **5 Finchingfield and Cornish Hall End**

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

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 5.2 Finchingfield is a relatively small rural village, albeit very popular with visitors as it is considered to have all the features of a quintessential English village, and is surrounded by open fields confirming its rural position. In considering any proposal to add to the housing stock in such a location, it is not a question whether land exists upon which to build the new dwellings but rather whether such a development is needed, desirable or wanted.
- 5.3 Finchingfield Parish Council share the view of BDC that new housing of scale should be located reasonably close to where economic growth and new jobs are likely to be created in future years and where the infrastructure can either cope with the resultant increase in resident numbers or is able to be enlarged to accommodate the increase. Future employment growth is expected to be along the A120 corridor, Stansted Airport and in the larger towns. None of which are close to Finchingfield. A housing development of this scale would involve lengthy journeys to and from work and entail a minimum of twenty mile round trips for the main household shopping. It is unlikely that the local health centre and local village primary schools could accommodate the increased number of young children and older youngsters would have to travel relatively long distances to/from school. Also, the roads around Finchingfield are typical country roads that make for slowish journeys – a feature that can be attractive but frustrating for those needing to travel some distance to get to work, to shop or get to school.
- 5.4 The proposed development, which is walking distance from the centre of the village, would increase the number of dwellings in the village by 25% or more and impact negatively on the current balance of period and newer properties. Properties in the village have been built over a period of time so that new and old sit comfortably together. To maintain that village character, the Parish Council believe new residential properties should be built only on the basis of proven local need. In the process of completing the Parish Plan Refresh in 2012 (the successor to a five year Action Plan that had previously guided

parish council policies), 64.1% of the population in Finchingfield completed a household questionnaire. A majority of residents indicated they did not favour additional housing development, but of those that did favour some increase the preference was for small scale development.

- 5.5 At the September 2016 Parish Council meeting, Gladman staff gave a short presentation of the company's proposal in Wethersfield Road. By a show of hands, after the presentation, amongst the approximate one hundred residents who attended the meeting, the overwhelming majority (about 95%) objected to the proposal. Three residents were in favour and two abstained. As regards affordable housing and social housing, Finchingfield village has quite a lot of each already and in five areas, namely Valley View, Berners Place, Kempe Road, Wincey Chase and Stephen Marshall Avenue. The first three are along Wethersfield Road and close to the proposed site. The view of the Parish Council and of residents of Finchingfield is that the proposal FINC 646 is not wanted, is not needed and is totally unsuitable in Finchingfield.
- 5.6 The Council believes that BDC has already compiled a list of preferred sites for new housing development to the year 2033 in its draft Local Plan, apparently from an availability supply that was many times greater than that needed. It is presumed the Gladman proposal for Finchingfield would need to have greater preference than some other sites included in the draft plan, which it would need to replace in order to maintain the same overall target.
- 5.7 The proposal (FINC 235) is a site that has previously been refused due to access and location and as such nothing has changed, again the development remains

### **Comments Received**

- 5.8 No comments were received on inset map 18 – Cornish Hall End.
- 5.9 Three comments were received against Inset Map 24.
- 5.10 FINC235 – An objection has been received that this site has not been allocated on the basis that the site is well located on the edge of the village, where there is access to local community, health, retail, and recreational facilities and public transport.
- 5.11 It is noted from a review of the Draft Local Plan, that almost all of the allocated residential development sites are located to the south, south-east and south-west of the district as set on page 82 of the Draft Local Plan. We consider this approach by the Council to be unbalanced and do not give residents the choice of residing in other smaller settlements and villages elsewhere in the District.

- 5.12 FINC646 - The site is approximately 5.7 hectares in extent comprising two agricultural fields bisected by a line of trees. There are hedgerows and mature trees along all of the site boundaries. Finchingfield is a sustainable settlement with facilities including a shop, post office, primary school, GP surgery, three public houses, a church, village hall and a recreation ground. It is also served by an hourly weekday bus service to Braintree. Gladman submits that the site is appropriate for allocation for a high quality design-led residential development of up to 95 units which respects the character of the village.

#### **Officer Comment**

- 5.13 Finchingfield is identified as a village in the settlement hierarchy. It does not have any site allocations. It is relatively remote from the main centre in the District, and is located away from the main road and rail network.
- 5.14 A planning application has been submitted for site FINC646 – Land off Wethersfield Road for up to 80 dwellings, landscaping, open space and associated ancillary infrastructure (16/01735/OUT). The site is located outside, and away from, the development boundary, and is adjacent to the conservation area and the curtilage of the grade 2 listed buildings at Great Biggins Farm. A footpath is available on the opposite side of Wethersfield Road which connects to the village centre. The site appears to be well contained in landscape terms.
- 5.15 As this site has a current application, it may be more appropriate to determine the suitability of this site for development through the planning application process. In terms of the Local Plan, the site would not be a natural extension to the development boundary for Finchingfield, and would be development in depth in an area where the predominate character of development is that of linear development along the road frontage.
- 5.16 FINC235 - It is being proposed for residential use of up to 20 dwellings. The site would be accessed from the B1053 Brent Hall Road. This is a single lane between the village centre and the site, but increases in size to a single carriage at the site entrance. The site is within the Conservation Area but some distance from the historic centre of the village, and would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the wider historic area. The site is currently well screened. Given the size of the village, its overall historic character, and the local road network, a larger scale development may not be appropriate. The SA report also considered that the site would have a potential negative impact on the historical environment and heritage assets within the vicinity.

**Recommendation 7 - That the Inset Map for Finchingfield remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 8 - That the Inset Map for Cornish Hall End remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**6 Great Bardfield and Bardfield Saling**

- 6.1 Great Bardfield is located approximately 6 miles north west of Braintree and is within the Three Fields Ward. It has had a rural exception site permitted which is now known as Castle Shot. Local services include a primary school, village hall, pub, post office, and grocery store. The Bardfield Centre provides local employment opportunities.
- 6.2 The area has a Village Design Statement which provides general guidance for development within the village. It also seeks to avoid the development of large executive houses, in preference to smaller sites for starter type homes for young people.
- 6.3 Bardfield Saling is a much smaller low density linear development along Plumb Lane, it does not have a development boundary, and has a number of grade II listed buildings, it has very limited services.

**Parish Council Comments**

- 6.4 **GRBA255** This is simply his justification for his application for a development in Great Bardfield (see below). The agent are bound to make statements such as those referenced in his submission and it is felt that BDC have already successfully established the makeup of its villages and further assessments are unnecessary. My Council refute his statements much of which were part of original application and robustly argued against in my Council response of 28 December 2015. You may wish to refer to this.
- 6.5 **15/01354/OUT** Outline application for the erection of up to 37 dwellings: Land off Braintree Road, Great Bardfield, Essex. The status of this is unknown as an Appeal was lodged because the applicant argued that BDC were slow in responding. BDC refused the application and I understand that the Appeal was successful. As this application is 'between' local plans unsure as to its status now
- 6.6 **Developments** - This Council has been proactive and supportive of several developments of both affordable and private housing and does not discourage developments. It has recently approved a development of two unused barns and currently supporting an application that utilises unused business units abutting the village. Nevertheless, its role is to protect the community it serves and ensure that what is positive about Great Bardfield is maintained, that its services and facilities are not pressurised to the detriment of its existing residents and this must include any large scale development outside the village envelope.

6.7 A comment was also made about the West of Braintree garden community which will be considered in the garden community report.

#### 6.8 **Comments Received**

- BASA648 – New site submission. 110 dwellings. The current site is constrained and has a number of disadvantage including neighbour disturbance and vehicle movements.
- GRBA254 - No logical reason to exclude the Bardfield Centre from the development boundary. It is an established complex of buildings. It is sustainability located, and the boundary should be altered to follow the line of the conservation area.
- Limited development in the other villages, a village hierarchy should be looked at which aims development at villages with better services.

#### **Officer Comment**

6.9 GRBA255 land south of Alienor Avenue. Part of this site now has planning permission on appeal for housing, and should therefore be allocated for residential development as shown in the Appendix. The remainder of the site is considered inappropriate to develop due to potential landscape impact, and it would be a much larger scale extension to Great Bardfield.

6.10 GRBA254 The Bardfield Centre – As currently drawn the development boundary excludes the buildings around the Bardfield Centre including the grade II\* listed barn. Inclusion of this area within the development boundary could lead to inappropriate infilling development, which may be harmful to the character and appearance of historic assets in that area.

6.11 BASA648 is located within the area of Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting. It is currently used for the production of horse feed, and has several undeveloped areas around the site. It is currently in active use. The site is remote from any development boundary, and would therefore not be a logical extension to development, and would be a standalone development in a countryside location.

6.12 Comments regarding 5 year supply and the settlement hierarchy will be considered under the housing chapter.

**Recommendation 9 - That the Inset Map for Great Bardfield is amended to include part of site GRBA255, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 10 - That Bardfield Saling does not have a development boundary and remains as a countryside location.**

## **7 Great Notley and Black Notley**

- 7.1 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 via the A120. 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. This report only covers sites within Great Notley south of the A120. Sites north of the A120 will be included in the Braintree report.
- 7.2 Black Notley is identified as a village in the hierarchy. It has some services, and is within walking distance of Cressing station. It is in close proximity to Braintree which has a full range of services available.

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 7.3 **Great Notley Parish Council** - In relation to the proposal for some 2,000 houses to the east of London Road the Parish Council are not actively supporting or opposing the proposal but comment as follows –
- 7.4 It is understood that consideration will be given to a masterplan for the development and the Parish Council strongly support the view that a masterplan for the entire extent of development bordering London Road eastwards to Notley Road will be vital so that any development may be planned in a strategic way thus providing services of the appropriate volume and quality. In the Parish Council's view in all equity any such masterplan should include the land currently subject to a planning application submitted by Crest Nicholson for 97 homes.
- 7.5 In view of the fact that the potential development at London Road together with the potential development at Great Leighs will generate a substantial amount of additional traffic travelling to and from Braintree it is vital that the strategic road infrastructure and public transport arrangements are considered and locally, the need for both road access and improvements to London Road are reflected in the plan so as to be taken into account when the planning process reaches the application stage.
- 7.6 The Parish Council would wish both infrastructure and road improvements are dealt with in a timely manner so as not to put additional pressure on existing services within the Parish of Great Notley and the community as a whole.
- 7.7 That the quality of any housing in any potential development is of a comparable quality and standard as the existing development in the area.

- 7.8 The Parish Council would wish these representations to be taken into account as part of the Local Plan process.
- 7.9 **Black Notley Parish Council** comments in relation to site BLAN114. There must be no new housing on any part of this site until there is a major new road system installed.
- 7.10 Bakers Lane in an unclassified country lane and is already an overburdened dangerous rat run. We do not want to see any road widening schemes here that would set up an even more dangerous situation with cottages only feet from the road and some several feet below the road level it would set up an even more dangerous situation. With a new through access from Notley Road to London Road it would be possible to block off the narrow Pinch Point from before the Duck Pond to the War Memorial and deter traffic using the village as a through route to the A12.
- 7.11 The John Ray Walk crosses the proposed site and we want it and the surrounding area preserved as originally intended and included in a large Public Open Space for all South Braintree to enjoy (as they already do) not a footpath across a high density housing development. This could be incorporated in the above scheme for Bakers Lane and act as a buffer the 4 Listed Buildings and cottages on that sensitive area. S106 could be utilized for this.
- 7.12 There must be a Buffer around all the Listed Buildings on Bakers Lane.
- 7.13 A reduction in the density of housing, 2000 is twice as high as a previous application and with the opportunities available elsewhere this could be achieved. Care must be taken with the design and layout. Buildings should be limited to 2 floors high only; to match the surrounding character and historic properties and a condition put on to secure this in the future.
- 7.14 Buildings must be angled so as to avoid overlooking to any existing houses and to retain privacy and amenity to their owners. Planting must be with mature trees as was implemented on Notley Garden Village.
- 7.15 With the opportunity of a Garden Community to the West of Braintree with good access onto the highway system and road improvements at Galleys Corner and the A120 route solved, housing in that area would solve the housing needs of Braintree without putting such excessive pressure on the Parish of Black Notley.

#### **Statutory Consultee Comments**

- 7.16 NHS England – Land at Bakers Lane and London Road (97 dwellings) would require a contribution toward increasing primary care capacity in the area to accommodate additional patients generated by development growth.



## 7.17 New Site Submission

GRNO261 - Oaklands Public House & Car Park, Notley Green, Great Notley, Braintree, Essex – Proposed for residential/retail uses. 15 units.

BLAN637 – Land at St Kitts, Bakers Lane – Proposed residential use.

BLAN633 – 197 – 201 London Road Great Notley – Proposed residential use

### Comments Received

7.18 Six comments have been received for Black Notley village Inset Map covering a variety of subjects.

- Black Notley is a village and should remain separate to Braintree
- Road and traffic infrastructure cannot cope with additional development
- Development will have a negative impact on the current hospital development
- Loss of local wildlife
- Flooding of existing properties
- Local safety issues
- Noise, air, and traffic pollution
- Black Notley has limited shops
- Increased number of cars
- BLAN120, BLAN121 and BLAN122 – Further consideration should be given to these sites as they are invisible from the road, Black Notley has good services and schools within walking distance. It also has recreational opportunities.
- Objection to BLAN501, 118, 119, 120, 121 & 122, as there is a requirement to keep the village and should not be expanded, current boundary should be respected.
- Alternative sites for the village are all in the countryside, Black Notley has already doubled in size with the addition of the hospital site.
- Village communities are under threat from too much development.
- Proposed site submission BLAN637 – St Kitts, Bakers Lane, Great Notley – proposed for inclusion within the strategic growth area.
- BLAN118 and BLAN119 – Land at Brain Valley Avenue should be included due to the increased requirement for housing, and the current local plan has a reliance on strategic sites.
- Support for the allocation of BLAN113.

7.19 Thirty two comments have been received for Great Notley and Black Notley Inset Map the majority of which are in relation to the strategic site BLAN114/115

- Concerns about increased traffic driving toward Chelmsford, and concerns about heavy construction traffic
- Road traffic will become more dangerous and people will use roads as rat runs
- Access to doctors/dentists is limited
- Local trains have a poor service
- Schools are over subscribed
- Water pressure is poor along London Road
- How will bandwidth of broadband be impacted
- Drainage is an issue in London Road
- Loss of green belt and wildlife
- So many houses should not be concentrated in one area
- Where will the new site accesses be?
- The Plan seems to be based on known unknowns
- Braintree branch line needs a passing loop, and the site has no direct access to a station
- The site will have significant impacts on listed buildings and trees
- Speed safety cameras/ 20mph speed limit and local traffic only should be along London Road. Introduce speed restrictions on the A120 and re-surface the road with quiet technology to reduce noise.
- Land should be retained between properties along London Road and the new development
- The proposal would ruin a beautiful semi-rural area
- Bakers Lane is a narrow winding road with many accidents, but the lane must not be widened or straightened
- Loss of grade 2 agricultural land and the site is a greenfield site
- Development should be around Galleys Corner where it can improve the road network and help provide the new A120
- Impact on heritage assets including John Ray Cottage
- Area along the A120 should be retained as a green corridor for recreation and dog walkers
- Would double the size of Great Notley and effectively make it part of Braintree
- The district centre boundary at Great Notley should be amended to exclude land on the east side of Notley Green Road
- BLAN115 – Allocation is supported.
- Proposal would result in the coalescence of Braintree, Great Notley and Black Notley.
- Site BLAN637 should be included in the development boundary
- Green buffers should be required to protect existing homes
- Site must be assessed in the context of its impact on Galleys Corner
- Site GRNO260 – supported for development

7.20 Twenty Eight comments have been received against policy LPP17 – Strategic Growth Location – Land East of Great Notley, south of Braintree.

- Historic England – The degree of harm to heritage assets will be largely dependent on the layout and design of development. Any harm would need to be weighed against public benefit and requires a clear and convincing justification.
- Essex Wildlife Trust – The master plan should incorporate green infrastructure and a network of interconnected semi natural habitats for wildlife as well as amenity open space.
- NHS – The proposal would generate 4800 residents. Development will likely require a new primary care facility in the region of 800 sqm or a financial contribution toward significant extension of the current practice.
- Essex County Council – Consideration will be needed at the planning stage with regards a multi-functional community space in the urban extensions or a contribution toward one.
- Education requirements should be more flexible and have the wording “primary education facilities and contributions towards secondary school provision”
- Essex County Council (Schools) – Additional wording to policy for “a minimum of 3 new 56 place early years and childcare facilities, potentially co-located with any new primary school.”
- Essex County Council (Schools) – A new primary school of between 525 and 630 places would be required. Secondary education would be approximately 400 pupils, additional growth in Braintree may indicate a need for an additional secondary school on site in conjunction with development in Great Leighs. If development was for less than 2000 then the case for a new secondary would be less compelling.
- Lack of infrastructure in place to support the development
- Support for the inclusion of the site and additional land adjacent (BLAN116)
- Alternative development proposals around other parts of Braintree are better
- Growth should be allocated at Halstead as it is a main settlement
- The need for more homes is unsubstantiated
- Significant increase in the size of Great Notley and pressure on local infrastructure
- Support for the allocation of BLAN114 and BLAN115
- Infrastructure should come first
- The Tesco may not be able to cope with additional customers

- BLAN 633 - Additional wording to policy LPP17 to allow development proposals which enable the development of strategic growth locations. Also the site should be allocated
- Policy LPP17 should be amended to link it to policy SP5 which requires development frameworks, master plans, and design codes to ensure high standards of design in strategic scale developments
- Traveller sites are not compatible with residential sites
- Objection to the inclusion of Gypsy and Traveller provision in the policy as it is not supported by evidence
- Unclear whether the 2000 new dwelling all take place at BLAN114.

### **Officer Comment**

- 7.21 BLAN120-122 – Troys Farm – BLAN120 is approximately 1.83 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 38 homes and community facilities. BLAN121 is approximately 0.25 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 10 homes. BLAN122 is approximately 0.275 ha in size. It could accommodate up to 10 dwellings. The site is located within an area of Medium landscape capacity (7b), as set out above 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.
- 7.22 BLAN637 – land at St Kitts, is adjacent to the proposed strategic growth location. As such it could be included within the boundary of that site, although it would be required to be developed as part of the wider scheme rather than on its own.
- 7.23 GRNO261 - Oaklands Public House & Car Park, Notley Green, Great Notley – Proposed for residential/retail uses of 15 units. Whilst there are other pubs in the vicinity, this is the only one within the heart of the residential development and is part of the planned community, as such it would not be appropriate to alter the district centre to exclude this site. Proposals for different uses such as retailing would be considered positively within a district centre, also residential uses could take place on upper floors as set out in draft policy LPP9. If the site were to be developed as an independent block of residential then it would not fit well within the context of local development as it is not in close proximity to other residential areas.
- 7.24 BLAN633 – 197 – 201 London Road Great Notley – Proposed residential use from the current petrol station/car wash. Great Notley does already have a

petrol station at Tesco and there is a further petrol station to the north of the village, just off the A120. The site is included in the development boundary and as such re-development proposals could be considered on their merits through the planning process, however an allocation would provide the site owner with more certainty.

- 7.25 BLAN115 – Land off Bakers Lane has recently been granted planning permission and therefore continues to be a stand-alone allocation
- 7.26 BLAN114 and policy LPP17 - The majority of comments relate to the development proposal for BLAN114 – Land east of Great Notley/South of Braintree. The site has been assessed in the context of landscape impact, traffic and highways, and heritage impact. Further work will need to be done through the planning process to determine more detailed matters such as access and layout, but it is considered that the points raised by Black Notley Parish Council and Historic England can be addressed.
- 7.27 Wildlife and a more detailed agricultural land classification would be carried out at a more detailed planning stage, as would proposals for minimising the impact of the development on existing heritage assets. The site is of a sufficient scale to enable appropriate buffers to be drawn around those areas which are deemed to be more sensitive to the new development, and to maintain appropriate buffers between the development and Black Notley. The development would also be expected to provide local amenity space, allotments, and significant levels of formal and informal recreation. Public footpaths on the site would be maintained.
- 7.28 When considered against the alternative growth areas, land east of Great Notley is considered to be one of the more appropriate sites for development. 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 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 Grade II listed buildings include Hayeswood Farm, Ratcliffs, The Friary, and grade II\* Cards. The grade II listed John Ray Cottage is on the opposite side of Bakers Lane.
- 7.29 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. It is necessary through the planning process to ensure that any harm to heritage assets needs to be weighed against public benefit, however the site is of a size that harm should be mitigated, through appropriate layout and design, and landscaping.

- 7.30 ECC has undertaken highways assessments of the whole Local Plan which indicate what mitigation will be required for the Braintree road network. Further detailed work on mitigation measures, walking and cycling improvements and bus improvements would be undertaken as part of detailed planning for the site. In terms of how the road network would be managed, that is a matter for ECC who have overall responsibility for route management.
- 7.31 A site of this size will be expected to have its own village centre with its own facilities such as shops, dentists, etc so would have a minimal impact on existing services within either Great or Black Notley. It will also need to have at least one primary school.
- 7.32 Essex County Council has indicated that the depending on other development in the area, there may be a need for a new secondary school on this site. It is therefore intended to keep this within the policy at present, but the requirement could be removed if ECC consider a school is no longer required.
- 7.33 Objections have been raised for the inclusion of provision for a Gypsy and Traveller site. This requirement has been added to all the larger scale growth location, as the Council's evidence base indicates that over the Plan period 40 pitches will be required for Gypsy and Travellers. The Council is required to meet its need for pitches in much the same way as it is required to meet its other housing needs, and not doing so could result in the plan being found unsound. No specific sites have been put forward elsewhere in the Plan or through the Call for Sites for sites and as such general areas within the growth locations and garden communities will have to be identified. If alternative proposals were to come forward through the planning application process, they would have to be judged on their merit. If they were considered appropriate and subsequently granted permission, then the number of pitches which would need to be provided at the growth locations would go down.
- 7.34 It is expected that the majority of the 2000 dwellings proposed would be on land identified as BLAN114. Other smaller sites on the periphery have been included within the overall strategic boundary, and these would be expected to be developed as part of the overall scheme. The 2000 is a minimum requirement for the site; however the final number would be determined through the planning application process.
- 7.35 Overall 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.

- 7.36 Additional wording has been suggested in relation to developments be allowed which enable the strategic growth locations to come forward. This is however felt unnecessary, as the policy is supportive of such development proposals.
- 7.37 Further wording has been suggest to ensure that the right type of education provision is provided on site, dependent on what would be required. A reference has also been added to ensure early years and childcare facilities are also provided.

**Recommendation 11 - That the Inset Map for Black Notley remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 12 – The Inset Map for Great Notley be amended to allocate site BLAN633 is allocated as a residential development site and to alter the strategic growth location boundary of site BLAN114 to include small areas along Bakers Lane, as set out in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 13 – Policy LPP17 is amended as set out in this report.**

*“Land East of Great Notley (within Black Notley Parish)*

*This site is the largest urban extension allocation in the Local Plan and will expect to provide a new community linked to both neighbouring Great Notley and Braintree. Whilst in Black Notley Parish the development will need to ensure that the character of Black Notley village remains separate to the development. Given the scale of the development, an appropriate level of new community services and facilities will need to be provided on the site, and further detail on the extent and quantum of these will be developed during the planning process in consultation with the local residents and Parish Councils.*

**A high standard of design and layout will be expected for strategic growth locations, the production of master plans, and design codes would be encouraged to ensure developments are of the highest standard.**

### **Policy LPP 17**

*Strategic 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 Braintree and is shown on the Proposals Map. Development will be expected to provide;*

- ~~Up to~~ 2,000 new homes of a mixed size and type appropriate to the area
- Affordable housing as per the Council's requirements
- Appropriate employment uses to support a major new community
- Primary **school facilities** and **either contributions to, or provision of** 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
- **A minimum of 3 new 56 place early years and childcare facilities, potentially co-located with any new primary school**
- Public open space, and informal and formal recreation
- Provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site

*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 developments and the wider area through provision of public footpath, cycle ways and, where opportunities exist, to Bridleways. This could be done through the enhancement of existing public rights of way or by the creation of new rights of way.*

**The development is expected to be planned and delivered in a holistic way, and not as smaller portions of separate development.** Development proposals which would compromise the delivery of an identified strategic growth location will be resisted.”

## **8 Greenstead Green and Burtons Green**

- 8.1 Greenstead Green is a small village that is recognised as a village to the south east of Halstead. The village has several facilities however not the level of services required for day to day life. Significantly the village does not have a primary school. Comments here relate to sites on the Greenstead Green Inset Map only.
- 8.2 The only comments submitted in relation to the Inset Map were in objection to the exclusion of GGHR279. The points conveyed are summarised below:
- The village has several facilities including a farm shop, post office, nursery, village hall and playing field.
  - There are schools within Stisted and Halstead
  - The land is of poor agricultural quality



- The development of the site could help sustain the village services
- Greenstead Green has not had any substantial development for 30 years.

8.3 Parish Council Comments – No further commentary has been received from the Parish Council since the Local Plan Sub-Committee of the 15<sup>th</sup> of May on which date it was reported that the Parish Council does not support the development of the site for the following reasons:

- Landscape character of the village would be negatively impacted by the level of development sought
- The site has a poor relationship with neighbouring development
- This is not the right site for development on the edge of the village

8.4 Officers Comments – Greenstead Green is within close proximity to Halstead. The village does not benefit from suitable public transport and only has a limited level of services within the village. In relation to the supporting statements submitted for GGHR279 it is considered that the development sought is not appropriate. Greenstead Green is predominately a street frontage village and the proposed development pattern would not conform to this characteristic. The Sustainability Appraisal highlights the negative impact of the development of a greenfield location and when this is coupled with the relatively low level of sustainability the proposal offers it is considered that the site should remain unallocated for housing development.

**Recommendation 14 - That the Inset Map for Greenstead Green remains unchanged from the Draft Local Plan as shown in Appendix.**

## **9 Wethersfield and Blackmore End**

9.1 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 and is proposed to be enclosed by a development boundary.

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 9.2 The Parish Council did not make any comments to the formal consultation. The District Council has sought Parish Council comments on the new sites which are as follows;
- 9.3 The Parish Council has discussed these sites and is of the view that it would be appropriate to include them in the draft local plan which will, of course, be subjected to full public consultation before being adopted.
- 9.4 It is the view of the council that the principle housing need in the village is for affordable and starter homes and it is hoped that inclusion of a significant

proportion of such property would be required in any application, particularly for the West Drive site.

### **Comments Received**

- 9.5 Three comments have been received for the Wethersfield Inset Map. No comments have been received regarding Inset Map 8 Blackmore End.
- 9.6 WETH414 – The landowner supports the proposal to extend the village envelope, to include this site. A number of discussions have taken place with local developers with a view to developing this site immediately.
- 9.7 WETH624 – Land on corner of Braintree Road and West Drive (New site) – Site proposed for residential development of up to 23 dwellings.
- 9.8 WETH636 – Land at Hudsons Hill, Wethersfield (New site) – Site proposed for 5 dwellings.

### **Officer Comment**

- 9.9 WETH624 – This site is also within the conservation area and is near the curtilage of a grade II\* listed building. The site has a number of trees on its boundary, and a footpath runs along the rear boundary. While no paved footpath exists connecting the site to the village, one could likely be provided. The Braintree Road frontage has a well-established hedgerow, and it would be difficult to breach this without causing potentially significantly impact on the character of the area, and would be in close proximity to the existing junction on West Drive. As such an access would be most appropriate from West Drive. West Drive is relatively narrow and has on street parking issues, which are exacerbated by the proximity of the primary school during the school run. The existing verge has some trees which contribute to the character of the area and would need to be retained; however an existing gap further up West Drive could potentially be used as an access. Considering the parish council support for the development of this site, it is recommended to allocate it for a site of 10+ homes. The applicant will need to ensure that highways access and any heritage issues are assessed.
- 9.10 WETH636 – This site is located outside the development boundary for Wethersfield, and it is within the conservation area. This site is not considered to be a natural extension to development for Wethersfield, as it would extend built development into a relatively undeveloped area between the recreation ground and a cluster of buildings at Parsonage Farm, not in line with the development boundary amendment methodology.
- 9.11 Development has been allocated in Wethersfield at Silver Street and West Drive which could provide up to 14 dwellings. The village is lower down the settlement hierarchy but it does have a primary school, and a local shop. The

parish council have supported development of this site, however it would not be considered as a natural extension to residential development to Wethersfield and could have a significant impact on the landscape and conservation area.

**Recommendation 15 - That site WETH624 is allocated as a residential site, and that rest of the Inset Map for Wethersfield remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 16 – That the Inset Map for Blackmore End remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown on the Inset Map.**

## **10 White Notley and Faulkbourne**

- 10.1 White Notley is located north of Witham. It has a station which is about 500m away from the main body of the village. Local services include a primary school, village hall and a pub.
- 10.2 Faulkbourne is located to the south east of White Notley, it has limited services available and does not have a settlement boundary. No comments or sites have submitted for Faulkbourne.

### **Parish Council Comments**

- 10.3 White Notley Parish Council has informally stated that they do not wish to support any of the proposed development sites.

### **Comments Received**

- 10.4 Three comments have been received promoting three new sites.

WHIN610 – Land adj to the Hall, north of The Street, White Notley – proposed for 5 units.

WHIN614 – Land south of The Street, White Notley - proposed for 10 units.

WHIN651 – Land rear of Temple End View, 4 Station Road, White Notley – Approximately 4 units.

Houses should be allowed in countryside locations to enable families of farmworkers to stay.

### **Officer Comment**

- 10.5 WHIN610 – Is located adjacent to the village hall on The Street and has been proposed for 5 dwellings. The site is well contained and would not intrude into open countryside. It has hedgerows on its boundaries, but in order to gain access to the site from The Street part of it would have to be removed. Housing on this site would be separated from other housing in the area by the

village hall and its car parking, meaning that it would be separate from existing development in the village. It would also be necessary for a suitable access to be identified either from The Street or perhaps through the adjacent village hall car park.

- 10.6 WHIN614 – is located opposite WHIN610 on the southern side of The Street. It is in close proximity to several listed buildings at Old Mill Barn and the grade II\* listed White Notley Hall, although the unlisted “Leylandii” is between the site and those heritage assets which could reduce any potential impact. It is also adjacent to a Conservation Area, and bridleway. It is also located within a large archaeological site (SMR5994) albeit on the edge of that large site. The front of the site is well vegetated which screens the rear part of the site from the road, it is proposed to access the site from the existing farm track, but considering the width, condition, and utility pole at the junction, it may not be capable of being improved to an adoptable standard capable of service 10 new dwellings.
- 10.7 WHIN651 – Is located to the rear of properties along Station Road. It is located away from the existing development boundary and would not form a natural extension to development in White Notley, and would be considered inappropriate back land development in a countryside location.
- 10.8 White Notley does have limited services, but it is on the train line, although access is restricted by foot due to the narrow unlit bridge and road, the station is located approximately 500m away from the village. It is however considered unsuitable for further development, due to its small size and limited services.

**Recommendation 17 - That the Inset Map for White Notley remain unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.**

**Recommendation 18 - That Faulkbourne remain as a hamlet in the countryside.**

## **11 Introduction, Background and Next Steps**

- 11.1 These are the introductory sections of the Local Plan and set the broad context for development of the Local Plan and the District in general. A range of comments have been made against paragraphs within this section which are set out below.
- 11.2 Paragraph 2.1 is the first paragraph in the Local Plan and notes that the Council is required to put a Local Plan together. Thirty two comments have been received on this paragraph. They include general comments which are attributed to the Local Plan in general. These comments are summarised below;
- Received the notification email too late to attend the Witham presentation

- Understand the need for more homes but the roads are already full
- Hope the roads will improve and there will be more doctors and starter homes
- Sorry to see the loss of more countryside but do understand the Council has to make a Local plan with regard to levels of housing.
- Please make sure infrastructure Support the decision to build a few large sites to satisfy requirements and services keep up with demand
- Make a stand and refuse to prepare any plans until the current deficiencies have been fixed in infrastructure. Government 'demand' for Plans can be resisted if you have the will and respect for the livelihoods of the residents
- Local Plan is a necessary evil and whilst in the long term unable to halt the loss of countryside we have to make sure we have 'planned' for the future
- The Plan does not address a key objective to benefit the existing community. Delay the implementation of the Local Plan and refocus on developing infrastructure before expansion
- No evidence of local community support for West Braintree garden community
- Local Plan needs to include locations of stores, shops, health facilities and eating and drinking places
- Plan can't be a commitment to leave space for things to be built and it will never happen
- Don't object to the Plan in principle and acknowledge the effort and hard work but cannot support it because of the antiquated infrastructure in the local area
- Local Plan does not go far enough to reflect the widely held view of the people to protect heritage sites, rural hamlets and villages
- A Local Plan is not required, but a bigger plan and vision is required for the Country. Local Councils should not be involved with planners making decisions locally in isolation
- BDC has not done enough to explain why 800 homes per annum are needed
- We should be building affordable homes and homes for the elderly and disabled. Let the market deal with executive homes
- In acknowledging the need for the District to grow and develop we request care is taken to ensure it remain a desirable place to live and the unique characteristics are protected and enhanced for the future
- Plan does not reflect the views of the local people in that the location of the sites has been developer led and selection criteria were inconsistent
- Plan as it stands appears too vague and further information is required before residents can agree or disagree with it
- The need for housing cannot be fully assessed until all accepted proposals are built which would ease the housing need for the best part of a decade. Proposals need to be restructured and alternative options sought

- Finding over 200 'questions' here only adds to the uncertainty over how to respond
- Concerned about complicated consultation process and how inaccessible it is to anyone who doesn't use a computer.
- Tendring DC – committed to working with BDC on an active and ongoing basis
- Stebbing PC – creation of garden communities does not reflect the views of local people
- Rayne PC – BDC should be congratulated to have produced a plan to meet the timetable. Not the finished article but moving in the right direction
- Felsted PC – Understand the drivers and by their nature the complexities of Local Plans, but the event at Great Saling was woefully inadequate on the presentation of information

11.3 Paragraph 2.2 on the NPPF and presumption in favour of sustainable development whilst boosting housing supply received 8 comments in the Draft Local Plan consultation and those comments can be summarised as;

- The focus here is on homes and housing, it needs to be wider as this is only a small part of the overall requirement
- This statement on the NPPF is very selective and more could be said about the NPPF guidelines in the final draft. Request that paragraph is modified to reflect strong protection against unwise development and the environment
- NPPF has been in place for 4 years and the development industry has experience with its application and fundamental changes brought to the planning system.
- BDC should encourage building of 250 homes to meet local need for mostly starter and elderly disabled homes
- Rayne PC – NPPF has attracted enough criticism since its inception, it does not give enough credence to the matter of supply of appropriate infrastructure
- Approval of the site in Great Maplestead does not comply with the NPPF

11.4 Paragraph 2.3 sets out the three dimensions of sustainable developments to which there have been eight comments

- Provision should be made for business growth and employment opportunities
- Draft Local Plan goes no way towards enhancing the environment but totally the opposite; it would destroy what's here
- Villages like Rayne would lose their identity, just like Bocking has

- SP10 restricts organic growth of villages like Great Saling, Rayne and Stebbing Green making them suburbs of a new town. Therefore 2 out of the 3 dimensions of the NPPF are not being met by this development
- SP10 does not constitute sustainable development, as it does not contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built or historic environment however it is dressed up
- No account has been taken of the historical importance of sites like Andrewsfield. All public rights of way should be kept, not severed like when they built the bypass
- The Plan provides no flexibility and offers no alternative options for meeting the assessed housing needs; as such it is not compliant with the NPPF
- Expansion of existing cities and new town would be better
- Council should demonstrate a commitment to reducing building on grade 2 listed agricultural land
- Brownfield land should be used in preference to greenfield land as set out in the NPPF
- Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting – Council fails to demonstrate how it will assess and balance each role of sustainable development so as to provide sustainable solutions. The whole Plan should accord with the presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Rayne PC – statement demonstrates failure of the NPPF to address issues of insufficient or poor quality infrastructure

11.5 Paragraph 2.4 sets out the requirements for economic prosperity as part of the Local Plan and has received eight comments which can be summarised as;

- Communities to be expanded should have adequate access to health care, shops and schools
- Accept more housing is required but concerned about the impact of vehicles trying to park in Newland Street
- Concern that the Council is working in isolation, any plan should show the dependencies and order of work on roads, rail, businesses, shops, clinics, housing and schools
- Appears little provision for the creation of jobs, I doubt the airport has any spare job capacity
- The draft Local Plan shows no vision and taken the line of the least resistance
- No evidence in the Local Plan of how west of Braintree transport infrastructure would develop in terms of connectivity, scale and deliverability

- Overdevelopment of Hatfield Peverel with limited jobs, school places and doctors' surgery would be a problem for infrastructure and disastrous loss of wildlife and countryside
- Rayne PC - needs to be review of housing numbers following the Brexit vote

11.6 Paragraph 2.5 says that the Council works with local communities and has received twenty comments in the consultation, summarised as;

- How is the Council going to do this?
- The Council should set up a design review panel to guide future planning permissions
- No evidence of Parish Council support or cross boundary support for the garden communities
- BDC has failed to create a detailed and fully accessible vehicle for public consultation. The portal is difficult to navigate
- Interactive comment forms were hard to find and Inset Maps are available but details for allocated sites are not. Without them consultation falls short of the standards that BDC residents deserve
- Understand each PC getting £8,000 for consultants. I would advise Parishes to get together and pay an artist to record area so if BDC get its way we will be reminded of what we have lost
- Strong evidence of BDC, Colchester and Tendring working together but no evidence that BDC and UDC have been working together
- West Braintree garden community presented as a 'fait accompli' this is not a meaningful consultation and engagement
- The Council has limited influence over infrastructure improvements
- Braintree should not take development from other areas, neighbouring Districts are already committed to extensive developments
- Need to liaise with Uttlesford, Maldon and Chelmsford on infrastructure and Crossrail and Babergh, St Eds and South Cambs on commuting to Cambridge and Ipswich.
- Braintree must show it has engaged with neighbouring authorities
- Great Maplestead does not feel that the Council has worked with local communities as we did not want a development which has gone ahead
- Stebbing PC – to date very little written evidence of close working with UDC whose co-operation is key
- Rayne PC – essential that the Council involve the community. This Plan is too important for promises not to be met

11.7 Paragraph 2.6 sets out some of the basic statistics and description of the District. Nine comments were received on this section which are summarised below;



- Action needs to be taken on parking as Witham is jammed with cars
- Would be good to keep as much wildlife as possible, the open space between towns shouldn't be taken for granted. Use heritage to its full capacity
- These Plans will make it an urban District, instead of a rural District
- Correctly identified character of the area, but appear to be making a Plan which will destroy it. I trust this can be addressed in the next draft
- Lead time to complete A120 improvements will be beyond the Plan period
- Concerned to see large scale housing in Maldon and the stains it would place on B roads in Hatfield Peverel
- This proposal will vastly increase traffic and pollution and is unsustainable and indefensible building on arable land and sensitive ecologies
- The countryside is not finite and the Council should take responsibility for protecting it
- Rayne PC – Key community assets need to be safeguarded, disagree with the District having good road and rail links. Most of the District doesn't benefit from a dualled A120.

11.8 Paragraph 2.7 includes the population and other figures for the District. Seven comments have been received which can be summarised as;

- Braintree may be the largest town but Witham suffers most from commuters jamming the streets
- Let's move the work to the people by the internet and by promoting good local businesses. The small rural business area I live next to has been sold off for property speculators
- Better road and rail links are required, alongside a lack of buses especially at weekends
- The fact that Hatfield Peverel High Street is a bypass for the A12 should be taken into account when developments are planned
- We must look at the County as a whole. We have Colchester with more fast stopping direct trains. The majority of workers are outworkers and commuters
- As jobs are in Chelmsford, Colchester and London the homes should be there
- Character of area as described should be maintained. Develop towns and leave the rural areas alone

11.9 Paragraph 2.8 includes statistics on population and age structure. Comments can be summarised as follows;

- Are you saying old people should be shuffled off because they are blocking homes?

- Could a scheme be created for families to adopt a room in an under occupied house where a young person could live and provide rent and company for the older person
- A120/A12 won't be attractive if they are not improved before homes
- Don't agree with this paragraph. Colchester is one of the fastest growing Districts and is an investment hotspot
- Continuing growth of population and local economy cannot be assured in light of Brexit.
- Appears to be little thought for providing homes for retired people. Most of development appears to focus on family or social housing
- Assumptions are based on old data and new projections should be referred to
- Dramatic and potentially damaging growth envisaged in the Plan and which are unlikely to be accurate. Flexibility in monitoring results should be built into it
- Statistical fallacy to assume population growth will continue in the same pattern
- Council needs to be together in implementing its policies on the type and number of affordable homes that are built
- Stebbing PC – population projection assumptions are dubious, this is based on the need for workers but projections also indicate large number of older people who may not be working
- Rayne PC – need to handle an increased age profile. Without social care provisions, the Local Plan will be presented with significant challenges.

11.10 Paragraph 2.9 on employment and travel statistics has received five comments which have been summarised as;

- How many over 65s will there be – you try and see a doctor now
- Braintree has grown fast and development has been disappointing and destructive to heritage and rural communities. Need to pause and reconsider. A big picture fresh approach needed.
- Last thing good planning would want is unfettered ugly sprawl between London and East Anglia
- Figures show that education and investment in schools are needed
- Jobs to population ratio lower than average but average earnings higher. Most people commute out of the District to work
- High proportion of residents commute to London, Chelmsford and Colchester. Development should be located in these areas, rather than destroying grade 2 arable land and historic rural villages
- Council needs to focus on guaranteed infrastructure before developments are created. Alternatively the local authority needs to review how to attract large employers.

11.11 Paragraph 2.10 is about the recent improvements in leisure facilities across the District. Four comments have been received which are summarised below;

- So much for leisure when land at teign Drive is proposed for development
- For a sustainable future we should seek ways to cut down on travel by bring work and better broadband access to people. Switch efforts to providing local work not housing estates.
- Rayne PC – Rural areas are as important as those in the Districts developed areas, if not more so. There are lots of schools in the District which should allow residents to use their facilities

11.12 Paragraph 2.11 sets out some of the health issues for the District and includes the Councils commitment to the Livewell Campaign. A total of eight comments have been received on this section of the Local Plan and can be summarised as;

- Maybe this is because people can't afford to use leisure facilities and there are no outdoor gyms in Witham
- This is great however we need more facilities if more people are expected
- Concerned by the statistics on health issues. Plan should put more emphasis on enhancing the countryside, outdoor and open space.
- A plan for Hatfield Peverel Country Park had been programmed but has not happened.

11.13 Paragraph 2.12 sets out that statistics on the District can be found in the Councils monitoring report. A single comment was received which is summarised as;

- This is not important, but providing better lifestyles and health regimes could be incorporated into community schools rather than academies

11.14 Figure 2.1 is a map of the District for illustrative purposes to which three comments were received and are summarised below;

- There will be a huge demographic impact from the garden community from the garden community to the West of Braintree
- Rayne PC – provides a good visual to the large proportions of rural communities and predominance of rural areas in the north and west of the District.

11.15 Paragraph 2.13 on the consultation received five comments in the consultation which can be summarised as follows;

- Don't believe consultation has been made accessible to all those who would have views and therefore plan should have been promoted more effectively and specifically to all Parishes.
- Please let us know how you advised local residents
- Authority has made responding to the consultation complicated and cumbersome, calling into question its impartiality and validity

11.16 Paragraph 2.14 explains the next step in terms of taking the comments and producing a new version of the Local Plan

- The failure to co-ordinate meaningful engagement means that in the case of West Braintree, the residents of Stebbing are unable to comment fully on a proposal that could affect them
- Develop the Plan? How about shelve it. Or is this not a democratic process?
- Consultation must be made accessible and promoted more effectively than previously
- Rayne PC – diagram in 2.15 and text in 2.14 don't quite match up and this requires amendment
- Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting – because policies potentially impact on adjacent Districts the consultation period should be extended to coincide with that of the adjacent Local Plan and no decisions should be made until all Councils complete the consultation process

11.17 Paragraph 2.15 sets out the timetable for the next steps of the process. Comments have been received on this paragraph and note that;

- Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting – The key stages and timetable make no reference to further consultation on the revised plan. Table should be amended to allow time for alternative strategic housing and employment options
- Lack of clarity on respective Local Plan timetables and whether the shared strategic plan will become a subsequent joint Local Plan or strategic growth DPD which is confusing.
- What happens next with reference to the Local Plan?

### **Officer Comments**

11.18 Many comments relating to this introductory section are relating to the Local Plan as a whole and so these comments will be taken into account when considering the Plan as it whole. It is considered appropriate however to amend this part of the document to clarify the introduction text and relationship with the NPPF and neighbourhood plans and to add in an

explanation regarding the structure of the document and the relationship between the shared strategic plan and the Braintree specific plan.

- 11.19 The 'how to respond' section has been updated to reflect the requirements for the formal pre submission consultation.
- 11.20 The 'what happens next' section has also been updated to the latest position on the timetable and a line has also been added as a response to consultees responses directing them to the timetable for other documents which are also to be produced and whose timetable for production is set out in the draft Local Plan.
- 11.21 The 'District profile' section is not proposed to be amended. Comments which have been received on this section primarily relate to views on the infrastructure and statistics listed not the text itself.

**Recommendation 19 – That the text for the Introduction, Background and What Happens Next sections of the Local Plan is amended to that set out in the report**

### **Why a new Local Plan is required**

Government planning policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Those documents place the Local Plan at the heart of the planning system. Local Plans set out a vision and framework for the future development of the area, addressing needs and opportunities in relation to new homes, jobs and infrastructure, as well as safeguarding the environment.

Local Plans and a Neighbourhood Plan (if available) are the starting point for considering all planning applications received. If a planning application is received which accords with policies in the Local Plan (and Neighbourhood Plan where relevant) it should be approved and if it conflicts with the Local Plan (and Neighbourhood Plan where relevant) it should be refused.

The Local Plan must be in conformity with the national policy set out in the NPPF. This includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This presumption in favour of sustainable development is considered the 'golden thread' which must run through both Plan-making and decision-taking.

The NPPF notes that there are three dimensions to sustainable development. An economic role contributing to a strong, responsive and competitive economy, a social role supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities and an environmental role contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.

The Council has worked with local communities, Parish and Town Councils, landowners and statutory consultees such as the Environment Agency in the production of this Plan and we will continue to do so throughout its implementation.

## **Structure of the Document**

The Braintree Local Plan is set out over two separate documents, one at a more strategic regional level and one which relates to Braintree District only. Both documents together are considered to be the Braintree District Local Plan.

## **Shared Strategic Plan**

Braintree District Council, along with its partners of Colchester Borough Council and Tendring District Council and with the support of Essex County Council, have been working together to plan strategically for growth across the North Essex area. This is recognition that wider than individual Local Authorities issues such as strategic transport infrastructure can have a significant impact on what is being proposed.

This work has resulted in a shared Strategic Plan, which covers major sub-regionally issues and providing a guiding framework in which local policies can then be formed. This section which includes the 10 policies that start with a 'SP' reference can be found in this document in section X from page XX.

This section is replicated within the Colchester Borough Council and Tendring District Council Local Plans which are at the same stage as the Braintree District Local Plan. All three Local Plans are intended to be published and submitted to the government for examination simultaneously, allowing for a joint examination to be held if appropriate.

## **Braintree District Specific**

The Braintree specific part of the Plan starts with a brief profile of the District and then sets out the Vision and Objective of the Plan and goes on to set out the Spatial Strategy and the Local Plan Key Diagram which is on page XX. The main policy part of the Local Plan is then split into three main themes; A Prosperous District, Creating Better Places and the Natural Environment. Within each of these themes there are a number of separate chapters on things like homes, heritage and community facilities. There is also a Delivery and Implementation Chapter at the end of the document.

Policies within these sections have the prefix LPP and are shown in the XX boxes throughout the document.

There is a glossary at the end of the text which includes an explanation of acronyms and terms used within the Plan. There are also a number of Appendices to the document which include the Housing Trajectory at Appendix 1

Page XX onwards in the document contains the 66 numbered Inset Maps. These maps cover all parts of the District which contain a development boundary. They show allocations for things like housing and employment as well as safeguarding land for open space and allotments.

Outside of the development boundaries is considered countryside. These areas can be found by looking at the overall map of the District which also includes allocations and safeguarding which goes beyond development boundaries including Local Wildlife Sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

A list of all the maps and their Inset Number and a Key to the Plans can be found at the beginning of this section.

## **How to Respond**

This document represents the Braintree Local Plan which is being published under regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012. As set out in those regulations this is the Local Plan that Braintree District Council intends to submit to the Planning Inspectorate for an independent examination under regulation 22 of the same regulations.

This means that all responses to the consultation will be sent on directly to the Inspector to consider in the examination of the Local Plan. It also means that responses should take a more formal position and our response forms and guidance notes are in line with the model forms which are produced by the Planning Inspectorate.

When making a response the Braintree Local Plan, you will need to consider whether you believe the Plan is;

- Legally complaint
- Sound
- Compiles with the Duty to Co-operate

In order to be considered 'sound' the Inspector must be satisfied that the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. An explanation of soundness can be found in paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

If you believe that the Local Plan does not meet one of the criteria above, you will be asked to state why and set out what modifications you believe will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound.

You will be also asked to consider whether you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination. Both written and oral representations carry exactly the same weight and will be given equal consideration in the examination process. Only where a change is sort to the Plan is there a right for the representation to be heard at a hearing session(s).

More details of how to respond can be found by looking at the published response form and guidance notes which support this Plan.

The Council encourages people to submit comments online. Although representations can be made and submitted using the form provided, if you register to submit comments online, you can update your own contact details as needed, and you will receive e-mails informing you when new documents are available for consultation. The consultation portal can be found at:

[www.braintree.gov.uk/consultlp](http://www.braintree.gov.uk/consultlp)

You will be asked to register or login before being able to comment on the documents listed below but you can read the documents without registering. To register please click on the 'Register' link within the 'Login' section. The portal is also used to maintain the mailing list. To join the Local Plan mailing list please register using the 'Register' link within the 'Login' section.

Alternatively please use the following contact details. We would encourage respondents to use response forms wherever possible which are available to download on the website or can be requested from the Planning Policy team.

By email to [localplan@braintree.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@braintree.gov.uk)

By post to:

Planning Policy  
Braintree District Council  
Causeway House  
Braintree

CM7 9HB

All consultation responses must be received no later than **5pm on Friday @@ 2017.**



**Only representations made within this period will be taken into account by the Inspector as part of the examination.**

**Please note that responses which include a series of supporting documents must be received both electronically and with 3 hard copies. A summary of the response must be included within the representation.**

If you have any questions about the consultation please contact the Planning Policy team on 01376 551414 or e-mail [localplan@braintree.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@braintree.gov.uk)

If you would like this document in an alternative format such as large print, braille or another language then please contact the Planning Policy team. A fully accessible version of the document can be found on our website at <http://www.braintree.gov.uk>

### **What Happens Next?**

The Local Plan will be published for 6 weeks public consultation commencing in February 2017 to enable the public and stakeholders to comment upon the Local Plan.

At this stage of the process all responses are processed and published and then sent on to the Planning Inspectorate to consider, alongside the Local Plan and supporting evidence base. This will be done shortly after the close of the consultation period. All respondees will be notified when this takes place.

After submission the Local Plan programme officer is the main point of contact with respondees and will advise on the process and timetable for the examination, including the hearing sessions, which will be held locally.

The key stages in the Local Plan preparation, and the planned timetable, are:

- |   |
|---|
| 1. <b>Issues and Scope:</b> to consider what the main aims and objectives are going to be for the Local Plan (January 2015)   |
| 2. <b>Draft Local Plan:</b> Provides a first draft of the Local Plan, with specific policy proposals and sites for particular uses, including areas identified for future new homes, employment and green space (June/July/August 2016) |
| 3. <b>Submission Local Plan:</b> Takes into account changes made following consultation on the Draft Local Plan. This is the version of the Local Plan that will be formally submitted to the Secretary of State and Planning Inspector |

(consultation on this stage, followed by submission Spring 2017)

4. **Examination in Public:** The Inspector examines the "soundness" of the Local Plan in a series of round table discussions on different issues, giving individuals and organisations the opportunity to challenge or support the Local Plan (probably Autumn/Winter 2017)
5. **Adoption:** if the Planning Inspector is content that the Local Plan is sound, then the Council can adopt the Local Plan, taking on board any relevant recommendations from the Inspector to change the Local Plan. The Council is aiming for the new Local Plan to be adopted in 2018.

The timetable for other documents such as Area Action Plans for specific areas and Supplementary Planning Documents is set out in the Councils Local Development Scheme.

### **District Profile**

Braintree is a predominately rural District in the north of Essex covering 612 square kilometres. The majority of the populations live within the three towns of the District; Braintree, Witham and Halstead which are all located towards the south. The District is an advantageous place to live with an attractive rural setting and many historic buildings, nature reserves and local wildlife sites including ancient woodlands. The District is well placed for economic growth with the central and southern portions of the District benefiting from good rail and road links to London as well as London Stansted Airport and the ports to the east.

Braintree is the largest town followed by Witham and Halstead. In addition to the town centre facilities, the District benefits from the Freeport Designer Outlet Village that attracts shoppers from the wider District and beyond. The areas in proximity to the A120 and A12 are attractive to commuters, with many who reside in the District travelling to Chelmsford, Colchester and London for work.

Braintree District has been one of the fastest growing areas in the country over the past decade. The population of the District is currently approximately 150,000 and is projected to rise substantially by 2033. As life expectancy increases, the age structure is expected to change, with a marked increase in the number and proportion of the population who will be aged 65 and over. The number of one-person households is also expected to increase.

The Braintree District has a wide employment base of mainly small and medium-sized businesses. In 2011, approximately 58,000 residents worked within the District, 15,000 travelled into the District to work and 32,000 travelled from the District to work in the major centres of London, Chelmsford and Colchester. Unemployment and youth employment rates have been falling and are below the national average.

The Council has invested in new and enhanced leisure facilities in the District. In 2014 a new leisure centre with swimming pool and gym opened in Witham, and facilities at Braintree Sports & Health Club and at Braintree Swimming and Fitness were expanded and enhanced. Outdoor gyms have also been provided in Braintree and Witham.

The Council is promoting the Livewell campaign, working together with partner agencies to reduce levels of adult obesity and reduce numbers of hip fractures in the over 65s. Braintree District has the highest rate of excess winter deaths out of all the Districts in Essex. Levels of adult obesity in the District are currently higher than the national average, and levels of physical activity amongst adult residents are lower than the national average and the lowest in Essex.

More details on the statistics on the District can be found in the Council's Monitoring Report.

## **12 Chapter 5 Spatial Hierarchy**

- 12.1 This section of the Local Plan sets out the broad spatial strategy for the Local Plan and also the settlement hierarchy of villages and towns within the District.
- 12.2 Paragraph 5.1 is the introductory paragraph to the spatial hierarchy section and sets out the premise of the settlement hierarchy. 19 comments have been submitted to this section of the Local Plan.
- Rayne PC – prime issues regarding the spatial strategy is the lack of infrastructure on garden communities
  - Braintree should be given pre-eminence in the spatial strategy in terms of its population, sustainability merits and the range, function and services it offers.
  - No objection in principle to the settlement hierarchy however the Plan has not adopted a suitable approach to the distribution and opportunities for directing development to the most sustainable locations or to support existing communities
  - Unclear whether the Council has prepared any evidence to catalogue the facilities and services available but the methodology for the settlement hierarchy should be added to the evidence base

- NPPF requires planning policies to support economic growth in rural areas and support sustainable rural communities. Draft Plan should therefore direct additional housing to the villages
- Strategy of the Plan is fundamentally flawed and isolated the villages from being appropriate locations for new growth. Concerned the low number of homes in other villages which amounts to just 0.6 dwellings per village, per year.
- The spatial strategy approach has potentially negative social and economic implications for the rural areas
- The spatial strategy fails to identify how policy SP1 on sustainable development will be applied positively as per government policy
- Our clients support the identification of Halstead within the settlement hierarchy and note that growth levels should reflect its role within the settlement hierarchy
- Support identification of Coggeshall as a Key Service Village and given its range of facilities is a sustainable location of additional housing growth
- Coggeshall has only 52 homes which is not a fair or meaningful proportion of housing need
- The Council approach of not allocating more homes to rural areas is counter to current government policy and fails to recognise the opportunity and the positive roles that the Key Service Villages, including Coggeshall can play
- Council have failed to consider any reasonable alternatives to the spatial strategy as set out in the SA which is a requirement of the SA process.

12.3 One comment has been submitted to paragraph 5.2 which relates to the towns in the District. This was a general comment which;

- Noted that calling places small market towns should be dropped and replaced with small towns that encourage healthy living.

12.4 Paragraph 5.3 is on the service villages and five comments have been received on this section. There are summarised as;

- Earls Colne has poor access to education, medical care, public transport and leisure facilities. Workers commute on overcrowded roads or rails.
- Generally agree with the approach that BDC are taking but if garden communities don't happen until 2023 where so the other homes go? Concerned about the small villages taking development when Coggeshall as a Key Service Village only takes 53.
- Black Notley can't be classed as a Key Service Village, it has limited facilities and poor transport links. How can it be deemed suitable for 2,000 homes.

- Don't accept Hatfield Peverel as a Key Service Village
- Only with a development boundary reassessment can the development limits be sound and credible for their aims and inclusion in the Local Plan.

12.5 Three comments were received to paragraph 5.4 which relates to Kelvedon and Feering, two of which were objections and one is a support. These can be summarised as;

- Crown Estates support this paragraph given the facilities and transport links the villages share. Sustainable expansion of Feering will provide new services and make existing ones more viable.
- Feering is not within walking distances of facilities in Kelvedon leading to more car journeys
- The two communities are linear development with limited crossings of the River Blackwater in between. There are 20 -25minutes walking distance apart.

12.6 Paragraph 5.5 relates to the villages. Five comments were received on this paragraph. Two were general, two were objections and one was support. They can be summarised as;

- Other villages need to be protected from large scale development
- No technical work has been carried out to understand the sustainability within the villages, prior to allocating them for development
- Government objectives for rural areas are to create and sustain thriving communities. Rural housing is an essential tool to support and retain services
- Development in neighbouring villages can support a service in one and whilst residents would need to drive to it, social importance outweighs the environment concerns
- A robust village hierarchy assessment should have been undertaken as an evidence base to support the proposed policies. The lack of assessment makes the Plan unsound.
- Hatfield Peverel should not be allocated as a service village
- Great Maplestead Parish Council noted that the commitment that development levels relate to sustainability are good, but this is not what happened in Great Maplestead.

12.7 Paragraph 5.6 relates to the countryside. We received five comments on the paragraph, with two objections and 3 general comments. These are summarised as follows;

- Existing Local plan policies are strong are not building in the countryside and explicit policies on this should remain

- Impact of large communities doesn't end at the boundaries. Leaving a narrow gap between urban areas is not leaving countryside
- Great Maplestead Parish Council – Pleased to see attempts to protect the countryside but disappointed that it wasn't applied to site GRMA259 in Great Maplestead
- A thorough review of boundaries should be carried out to take account of local environmental considerations and opportunities for sustainable development as required by the NPPF. It should not be based on the historical boundary.
- Wording of the paragraph is supported providing an additional sentence added which states that; 'Priority will be given in such areas to appropriate new development on already developed sites that are well connected with and form an effective functioning part of a settlement.

12.8 Paragraph 5.7 relates to the new garden communities and includes the overall settlement hierarchy table for the District. Three objection comments have been received and are summarised below;

- West of Braintree will impact on Braintree town centres economy and vibrancy. The area will be a donut, a ring of housing with no core
- Hatfield Peverel is not a key service village
- Draft Local Plan fails to consider opportunities for directing development to the most sustainable locations or supporting existing communities
- Should direct more development to rural settlements to ensure rural communities are sustained as per the requirements of the NPPF.
- Other villages cannot thrive due to restrictive planning policies
- Policy SP1 provides a District wide presumption in favour of sustainable development, but there is no indication that development would be considered favourably given restrictive settlement boundaries.

12.9 The Spatial Strategy is set out in paragraph 5.8 alongside its support text. Four objection comments have been received to this section and are summarised below;

- Wording should be amended to put the garden communities last. Highly sustainable sites on urban fringes should be developed before them.
- Spatial strategy ignores the NPPF requirement for brownfield sites to be developed in preference to greenfield sites like the West of Braintree
- The Local Plan should allow 'other villages' to grow by 10 – 20% to achieve positive, vibrant communities
- Protection of villages can have a negative effect on them and the aspects of social, cultural and economic value

- Need to encourage investment and provide opportunities to live and work locally. Changes in technology will make villages with great broadband highly desirable
- Bardfield Saling Parish meeting – Object to the spatial strategy as it is reliant on two garden communities which are not viable or deliverable.

### **The key diagram**

12.10 The key diagram represents the spatial strategy in map form. Seven comments were made to this section. Several of the comments on the key diagram relate specifically to the sites which are marked on the map. These will be dealt with during the considerations of the individual towns and villages.

- Town and Country Planning Regs require sites to be shown on an OS map that clearly presents where sites are being proposed
- Why are the garden communities specified as orange dots of broad areas of search. At this stage other proposals have more detail enabling proper consideration to be given
- Not properly defined areas does not conform to the NPPF
- Support the identification of an area of search for West of Braintree. We understand that the Key Diagram is necessarily high level. Nevertheless we hope that the next draft of Local Plan should identify the extent of the West of Braintree GC in line with the indicative masterplan that has been produced.
- Map highlights the fundamental problem with the lack of transport infrastructure in the District. Proposals will lead to major gridlock unless major road improvements are made first. Rail links between Braintree and Witham must also be upgraded
- Map fails to recognise the ECC strategic A131 link road between Great Leighs and Boreham.
- Hatfield Peverel should be classified as an 'other village'.

### **Officer Comments**

12.11 Officers note the concerns raised by objectors to this section of the Plan and the spatial strategy to which it refers to. Many of the comments were related to specific sites which the respondent was keen to see included or excluded from the Local Plan. Several respondents have noted concerns about the settlement boundaries and the process of reviewing them. A review of every settlement boundary in the District has taken place in line with the Development Boundary Assessment methodology which was approved by the Local Plan Sub Committee and is located in the evidence base. However it is

noted that this is not mentioned within the report and therefore will be added to the revised text.

- 12.12 Concern has also been expressed about the evidence to support the spatial hierarchy which is set out in the Plan, noting that there does not appear to have been any supporting work on this aspect. Officers had based the spatial strategy primarily on the work undertaken in the Sustainability Appraisal and in the rural services survey. However it is recognised that the last rural services survey was undertaken in 2011 and further work has been carried out. However following recent appeal decisions and in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, officers are proposing to propose a change to the spatial hierarchy which splits the 'villages' section into two given the huge sustainability differences between places like Great Yeldham and very small villages like Audley End.
- 12.13 Given the views expressed, officers are of the opinion that this section requires a more substantial rewrite to better explain the spatial strategy of the draft Local Plan. The following revised text is proposed. Given the major changes proposed the deletions and additions have not been marked in the usual way.
- 12.14 In relation to the Key Diagram, it is recognised that the garden community areas of search are not in the same scale as the other proposals and as such will be revised. A final key diagram will be included within the Submission Draft Document to reflect the decisions the committee will be making in regard to the growth locations and spatial strategy.

**Recommendation 20 – To revise the spatial strategy chapter of the Local Plan as set out in this report**

**12.15 The Spatial Strategy – Revised Text**

The Spatial Strategy directs development towards the most sustainable locations and provides the framework in which the Local Plan growth is provided. This District specific spatial strategy follows on from that which is set out in the Strategic Part 1 of the Local Plan for North Essex and completes the picture of the role and functions of different areas within the District.

The settlement hierarchy below ranks areas of the District in order of their sustainability merits and the size function and services that each of these areas can offer. Each particular town or village has its own unique characteristics and capacity and therefore villages within the same category may be allocated differing levels of growth.

Whilst large parts of the District are rural, by focusing future development on highly accessible locations this will reduce the need to travel. Good



accessibility means that the community can access their needs easily and without always needing a car. Accessibility can be improved by locating development at accessible locations and improving public transport, walking and cycling facilities and services.

The spatial strategy and hierarchy has been formulated to provide the most sustainable locations for new growth in the District in accordance with the golden thread of sustainable development which should run through all planning decisions. The settlement hierarchy has been completed through reference to the three dimensions of sustainable development;

- The availability of local employment
- The availability of local sustainable transport links including rail and bus services, walking and cycling.
- The availability of community services including education, small shops, pubs and eateries, community hall and open space and health care facilities.
- Natural, built and historic environment constraints

### **Neighbourhood Plans**

There are currently six neighbourhood plans underway in the District in the villages of Bradwell with Pattiswick, Cressing, Coggeshall, Feering, Hatfield Peverel and Kelvedon. These Neighbourhood Plans can allocate land within their villages for homes, employment or other uses. The neighbourhood plans cannot allocate less housing than the Local Plan proposes but they cannot allocate more.

### **Towns**

These are the largest urban areas in the District, but are nevertheless relatively small market towns in the wider context with populations of around 50,000 in Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley, 25,000 in Witham and 12,000 in Halstead.

### **Key Service Villages**

The key service villages are large villages who serve a wider rural hinterland. The ability to meet day to day needs is normally possible in a Key Service Village through the availability of early years and primary schools, primary health care facilities, convenience shopping facilities, local employment opportunities and links by public transport and road to the larger towns. Development may be considered sustainable within a Key Service Village, subject to the specific constraints and opportunities of that village.

Kelvedon and Feering are two separate villages, but functionally act as a whole, with services and facilities in one, serving the population of the other. As such for the purpose of the settlement hierarchy they are both treated as Key Service Villages, but it is important that they maintain their own identity and character.

### **New Garden Communities**

At present there is no existing population centre about the proposed new communities within the District (Marks Tey is within Colchester Borough). However it is considered that given the scale of development and infrastructure being proposed within the Plan period that the new communities be considered as Key Service Villages. As they progress they will move up the spatial hierarchy to Towns.

### **Secondary Villages**

Secondary villages are those which may not serve a wider hinterland but provide the ability for some day to day needs to be met, although they lack the full range of facilities of a Key Service Villages. Development of a small scale may be considered sustainable within a Secondary Village, subject to the specific constraints and opportunities of that village.

### **Tertiary Villages**

All other villages which have a development boundary are considered Tertiary villages. These are the smallest villages in the District and lack most of the facilities required to meet day to day needs. They often have very poor public transport links and travel by private vehicle is usually required. When considering the tests of sustainable development, these will not normally be met for development within a Tertiary Village.

### **The Countryside**

All other areas of the District, including hamlets and small groups of homes, which are outside development boundaries are considered to be within the countryside. In order to protect the intrinsic beauty of the countryside development here is normally restricted to that which is support countryside uses.

<b>Towns</b>	Braintree with Bocking and Great Notley
	Witham
	Halstead
<b>Key Service Villages</b>	Coggeshall
	Earls Colne
	Hatfield Peverel
	Kelvedon with Feering

	Sible Hedingham
	West of Braintree Garden Community
	Colchester Braintree Borders Garden Community
<b>Secondary Villages</b>	Bures Hamlet
	Finchingfield
	Great Bardfield
	Great Yeldham
	Rayne
	Silver End
	Steeple Bumpstead
<b>Tertiary Villages</b>	Ashen
	Audley End
	Belchamp Otten
	Belchamp St Paul
	Belchamp Walter
	Blackmore End
	Black Notley
	Bradwell
	Bulmer
	Bulmer Tye
	Castle Hedingham
	Colne Engaine
	Cornish Hall End
	Cressing
	Foxearth
	Gestingthorpe
	Gosfield
	Great Maplestead
	Great Saling
	Greenstead Green
	Helions Bumpstead
	Lamarsh
	Little Maplestead
	Little Yeldham
	Nounsley
	Panfield
	Pebmarsh
	Ridgewell
	Rivenhall
	Rivenhall End
	Shalford

	Shalford Church End
	Stambourne Chapelend Way
	Stambourne Dyers End
	Stisted
	Sturmer
	Surrex (Coggeshall)
	Terling
	Tilbury Juxta Clare
	Toppesfield
	Wethersfield
	White Notley
	Wickham St Paul

### **Spatial Strategy**

Taking into account the above hierarchy, along with the constraints and opportunities which have been identified and drawn out in the evidence base, including but not limited to the Sustainability Appraisal, Landscape Character Appraisal and Highways Option Assessment, the spatial strategy for the Local Plan is;

***That the broad spatial strategy for the Braintree District should concentrate development on the town of Braintree, planned new garden communities, Witham and the A12/Great Eastern Mainline corridor, and Halstead.***

***An appropriate amount of new development will be brought forward primarily in other Key Services Villages and Secondary Villages to support thriving rural communities.***

### **Development Boundaries**

Development boundaries provide a guide to where the Council believes new growth should be directed. Primarily settlement boundaries mark the existing built form of a town or village and represent the distinction between a built up area and its surrounding countryside. This is in line with the NPPF core planning principles outlined in paragraph 17 which note that the Council should; *“take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it;”*

Development boundaries within this document have been set in accordance with the Development Boundary Review Methodology which can be found in

the evidence base. They will be revised periodically through the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans to ensure that meet the needs of their community.

Development within a development boundary is generally considered sustainable and acceptable in principle subject to the detailed assessment of issues such as design, amenity, highways and impact on historic assets. The approach that the Council will take in assessing these matters is set out in policies within this Plan.

Outside of the development boundaries, it is considered that new development would not normally be able to meet the NPPF Core planning principles set out in paragraph 17 and that the test of sustainable development would be unable to be met. Areas outside of a development boundary are considered 'Countryside'

### **New Policy LPP – Development Boundaries**

**Development outside development boundaries will be strictly controlled to uses appropriate to the countryside to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.**

**Within development boundaries, development will be permitted where it satisfies amenity, design, environmental and highway criteria and where it can take place without material adverse detriment to the existing character and historic interest of the settlement.**

## **13 Draft Local Plan Amendments to Glossary**

13.1 The glossary section of the Local Plan includes terminology that may not be apparent to the general public. This includes abbreviations and what they stand for. Through the draft consultation several further terms and abbreviations have been suggested by consultees for inclusion within the glossary.

**13.2 Officer Responses and proposed changes** – After consideration of the terminology of the terms suggested it is recommended that all terms are included within the glossary element of the Local Plan. New terms submitted are highlighted within the below updated text in bold.

**Recommendation 21 - Updated Glossary Text as set out in this report**

### **Abbreviations**

Initials	What they stand for
----------	---------------------

<b>Initials</b>	<b>What they stand for</b>
ADMP	Braintree District Pre-Submission Site Allocations and Development Management Plan including further proposed amendments
AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BDC	Braintree District Council
BRE	Building Research Establishment
BREEAM	Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method
CHP	Combined Heat and Power
CDA	Critical Drainage Area
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CIRIA	CIRIA is a member-based UK research and information organisation dedicated to improvement in all aspects of the construction industry
DPD	Development Plan Document
Dws	Dwellings
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
EA	Environment Agency
ECC	Essex County Council
EIA	Equalities Impact Assessment
ELR	Employment Land Review
<b><u>FTTP</u></b>	<b><u>Fibre to the Premises (broadband)</u></b>
Ha	Hectare
HCA	Homes and Community Agency
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
JSNA	Joint Strategic Needs Assessment
KSV	Key Service Villages
LAA	Local Area Agreement
LCA	Landscape Character Assessment
LDF	Local Development Framework
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
LFRZs	Local Flood Risk Zones
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LSP	Local Strategic Partnership
LTP	Local Transport Plan
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
<b><u>NGA</u></b>	<b><u>Next Generation Access</u></b>
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework

Initials	What they stand for
NPPG	National Planning Policy Guidance
OAHN	Objective Assessment of Housing Need
ONS	Office of National Statistics
PCT	Mid-Essex Primary Care Trust
SANG	Sustainable Accessible Natural Greenspace
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SA/SEA	Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SAB	SUDS Approval Body
SUDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
SWMP	Surface Water Management Plan

Explanation of some of the terms used in this document

Term Used	Explanation
Abstraction	Taking from; an example in planning terms is water abstraction.
Affordable Housing	Includes social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Affordable housing should meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices.
Air Quality Management Areas	Areas designated by local authorities because they are not likely to achieve national air quality objectives by the relevant deadlines.
Airtightness	Airtightness is the fundamental building property that impacts infiltration (the uncontrolled inward leakage of outdoor air through cracks, interstices or other unintentional openings of a building, caused by pressure effects of the wind and/or stack effect).
Allocation	The specific identification of an area of land for a particular use or to protect an area from unsuitable re-development.
Annual Monitoring Report/Authorities Monitoring Report (AMR)	Sets out the principal characteristics of the District, assesses progress in preparing Local Development Documents and monitors progress in housing, employment and other development.
<b><u>Ancient woodland</u></b>	<b><u>An area that has been wooded continuously since at least 1600 AD</u></b>
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – Areas of high scenic quality

Term Used	Explanation
	that have statutory protection in order to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of their landscapes. It is a statutory designation which can be exercised by Natural England previously under the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act and more recently the Countryside Rights of Way Act 2000.
Archaeological interest	There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places and of the people and cultures that made them.
<b><u>Avoidance</u></b>	<b><u>Action taken to avoid a possible impact by either re-locating the works to an area that will not have an impact or timing them to avoid the impact i.e. outside of the bird breeding season, amphibian mating season, etc.</u></b>
Best and most versatile agricultural land	This is land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification.
Biodiversity	The wealth of wildlife or variety of life on earth. It includes all living organisms (plants and animals) and collections of species that form different natural habitats.
<b><u>Biodiversity Offsetting</u></b>	<b><u>A standardised system – using conservation credits – to measure residual impacts of development and compensate by providing new wildlife habitat off-site.</u></b>
Bridleway	A bridle path or bridleway is a path, trail or a thoroughfare that is used by people riding on horses.
<b><u>Broadband (Superfast)</u></b>	<b><u>Superfast broadband is currently defined as speeds of 24Mbps or more, however Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) are currently updating the definition as speeds of 30Mbps or more.</u></b>
<b><u>Broadband (Ultrafast)</u></b>	<b><u>Ultrafast is defined, depending on the supplier, as delivering between 300Mbps and 1,000Mbps. Achieving these speeds would require FTTP.</u></b>
<b><u>Broadband (FTTP)</u></b>	<b><u>Fibre to the Premises. Use of fibre optic cabling instead of copper is required to receive Ultrafast broadband internet speeds.</u></b>
Brownfield site	Land that has been previously developed, usually but not always within the existing built-up area of a town or village. (This excludes agricultural or forestry buildings and residential gardens which are categorised as greenfield.)
Canyoning	Stagnation of air between tall buildings.
Climate Change	Climate Change is a large-scale, long-term shift in the planet's weather patterns or average temperatures.
Climate change adaptation	Adjustments to natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic factors or their effects, including from changes in rainfall and rising temperatures, which moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities.
Climate change	Action to reduce the impact of human activity on the climate system,



Term Used	Explanation
mitigation	primarily through reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Conservation Area	An area designated for special protection under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, for which it is considered desirable to preserve and/or enhance an historic interest and/or a special architectural character. Such areas have restrictions over works which can be done to buildings or trees.
Community Right to Build Order	An Order made by the local planning authority (under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) that grants planning permission for a site-specific development proposal or classes of development.
Commuted Sums	Commuted Sums are monies received from the developers of new residential dwellings within the District and are held specifically for the enhancement of open spaces and village halls within the area of the development.
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	A mechanism by which charging authorities can set a standard charge on specified development in their area to pay for the new infrastructure required to support growth.
Comparison goods	Goods which are purchased less frequently such as white goods (TVs, fridges etc.) and clothing.
<b><u>Compensation</u></b>	<b><u>Measures provided to offset residual adverse impacts that remain after the application of mitigation. This can be the provision of an area of like-for-like habitat directly or providing financial contributions to achieve it.</u></b>
Comprehensive Development Area	Land defined for development which consists of the removal of the existing use of the land.
Conservation (for heritage policy)	The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.
Convenience Goods	Day-to-day goods which are purchased regularly such as food.
Core Strategy	The overarching planning policy document in the Local Development Framework, which sets out the broad planning strategy for the District. All subsequent documents must be in accordance with it.
Countryside	The area outside defined development boundaries.
Critical Drainage Areas (CDA)	A discrete geographical area (usually a hydrological catchment) where multiple or interlinked sources of flood risk cause flooding during a severe rainfall event thereby affecting people, property or local infrastructure. The CDA comprises the upstream contributing catchment, the influencing drainage catchments, surface water catchments and, where appropriate, a downstream area if this can have influence on CDA.
Curtilage	The area, usually enclosed, encompassing the grounds and buildings immediately surrounding a home that is used in the daily activities of domestic life.
Cycle path	Either a mandatory or an advisory route along which bicycles may travel, either segregated from pedestrians or as shared users.
Dark Sky Movement	The Dark-Sky Movement is a campaign to reduce light pollution. The

<b>Term Used</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
	advantages of reducing light pollution include an increased number of stars visible at night, reducing the effects of unnatural lighting on the environment and cutting down on energy usage.
Decentralised Energy Networks	Decentralised Energy Networks can refer to local generation of energy through renewable resources such as solar and wind energy. It can also relate to combined heat and power systems connected to district heating networks.
Design and Access Statement	A statement which would normally accompany a planning application for certain types of development, to illustrate the process that has led to the formulation of the development proposal and to explain and justify the design and access arrangements in a structured way.
Development	'Means the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operation in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any building or other land.' (Section 55, Town & Country Planning Act 1990)
Development Boundary	The designated boundary surrounding a built-up area within which there is a presumption in favour of development subject to the detailed policies in the plan.
Development Plan Document (DPD)	Statutory Planning documents that set out the Council's policies and proposals for the District. They are subject to an examination and approval by an Inspector before they can be used by the Council.
District Centre	A centre which serves a wider area than a local centre.
District Heating and Cooling	District Heating and Cooling (also known as heat networks) is a system for distributing heat generated in a centralised location for residential and commercial heating requirements such as space heating and water heating.
Educational Infrastructure	Pre-school education and childcare, primary and secondary schools and post-sixteen and adult life-long learning facilities.
Enabling Development	Development which would be unacceptable in planning terms but for the fact that it would bring heritage benefits sufficient to justify it being carried out and which could not otherwise be achieved.
Equality Impact Assessment	Assessment required when reviewing or developing new policies, strategies and functions to determine if there is any adverse impact, illegal discrimination or any unmet need or requirements.
Employment Land Review	A technical study prepared for the Council which looked at the future needs for employment land and where it should be located.
Employment Site	Land developed, or to be developed, for the provision of workplaces.
Exception Site	Sites for affordable housing on land where development would not normally be allowed - hence they are "exceptions" to policy.
Essex Biodiversity Action Plan	A biodiversity action plan (BAP) is an internationally recognised programme addressing threatened species and habitats and is designed to protect and restore biological systems.
Essex Design Guide	First published in 1973 the Design Guide sets the standard for best practice for the design and layout of residential developments. The guide was updated in 1997 and 2005.

Term Used	Explanation
Farm Diversification	On farm development which supplements ongoing agricultural activity either by adding value to existing operation, or introducing new income streams, which remain under the same management control as the main farm enterprise.
Flood Plain/ Flood Zone	A floodplain is the area that would naturally be affected by flooding if a river rises above its banks. The Environment Agency <i>Flood Map for Planning (rivers and the sea)</i> identifies areas that could be affected by flooding if there were no flood defences and the the chance of a flood happening each year.
<b><u>Flood Resilience</u></b>	<b><u>Buildings that are designed and constructed to reduce the impact of flood water entering the building so that no permanent damage is caused, structural integrity is maintained and drying and cleaning is easier.</u></b>
<b><u>Flood Resistance</u></b>	<b><u>Flood-resistant construction can prevent entry of water or minimise the amount that may enter a building where there is short duration flooding outside with water depths of 0.6 metres or less.</u></b>
Flora and Fauna	Flora is plant life and fauna refers to animals.
Formal Recreation	Recreational activities which use or require dedicated or purpose-built facilities, either in public or private ownership, for example, sports pitches, swimming pools, playing fields, tennis courts, bowling greens.
Geodiversity	The variety of geological environments, phenomena and processes that make those landscapes, rocks, minerals, fossils and soils which provide the framework for life on earth.
Green Infrastructure	Green infrastructure is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities. Green infrastructure includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, allotments and private gardens.
Greenfield Site	Land which has not been developed before, usually but not always agricultural or natural land. Sites may also be considered greenfield if they have been unused for a period of time and the previous use has “returned to nature”. Agricultural and forestry buildings and residential gardens are also categorised as greenfield.
Growth Locations	Areas in the Core Strategy which the Council has identified for strategic growth for housing, employment and other uses. They are situated in the main towns of Braintree and Witham.
Gypsies and Travellers	For the purposes of Section 225 of the Housing Act 2004 (duties of local housing authorities: accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers) “gypsies and travellers” means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. persons with a cultural tradition of nomadism or of living in a caravan and</li> <li>b. all other persons of a nomadic habit of life, whatever their race</li> </ul>

Term Used	Explanation
	<p>or origin, including -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. such persons who, on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependant's educational or health needs or old age, have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently and</li> <li>ii. members of an organised group of Travelling Show or circus people (whether or not travelling together as such).</li> </ul>
Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)	The Habitat Regulation Assessment forms part of the Local Plan evidence base. The Habitat Regulation Assessment is a statutory requirement under the Conservation (Natural Habitats) (Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006. An HRA is required for a plan or project which, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects is likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of a European site (one that forms part of the Natura 2000 (N2K) network), plus Ramsar sites (collectively 'international sites').
Hamlet	A small village which does not have a development boundary.
Heritage Asset	Heritage Assets include Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens.
Highway Authority (The)	The authority with responsibility for highways matters currently Essex County Council
Highways England (formerly the Highways Agency)	National body with authority over the trunk road network; operates, maintains and improves England's motorways and major A roads. In the District those roads are the A120 and A12.
Housing Density	The number of dwellings proposed to be accommodated on a set unit of land. Urban areas tend to have higher densities than rural areas.
Housing Supply	The amount of housing (new dwellings) the local authority will supply over the plan period. This is split into a 15-year housing supply and a shorter term 5-year housing supply. The 5-year supply has to be reviewed annually and include an additional 5% buffer.
Impact Assessment	An assessment required to demonstrate what impact a proposed retail development may have on any particular town, district or local centre. Different assessment thresholds apply.
<b><u>Important Hedgerow</u></b>	<b><u>A hedgerow meeting the criteria set out in the Hedgerow Regulations 1997</u></b>
Informal Recreation	Recreational activities which do not make use of or require dedicated or purpose-built facilities, either in public or private ownership. Informal recreation land would include trails and walks.
<b><u>Infrastructure</u></b>	<b><u>Infrastructure means any structure, building, system facility and/or provision required by an area for its social and/or economic function and/or well-being including.</u></b>
Inset Map	A map showing an area around a particular town or village within the District. The areas defined by the inset are shown on the proposals map.
<b><u>Irreplaceable</u></b>	<b><u>Habitats which is it not possible to re-create, due to their age</u></b>

Term Used	Explanation
<b><u>Habitats</u></b>	<b><u>and/or condition and/or composition. Includes Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees in Essex.</u></b>
Landscape Character Assessment	Carried out in 2006 the LCA analyses, describes and classifies the landscape areas in the District. The District is divided into three different types of landscape being, River Valley, Farmland Plateau and Wooded Farmland.
<b><u>Legally Protected Species</u></b>	<b><u>Those species protected under: The Protection of Badgers Act 1992 (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) or the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)</u></b>
Listed Building	A building listed by the Secretary of State for the Environment as being of special architectural or historic interest.
<b><u>Living Landscape</u></b>	<b><u>Landscape-scale areas of the countryside, such as river valleys, estuaries, forested ridges, and grass and heath mosaics, which form ecological networks. The networks allow wildlife to move through them and increase their resilience to threats such as climate change, floods, drought, sea-level rise and development pressure. There are 80 Living Landscapes within Essex.</u></b>
Local Centres	Local Centres are listed in the document. They typically contain a small supermarket, shops, sub-post office etc. Other facilities could include takeaways and launderettes. In rural areas large villages may perform the role of a local centre.
Local Community Facilities	Provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.
Local Nature Reserves	Habitat recognised under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 as an ecosystem of flora and/or fauna considered by the Local Authority to be of significant County or District-wide value and interest to merit its conservation and management for public enjoyment.
Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS)	Semi-natural habitats identified by Essex Wildlife Trust as important for the conservation of wildlife.
Main Towns	The main urban centres in the District. They are Braintree, Witham and Halstead.
Main Town Centre Uses	Retail development (Including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres); leisure, entertainment facilities the more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, night-clubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres, and bingo halls); offices; and arts, culture and tourism development (including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities).
<b><u>Major proposal</u></b>	<b><u>A major development proposal as defined by Article 8(7) of The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995.</u></b>
Market Position Statement	A statement outlining current provision or availability of a specific service (i.e. availability of care home spaces).
<b><u>Mitigation</u></b>	<b><u>Action taken to reduce the severity of adverse impacts.</u></b>

Term Used	Explanation
	<b><u>Mitigation can include minimising impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of an action, or rectifying impacts by restoring, rehabilitating, or repairing the affected environment or reducing or eliminating impacts over time.</u></b>
'Mixed use' sites	Land developed to consist of a combination and integration of uses including residential, employment and community.
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Sets out Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)	Supports the NPPF; the guidance is published online and regularly updated.
<b><u>Next Generation Access</u></b>	<b><u>Refers to new technologies, including fibre, wired and fixed wireless technologies. NGA white areas are identified by Superfast Essex where alternative solutions may qualify for state aid.</u></b>
Original Dwelling	The extent of a dwelling house as originally built, or its extent as it was on the 1 <sup>st</sup> July 1948.
Permeable Surface	Permeable surfaces consist of a variety of types of pavement, pavers and other devices that provide stormwater infiltration while serving as a structural surface.
Permitted Development Rights	The level of development that can take place before planning permission is required, as stated in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.
Planning Obligation/Section 106 Agreement	A legally binding settlement between a local planning authority and any person interested in land within the area of the local authority, in which development is restricted; specified operations, activities or uses required; or a financial contribution to be made.
Primary Shopping Areas	Area within a town centre consisting of primary and secondary frontages and is used as the basis for applying the sequential test for food (Convenience) retail proposals.
<b><u>Priority Species and Habitat</u></b>	<b><u>Species and Habitats of Principal Importance included in the England Biodiversity List published by the Secretary of State under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.</u></b>
Primary and Secondary Retail Frontage	Primary frontages are likely to include a high proportion of retail uses which may include food, drinks, clothing and household goods. Secondary frontages provide greater opportunities for a diversity of uses such as restaurants, cinemas and business.
Proposals Map	The detailed plan on an Ordnance Survey base showing development boundaries and site allocations across the whole of the District.
Protected Lane	Lanes identified as being of special historic or landscape value in the countryside.
<b><u>Ramsar sites</u></b>	<b><u>Wetlands of international importance, designated under the 1971 Ramsar Convention.</u></b>

Term Used	Explanation
Red Data List	List of Threatened Species (also known as the IUCN Red List or Red Data List), founded in 1964, is the world's most comprehensive inventory of the global conservation status of biological species.
Registered Parks & Gardens of Special Historic Interest	Sites included in the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest compiled and maintained by English Heritage, that make a significant contribution to the diversity of the local and/or national landscape and/or which are of particular historical importance.
Retail Hierarchy	Requirement of the NPPF for Local Authorities to define a hierarchy of retail development for the District. This is defined in the Core Strategy.
Risk Assessment	A systematic process of evaluating the potential risks that may be involved in a projected activity or undertaking.
Run Off Rates	The rate at which water will leave a given area.
Rural Worker	Person currently employed by or retired from agricultural employment.
Scheduled Ancient Monument	A building or structure considered by the Secretary of State to be of national importance and given legal protection under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.
Service Villages	The largest villages in the District that have a good range of day to day facilities and act as a service centre for other smaller villages.
Sequential Test (Retail)	A test required to demonstrate that no other sites are available in a more sequential location.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Land notified under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as an ecosystem of flora and/or fauna considered by English Heritage to be of significant national value and interest to merit its conservation and management.
Solar Shading	System which controls the amount of heat and light admitted to a building, permitting users to control heat gains from the sun.
Specialist Housing	Accommodation which is specifically designed and built to meet the needs of the elderly, young or vulnerable adults and may include elements of care and support for people living there.
Special Policy Area	Parcels of land for which specific development objectives exist. These may relate to the density, nature and/or use of the land.
<b><u>Special Areas of Conservation</u></b>	<b><u>Areas given special protection under the European Union's Habitats Directive, which is transposed into UK law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.</u></b>
<b><u>Special Protection Areas</u></b>	<b><u>Areas which have been identified as being of international importance for the breeding, feeding, wintering or the migration of rare and vulnerable species of birds found within European Union countries. They are European designated sites, classified under the Birds Directive.</u></b>
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)	A document which sets out how the Council intends to involve the whole community in decisions on both planning policies and planning applications.

<b>Term Used</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment	A technical study which identifies sites with development potential for housing and assesses their developability, deliverability and capacity.
Strategic Housing Market Assessment	A technical study prepared for the Council which assesses the overall state of the housing market and advises on future housing policies used to inform the Council's Housing Strategy.
Structural Landscaping	The treatment of land, usually by including substantial tree and shrub planting, to enhance visual amenity and integrity with surrounding landscape features.
Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP)	Plan produced by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) that outlines the preferred surface water management strategy in a given location. These plans focus on areas of highest surface water flood risk and consider flooding from sewers, drains, groundwater and runoff from land, small water courses and ditches that occurs as a result of heavy rainfall.
SUDs	A sustainable drainage system is designed to reduce the potential impact of new and existing developments with respect to surface water drainage discharges.
Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)	These documents are supplementary to the Development Plan and are used to provide additional detail as deemed necessary.
Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)	Assessments required by European and national law into how the plan will impact on the District's environment in the long term and contribute towards sustainable development.
Sustainable Design and Construction Checklist	A checklist required to be completed in support of a planning application. The checklist assists developers to take account of sustainability at the design stage, to ensure environmental features are an integral part of development projects. The checklist is subject to review as emerging technologies and national policy are updated.
Sustainable development	Generally defined as: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
Swale	A swale is a low tract of land, especially one that is moist or marshy. The term can refer to a natural landscape feature or a human-created one.
Town Centres	The area defined on the proposals map which contains the majority of town centre uses. It is used as the basis for applying the sequential test for comparison goods.
Transport Assessment	An assessment of the likely transport impact a development may have.
Travel Plan	A plan demonstrating how a development would encourage its users to use more sustainable methods of transport to access a development.



Term Used	Explanation
Tree Preservation Order	Provides protection to individual trees, groups of trees or woodland by prohibiting topping, lopping or felling except by the consent of the Local Planning Authority.
Urban Capacity Study	A technical study prepared for the Council that assesses the potential for building more dwellings in the existing built up parts of the District, usually the main towns and large villages.
Use Class Order	Different uses are given a classification as defined by The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (As amended). For example an A1 use refers to retail and a C3 use would refer to a residential use.
Water Course	A brook, stream, or artificially constructed water channel.
Water Framework Directive	The Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for community action in the field of water policy) is a European Union directive which commits European Union member states to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water bodies (including marine waters up to one nautical mile from shore) by 2015.
<b><u>Veteran tree</u></b>	<b><u>A tree which, because of its great age, size or condition is of exceptional value for wildlife, in the landscape, or culturally.</u></b>
Villages	Any village which has a development boundary and is not a Town or Service Village
Visually Important Space	Open-space which is considered to make a significant contribution to the visual character of an area.