

Local Plan Sub-Committee AGENDA



THE PUBLIC MAY ATTEND THIS MEETING

Please note this meeting will be webcast and audio recorded.

Date: Wednesday, 13 April 2016

Time: 18:00

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

Membership:

Councillor D Bebb

Councillor Mrs L Bowers-Flint (Chairman)

Councillor G Butland

Councillor T Cunningham

Councillor D Hume

Councillor Mrs J Money

Councillor Lady Newton

Councillor J O'Reilly-Cicconi

Councillor Mrs W Scattergood

Councillor Miss M Thorogood

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

PUBLIC SESSION

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Declarations of Interest

To declare the existence and nature of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, other Pecuniary Interest, or Non-Pecuniary Interest relating to Items on the Agenda having regard to the Code of Conduct for Members and having taken appropriate advice where necessary before the meeting.

3 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings of the Local Plan Sub-Committee held on 14th March 2016 and 16th March 2016 (copies previously circulated).

4 Public Question Time

(See paragraph below)

- 5 **Braintree District Draft Local Plan - Draft Site Allocations Maps** 4 - 52
- 6 **Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Replacement
Waste Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation 2016** 53 - 58

7 **Urgent Business - Public Session**

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

8 **Exclusion of the Public and Press**

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

At the time of compiling this Agenda there were none.

PRIVATE SESSION

9 **Urgent Business - Private Session**

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

Cont'd

E WISBEY
Governance and Member Manager

Contact Details

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

Public Question Time

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

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

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

Health and Safety

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

Mobile Phones

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

Comments

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

Please let us have your comments setting out the following information

Meeting Attended..... Date of Meeting

Comment.....

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

Contact Details:

Braintree Draft Local Plan – Proposed Allocations		Agenda No: 5
Portfolio: Planning and Housing Corporate Outcome: Securing appropriate infrastructure and housing growth Report Presented by: Emma Goodings Report Prepared by: Emma Goodings, Sean Tofts, Julie O'Hara		
Background Papers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) • National Planning Practise Guidance (NPPG) • Localism Act (2011) • Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) • Local Plan Review (2005) • Core Strategy (2011) • Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (2015) 		Public Report: Yes Key Decision: No
Executive Summary: <p>A key part of the new Local Plan is to produce a site allocations map for each defined settlement within the District. This map is known as an inset map and sets out key data for that area, including development boundary, conservation area, areas allocated for development and areas protected for specific uses such as open space, allotments or employment. As part of the draft Local Plan, the allocations and development boundary for each town and village in the District have been reviewed. This review has included ensuring that the development boundary is in the correct location and making an assessment of the sites submitted in the Call for Sites as potential development options. Town and Parish Councils have also been consulted and their comments have been summarised where provided.</p> <p>In the draft Local Plan an inset map for each area will be produced setting out the preferred option and an alternative map will also be produced which shows all the sites that have been considered.</p>		
Decision: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To approve the Inset Map for Witham as shown in Appendix 2 to this report which includes the allocations for development at; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) WITC421 Gimsoms b) WITN425 Chipping Hill Industrial Estate 		

c) WITN426 and WITN427 Land at Conrad Road

d) HATF315 and 316 Land at Woodend Farm (within Hatfield Peverel Parish)

For residential development

e) And sites RIVE362 and RIVE363 (in Rivenhall Parish) for employment development.

f) To retain allocations for residential development at, Lodge Farm (partly within Hatfield Peverel Parish), Land off Forest Road (within Rivenhall Parish), WITW431 land between Blunts Hall Road and Teign Drive, former Forest Road Community Centre, former Magistrates Court, Ivy Chimneys, land off Constance Close and Maltings Lane.

g) To retain employment allocations at site WCHE25 Collingwood Road, Witham.

h) To retain comprehensive redevelopment allocations for Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre and Newlands Precinct with appropriate policies

- 2 To approve the Inset Maps for Rivenhall and Rivenhall End as set out in Appendix 3 and not allocate sites RIVE367, RIVE368, RIVE369, RIVE370 and RIVE521 for development.**
- 3 To approve the Inset Map for Kelvedon Park as set out in Appendix 4 allocating the site for specialist employment with the appropriate policy.**
- 4 That the Inset Map for Hatfield Peverel as set out in Appendix 5 is approved and that sites HATF313 Sorrels Field and HATF314 Land to the South of Stone Path Drive are allocated for residential development.**
- 5 That the Inset Map for Nounsley as set out in Appendix 6 is approved and that no sites are allocated for development.**
- 6 That the Insert Map for Belchamp Walter as shown in Appendix 7 is approved and no sites are allocated for development.**
- 7 That the Inset Map for Bures Hamlet as shown in Appendix 8 is approved and that no sites are allocated for development**
- 8 That the Inset Map for Gestingthorpe as set out in Appendix 9, is approved with the three minor amendments to reflect the development within the village but that no sites should be allocated for development**
- 9 That the Inset Map for Helions Bumpstead as set out in Appendix 10 is**

approved including the proposed development boundary for Pale Green.	
10 To approve the Inset Map for Great Maplestead as set out in Appendix 11 with the amended development boundary but no sites allocated for development.	
11 That the Inset Map for Little Maplestead as set out in Appendix 12 is approved and that no sites are allocated for development.	
12 To approve the Inset Map for Little Yeldham as set out in Appendix 13 and not allocate any sites for development	
13 To remove the development boundary for North End as set out in Appendix 14, and for the village to be located within the Countryside.	
14 The Inset Map for Pebmarsh as set out in Appendix 15 be approved and that no sites are allocated for development.	
15 The Inset Map for Sturmer village, as set out in Appendix 16 be approved, and that no sites be allocated for development.	
16 That the Inset Map for Sturmer west, as set out in Appendix 17 be approved.	
17 That the Inset Map for Toppesfield as set out in Appendix 18 is approved and no sites are allocated for development.	
Purpose of Decision: To agree the draft site allocation maps for inclusion within the draft Braintree District Local Plan	
Corporate Implications	
Financial:	The preparation of the Plans set out within the Local Development Scheme will be a significant cost which will be met through the Local Plan budget.
Legal:	To comply with Governments legislation and guidance.
Equalities/Diversity	The Councils policies should take account of equalities and diversity.
Safeguarding	None
Customer Impact:	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
Environment and Climate Change:	This will form part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and will inform policies and allocations.
Consultation/Community Engagement:	There will be public consultation during various stages of the emerging Local Plan.
Risks:	The Local Plan examination may not take place. The Local Plan could be found unsound. Risk of High Court challenge.
Officer Contact:	Emma Goodings

Designation:	Planning Policy Manager
Ext. No.	2511
E-mail:	emma.goodings@braintree.gov.uk

1 Background

- 1.1 Braintree District Council is working on a new Local Plan which will guide development in the District between now and 2033. Once adopted this will replace the 2011 Core Strategy and the 2005 Local Plan. As part of the Local Plan, the Council is required to boost significantly the supply of housing as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 1.2 In 2013 and 2014 the Council consulted on the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan document. This included a proposed new inset map for all defined settlements (towns and villages) within the District. During this time significant detailed revision of many of the inset maps were considered. For the new Local Plan these maps will provide a starting point for any further changes and updates required.
- 1.3 The preferred inset map for each defined settlement, together with a map showing the alternative site options that were considered and not taken forward will be contained within the draft Local Plan for public consultation in the summer.
- 1.4 At the Local Plan subcommittee on the 14th March, Members agreed a recommendation that the Local Plan should deliver 845 new homes between 2016 and 2033 to meet the objectively assessed need for new homes. This requires the Council to allocate around 10,000 new homes within the Local Plan, given the sites that are already within the pipeline.
- 1.5 Members also agreed a spatial hierarchy which is set out in the table below and the broad spatial strategy which proposes that the most suitable locations in the District for growth are therefore considered to be Braintree, Witham and the A12 corridor, planned new garden communities and Halstead.

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

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

allocations.

2 Methodology

- 2.1 Planning policy officers have visited all the proposed sites and villages within the District and have also carried out a desk based assessment of the village and any proposed changes. In a small amount of cases, detailed historic buildings advice is currently being sought to supplement the current information.
- 2.2 Informal consultation has been carried out with the relevant Parish or Town Council and where we have received their comments, they have been included within the committee report. All relevant Parish, District and County members have been notified of the committee agenda and made aware of the opportunity to speak if they wish to do so.
- 2.3 The development boundary for each village has been assessed using the criteria set out in the settlement boundary review report.
- 2.4 Officers have reviewed the areas that are protected for uses, such as allotments, visually important open space and recreational land to ensure that the area covered is still in use and is appropriate.
- 2.5 Sites submitted in the call for sites have been considered for whether they are suitable for development. All sites have been subject to a screening regarding a Sustainability Appraisal and where it has been judged to be potentially having a significant impact has been assessed against the criteria and a summary of that draft assessment is set out in the report.
- 2.6 If sites are considered suitable and are for sites of 10 or more, they are shown as orange on the maps and will be incorporated within the settlement boundary. This would include sites which currently have planning permission (either outline or full) or which are currently under construction. Where there are small sites which may accommodate less than 10 they would not be formally designated but where necessary the settlement boundary would be extended around the site. The key to maps is located in **Appendix 1**.
- 2.7 It should be noted that rural exception sites to facilitate affordable housing do not need to be specifically allocated but would be assessed against the policy within the Local Plan. As such there is an opportunity for small sites to meet local need to come forward in addition to those which are set out here.
- 2.8 It should also be strongly noted that Essex County Council is currently undertaking a study to assess the opportunities to improve the A120 between Braintree and Marks Tey. The location, route and land needed to support this scheme are not yet known, and this could have implications for a number of sites being proposed for development in the Plan. This is also the case for a scheme that Highways England is currently developing to widen the A12 to 3 lanes. The officer recommendations in this report are based on the information available at this time, but may be subject to change or amendment

as further information on the A12 and A120 schemes is released, prior to the submission of the Local Plan to the government.

3 Format of this report

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

4. Witham

- 4.1 Witham is the second largest town in the District and is situated in the south of the District. The town sits on the A12 which provides good road access between London and the east, making it an attractive place for industry to locate. The town also has a mainline railway station to London, although the railway line does act as a barrier between the north and south sides of the town.
- 4.2 Witham is allocated as a main town within the Core Strategy 2011 and is proposed to remain allocated as such within the new Local Plan.

Current policy position

- 4.3 The town had two strategic allocations in the 2011 Core Strategy in the north east and south west of the town. The town centre is also defined, as are primary and secondary retail frontages.
- 4.4 The town is enclosed by a development boundary and has a wide variety of allocations within it, including a conservation area which covers a large portion of the centre of the town as well as areas at risk of flooding due to their location close to the river. Town centre and retail boundaries are laid out in the central area and allocations for visually important open space, open space and employment can be seen within the town.
- 4.5 Protective allocations are shown for formal and informal recreation areas, existing employment areas, cemeteries, and education provision among others.

Sites Submitted

WITC421 'Gimsons'

- 4.6 WITC421 land at Gimsons was previously submitted as WCH2. It should be noted that the current house and some land to form a large garden are excluded from the proposed site. The site is 3.23ha and is being proposed for residential development of around 70 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 4.7 This notes that around 1% of the site is within a flood risk area and local wildlife site as currently drawn and these areas will need to be excluded from development. There are also potential negative affects with regards to the impact on adjacent conservation area.

Town Council Comment

- 4.8 Members agreed that this is a small site, which is unlikely to be critical to the housing numbers, but there is potential for a low density sympathetic development to contribute to the improvements of the frontage onto Newland Street.

Officer Comment

- 4.9 The site is a large green area located to the rear of Newland Street the main street in Witham. It is centrally located and would be within walking distance of retail and other community facilities. The land sits adjacent to the town park and sports and cricket grounds creating a green lung to this area, however is within private ownership with no public access. The site is adjacent but outside the conservation area and is also bordered by recreational land to the south side along the river which is also a local wildlife site. One balance it is considered that the site should be allocated for new homes, providing that appropriate access can be gained to the site. The site would suit a lower density development and must provide appropriate green walking and cycling links between the town, town park and the river walk area, linking these areas and providing a network of recreation spaces within the heart of the town. There are several group and single Tree Preservation Orders on the site which must be retained and designed to be incorporated into the scheme as appropriate. Appropriate management of the site in relation to the neighbouring local wildlife site would need to be accommodated and design would need to be appropriate to its position adjacent to the conservation area. Vehicular access will need to be provided from River View with pedestrian and cycle links from Kings Chase, which is considered too narrow to accommodate a vehicle access.
- 4.10 The developer has submitted a scheme which shows 70 new homes on the site, however given the constraints and requirements for public links as set out above, it is suggested that a lower density scheme would be more appropriate to preserve the green setting. 40-50 homes may be more appropriate for the site.

Buildings adjacent to Kings Chase, Newland Street

- 4.11 This is an area effectively with two buildings located on either side of the narrow lane of Kings Chase off Newland Street the main shopping street in Witham. The site is located within both the town centre and primary shopping area. The site requires some regeneration and refurbishment however given its position within the conservation the retention of the existing buildings, is likely to be more favoured that a complete refurbishment. The site is within the development boundary and as such it is not proposed to be specifically allocated

WCH25E 8 Collingwood Road, Witham

- 4.12 The site is currently used an office block and car park within the town centre boundary of Witham. The site is 0.79ha. The site is currently within NHS ownership and has a number of additional tenants occupying space in the buildings. The landowner has put forward the site for a residential redevelopment of around 40 units.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 4.13 Notes the potential negative impacts of redevelopment of the site on the historic environment, given its position within the development boundary.

Town Council comments

- 4.14 None on this site

Officer Comments

- 4.15 The building occupies an edge of town centre location where there is a mix of commercial, community and residential uses. The employment land needs assessment recognises a strong need for new office accommodation within the District, with town centre locations close to railway stations being the most appropriate place. There are few areas such as this within the District and therefore it is proposed that the site is retained as a B1 only employment policy area which means it will be protected for offices uses. That could include retention and refurbishment of the existing building, or appropriate new buildings.
- 4.16 It should however be noted that this allocation would not prevent the landowner from changing the existing building from office to residential development under the permitted development powers.

WITN425 4 and 6 Chipping Hill and adjoining Chipping Hill industrial Estate

- 4.17 The site is around 04ha and is previously developed land containing 2 residential dwellings and a commercial/retail outlet over a number of buildings. The site was considered under reference WCH17HAIt within the site allocations and development plan and was left unallocated within the development boundary. The land owners propose the site for residential redevelopment of approximately 40 to 50 units. Overall the site size is 0.4ha.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 4.18 The report notes potential positive improvements to the historic environment by the development of this site increasing its contribution to the conservation area.

Town Council Comments

- 4.19 That WITN 425 – 4 & 6 Chipping Hill, Ramsden Mill and Chipping Hill Industrial Estate, would receive sympathetic consideration subject to access problems being resolved.

Officer Comments

- 4.20 The site is in a highly sustainable location in close proximity to the railway station and bus stops. The main town centre is located within walking distance of the site. As such the site may be considered for a number of uses including additional station car parking, residential and office type development.
- 4.21 The site sits partly within the conservation area and at present is served by three access points from Chipping Hill/Albert Road. At present none of these access points are considered suitable for future access onto the site without the demolition of properties on the access route.
- 4.22 The Grange, number 4 Chipping Hill, was previously a listed building and the front part of the site is located within the conservation area. As such expert advice has been requested on the site from Essex County Council historic buildings.
- 4.23 The site is in current active use as a commercial/retail site however the operator has indicated the likely closure of the business in a number of years on their retirement. If the current occupier were to vacate, given the nature of the site, it is unlikely that other suitable similar uses would be found. Other commercial uses such as office accommodation are in demand in the District and particularly within close proximity to mainline railway services. However given the relatively small size and irregular shape of the site, the adjacent mainly residential character and the conservation area, the size of any office type accommodation would be constrained.
- 4.24 On balance therefore it is considered that a suitably designed residential scheme may be most appropriate for the site if the existing commercial use is to cease. This would however be subject to more detailed discussion with Essex County Council highways regarding a suitable access point and historic building advisors regarding the demolition of properties with the conservation area.

WITW431 land between Blunts Hall Road and Teign Drive.

- 4.25 The site was previously submitted and considered in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan where it was considered a suitable site for new homes. The site is 1.71ha in size.

Town Council comments

- 4.26 That WITW 431 – Land off Blunts Hall Road, should be allocated for allotments as there is a problem with access.

Officer Comments

- 4.27 The site remains suitable in principle for new residential development subject to an appropriate access to the site being secured. Additional highways work is being carried out which may suggest that the site is only allocated for a small number of new homes, perhaps on the frontage to Blunts Hall Road. This would leave the remainder of the site to be available for open space or allotment provision. It is therefore proposed that the site retain its allocation

for residential development through this consultation, but that this allocation be reviewed when further advice on access is considered.

WITN428 Land to the north west of Conrad Road

- 4.28 WITN428 is a large site measures around 67ha located between the existing built development on Cressing Road and the agricultural reservoir. The site could accommodate around 1500 new homes and would also be required to delivery appropriate community facilities.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 4.29 The site has significant positive effects in relation to the provision on homes and distance to facilities as well as scoring well on access to public transport. The site scores less well on distance to employment, town centre and health facilities.

Town Council View

- 4.30 That site WITN 428 – Land at Cressing Road, North of Elm Hall Cottages, Witham/Rivenhall is not sustainable and therefore unsuitable for development.

Officer View

- 4.31 The site is located in proximity to local schools and within walking and cycling distance of employment in the north of the town. However given its north Witham location it is located some distance from the high street as a main source of everyday facilities and also from GP surgeries. This north Witham location also means that traffic from the site going towards Witham town centre or the A12 would need to access the congested single crossing point of the railway line in the centre of the town.
- 4.32 The site is relatively flat and featureless although it assessed as having a medium to low capacity to accommodate new development. However given the scale of development here, this would not be able to be accommodated within the infrastructure of the town.

WITN426 and WITN427 Land at Conrad Road

- 4.33 This is a smaller portion of the above site, approximately 5.4ha and suitable for around 130 new homes. A planning application on this site is currently awaiting determination. Site WITN427 is a small adjacent site of 0.3ha located between the site and Conrad Road at its north western edge.

Town Council View

- 4.34 That site WITN 426 – Land to the north west of Conrad Road is subject to planning application 15/01273/OUT which Members had considered in November 2015.
- 4.35 WITN427 - Members suggested that the redundant allotments should be brought back. The suggestion was also made that this land should be used to

solve the parking issues at the Southview School for the special needs children.

Officer View

- 4.36 The larger of the two sites is currently subject of a planning application for up to 150 residential units which is due to be considered at the meeting on the 12th April 2016 planning committee and is recommended for approval. This area includes the first field between Conrad Road and the two Elm Hall Cottages. The site stretches to the school site to the north west. The site is considered to have a medium to high capacity to accommodate new growth and in landscape terms is considered to be the most suitable site on the edge of the town. It was considered to straighten the development boundary between the edge of this site and the edge of the school grounds. However the site area put forward by the landowner follows the natural boundaries of the field pattern and as such is considered the most appropriate.
- 4.37 The smaller part of the site was previously being proposed as a facility for the school, but we understand this is no longer being taken forward. It is therefore proposed that the site be included within the development boundary and the neighbouring residential site allocation, however this would not preclude other school related uses coming forward on the site.

WITN429 Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre

- 4.38 The neighbourhood centre is located on Laburnum Way and Dorothy Sayers Drive and is a poor quality development of shops, garages and residential flats above as well as an adjacent pub. The site is adjacent to a large playing field with play equipment and a pavilion.
- 4.39 The site owner is proposing a comprehensive redevelopment of the area including housing, some retail units and incorporation of the pavilion.

Town Council Comments

- 4.40 Keen to see regeneration of the flats and shops in Dorothy Sayers Drive.

Officer Comments

- 4.41 The site has been proposed to be allocated as a comprehensive redevelopment area in the 2005 Local Plan and it is proposed to retain this allocation. A development brief for the site was approved in 2010 and whilst of some age now, the overall requirements of redevelopment have not significantly changed over that time. In addition to the allocation a policy on the site is proposed as set out below;

“Comprehensive Development Areas – Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre, Dorothy Sayers Drive, Witham

Land at Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre, Dorothy Sayers Drive, Witham is allocated as a Comprehensive Development Area for a mixed use development where a combination of retail, community uses, public house, pavilion, and residential development and car parking will be supported.

Development of the Comprehensive Development Area should be in accordance with the principles of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document”.

Newlands Precinct

- 4.42 It is proposed to retain the allocation of comprehensive redevelopment area around the Newlands Precinct shopping centre and adjacent car park. The centre would benefit from some reorganisation, particularly to the rear of the shopping centre to allow better accessibility and connectivity to the car park to the rear.

“Comprehensive Development Area – Newland Shopping Centre, Witham

Land at Newland Shopping Centre, Newlands Drive Car Park, Lockram Lane and Coachhouse Way is allocated as a Comprehensive Development Area for mixed-use development, where a combination of retail, employment, leisure, community facilities, car parking and residential uses will be allowed.

A development brief will be required for the whole site prior to any redevelopment, which should address the following issues:

- *Provision of convenience and comparison retail uses;*
- *Refurbishment of Newland Shopping Centre;*
- *Provision of residential uses;*
- *Satisfactory service access;*
- *Appropriate provision for any displaced parking;*
- *Enhancement to the frontage to Newland Street, the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings;*
- *Retention of pedestrian access through Lockram Lane;*
- *Public realm improvements”.*

- 4.43 WITC423 is the Lodge Farm site allocated for development within the 2011 Core Strategy. The site has a resolution to grant planning permission subject to the completion of the s106 agreement. It is therefore continued to identify the site for development of up to 750 new homes.

- 4.44 The Maltings Lane development on the opposite side of the road to Maltings Lane also continues to be built out. Allocations on the map for homes, employment, open space, retail and community uses are proposed on the site in accordance with the latest masterplan.

- 4.45 There are a small number of other sites within the town development boundary which have previously been allocated for residential development and which planning permission has now been granted. This includes the land at the former Forest Road community centre, the former Magistrates Court, the land off Constance Close and the NHS site and adjacent bowling green known as Ivy Chimneys. These will be continued to be allocated until development is built out.

- 4.46 All other allocations are proposed to be retained as per the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan including the town centre and shopping boundaries which updated evidence has confirmed remain appropriate.

5. Rivenhall and Rivenhall End

- 5.1 Within Rivenhall Parish there are two main areas of housing which are enclosed by development boundaries. These are Rivenhall End between the A12 and the railway line and Rivenhall which is located further north. There is also some linear development along Rickstones Road.
- 5.2 There are various designations in the two villages for visually important open space, open space, allotments, education and churchyard/cemetery and these are all proposed to remain.
- 5.3 The Parish directly abuts the Witham town boundary and site RIVE360 was allocated as a growth location within the 2011 Core Strategy and the site now has a resolution to grant planning permission.
- 5.4 The villages are classed as 'other villages' within the 2011 Core Strategy and are proposed as 'villages' within the new Local Plan.

RIVE367, RIVE368, RIVE369 and RIVE369 Sites at Rivenhall and Rivenhall End

- 5.5 These sites have all been submitted by the same landowner. The sites encompass land to the east of Oak Road between the Rivenhall and Rivenhall End villages, land to the east of Rivenhall End between the A12 and the railway line and also to the southern side of the railway line adjacent to Rivenhall End.
- 5.6 The sites together are 53.3ha and are proposed for a residential led scheme with other mixes of uses possible. The landowner has suggested that around 40ha may be available for residential use which we estimate could accommodate around 1,000 homes. The sites are currently agricultural fields

Sustainability Appraisal

- 5.7 The sites around Rivenhall score well in terms of proximity to a main town and bus services but score very poorly over impact on the landscape.

Parish Comments

- 5.8 RIVE 367 – Land off Church Road & Oak Road between Hoo Hall land and the playing field - The Parish Council opposes this proposed new allocation. It would be a major loss of agricultural land and would have a severe impact on the valley of Rivenhall Brook. It would completely change the village character of the main part of Rivenhall. Same comment re traffic as for RIVE 366(a)
- 5.9 This site attracted a high number of comments from residents, all opposed.
- 5.10 The main concerns were: not suitable for development, flooding (nearby Rivenhall Brook known to flood), traffic, lack of healthcare and dentists etc, pressure on schools, inadequate sewage capacity, loss of wildlife, effect on village green area of the village.

- 5.11 The Parish Church together with parts of the local Primary School site are scheduled as Ancient Monuments.
- 5.12 A suggestion that a much smaller ribbon development could be allocated along Oak Road attracted 5 votes agreeing, 15 votes disagreeing.
- 5.13 RIVE 368 – Land between the railway line and Hoo Hall land off Oak road - The Parish Council opposes this proposed new allocation. It would be a major loss of agricultural land and would have a severe impact on the valley of Rivenhall Brook. Same comment re traffic as for RIVE 366(a).
- 5.14 This site attracted a high number of comments from residents, all opposed. The main concerns were: not suitable for development, flooding (nearby Rivenhall Brook known to flood), traffic, lack of healthcare and dentists etc, pressure on schools, inadequate sewage capacity, loss of wildlife, danger re traffic near narrow railway bridge access, loss of dog walking area.
- 5.15 A suggestion that much a smaller ribbon development could be allocated along Oak Road if road improvements could be made together with a lorry turning point attracted 11 votes agreeing, 12 votes disagreeing.
- 5.16 RIVE 369 – Land from Henry Dixon Road up to Durwards Hall between railway line and north side of A12 - The Parish Council opposes this proposed new allocation. It would be a major loss of agricultural land and would have a severe impact on the valley of Rivenhall Brook. Same comment re traffic as for RIVE 366(a) and questions about impact on any future plans re A12 widening.
- 5.17 This site attracted many comments from residents, all opposed. The main concerns were: unsuitable for housing, drainage and existing flooding problems, traffic.
- 5.18 A suggestion that part of the land may become suitable for development if A12 widening means land becomes unsuitable for arable farming attracted 8 votes agreeing, 3 votes disagreeing.
- 5.19 RIVE 370 – Land off Henry Dixon Road south of the A12 - The Parish Council opposes this proposed new allocation. It would be a major loss of agricultural land and would impact on the valley of Rivenhall Brook. Same comment re traffic as for RIVE 366(a) and this is another site close to the line of the A12 when the widening plans are as yet unknown.
- 5.20 This site attracted many comments from residents, all opposed. The main concerns were: unsuitable for housing, drainage and existing flooding problems, traffic.
- 5.21 Suggestions regarding the future of this land subject to any future A12 widening produced mixed responses.

Town Council Comments

- 5.22 Members also considered that the proposal for housing on RIVE 369 along the A12 to the northeast of Rivenhall End was unacceptable because it would further promote the merging of Hatfield Peverel, Witham and Rivenhall

Officer Views

- 5.23 The sites proposed are extensions of the small villages of Rivenhall and Rivenhall End. The villages have few facilities and whilst the town of Witham is in close proximity, these proposed sites are not adjacent to the town. Development of any of the sites would lead to a substantial extension to the village of Rivenhall or Rivenhall End which without the appropriate community facilities would not be suitable for development, encouraging journeys by private vehicle. All four of the sites are located adjacent to or within an area at risk of flooding, whilst development could be kept of these areas, all sites slope towards the rivers. Sites RIVE369 and RIVE370 are located adjacent to the A12 where widening to 3 lanes is proposed and it is not known the impact this may have in the area. The Parish Council are not supportive of this development
- 5.24 All existing allocations and designations are proposed to be retained.

Kelvedon Park – Headquarters of Essex County Fire and Rescue

- 5.25 The site RIVE364 is proposed to be allocated as a special employment area within the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan with an accompanying policy setting out the appropriate uses for the site. It is proposed to carry this allocation forward with the slightly amended new policy on the site set out over the page;

“Essex Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters - Kelvedon Park

Land at Kelvedon Park is allocated as a Special Employment Area specifically to meet the requirements of Essex Fire and Rescue Service for;

999 facilities;

Centralised training facilities;

Integrated administration facilities; and

Vehicle maintenance facilities.

Additional development on site must provide sufficient parking.

Appropriate boundary screening is required to the rear of the site

Additional development must retain the parkland setting to the front of the site”.

RIVE362 and RIVE363 land adjacent Eastways

- 5.26 These two sites are situated within Rivenhall Parish, but directly about the Witham town development boundary at the Eastways Industrial Estate. The sites are currently undeveloped/agricultural land situated between the A12 and the railway line. A residential property sits on far eastern edge of the site, accessed directly from the A12.

- 5.27 The sites are being proposed by two separate developers with a total of 6.78ha which is estimated could deliver around 15,000 sq. m of B1, B2 and B8 employment uses (the types of uses already in evidence on Eastways)

Sustainability Appraisal

- 5.28 The site remains relatively neutral in the sustainability appraisal with positives for its proximity to the main town and able to provide employment opportunities but negative in relation to landscape, agricultural land and distance to transport facilities.

Parish Council Comments

- 5.29 RIVE 362 & RIVE 363 – Burghey Brook and land adjoining off A12 – The Parish Council continues to oppose these allocations. There have been several attempts to allocate these sites previously which BDC rejected. The bunding and planting around the northern boundary of the existing industrial site was provided as a prominent screening measure and as demarcation of the final extent of the expansion of the Witham industrial estates into the parish.
- 5.30 Suggestions regarding the future of this land subject to any future A12 widening produced mixed responses.
- 5.31 This site attracted comments from residents, all opposed, none in favour. The main concern was loss of identity of rural parish.

Town Council Comments

- 5.32 That no objection be agreed for the sites RIVE 362, 363 and 365 – Land to the north of Eastways Industrial Estate, subject to a green buffer of woodland between Rivenhall End and Witham.

Officer Comment

- 5.33 Whilst there remains the business park at Maltings Lane to be completed, there are no other sites which are being put forward for employment development within the town. The Local Plan is to guide development between now and 2033 and as such it is considered appropriate for a small expansion of the Eastways Industrial Estate to be considered.
- 5.34 Sites RIVE362 and RIVE363 were assessed in the landscape character assessment as having medium landscape capacity to accommodate new growth and are therefore amongst the most suitable sites adjacent to Witham for development. The site is therefore proposed to be allocated for employment uses, subject to additional work being submitted by the landowners to prove that appropriate width access can be taken from the existing industrial development. It will also be subject to change following the Highways England announcement of the widening route of the A12 in the vicinity of the site.
- 5.35 This development would bring the Eastways development broadly in line with the approved residential development at Forest Road and retain an

approximately 600m gap between this development and the development at Rivenhall End. Appropriate boundary screening would need to take place to minimise the visibility of development here from residents in Rivenhall End.

RIVE365 Land between Burghey Brook and Rivenhall End

- 5.36 The total site area is 14ha, 7.9ha are proposed for a mixed employment development, with the remainder nearest Rivenhall End village to be given over for woodland planting. The proposal notes that development could be accessed through the Eastways industrial estate and neighbouring development being promoted for development and also has a current farm access onto Oak Road.

Parish Comments

- 5.37 RIVE 365 – Land between Burghey Brook and Rivenhall End – The Parish Council opposes this proposed new allocation. It would be a major loss of the agricultural land between the village and Witham and would have serious visual and traffic impacts on Rivenhall End.
- 5.38 This site attracted many comments from residents, all opposed, none in favour. The main concerns were: unsuitable for any development, traffic impacts and worsening drainage problems in the area.
- 5.39 Suggestions regarding the future of this land subject to any future A12 widening produced mixed responses.

Town Council Comments

- 5.40 That no objection be agreed for the sites RIVE 362, 363 and 365 – Land to the north of Eastways Industrial Estate, subject to a green buffer of woodland between Rivenhall End and Witham.

Officer Comments

- 5.41 As stated in the response to the above it is considered that site RIVE363 is an appropriate extension for Eastways but that no further development should take place in this location due to the requirement to maintain an appropriate gap between development and Rivenhall End. This site was assessed in the landscape character appraisal as having medium to low capacity to accommodate development and is therefore less suitable for development than the adjoining sites.

RIVE361 Old Rectory Meadows

- 5.41 The site is situated to the north of Forest Road between the builders yard and Rectory Lane. The site is close to but not directly adjacent to the proposed development site approved in the Core Strategy.
- 5.42 The site is 3.5ha in size and is being proposed for residential development. Whilst the landowner has not submitted a number of homes, we estimate it could accommodate between 80 and 90 homes if constraints were limited.

Sustainability Appraisal

5.43 The site was found to have a significant negative effect on local wildlife sites.

Parish Council Comments

5.44 RIVE 361 – Former parkland behind Old Rectory off Forest Road - The Parish Council opposes this proposed new allocation. It would be a further loss of the land between Witham and Rivenhall. The site has high wildlife value. This site attracted comments from residents, all opposed apart from two who supported.

5.45 The main concerns were: Loss of green areas between Witham and Rivenhall, not suitable for development.

Town Council Comments

5.46 That RIVE 361 – Old Rectory Site, Rivenhall, would be unsuitable for development because of the constraints of the Listed Building and the wildlife site.

Officer View

5.47 The site is situated with a large part of the site as a designated Local Wildlife Site and is the historic of the grade 2 listed rectory. However the site owner has submitted a report setting out they do not believe that the site no longer meets the criteria for a Local Wildlife Site. Notwithstanding this issue there are concerns regarding the impact on the listed building and on the protected rectory lane which bounds the site and currently provides the only access point to the development site. It is not clear from the submission where access is proposed to be taken from the site but it appears this may be possible from the existing Rectory driveway or from Forest Road, but in either case the removal of trees would be required to widen access.

RIVE366a and RIVE366b

5.48 The sites together are 22.4ha in total and the developer is proposing up to 350 homes across the two sites.

5.49 RIVE366a is the larger of the two sites and stretches between the railway line and Rickstones Road, mainly to the north west of the existing allocated site known as 'Forest Road'. The site is mainly agricultural uses with some golf course but this has been proposed to be moved outside of the development area. It is proposed to retain the current hedging and ponds on the site and provides open space to the Rickstones Road to the end of the site. Accessed is proposed through the existing development off Oak Road and from Rickstones Road between existing properties.

5.50 RIVE366b is a much smaller frontage development onto Rickstones Road opposite the open space. The site does not include the builders yard which is located to the rear. A single access to Rickstones Road is proposed.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 5.51 The site scores well in relation to proximity to schools, bus stops and employment but less well in relation to agricultural land, access and proximity to local wildlife site.

Parish Council Comment

- 5.52 RIVE 366 (a) – Land off Forest Road and alongside Rectory Lane - The Parish Council opposes this proposed new allocation. It would be a major loss of the agricultural land between Witham and Rivenhall and would add to the more than doubling of the population of the parish already committed to in site RIVE 360. It would greatly add to the peak time traffic congestion and dangers at the sub-standard A12 junctions and along the roads into Witham, which BDC has already flagged up as a possible Air Quality Monitoring location due to worsening traffic related air pollution. The proposed access on to Rickstones Road is wholly unacceptable as the sight line to the left (towards Witham) is almost non-existent and Rickstones Road is narrow at this point with narrow footways. The development would greatly impact on the Protected Rectory Lane, both visually and by adding more traffic on this very quiet lane used by pedestrians. Site RIVE 360 offers very little in the way of services and facilities and the Parish Council voices strong concerns about the growing deficits of healthcare and primary school and pre-school places.
- 5.53 This site attracted a large number of comments from residents, all opposed apart from one who supported a much smaller area for housing in the former farm yard area subject to local road junction improvements.
- 5.54 The main concerns were: Rickstones Road access unsuitable, merger of Witham and Rivenhall, major harm to Rectory Lane as a quiet Protected Lane, lack of services and facilities, loss of agricultural land.
- 5.55 RIVE 366 (b) – Field off Rickstones Road opposite School Playing Field - The Parish Council opposes this proposed new allocation. It would be a further loss of the agricultural land between Witham and Rivenhall.
- 5.56 This site attracted many comments from residents, all opposed apart from one whom supported. The main concerns were: Loss of countryside, traffic.

Town Council Comments

- 5.57 That RIVE 366a and RIVE 366b – Land in the Parish of Rivenhall, are not sustainable as there is a lack of infrastructure to make the development sustainable.

Officer Comments

- 5.58 The site is being proposed for a 'phase 2' of the approved site at Forest Road, within Rivenhall Parish. This would bring a total of around 700 new homes to this area. This is in addition to other sites in the vicinity which could deliver additional homes. Whilst the site is in close proximity to education and employment opportunities and could be considered within walking distance of

the railway station, it is further away from the main facilities in Witham town centre.

- 5.59 The site would completely border the protected lane at Rectory Lane and whilst vehicle traffic would be discouraged the nature of this quiet lane would be changed by residential development along its entire length.
- 5.60 At its closest point the development would be within around 400m of Rivenhall main village. RIVE366b would join development at Witham with the built development of homes at Rickstones Road in Rivenhall. Development in this location would extend the built form of Witham beyond its current extents, changing the character of the journey between Witham and Rivenhall, with as viewed from Rickstones Road, the edge of built development at Witham marked by the entrance to Forest Road.
- 5.61 It is not proposed to allocate either site at this time, however additional homes are required then this site could be reconsidered, subject to the traffic implications of development.

RIVE521 Land off Parkgate Road

- 5.62 This is a site of 0.77ha which is being proposed for residential development. The site is some distance from Rivenhall itself, although within the Parish is around ¼ of mile from the edge of Silver End.

Officer Comments

- 5.63 The site is made up of a serious of redundant or poor quality agricultural buildings which as they are located adjacent to the road and are of some scale are visually quite intrusive. The site is located adjacent to a residential property, however given the distance to settlements and facilities and the lack of public transport and safe walking routes, it is not proposed to allocate this site for development.

6. Hatfield Peverel

- 6.1 Hatfield Peverel is a Key Service village in the 2011 Core Strategy and is proposed to retain that designation within the new Local Plan. This means it is one of the larger more sustainable villages in the District. The village has a good range of everyday facilities including a primary school, doctors' surgery, local shops and pubs and has a mainline railway station to London Liverpool Street, with journey times of around 45minutes.
- 6.2 The village has open space, education, allotments and churchyard protected as such. These designations are proposed to remain.
- 6.3 Hatfield Peverel are in the process of preparing a neighbourhood plan, which if approved will provide the local development plan policies and allocations for the village. The neighbourhood plan can allocate different sites for development within the Parish as long as they provide for at least as many homes as the Local Plan is proposing. However strategic site allocations can

be excluded from this process. Overall the sites below, including the site on the edge of Hatfield Peverel Parish but on the edge of Witham could provide around 550 new homes (450 of which on the strategic extension on the edge of Witham). It is proposed therefore to go out for consultation on the draft Plan on that basis but to continue to work with the neighbourhood plan group and agree sustainable deliverable sites which are deliverable for the number of homes proposed.

- 6.4 The village has two local centre boundaries marking the main area of retail uses within the village and again these are proposed to remain in the new Local Plan.

HATF310 Land adjacent Walnut Tree Cottage

- 6.5 Land adjacent to Walnut Tree Cottage. The site is being proposed as an extension to the development boundary to accommodate 3 new dwellings and is 0.19ha in size. A planning application was refused on the site last year and is currently the subject of an appeal.

Parish Council View

- 6.6 Do not support

Officer View

- 6.7 The site is located on a thin strip of land between the road and the A12. It is recognised that the site is adjacent to the development boundary and is not being kept in a good condition by its current owner and therefore does not make an ideal gateway into the village. Nevertheless the site is located in an area where the District Council believes it would be unsuitable for new homes due to the impacts of noise and pollution.

HATF321 Land between Hatfield Peverel and Witham

- 6.8 This site is between Hatfield Peverel and Witham to the south side of the A12. The site is approximately 68ha and is currently open land including 4 large reservoirs. Given the presence of the water on the site, despite its size, the developer is proposing the site for up to 500 new homes.

Parish Council View

- 6.9 Do not support

Officer View

- 6.10 The site is an extremely large site which would deliver a small total number of houses at a very low density. The landscape does have a medium capacity to accommodate change, however it would almost completely fill the gap between built development at Hatfield Peverel and at Witham. The site does have the potential to be a route for a bypass for Hatfield Peverel to take traffic directly from the Maldon direction to the A12. However this route is unfunded and would require a new junction on the A12 which could not be funded by the development. It is therefore recommended to not include the site for

development at this time, but to continue to push the highways authorities to explore opportunities for a bypass route to the A12 in this vicinity.

HATF317 Land off Gleneagles Way

- 6.11 This site is known as land off Gleneagles Way and is 5.2ha. The developer estimates the site could deliver 135 new homes and currently the subject of a planning application.

Parish Council View

- 6.12 Do not support

Officer View

- 6.13 The site is situated adjacent to the development boundary of Hatfield Peverel, adjacent to existing properties. It is in an area of medium landscape capacity. However there is a serious concern over the potential access to the site, both within the residential road network which leads directly to it and increasing the traffic that comes out of this residential area onto the main road in very close proximity to the A12. As such it is not considered suitable for allocation.

HATF313 Sorrels Field

- 6.14 This site known as Sorrels Field is a 1.93ha site submitted for residential development for between 50 and 70 new homes. The site has been subject of a withdrawn planning application and was allocated as a residential site in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. Additional allocations of a new link road to the Arla Dairy site and some structural landscape were proposed.

Parish Council View

- 6.15 Supported subject to the emerging NDP and the provision of the access road to Arla Dairy site.

Officer View

- 6.16 The site was allocated as a residential site previously. Since that time further information on noise and air pollution have been considered. It is proposed that the site still remains suitable for residential development, but that the density of development may be less than previously expected given the need to include an appropriate distance from the A12. In the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan document it was proposed to add a link road requirement across the site from the A12 slip road to the Arla Dairy site to allow HGVs to travel more directly from the site avoiding the centre of Hatfield Peverel. Given that the site is now more limited in development and the consultation on the closure of the Arla Dairy facility (see below) it is not proposed to carry forward the allocation of a HGV suitable link road across this residential site. However the developer may wish to consider including a potential link to the Arla Dairy site in order to facilitate potential redevelopment in the future.

Arla Dairy

- 6.17 The site has not been proposed by the landowner for redevelopment, however we note that a consultation is currently underway on the closure of the plant. Given its uncertain future and the likelihood of the site being suitable for other uses it is proposed at this stage to de- allocate the site for employment uses, but leave it as unallocated land in the development boundary.

HATF314 Land to the South of Stone Path Drive

- 6.18 This site to the south of Stone Path Drive in Hatfield Peverel is around 11ha in size and was being proposed by the developer for approximately 45 units with the remaining 6.3ha being open space.

Parish Council View

- 6.19 Do not support

Officer View

- 6.20 The site is situated adjacent to current built development and the development boundary for Hatfield Peverel. It is in an area which has a medium capacity to accommodate change. A planning application has just been received for around 70 homes and open space. The site is within walking distance of the main community facilities, although is on the opposite side of the village to the railway station. Significant planting would be required to Crabbs Hill and appropriate traffic management measures put in place to prevent significant numbers of additional vehicles using this lane, given its rural nature and the protected lane status further south. It is therefore recommended to allocate part of the site for residential development and part of the site new open space which is located outside of the development boundary.

HATF311 The Vineyards

- 6.21 The site known as the Vineyards is being proposed for residential development and is 7.6ha in size with the potential for up to 150 new homes. Access would be taken from the existing access onto the A12 slip road.

Parish Council View

- 6.22 Part of The Vineyards – supported subject to the emerging NDP

Officer View

- 6.23 The site was originally proposed to be allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan but was not carried forward to the final draft. The site is situated within a medium capacity landscape area to accommodate change. The site is primarily open agricultural land although there is a woodland area around the existing properties on the entrance. If pedestrian access can be achieved through the existing residential development it would be extremely well located for access to the railway station.

6.24 Access to the site is difficult, as it is located on the A12 slip road. Whilst there is a wide entrance to the site, the bend in the road and the speed of traffic travelling onto or off of the A12 may be dangerous, particularly for vehicles stopped in the road coming from the A12 to turn right into the site. Investigation into the site in 2013 by Highways England consultants noted that the access could be possible for 30 new homes, if various measures and improvements were made, however concern was noted that the average speed assessment of vehicles using the road may be lower than normal due to traffic management works which were in place on the bridge at the time of the study. Since 2013, Highways England have announced the scheme to widen the A12 to 3 lanes between Chelmsford and Colchester by 2020. It is not known at this time how this would affect the A12 in this location and the potential for the improvements or amendments to the junction and slip road from which this site gains its access. As such it is proposed not to allocate this site given the current uncertainties around the access onto the site in relation to the A12 widening project.

HATF319 Land adjacent to Ambleside, London Road

6.25 This is a 0.5 ha site submitted for residential development.

Parish Council View

6.26 Do not support

Officer View

6.27 The site is situated at some considerable distance from the development boundary of Hatfield Peverel adjacent to 3 other residential properties. The site is currently a small field. Whilst there is a bus stop adjacent to the site, given the significant distance between the site and local facilities it is not considered appropriate to allocate for development.

HATF315 and HATF316 Wood End Farm

6.28 The two sites has submitted stretch from the A12 slip road in the south the railway line to the north and is bounded on the western boundary by the residential development at Lodge Farm. The site is currently mainly farmland with a frontage development of commercial development and takeaway food trailer which makes a poor quality gateway into Witham. The larger rear site is 16ha, the smaller frontage around 2ha. Together they may deliver up to 450 new homes

Sustainability Appraisal

6.29 The site scores well in relation to proximity to transport facilities and bus stops in particular but less well in the distance to some facilities.

Town Council View

6.30 That HAT 315 – Land to the south of Lodge Farm has potential but road improvements would be required before development was sustainable.

- 6.31 That HAT 316 – Land to the south of Lodge Farm would be suitable for development.

Parish Council View

- 6.32 HATF 315 Land at Woodend Farm London Road – not supported
- 6.33 HATF 316 Land at Woodend Farm (including Mayfield Nursery) London Road – not supported

Officer Comments

- 6.34 The sites are located within a medium landscape capacity to accommodate new development, and is therefore one of the most suitable places on the edge of Witham, in landscape terms to accommodate new development. It is anticipated that a site of this size may be able to accommodate around 450 homes, although detailed work on masterplanning is yet to take place. The site would be required to include appropriate buffers to the railway line and a countryside edge to the development. Given the community facilities located on existing sites at Lodge Farm and Maltings Lane it is likely that contributions will be sought to things like education and community facilities, although the site would need to provide allotments, open space and play space and affordable housing on site. Some aspect of commercial or retail development could also be considered on the frontage to the A12. Proposals to expand the A12 to three lanes are unlikely to have a significant impact on this site, although there is the potential for changes to the junction arrangements which could potentially have implications for the front part of the site.
- 6.35 Beyond this site it is intended that a green buffer be designated between Hatfield Peverel and Witham to ensure that the village and town retain their own independence and character.

“Policy - Strategic Growth Location at Wood End Farm, Witham

A Strategic Growth Location has been identified at Wood End Farm Witham and is shown on the proposals map. It is expected that this location will provide up to 450 new homes.

It is expected that the development of the site will provide for;

- *Up to 450 new homes of a mixed size and type appropriate to the area*
- *Affordable housing as per the Councils requirement*
- *Formal and informal open space, play space and allotments including an appropriate countryside edge to the development and buffering to the railway line.*
- *A site for or contributions to a new primary school and contributions to early years and secondary education*
- *Contributions to other community facilities including health provision as required by the NHS*

Appropriate vehicular access and improvements as necessary to local road network. Contributions and a route for a cyclepath/footpath between the site and Hatfield Peverel railway station.

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”.

7. Nounsley

- 7.1 Nounsley is within Hatfield Peverel Parish but has its own development boundary. There are no other allocations or designations within the village although there is a protected lane and a registered historic park and garden located to the north east of the village. The village has a public house which is currently closed but no other local facilities.

HATF318 land off Sportsman Lane

- 7.2 This is a small site of 0.14ha which is being proposed for 3 homes. It is adjacent to but outside the development boundary.

Parish Council Views

- 7.3 Do not support

Officer Comment

- 7.4 This is the frontage of a large field and there are no natural boundaries. The front of the site is heavily vegetated and adjacent to the entrance to a historic park and garden. The development boundary for Nounsley is not on this side of the road with both the pub and properties on this side of the road being outside of the development boundary. It is therefore not proposed to allocate this site.

HATF320 Land adjacent Badgers Oak, Nounsley Road

- 7.5 Land adjacent to Badgers Oak, Nounsley Road. The site is 0.13ha and is proposed for 3 new homes. The site was considered under site reference HAT15 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan but was not considered suitable for development.

Parish Council Comment

- 7.6 Do not support

Officer Comment

- 7.7 The site is relatively self-contained, appearing to be former residential curtilage and is separated by some vegetation from the main agricultural field behind. The road is very narrow to the front of the property and slopes downwards towards the ford which can often flood the road here. Adjacent properties on this side of the road including Badgers Oak are not located within the development boundary and as such it is not proposed to make any changes in this location.

HATF322 West of Nounsley Road

- 7.8 A 3ha site off Nounsley Road which currently includes a property and fishery business. The proposal is for up to 4 new homes.

Parish Council Comment

- 7.9 Do not support

Officer Comment

- 7.10 The site is situated opposite site HATF320 above and as such shares the same constraints in relation to access. The site has proposed has now road frontage outside areas at risk of flooding and as such any new homes would be built some distance from the development boundary in open countryside. This is not considered an appropriate place for new development.

HATF514 and 515 to the rear of Manor Road/Peverel Avenue

- 7.11 These two sites are adjacent to each other and have been put forward by two separate land owners. Together they are approximately 0.5ha and are being proposed to accommodate a small number of homes. Site 514 would be accessible from Manor Road, whilst site 515 could be accessed from Peverel Avenue.

Parish Council View

- 7.12 Not supported

Officer Views

- 7.13 The sites are small sites which are relatively self-contained within the landscape, with some vegetation between them and the agricultural land behind. Given that Peverel Avenue is an unmade road it may be more suitable to access both sites from Manor Road. The addition of 3 or 4 new homes perpendicular to the current homes would minimise the developments depth into the countryside and could be considered a suitable location for a small number of dwelling in keeping with the adjacent properties could be acceptable, although it is noted that the Parish Council is not supportive of development here.

Recommendations

- 1) **To approve the Inset Map for Witham as shown in Appendix 2 to this report which includes the allocations for development at;**
 - a) **WITC421 Gimsons**
 - b) **WITN425 Chipping Hill Industrial Estate**
 - c) **WITN426 and WITN427 Land at Conrad Road**
 - d) **HATF315 and 316 Land at Woodend Farm (within Hatfield Peverel Parish)**

For residential development

- e) And sites RIVE362 and RIVE363 (in Rivenhall Parish) for employment development.
 - f) To retain allocations for residential development at, Lodge Farm (partly within Hatfield Peverel Parish), Land off Forest Road (within Rivenhall Parish), WITW431 land between Blunts Hall Road and Teign Drive, former Forest Road Community Centre, former Magistrates Court, Ivy Chimneys, land off Constance Close and Maltings Lane.
 - g) To retain employment allocations at site WCHE25 Collingwood Road, Witham.
 - h) To retain comprehensive redevelopment allocations for Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre and Newlands Precinct with appropriate policies
- 2) To approve the Inset Maps for Rivenhall and Rivenhall End as set out in Appendix 3 and not allocate sites RIVE367, RIVE368, RIVE369, RIVE370 and RIVE521 for development.
 - 3) To approve the Inset Map for Kelvedon Park as set out in Appendix 4 allocating the site for specialist employment with the appropriate policy.
 - 4) That the Inset Map for Hatfield Peverel as set out in Appendix 5 is approved and that sites HATF313 Sorrels Field and HATF314 Land to the South of Stone Path Drive are allocated for residential development.
 - 5) That the Inset Map for Nounsley as set out in Appendix 6 is approved and that no sites are allocated for development.

8. Belchamp Walter

- 8.1 Belchamp Walter is a village in the north of the district, approximately 5 km west of Sudbury. It is in close proximity of Belchamp St Paul and Belchamp Otten. The village is within the Stour Valley.

Current policy position

- 8.2 Belchamp Walter has a clearly defined development boundary that follows the perimeter of the existing urban form. The majority of the northern area of the village is designated a conservation area. There is a village hall, however it lacks other facilities. The village is an 'other village' in the 2011 Core Strategy

Sites

- 8.3 No sites submitted.

Parish Council comments

- 8.4 The Parish Council do not support the extension of the existing village envelope for a new area of residential development. The parish council do not own any land within the village and hence has none to allocate for use as

allotments. The Parish Council cannot recommend any small sites that would be suitable for gypsy and traveller pitches.

Officer comments

- 8.5 Any further development of the village would be deemed unsustainable due to the significant reliance of private transport and the lack of facilities within the village. The area is sensitive to change as set out in the Braintree District's Landscape Character Assessment. No sites have been submitted for consideration.

Recommendation

6 That the Insert Map for Belchamp Walter as shown in Appendix 7 is approved and no sites are allocated for development.

9 Bures Hamlet

- 9.1 Bures Hamlet in close proximity to the district borders of Babergh and Colchester Districts. The village has a small train station on a branch line to Marks Tey and a conservation area that covers approximately half the hamlet. The village is constrained by areas at risk of flooding on the east and towards the south of the village.

Current Policy Position

- 9.2 Bures Hamlet is adjacent to Bures St Mary which is within Babergh District Council. Together Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary have a range of services which serve the local population including a doctor's surgery, shop and primary school. With regards to public transport the village benefits from an hourly bus service as well as a railway station on the line between Marks Tey and Sudbury.

Sites that have not been previously assessed

- 9.3 BURE166 is located south of Cambridge Way with an area of 1.1 hectares that is currently agricultural land use.
- 9.4 BURE526 is located at Windy Ridge, Colne Road and has an area of 0.26 hectares.
- 9.5 BURE552 is the site of the former Ambrose Garage site on Colchester Road.

Submitted and assessed previously

- 9.6 Part of the BURE165 has previously been previously submitted under the reference BUR2HALT in the Site Allocations and Development Management. The site has an area of 5.34 hectares and is situated on Colchester Road. It is being proposed for 85 homes with some additional open space on the southern and eastern edges of the site.

Parish Council Comments

- 9.7 BURE165 - Bures Hamlet Parish Council does not support the outline proposals for residential development on this site because our village facilities make development of this scale unsustainable. The primary school is already operating at full capacity and the lack of adequate retail facilities means that all but the basic shopping must take place elsewhere. Also the village surgery would be unable to expand to cope with such a large influx of patients. We also have long-term concerns over the amount of traffic currently using the B1508 and its speed through our village and we would not want to see this volume increased. This site would have access safety issues and would have a particularly unwarranted detrimental visual impact on the countryside of the Stour Valley.
- 9.8 BURE166 - Bures Hamlet Parish Council does not support development of this site as it is designated as reserved for recreational use, an option which the Parish Council may wish to take up when funds permit.
- 9.9 BURE526 - Bures Hamlet Parish Council has no objections in principle to this site being developed for three properties rather than the current development of one property.
- 9.10 BURE552 - Bures Hamlet Parish Council is keen to see this site developed as a convenience store but has always supported a residential component to such development.
- 9.11 With reference to identifying Gypsy sites, although Bures Hamlet has an established site for two pitches in its village, for which planning permission was granted on appeal, the Parish Council remains opposed in principle to this development and would certainly not welcome further intrusions into the countryside outside the 'Village Envelope?'

Officer comments

- 9.12 Though there are several facilities within the cluster of villages that amount to the Bures locality Bures Hamlet is not identified as a key service village.
- 9.13 Looking at the site specific context of BURE165 it is located next to a previously submitted considered site. The site was given the reference BUR1HALT was not considered suitable for allocation primarily on the basis of visual impact and access issues. The site is a very large single field which is visually prominent from Colchester Road. The SA deemed the site to have a potentially beneficial effect on the affordable housing supply. The SA also suggested that there would be a significant negative effect upon the quality of the landscape.
- 9.14 BURE166 is a more contained field but as access is not possible from Cambridge Way, it states within the submission that it would likely require access via the land in the adjoining site submitted, BURE165. On the grounds of visual impact both sites are particularly prominent and would be viewed as having a unwarranted detrimental visual impact of the Stour Valley. The sites could be seen collectively as an inappropriate extension into the countryside.

The SA states that there would be a significant negative impact upon the Landscape Character.

- 9.15 BURE552 is located within the development boundary and also contained within the conservation area and flood zones 2 to 3. The site is a brownfield site and would benefit from some improvement. However the site is located in an area at risk of flooding and contains potential contamination issues. Given the complex issues and that the site is located within the development boundary it is not proposed to give the site a specific allocation but that these issues were considered in more detail through a planning application.
- 9.16 Though BURE526 is not BUR1HALT the site abuts the previously assessed site and the same principles can be applied. There is no pedestrian route to the site and this is undoubtedly an issue with regards to sustainability. The SA also suggested that there would be a significant negative effect upon the quality of the landscape. The site has recently been refused planning for 3 dwellings (planning application reference 15/01020/FUL). It was suggested in the decision notice that the scheme would likely lead to the prospective occupants of the dwellings to be highly reliant on personal modes of transport and as there is no scope for pedestrian access the site is not deemed to be sustainable. It is recommended that the site is not allocated.
- 9.17 BURE165, BURE526 and BURE166 would be unwarranted extensions into the open countryside and have a detrimental impact on the visual appearance of Bures and the locality within the Stour Valley. Bures has limited facilities as a village cluster and on the basis of the above considerations it is deemed an unfavourable location for further development. BURE 552 is a site with scope for development however due to the potentially complex parameters it is advised that the site should not be allocated for a particular use at this stage.

Recommendation

7 That the Inset Map for Bures Hamlet as shown in Appendix 8 is approved and that no sites are allocated for development.

10 Gestingthorpe

- 10.1 Gestingthorpe is a village in the Braintree District. It is approximately halfway between Halstead and Sudbury. The village is situated at a set of crossroads of North End Road, Nether Hill, Sudbury Road and Church Street.

Current Policy Position

- 10.2 Gestingthorpe is classed as an 'Other Village'. Land within and adjacent to the settlement boundary is currently protected for open space, visually important open space and a churchyard.

Sites submitted and assessed previously

- 10.3 GEST237 – The site is on North End Road, adjacent to Pound Farm in Gestingthorpe with an area of 0.6 hectares. The site was previously submitted as part of GES2/3 in the last call for sites.

- 10.4 GEST238 - The site is at Pound Farm Corner with an area of 1.8 hectares. The site has also been submitted previously in the last call for sites under the reference GES1.
- 10.5 GEST239 - Land at Boulders, Nether Hill, Gestingthorpe and has an area of 0.04 hectares. The site was previously submitted as part of GES2/3 in the last call for sites.
- 10.6 GEST240 – The site is to the south of Boulders, Nether Hill, Gestingthorpe and has an area of 1.32 hectares. The site was previously submitted as part of GES2/3 in the last call for sites.

New Sites

- 10.7 GEST241- The site is adjacent to Bridge Cottage on North End Road and has an area of 1.2 hectares.

Parish Council Comments

- 10.8 Gestingthorpe Parish Council reiterates its satisfaction with the consultation between Officers and the PC in 2011 and its contentment with the Local Plan proposals accepted by BDC in 2012. We remain committed to general principles in our detailed letter of response dated the 18th of November 2010 and the in the Village Design Statement. We believe that the lack of employment in the village, the narrow lanes without separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and the remoteness from key services, A roads, railways and centres of employment, make any housing developments in the Parish, beyond those required for local needs, unsustainable.
- 10.9 GEST237 Oppose. The PC confirms its strong opposition to development of the north side of this part of North End Road.
- 10.10 GEST238 Oppose. The PC opposes this and also suggests the addition of official Visually Important Space status to the area of this site horizontal hatched in yellow on the appended plan. Parts of this site are untidy, limited redevelopment allowable under Countryside Policy could help tidy it. The District Council would have greater control over any (re)development if the land remains outside the Village Envelope.
- 10.11 The south east corner of this site should be a Visually Important Space, close to the heart of the village. The pond and nearby trees make an important contribution to the village scene and the southern edge is part of the first impression on entry from the west. Except for lowering vegetation that obstructs the sightline at the crossroad, the PC would not like to see major change to this area.
- 10.12 GEST239 Oppose. The PC reaffirms its objection to extending the Village Envelope any further north along Nether Hill than the position agreed in 2011/12, on the grounds given then.
- 10.13 GEST240 Oppose. The PC reiterates its objection to back-land development and hence objects to this site.

- 10.14 GEST241 No Comment. This is in effect an application to extend the North End Envelope. As the original Envelope, part of the site and all properties overlooking the site (except the applicant's) are in the Parish of Little Yeldham, the PC is content to leave Little Yeldham PC to comment on this application.

Officer Comments

- 10.15 Gestingthorpe is designated as an 'other village'. The village has very little service provision and comparably low sustainability potential for further development. With regard to the principle of further development in Gestingthorpe planning policy would deemed any allocation of sites with in the village unfavourable. The village is considered as an unsustainable location for further development.
- 10.16 Looking at each site on individual merit highlights no significant reason to alter the recommendation to not allocate any sites submitted in Gestingthorpe as set out below.
- 10.17 Specifically GEST239 would be deemed unacceptable as this would constitute ribbon development. An Appeal Decision on the 18th of August 2015 refused the site saying;
- "The site is at the edge of the village and adjoins open countryside. It is at the end of a row of houses along Nether Hill and is said to have previously had a house on it which was demolished some time ago. The submitted information indicates that there is a shed on the site but on my visit I saw that the site is overgrown with vegetation and the shed was not visible from the road".*
- 10.18 As the site has returned to nature the site is suggested to not be included in the allocation process.
- 10.19 As the four sites submitted are all adjoining and under the same ownership it would seem logical to assume some of the overarching points made by the inspector are relevant to all four sites.
- 10.20 The view of the planning policy is in line with the findings of the inspector that the development of sites within Gestingthorpe would lead to occupants becoming reliant on car usage to a significant extent.
- 10.21 Based upon the existing character of the village GEST240 is not recommended for allocation due to this effectively representing a backland development scheme into open countryside.
- 10.22 It is also recommended that GEST238 is allocated as the built form on site currently is distinct from the other more established urban block within the village. Therefore a potential infill on the site would change the current natural break with in the street scene.
- 10.23 Finally GEST237 is also not recommended for allocation due to the site being deemed to be ribbon development and further encroachment into the countryside.

- 10.24 In addition to the commentary on the site allocations; there is a recommendation of several minor adjustments to the development boundary to rationalise the perimeter to incorporate development that has been allowed via planning applications since the development boundary was last reviewed.
- 10.25 The proposed alterations have are in the appendix to this report. To the west side of Nether Hill the south of urban block on the west side of Nether Hill, there is a small change recommended. The development boundary runs through the middle of two properties and it is suggested that the boundary should include the entire built forms. At the most westerly point of the village on the north side of Sudbury Road a small affordable housing scheme has been developed and it is suggested that the plots perimeters are incorporated in the development boundary. Similarly to the south the development boundary runs through the middle of one dwelling and currently excludes another from the village envelope. It is proposed that the development boundary should be moved to incorporate these dwellings.
- 10.26 These minor corrections are recommended to reflect the true nature of the development boundary with in Gestingthorpe currently. On the contrary the amendments are intended to define a robust development boundary that aims to stop further potential unwanted development.
- 10.27 GEST241 in line with the remarks of the parish council will be dealt in the report that is looking at the site allocations of North End.
- 10.28 The Parish Council has suggested a new area for allocation as visually important space. However officers do not agree with this with this view as the use of RLP4 is more appropriate for open space rather than hedging. However officers would like to make it clear that if there was to be any development in the future in the vicinity of the hedge that it should be retained.

Recommendation

8 That the Inset Map for Gestingthorpe as set out in Appendix 9, is approved with the three minor amendments to reflect the development within the village but that no sites should be allocated for development.

11 Helions Bumpstead

- 11.1 Helions Bumpstead is a small village in Essex located near Haverhill and the Essex/Suffolk/Cambridgeshire borders. It is 2 miles from Steeple Bumpstead. The centre of the village is marked by the crossroads and village green. There is also a meadow with a pond in the centre of the village. This report also deals with sites submissions in and around the hamlet of Pale Green to the North East of the village.

Current Policy Position

- 11.2 Helions Bumpstead and Pale Green both have clearly defined development boundaries, the later which was proposed as part of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. This is partially to stop coalescence between the two built areas. Both sit within the Bumpstead Farmland Plateau

which recognises the area as potentially highly sensitive to change. It is notable that only one site submitted in the current process abuts Helions Bumpstead and all 7 other sites submitted are effectively requests for development in Pale Green.

Sites that have not been previously assessed

- 11.3 HELI323 is land to the rear of Krikseys, Haverhill Road, Pale Green. The site has an area of 0.26 hectares and is currently part of an agricultural field.
- 11.4 HELI326 is to the north of Chestnut Lodge, Pale Green and has an area of 0.46 hectares.

Submitted and Assessed Previously

- 11.5 HELI324 has been previously submitted as HEL2 in the previous call for sites. The site is the land between Slate Hall and Chestnut Lodge, Haverhill Road, Pale Green and has a site area of 0.91 hectares.
- 11.6 HELI327 has been previously submitted as HEL3 in the previous call for sites. The site is adjacent and South West of Chestnut Lodge, Pale Green and has an area of 0.24 hectares.
- 11.7 HELI328 has been previously submitted as HEL4 in the previous call for sites. The site is the land between Haven Cottage and the water tower in Pale Green the site has an area of 0.27 hectares.
- 11.8 HELI329 has been previously submitted as HEL7 in the previous call for sites. The site extends from the current development boundary along Mill Road and the perimeter ends adjacent to Steeple Bumpstead Road. The site has an area of 2.13 hectares.
- 11.9 HELI330 has been previously submitted as HEL10X in the previous call for sites. The site is located on the land adjacent to Timbers, Pale Green and has an area of 0.1 hectares.
- 11.10 HELI325 has been previously submitted as HEL5 in the previous call for sites. The site is located between Hilltop Villa & Allemagn, Pale Green. The area of the site is 0.62 hectares.

Parish Council Comments

- 11.11 HELI324 – The Parish Council would support any development of this site solely for light commercial use but objects to any housing development.
- 11.12 HELI325 – The Parish Council has no objections to the development of this site and would like it to be included inside the village envelope.
- 11.13 HELI326 - The Parish Council would support the allocation of this site for allotments but would object to it being developed.
- 11.14 HELI327 – The Parish Council has no objections to the development of this site.

- 11.15 HELI328 – The Parish Council has no objections to the development of this site.
- 11.16 HELI329 - The Parish Council would not support the allocation of this site for development because the site is considered to be too large and, if fully developed, would adversely change the nature of the village.
- 11.17 HELI330 – The Parish Council has no objections to the development of this site. It recommends the extension of the village envelope to include this site and land extending from this site to HELI325.

Officer Comments

- 11.18 Helions Bumpstead is classed in the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations Plan as an 'Other Village'. It is also worth noting that the development boundary change to the rear of St Andrews Church in Helions Bumpstead, which was proposed in the SADMP is considered to still be suitable and is retained. Below the specific site context and constraints shall be considered.
- 11.19 HELI329 is particularly large in size. The site is outside the development boundary and abuts the conservation area. The allocation of the site would not be respectful of the built form of the village and landscape characteristics. The proposed extension to the village boundary would also equate to a further coalescence between Helions Bumpstead and Pale Green. As stated in the Braintree District Landscape Character Assessment the Bumpstead Farmland Plateau is sensitive to large scale development. The SA report also was uncertain on the effect of this site with regards to the conservation area commenting '*the site is located adjacent to a conservation area and there are several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site. The site has a marginal impact on the conservation area. It is unknown whether mitigation or enhancement is possible.*'
- 11.20 In principle further development of Pale Green is not favourable. There are no facilities and the road lacks any pedestrian routes. Furthermore there is no opportunity to introduce a footpath alongside Haverhill Road. Though Pale Green has a development boundary the built form is particularly fragmented and rural in nature. Infill of the dwelling clusters would be deemed unfavourable as the character of the hamlet would be detrimentally effected.
- 11.21 Site HELI324 is has a history of site submission and relevant planning history. The site has been allocated as business usage previously through the site allocation process. Prior to this there has been an attempt to gain residential usage on part of the site that was declined on appeal in 1991. The reasoning given by the planning inspectorate gave regard to the development would adversely affect the rural character of the vicinity. The site is also within the curtilage of the grade II listed Slate Hall Farmhouse and the redevelopment of the site would potentially impact on the character. However the Employment Land Needs Assessment suggests that the council could de-designate the site employment cluster (Slate Hall Farm) as it is not currently performing well. With this in mind it is recommended that the current employment designation is removed and that the site is left undesignated and remains within the village

envelope so that an appropriate scheme is brought forward; with employment usage or otherwise.

- 11.22 HELI325 is a proposed infill between two small clusters of dwellings and is deemed as an unwarranted coalescence between the two clusters and would be detrimental to the character of the Hamlet.
- 11.23 HELI330 is similarly to HELI325 a proposed infill between two small clusters of dwellings and is deemed as an unwarranted coalescence between the two clusters and would be detrimental to the character of the hamlet.
- 11.24 HELI328 is a proposed allocation between two small clusters of dwellings and is deemed as an unwarranted coalescence between the two clusters that would be detrimental to the character of the Hamlet.
- 11.25 HELI323 is a proposal to develop the land to the rear of a small residential cluster of 3 dwellings. The development would be viewed as inappropriate backland development.
- 11.26 HELI327 is not viewed favourably as this would amount to built infill and further lead to a further level of coalescence within the hamlet.
- 11.27 HELI 326 is currently allocated as allotments. The site is suggested for residential use by the applicant. However, the site is unfavourable for redevelopment as the site would lead to a built form that is uncharacteristic to the current linear clusters of Pale Green. Furthermore it would be deemed as inappropriate backland development that is an unwarranted encroachment on open countryside. Site has no natural boundary to three sides and has not been taken up as an allotment. It is suggested that the site is not allocated for residential usage and the allocation as an allotment and for the site to return to 'open countryside'. If a need for allotments arises in Pale Green then this shall be addressed in the future.
- 11.28 In conclusion area of Helions Bumpstead and Pale Green are particularly sensitive to change, and no further coalescence or extension into open countryside is encouraged. Pale Green has several small clusters of dwellings and the infill of any of the sites would detrimentally change the character of the hamlet. It is concluded with significant regard to the landscape character and lack of sustainability viable within the area that no sites are allocated within Helions Bumpstead or Pale Green.

Recommendation

9 That the Inset Map for Helions Bumpstead as set out in Appendix 10 is approved including the proposed development boundary for Pale Green.

12 Great Maplestead

- 12.1 The village lies north west of Halstead 10 miles north of Braintree. The village has a Village Hall, playing field, Primary School and church (grade 1 listed)

and is visited by the Mobile Library. The churchyard is a Local Wildlife site and an archaeological site.

Current Policy Position

- 12.2 Great Maplestead has a development boundary in the form of 3 separated clusters. The main settlement lies to the north with two smaller clusters on Lucking Street and Baretts Hall Road/ Mill Lane to the south and east.
- 12.3 The village has a Local Wildlife Site, Archaeological site, education. There are two playing fields one of which has a recreation designation. There are a number of listed buildings, protected trees (individually and group designations). The southern part of the Lucking Street cluster lies in Flood zones 2 and 3. Part of the southernmost development cluster lies on Mill lane which is a Protected Lane.
- 12.4 Great Maplestead had a development boundary alteration through the 2014 SADMP in the vicinity of Treeways.
- 12.5 A Village Design Statement was published in 2014.

Sites submitted and assessed previously

- 12.6 The following sites were submitted and considered during the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan process.
- 12.7 GRMA256 (formerly GRM1), Adj Long Fen, Church Street, Gt Maplestead, 1Ha gross for residential development.
- 12.8 GRMA257 (formerly GRM3), Land at Purls Hill, east of Pink House, Great Maplestead, 0.24 gross for 1 dwelling. GRM3 was a smaller site.
- 12.9 GRMA259 (formerly GRM5), 0.34 ha at Treeways, Church Street, Great Maplestead for a proposed boundary realignment to follow rear site boundary.

New sites

- 12.10 No additional sites submitted during the 2014 Call for Sites.

Parish Council Comments

- 12.11 The Parish Council rejects all of the proposed sites and considers that the development boundary should remain as presently drawn.
- 12.12 The Parish welcomes this further consultation on GRMA 259 (Treeways) though it remains concerned that this is a “retrospective consultation” to put right earlier decisions made in respect of this site.

Officer Comments

- 12.13 GRMA256 (formerly GRM1). Currently garden land and proposed for 1 dwelling. Although Great Maplestead has a school church and hall, it lacks other key facilities such as a grocery store, doctors’ surgery, post office and therefore would be an unsustainable location for green field development. This site could accommodate 25 dwellings and this scale of development

would be more appropriate in a larger village with key facilities and which would be more sustainable. Inclusion would run contrary to the Development boundary Review criterion which excludes curtilage land which has the capacity to significantly extend the built form of the settlement. Recommend that GRM1 is not included within the settlement boundary

- 12.14 GRMA257 (formerly GRM3). This proposal increases the size of the site previously submitted and known as GRM3. It now includes a tapering area of land to the east. This site does not adjoining the existing boundary. It would be impossible therefore to include these sites within the development boundary without allowing large areas of land for infill which would not be justified given the lack of key facilities. Inclusion would run contrary to the development boundary review criterion which excludes isolated and sporadic development clearly detached from the main built up area. Recommend that GRM3 is not included within the settlement boundary
- 12.15 GRMA259 (formerly GRM5). This proposal seeks to amend the development boundary to follow the rear site boundary instead of a line bisecting the garden. The development boundary at this site was already proposed for alteration as a result of the Site Allocation and Development Boundary process (GRM5). The Pre submission plan showed the development boundary altered from the Local Plan Review 2005 version to show the site included predominately within the settlement boundary though with some of its outer edges remaining outside within the countryside. The Council has received a representation (GRMA259) as a result of the call for sites 2014 requesting that the development framework be amended again to follow the rear boundary of Treeways instead of excluding two triangular areas from the village framework.
- 12.16 Following the pre submission plan and after the call for sites was initiated, a planning application (15/00914) for 3 dwellings (one being a replacement) was received and approved. The application site followed the rear boundary of the garden included two small areas hitherto shown as countryside. These two areas are shown in the plans as garden. They are small, awkwardly shaped and together with their location in relation to approved houses and other parts of the boundary are unlikely to play a significant role in protecting rural character at the village edge.

Recommendation

10 To approve the Inset Map for Great Maplestead as set out in Appendix 11 with the amended development boundary but no sites allocated for development.

13 Little Maplestead

- 13.1 Little Maplestead lies north west of Halstead. It has a population of 270 with 115 homes (2011 Census). Other than a restaurant close to the northern village cluster there are no services or facilities within the village boundary. Its church, St John the Baptist, is one of few surviving medieval round churches in England and there is a Local Wildlife site at Seven acre wood within the parish.

Current Policy Position

13.2 The Site Allocations and Development Management Plan village boundary comprises three blocks of ribbon development on Cock Road and School Road separated by countryside west of the A131 (Sudbury Road). There is scattered development elsewhere in the Parish. These boundaries are identical to those in the Local Plan Review.

13.3 The village is categorised as an “Other Village” in the Core Strategy hierarchy of settlements, Local Plan Review and Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.

Sites submitted and assessed previously

13.4 Three sites were proposed by landowners for inclusion within the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan see below. Two of these sites were previously considered through the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan process.

13.5 LITM 340 previously identified as LIM2, Land between formerly The Cock PH and Anfield. Inclusion of land within development boundary for residential use (0.08ha).

13.6 LITM342 previously identified as LIM1. Land at Cock Road, Inclusion of land within development boundary for residential use.

13.7 Both sites were considered at the Committee meeting of the 7th December 2011. It was considered that the services and facilities in Little Maplestead were limited and the village was considered an unsustainable location for the proposed scale of development then proposed.

New Sites

13.8 One additional site is now proposed, not been previously submitted:

13.9 LITM341 Open land adj Littlehame, east of the A131 and its frontage development (0.19ha). 2 dwellings area proposed. Also, 10 dwellings surrounding the site east of the Sudbury Road should be included within the village boundary though no plan is supplied showing the proposed framework boundary.

Parish Council Comments

13.10 The Parish Council objected to the sites put forward in the committee of the 7th December 2011, and all proposals to extend the boundaries.

13.11 The Parish Council wish to repeat their earlier comments put forward to the Committee meeting of the 7th December 2011 which are as follows:

13.12 Do not support LITM342 (formerly LIM 1), LITM 340 (formerly LIM 2),

13.13 Do not support extension of village envelopes.

13.14 Do not support removal of village envelopes.

- 13.15 Advised that there are no suitable sites for gypsy and traveller pitches in the village.

Officer Comments

- 13.16 In relation to LITM 340 and LITM 342 it was previously considered that as the services and facilities in Little Maplestead are limited, extension of the village envelope to accommodate further development would be inappropriate as it is an unsustainable location. The village remains an unsustainable location and hence the extension of its framework remains inappropriate.
- 13.17 LITM341 proposes inclusion of open land for 2 dwellings within boundary. Housing allocations are made for sites of 10 dwellings or more therefore this site is too small to be an allocation. The representation also adds that the proposed development site once accommodated a row of cottages which were demolished in the 1960s.
- 13.8 This village has few services and facilities and as such, still represents one of the less sustainable locations within the District. The proposed boundary extension would include low density properties with larger curtilages. If boundaries were drawn around this larger area they would encourage a scale of development in excess of that considered appropriate in a settlement with such a low provision of services and facilities.

Recommendation

11 That the Inset Map for Little Maplestead as set out in Appendix 12 is approved and that no sites are allocated for development.

14 Little Yeldham and North End

- 14.1 Little Yeldham and North End are to the east of Great Yeldham in a rural location. There are few local amenities. Bus Services are intermittent and the nearest key Service Village, Sible Hedingham, is over 4.5 miles from each village. Halstead is the nearest Main Town and this is approximately 8 miles from the villages.

Current Policy Position

- 14.2 Little Yeldham is recognised in the Core Strategy 2011 as an 'other village.' The village has limited key services and facilities including a church and village hall. As proposed in the last round at the request of the parish, the recreation ground was allocated as a formal recreation space and the village green was recognised as a visually important space. There is also an area protected for car parking to the rear of the village hall and the church yard is protected as such.
- 14.3 It was proposed to remove the settlement boundary at North End in the Core Strategy and this was carried forward to the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan 2014.

New Sites

- 14.4 LITY343 – A site adjacent to the mousetraps, Hall Green. The site is 0.54 hectares and is proposed for a single new dwelling.
- 14.5 LITY344 – withdrawn. (Sewells Farm, North End Road, Little Yeldham)
- 14.6 GEST241 – whilst technically within the Parish of Gestingthorpe, it is considered within the Little Yeldham and North End Committee report as it is essentially an application for development within the North End hamlet.

Parish Council Comments

- 14.7 Gestingthorpe Parish Council GEST241 - No Comment. This is in effect an application to extend the North End Envelope. As the original Envelope, part of the site and all properties overlooking the site (except the applicant's) are in the Parish of Little Yeldham, the PC is content to leave Little Yeldham PC to comment on this application.
- 14.8 LITY 343 – Land adj to Mousetraps, Hall Green – Opposed because this site is outside the Village Envelope and on a dangerous corner where numerous road traffic accidents have occurred over the years.
- 14.9 GEST 241 – Land adj Bridge Cottage, North End – Please note that the correct location is North End and not North End Road. This site is opposed on four grounds (i) it is outside the village envelope (ii) it is on a very narrow section of road, which is potentially dangerous, (iii) it will generate more traffic along inadequate lanes and (iv) it is in a flood zone where there has been extensive flooding on several occasions over the years and it is ludicrous to consider development on sites, which are liable to flood and where there is a long history of flooding.
- 14.10 With regard to Little Yeldham generally, the Parish Council opposed any development outside the village envelopes and this continues to be the case.

Officer Comments

- 14.11 With regards to the principle of development within Little Yeldham and North End; as there are very few facilities within Little Yeldham; it is deemed to be an unsustainable location for further development. There is only an intermittent bus service to and from the villages and private car usage would be relied upon to a significant extent. The area is also within the Yeldham Farmland Plateau which the Landscape Character Assessment suggests is visually sensitive to change and that the potential expansion of villages, such as Little Yeldham and North End could be conspicuous.
- 14.12 With Specific regards to GEST241 the site area is 1.49 hectares. The site is particularly prominent from several vantage points and the irregular and large site would significantly change the character of the hamlet.
- 14.13 LITY343 is a site of more modest proportions however is located in a very small cluster within the hamlet on a particular prominent corner in an elevated

position. The development of this site could be deemed to have a negative effect upon the visual character of the village.

- 14.14 In conclusion the sites submitted for consideration are not favourable for site allocation as they are both in prominent locations within the landscape and unsustainable for new development.

Recommendation

12 To approve the Inset Map for Little Yeldham, as set out in Appendix 13 and not allocate any sites for development

13 To remove the development boundary for North End, as set out in Appendix 14 and for the village to be located within the Countryside.

15 Pebmarsh

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

Current Policy Position

- 15.2 The village is identified as an 'other village in the Core Strategy. The village has three development envelopes that close relate to the dwelling clusters. The village also has a conservation area that is predominately formed around Pebmarsh Road, The Street and Mill Lane within the same region as the central development boundary.

Submitted and assessed previously

- 15.3 PEBM348 is located to the rear of the properties on the south side of Cross End. The site has been previously assessed under the reference PEB8 on the last call for sites. The area of the site is 0.36 hectares.
- 15.4 PEBM349 is a site situated between village hall the Church. The site has been previously been submitted and assessed under the reference PEB1. The site has an area of 0.17 hectares.
- 15.5 PEBM350 is situated west of Kings Mead, Water Lane and has been previously been considered in the last call for sites under the reference PEB3. The site has an area of 0.31 hectares.
- 15.6 PEBM351 is a site on Oak Road, north of Hamsters Close with an area of 0.83 hectares and has been assessed in the last call for sites under the reference PEB2.
- 15.7 PEBM352 is located on the north side of Pebmarsh Road and is the vacant Playing Field. The area of the site is 1.10 hectares. The site has been previously assessed under the reference PEB4.

Parish Council Comments

- 15.8 PEBM348 (which was PEB 8). We previously gave qualified support to a house being built here. Since then a full planning application has been made by the owner which was turned down.
- 15.9 PEBM349 (PEB 1). This site is close to the church and within the Conservation Area. Part of it is used as a footpath between the Village Hall Car Park (the Church has no car park) and the graveyard next to the church. As we said last time we consider it quite unsuitable for development.
- 15.10 PEBM350 (PEB 3). This is a possibility for very limited development (one or two houses at the most), in support of our general agreement to very limited village 'infilling'. The site has problems however, (a) the land is significantly higher (3 metres plus) than the land on which neighbouring houses are built. It would be essential for this height to be reduced accordingly, otherwise any house would dominate that part of the village, most of which is in the Conservation Area, and (b) There is a bus shelter on the edge of the site which we would not want moved. It is right in the centre of the village and there is no other suitable site nearby. Telegraph posts would also be affected. There could also be strong local objection to any development here and we would object to development of any size beyond one or two houses. The SA report suggested there could be a significant negative effect upon the historic environment and heritage assets.
- 15.11 PEBM351 (PEB 2). Contrary to what we said in 2012, we see no reason to extend the village at all, North of the current village envelope which ends at Hamsters Close.
- 15.12 PEBM352 (PEB 4). This is more difficult. This space has been the village playing field for over 40 years and is the only flat space of this size in the village. We would obviously prefer that it remained so. However, the Pebmarsh football team has – at least for the moment – disbanded and the owner (who in fairness has allowed the village to use this space without charge for many years), now wishes to develop it. In fact he has clearly had this in mind for many years because the space was first submitted to be part of the Local Plan some considerable time ago. The football posts have been taken away, because they were apparently a danger and the Football Club's changing facilities are also to be removed, because they are in a bad state of repair.
- 15.13 If this site is no longer going to be designated as 'formal recreation', we would consider a development of a few houses on the Eastern side (i.e. next to Clay Hills), provided that the rest of the site could then be designated as 'formal recreation' in perpetuity. This space would not be big enough for a full size football pitch, but would be significantly better than nothing. The remainder of our 2012 comments stand and we may well want to undertake a public consultation when the draft plan is published next year. In addition, the Parish Council does not wish the development boundary to change and no Gypsy and Traveller sites were put forward.

Officer Comments

- 15.14 Pebmarsh has a wide range of dwellings of different tenure however has limited other facilities to sustain large scale growth and limited public transport. The village has a relatively high sensitivity to change with regards to the visual impact of new development, as stated in the Landscape Character Assessment of the Braintree District.
- 15.15 PEB348 is considered in principle as inappropriate back land development. The access to the site is particularly narrow and difficult. Planning permission has been refused and dismissed on appeal in 2002. The site is also outside the development boundary.
- 15.16 PEB349 is a site between the Church and Village Hall. This site is a significant location within the conservation area and development here could impact on the character of the area.
- 15.17 PEB350 is located on a very prominent site which is significantly raised above the level of the street. Development here would be very prominent and amount to a detrimental and unfavourable impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is recommended that the development boundary is not amended to incorporate the land. The SA indicated that the site could have a potentially significantly negative effect upon the adjacent conservation area and the several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site.
- 15.18 PEB351 is considered as ribbon development between Clay Hills and Oak Farm. The access along the road is particularly poor and the extension of the dwelling cluster to the south into open countryside is not warranted. There is no boundary currently between the proposed site and the rest of the field which allows for a pleasant approach to the cluster to the south and indeed, to the wider village with panoramic views across open farmland.
- 15.19 PEB352 is located north of The Street. The site is a vacant playing field with an unused pavilion within the grounds. Though the site is currently vacant this is not reason enough to allocate the land for an alternative use. The site currently performs as a visual break between the central development and the properties on the corner of Pebmarsh Road and the unclassified lane. The site is particularly visible on the approach into Pebmarsh and any development would undoubtedly be viewed as an unwarranted extension into the countryside. The development would effectively amount to a large scale infill and lead to a coalescence of the western and central development envelopes which would change the character of the village detrimentally.
- 15.20 In conclusion it is for the reasons stated above considered that no site within or in the immediate vicinity of Pebmarsh should be allocated within the new local plan. The SA only commented upon the significant negative impact on the historic environment and heritage assets with regard to PEB350.

Recommendation

14 The Inset Map for Pebmarsh as set out in Appendix 15 be approved and that no sites are allocated for development.

16 Sturmer

16.1 Sturmer is a village 2 miles south east of Haverhill and close to the county border with Suffolk. The village is predominately centred on Rowley Hill, the main road through the village.

Current Policy Position

16.2 Sturmer is recognised as 'other village' by the Core Strategy 2011. Much of the northern side of the village is located within an area at risk of flooding and there are no other allocations within the village, although it is noted that a protected lane leads into the village from the south.

16.3 Part of Sturmer Parish sits within what is known as the Haverhill bypass and therefore includes part of the allocated employment site within this location, which is protected for employment uses.

Sites that have not been previously assessed

16.4 STUR405 is the site of Woodlands Hotel & Restaurant on Coupals Road the site has an area of 1.23 hectares. The site is proposed for 32 residential dwellings.

16.5 STUR407 is located on land north of Phoenix Road and effectively is part of Haverhill Business Park. The site has an area of 1.89 hectares and the site has been proposed for employment use.

16.6 STUR523 is located to the rear of The Spinning Wheel on The Street. The site area is 1.08 hectares.

Submitted and Assessed Previously

16.7 STUR406 is a site east of Crunch Croft in Sturmer and has an area of 0.46 hectares. The site has been previously assessed in the last call for sites under the reference STU1. At the time of this report the site is currently pending a decision via a planning application with the reference 15/01492/FUL.

Parish Council Comments

16.8 STUR405 – The Parish Council considers the site too far from the village envelope to be considered for housing and seeks the existing usages of restaurant and hotel to remain. There is a concern from the parish that the change of use may lead to St Edmundsbury District council to expand into Sturmer.

16.9 STUR406 – The Parish Council has concerns that the development of the site would lead to a loss of trees and wildlife habitat. The Parish Council want highlighted that the site was rejected by the planning inspectorate and that there would be a potential detrimental impact on the residents of Crunch

Croft. There was a minority view expressed by some members of the Parish Council that limited development could be permissible subject to severe environmental controls.

16.10 STUR407 – The Parish accepted the proposed allocation.

16.11 STUR523 – If the site was to be included there should be some affordable housing and the residents of Sturmer would require a financial contribution through section 106 for the village.

Officer Comments

16.12 Sturmer is a village with limited services and is recognised as an 'other village' in the Core Strategy 2011. Though there is no general requirement for further development in Sturmer due to the lack of sustainability with proposed development within the village each site has been addressed on the merits of the specific sites context below.

16.13 STUR407 is located to the North of Phoenix Road, Haverhill. With regard to this the site is essentially a planned commercial extension to Haverhill. The site will provide job prospects for those in the vicinity. Therefore the council concurs with the Parish Council that STUR407 should be allocated for development. The site has been allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan 2014 under the reference STU3E. The site will be retained for employment use.

16.14 STUR405 should not be allocated for housing. The site currently is beyond the development boundary of the village and is effectively an employment site. The site as noted by the Parish Council currently contains a significant amount of large trees and there is a fear that the development of the site would lead to a detrimental change in the visual characteristic of the area. However an appropriate reuse of the building would be considered.

16.15 STUR406 – The District Council concurs with the Parish Councils comments on this. The development of the site would undoubtedly amount to a detrimental impact of the residents of Crunch Croft. Furthermore the site would lead to a loss of natural habitat and there is no change in circumstances within the local context with regards to service provision in Sturmer since the planning inspectorate rejected an appeal.

16.16 STUR523 – The proposed development would be regarded as an unwarranted encroachment on the countryside, out of character with the linear nature of the village. Furthermore the site would amount to inappropriate backland development.

Recommendation

15 The Inset Map for Sturmer village, as set out in Appendix 16 be approved, and that no sites be allocated for development.

16 That the Inset Map for Sturmer west, as set out in Appendix 17 be approved.

17 Toppesfield

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

Current Policy Position

- 17.2 Toppesfield is a small village that is recognised by the Core Strategy as an 'other village'. The village has a clearly defined development boundary and the central area based around the historic core which is a conservation area. The school and churchyard are protected as such.

Sites that have not been previously assessed

- 17.3 TOPP408 is located on land north of The Thatchings, Gainsford End and has an area of 1.37 hectares.
- 17.4 TOPP409 is located on land at Gainsford End, to the south of Mission Hall. The site has an area of 0.81 hectare.
- 17.5 TOPP411 is situated to the north of Park Lane and has an area of approximately 1 hectare.
- 17.6 TOPP412 is located at Church Farm Barn on Church Lane. The site has an area of 0.03 hectares.
- 17.7 TOPP413 is located on Church Farm Barn and includes the store on Church Lane. The area of the site is approximately 0.15 hectares.

Submitted and Assessed Previously

- 17.8 TOPP410 is located to the west of The Causeway opposite numbers 11 through to 35. The site has been previously assessed in a previous call for sites as part of a larger site under the reference TOP1X. The area of the site is 0.6 hectares.

Parish Council Comments

- 17.9 The Parish Council held a public consultation regarding the sites submitted and the feedback was reflected in the Parish Council's comments. There were general concerns over the infrastructure and amenities within the village and the ability to sustain further growth.
- 17.10 Though there were mixed views regarding each site it would seem that some sites are more preferable to others. However no site was unanimously supported. The TOPP411, TOPP412 and TOPP413 were viewed more favourably as a whole than other sites submitted during the call for sites process.

Officer Comments

- 17.11 Toppesfield is a village with limited services and is recognised as an 'other village' in the Core Strategy 2011. Gainsford End is considered to be open countryside within the Core Strategy 2005. The SA report did not assess any site submitted in Toppesfield or Gainsford End. Notwithstanding this each site has been considered on its own specific merit.
- 17.12 TOPP408 is located to the north of Gainsford End. Though the site abuts the built form of the settlement the development of this site could be deemed to be an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside.
- 17.13 TOPP409 is a site located in between two clusters of built form. The development of this site would amount to a large scale infill and have a potentially detrimental change in the characteristic of the village.
- 17.14 TOPP410 is located to the west of The Causeway. The development of this site would undoubtedly change the characteristic of the village as there is relatively dense linear development on the other side of the road, but primarily open fields opposite. The change could be deemed to be detrimental to the character and setting of the listed Berwick Hall to the south of the site.
- 17.15 TOPP411 is isolated from the rest of the built form clusters. Currently an agricultural field between it and the yard/commercial built development. The road is single carriage between existing properties and would require significant upgrades. The size of the development and its poor relationship with the rest of the village make it detrimental to the character of Toppesfield.
- 17.16 TOPP412 and TOPP413 are located adjacent to each other to the rear of Church Lane. The development of either site would be considered inappropriate backland development and is not complimentary to the current built form. The site is also in close proximity to St Margret's Church and there is a concern on the impact of the grade 1 listed building and surrounding conservation area.

Recommendation

17 That the Inset Map for Toppesfield as set out in Appendix 18 is approved and no sites are allocated for development.

Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Replacement Waste Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation 2016		Agenda No: 6
Portfolio	Environment and Place Planning and Housing	
Corporate Outcome:	A sustainable environment and a great place to live, work and play A well connected and growing district with high quality homes and infrastructure	
Report presented by:	Alan Massow, Senior Policy Planner	
Report prepared by:	Alan Massow, Senior Policy Planner	
Background Papers: National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Practise Guidance (NPPG) National Planning Policy for Waste Waste Capacity Gap Report Replacement Waste Local Plan (2015) Essex County Council Waste Local Plan (2001) Waste Management Plan for England (2013) Braintree District Council Adopted Local Plan Review (2005) Local Plan Sub-committee Report – Replacement Waste Local Plan (2015) – July 2015.		Public Report: Yes
		Key Decision: No
Executive Summary: <p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council have agreed to plan jointly on waste matters, through the preparation of a new joint Waste Local Plan. Once adopted, the Plan will supersede the current Waste Local Plan from 2001.</p> <p>The Replacement Waste Local Plan will set a strategy for waste development to 2032. Once adopted the Plan will safeguard existing waste capacity, allocate sites suitable for waste facilities, and include policies for the management of future waste development.</p> <p>Two sites in the District (Cordons Farm near Galleys Corner, and the Rivenhall Airfield site) have been identified for allocation. Cordon's Farm is proposed for allocation for municipal waste management which reflects its current permission. Rivenhall Airfield is also identified as an opportunity site to provide additional waste management.</p> <p>Seven other sites in the District have been identified as having potential for future waste management facilities and are referred to as "Areas of Search". A number of other small scale existing facilities are also highlighted.</p> <p>The Council responded to the first consultation outlining a number of comments, the main objection was to the intensification of uses at IWMF2 – Rivenhall site for additional</p>		

waste management capacity. Other more minor comments and corrections were suggested made which have been incorporated into the new draft.

The latest draft is the Replacement Waste Local Plan Submission Draft (2016). It is currently out for consultation until the 14th April 2016. The purpose of this engagement opportunity is to consider the soundness of the Plan ahead of submission for independent examination by a Planning Inspector later in 2016.

The soundness of the plan would be considered against 4 criteria. They are;

Positively Prepared – based on an assessment of the development and infrastructure required over the plan period consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Justified – based on proportionate evidence and the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.

Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working.

Consistent with National Policy – enable the delivery of sustainable development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommended Decision:

The the following comment is submitted in response to the consultation.

We note and welcome the changes which Essex County Council has made in response to objections raised by Braintree District Council during the previous round of consultation. However, it is considered that the Pre-Submission Replacement Waste Local Plan (2016) is unsound on the basis that it is not consistent with National Policy. The plan identifies IWMF2 – Rivenhall Site, as suitable for allocation for management of biological waste treatment, and other wastes. The Local Authority is of the opinion that this site is not sustainable as it does not contribute toward the environmental goal of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF. It does not contribute to the protection or enhancement of the natural environment, or the prudent use of natural resources or the minimisation of waste.

Whilst we are aware that the site now has planning permission, additional waste capacity would be detrimental to the countryside. This is because it would be an intensification of industrial activity in the countryside, would have environmental impacts on the countryside and local residents which could include light pollution and noise, and would impact on local lanes and the A120.

The sites allocation for “management of other wastes” does not provide local residents or the Council any certainty over what future uses the site and its surroundings would be expected to accommodate. It therefore provides an unacceptable level of uncertainty over the future implications for the local residents, the local environment and the surrounding highway network.

Purpose of Decision:

To respond to the Pre-submission Replacement Waste Local Plan.

Corporate Implications	
Financial:	Costs associated with the collection of household waste.
Legal:	The Council is the waste collection authority with responsibility for the collection of municipal.
Safeguarding:	N/A
Equalities/Diversity:	N/A
Customer Impact:	Proposals will impact on customers.
Environment and Climate Change:	The transportation, collection and disposal of waste can have significant implications for the environment. The consultation document proposes to reduce impact on the environment and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The document is subject to Sustainability Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment.
Consultation/Community Engagement:	The consultation is for 6 weeks and concludes 14 th April 2016.
Risks:	That the replacement waste plan is found unsound, which could delay the provision of adequate waste facilities.
Officer Contact:	Alan Massow
Designation:	Senior Policy Planner
Ext. No:	2577
E-mail:	alan.massow@braintree.gov.uk

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council have agreed to plan jointly on waste matters, through the preparation of a new joint Waste Local Plan. Once adopted, the Plan will supersede the current Waste Local Plan from 2001.
- 1.2 The Replacement Waste Local Plan will set a strategy for waste development to 2032. Once adopted the Plan will safeguard existing waste capacity, allocate sites suitable for waste facilities, and include policies for the management of future waste development.
- 1.3 Two sites in the District (Cordons Farm near Galleys Corner, and the Rivenhall Airfield site) have been identified for allocation. Cordon's Farm is proposed for allocation for municipal waste management which reflects its current permission. Rivenhall Airfield is identified as an opportunity site to provide additional waste management.
- 1.4 Seven other sites in the District have been identified as having potential for future waste management facilities and are referred to as "Areas of Search". A number of other small scale existing facilities are also highlighted.
- 1.5 The Council responded to the first consultation outlining a number of comments, the main objection were to the intensification of uses at IWMF2 – Rivenhall site for additional waste management capacity. Other more minor

comments and corrections were suggested, which have been incorporated into the new draft.

- 1.6 The latest draft is the Replacement Waste Local Plan Submission Draft (2016). It is currently out for consultation until the 14th April 2016. The purpose of this engagement opportunity is to consider the soundness of the Plan ahead of submission for independent examination by a Planning Inspector later in 2016.
- 1.7 The soundness of the plan would be considered against 4 criteria. They are;
- Positively Prepared – based on an assessment of the development and infrastructure required over the plan period consistent with achieving sustainable development.
 - Justified – based on proportionate evidence and the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.
 - Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working.
 - Consistent with National Policy – enable the delivery of sustainable development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 Future Waste Capacity

- 2.1 Essex along with Southend does not have sufficient capacity at its existing waste management facilities to secure the maximum recovery of waste through methods such as recycling and composting. More facilities will be needed to enable a sustainable approach to waste management up to 2032. Landfill (including landraising) is the least preferred method of waste management.
- 2.2 In order to meet the future needs of the Plan area, waste development will be permitted to meet the identified shortfall in capacity;
- Up to 217,000 tonnes per annum of biological treatment for non-hazardous organic waste;
 - Up to 1.5 million tonnes per annum for recovery of inert waste;
 - Up to 200,000 tonnes per annum for waste treatment; and
 - Up to 50,250 tonnes per annum for the disposal of stable non-reactive hazardous waste.
- 2.3 Members will notice that these figures have been adjusted since the previous consultation. The level of biological treatment for non-hazardous organic waste has fallen, at has the figure for treatment of other waste. The amount of tones for the recovery of inert waste (1.27 million tonnes per annum increased to 1.5 million tonnes) and stable non-reactive hazardous waste has increased from 50,000 to 50,250 tonnes per annum. This is because of an update to the 2014 Waste Capacity Gap Report published in December 2015.

- 2.4 The Council had no comment to make regarding the change in levels of future waste capacity.

3 Site Assessments and Areas of Search

- 3.1 An area of search encompasses a particular area within which a waste management facility could be delivered. They differ from direct site allocations which represent the exact outline of where a proposed facility is intending to be delivered. Employment land was identified as the land use type most appropriate to base a county wide project on. The areas identified are considered suitable for B2 (general industry) and/or B8 (Storage or Distribution) as defined in the areas Local Plan.
- 3.2 The preferred areas of search within Braintree District remain;
- 3.3 Bluebridge Industrial Estate, Halstead; Earls Colne Airfield; Eastways, Crittall Road, Waterside Business Park, Freebournes Industrial Estate, Witham; Skyline 120, Great Notley; Springwood Industrial Estate, Braintree and Sturmer Industrial Estate.
- 3.4 Applications for waste uses on these sites would be subject to a planning application in the usual way and factors such as neighbouring uses, amenity, noise, smell and traffic generation would be taken into account.
- 3.5 The Council submitted comments regarding Springwood Industrial Estate and Broomhill Industrial estates which have resulted in a change to the draft Plan. The areas of search are otherwise considered appropriate.

4 Preferred Site Allocations

- 4.1 The Council has raised objections to the intensification of uses at site IWMF2 – Rivenhall Site for additional waste management capacity on the grounds of intensification of industrial activity in the countryside, environmental impacts on the countryside and local residents, including light pollution and noise, and impact on local lanes and the A120.
- 4.2 The pre-submission waste plan retains the allocation of IWMF2 – Rivenhall Site as a suitable allocation for biological waste treatment, and a site suitable for allocation for management of other waste.
- 4.3 The current wording of the allocation for “management of other wastes” does not provide the Council or local residents with any certainty over the future use of this site beyond what has been granted planning permission. It raises a level of unacceptable uncertainty over the future uses of the site and implications that they could have on local residents, the local environment and the surrounding highway network.

5 Next Steps

- 5.1 Once the pre-submission consultation concludes on the 14th April 2016, Essex County Council anticipates submission to the planning inspectorate by June 2016. The examination in public will be held in September 2016, with main

modifications on soundness and legal compliance. The Inspector's report is estimated to be in November 2016, with adoption in December 2016.

6 Recommendation

- 6.1 That the following comment is submitted in response to the consultation.
- 6.2 We note and welcome the changes which Essex County Council has made in response to objections raised by Braintree District Council during the previous round of consultation. However, it is considered that the Pre-Submission Replacement Waste Local Plan (2016) is unsound on the basis that it is not consistent with National Policy. The plan identifies IWMF2 – Rivenhall Site, as suitable for allocation for management of biological waste treatment, and other wastes. The Local Authority is of the opinion that this site is not sustainable as it does not contribute toward the environmental goal of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF. It does not contribute to the protection or enhancement of the natural environment, or the prudent use of natural resources or the minimisation of waste.
- 6.3 Whilst we are aware that the site now has planning permission, additional waste capacity would be detrimental to the countryside. This is because it would be an intensification of industrial activity in the countryside, would have environmental impacts on the countryside and local residents which could include light pollution and noise, and would impact on local lanes and the A120.
- 6.4 The sites allocation for “management of other wastes” does not provide local residents or the Council any certainty over what future uses the site and its surroundings would be expected to accommodate. It therefore provides an unacceptable level of uncertainty over the future implications for the local residents, the local environment and the surrounding highway network.