

Report on consultation responses to the Draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and proposed amendments in response to these.

Portfolio Area: Cllr Harley Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Culture

Report Presented by: Eleanor Dash Planning Policy Manager

Background Papers: Draft SHLAA
Consultation Responses to Draft SHLAA
Please refer to table at end of report.

Corporate Implications:

Options:

1. To approve the proposed amendments to the draft SHLAA.
2. Not to approve the proposed amendments to the draft SHLAA.

Risks: That the SHLAA might require further amendments.

Executive Summary

This report sets out part of the draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which will form part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework. It summarises responses to the consultation on the draft SHLAA and proposes changes to be made to the draft SHLAA in response to those comments.

Decision

1. To note the consultation responses to the draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and to approve the proposed amendments in response to these.

1. Background

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment is a key part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework. It identifies sites that have development potential for housing and assesses their developability, deliverability and capacity. It includes information on the likely timescale for site development and demonstrates:-

- a) That in order to meet the Regional Spatial Strategy housing requirement for this District up to 2026, that it will be necessary to include growth locations with a capacity to provide a minimum of 1400 dwellings. (The Draft Core Strategy provides for 1400 dwellings on proposed growth locations at present.)
- b) That there is a five year supply of housing land, as required by the Government.
- c) That it will be necessary to phase the development of the growth locations over the latter part of the plan period, to ensure that there is a continuous five year supply of housing land throughout the plan period.

The draft SHLAA is set out in full on the Planning Policy website at;

<http://www.braintree.gov.uk/Braintree/planning/Planning+Policy/LDF+Evidence+Base/Draft+Strategic+Housing+Land+Assessment.htm>

This report includes the introduction to the SHLAA (Appendix 1), summary schedule of identified supply (Appendix 2) and the list of persons consulted on the draft study (Appendix 3).

2. Consultation

There were two stages of consultation on the SHLAA. Site owners and agents were contacted early on during the preparation of the study about potential sites and asked whether they wanted their land to be included in the SHLAA, and were requested to provide information on capacity and deliverability.

Secondly, key stakeholders including statutory bodies, the Housing Market Partnership, developers and agents were consulted on the draft SHLAA in August/September. The comments that were received are summarised in Appendix 4 to this report.

Appendix 1 – SHLAA Contents and Introduction

Braintree District Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Draft for Stakeholder Consultation September 2009

1. Introduction

Purpose

1.1 This is the first Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) for Braintree District. This assessment, which is a requirement set out in the Government's *Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3)*, identifies sites that have development potential for housing over the period up to 2026. It forms part of the evidence base, which supports the Local Development Framework.

1.2 The form of this SHLAA is based on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments Practice Guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in July 2007.

1.3 The purpose of the SHLAA is to identify sites with potential for housing, assess their housing potential and consider if and when they are likely to be developed. This will assist the Council's decision making in respect of growth locations and housing allocations in Local Development Documents. It will help to ensure that land availability is not a constraint on the delivery of housing needed to meet the district housing requirement, set out in the East of England Plan, adopted in 2008.

1.4 It is important to note that the SHLAA provides evidence to support decision making; it does not determine which sites should be developed for housing. Potential sites identified through the SHLAA will be tested through the plan making process for Development Plan Documents, by way of Sustainability Appraisal, public consultation, and independent examination. Inclusion of a site in the SHLAA does not mean that site will be allocated; moreover the non-inclusion of a site in the SHLAA does not prevent a site being considered further.

1.5 The SHLAA will assess future housing supply against a short term target for a five year supply, and a longer term target of a fifteen year supply for the Local Development Framework. PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify sufficient specific, deliverable sites to deliver housing in years 1-5, and developable sites in years 6-10 and where possible 11-15. Broad locations of growth have been identified where needed.

1.6 The base date of the assessment is April 2009. As at 2009, the assessment for the five year supply requirement relates to the period April 2010-March 2015. In the Local Development Framework, the Council needs to plan for sufficient housing for a period of 15 years from the date of adoption of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy is planned to be adopted in 2011, which means the assessment will examine the period up to 2026.

1.7 The East of England Plan requires the District to make a minimum dwelling provision of 7,700 dwellings between 2001 and 2021. For the period 2021-2026, the District should plan for provision of an annual average of 385 dwellings.

1.8 The SHLAA is intended to be a “living document” and will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis to demonstrate that a rolling supply of deliverable and developable housing sites is available over the short, medium and long term.

1.9 The purpose of this report is to explain the methodology and to set out the initial findings of the Assessment.

1.10 The table below sets out the annual net housing supply achieved 2001-2009 and the outstanding housing required to meet the East of England Plan target.

Table 1 Housing Land Requirement

East of England Plan target for Braintree District 2001-2021	7,700
Roll forward at RSS annual rate of 385 dwellings per annum 2021-2026	1,925
= East of England Plan target for Braintree 2001-2026	9,625
Braintree Annual net housing supply achieved 2001-2009:	
2001-2002	647
2002-2003	659
2003-2004	854
2004-2005	693
2005-2006	507
2006-2007	658
2007-2008	628
2008-2009	352
Total:	4,998
Outstanding requirement for Braintree District 2009-2026	4,627

1.11 The SHLAA consists of this introduction, which describes the process undertaken and summarises the results, together with schedules, which provide site by site details of the assessment for each sub-area examined. A set of maps indicate the location of the individual sites and of the growth locations, and each site record includes a location plan. Individual site assessments are included for sites with an estimated capacity of 10 or more dwellings. These assessments examine the deliverability/developability of sites; whether the sites are suitable, available and achievable (the definition of these terms is set out in Stage 7 of the DCLG SHLAA Practice Guidance) and estimate when a site is realistically expected to be developed.

1.12 Braintree District is within the East of England Region and geographically is the second largest district in Essex. The mid-year population estimate for 2008 was 142,100 and just over half of this population live in the three main towns of Braintree, Halstead and Witham. The six largest villages in the District all have populations of over 3,000 persons and are referred to as Key Service Villages in the draft Core Strategy.

Stage 1 Planning the Assessment

1.13 This study relates solely to land within Braintree District. A joint Housing Market Assessment was carried out for the local authorities of Braintree, Chelmsford and Colchester and published in February 2008. The timescales for the preparation of local development documents and evidence for each local authority differ, so the preparation of a joint SHLAA was not practicable and it was therefore decided that Braintree would not prepare its SHLAA in partnership. However these authorities, as well as other adjoining authorities and the Housing Market Partnership will be consulted on the Braintree SHLAA, to try and achieve consistency across the County and sub region.

1.14 The SHLAA is being prepared by a project team within the District Development Department at Braintree District Council. A draft SHLAA will be published for consultation purposes. The draft SHLAA and comments received will be scrutinised by the Council's Local Development Framework Panel. The Panel will decide what amendments should be made to the SHLAA and approve the final document, as part of the LDF evidence base.

1.15 The Council intends to integrate the SHLAA with the preparation of the Braintree District Local Development Framework, including the progression of the Allocations Document. The Allocations document sets out detailed allocations for housing, employment, retail and other major land uses. Work commenced on the Allocations Document in September 2007. During the preparation of the Core Strategy and Allocations Document, the Council has received many representations proposing development sites, which landowners and developers wished the Council to consider. (These are listed on the Planning Policy webpage of the Council's website.) The assessment of whether to include these sites in the SHLAA followed the criteria set out in Stage 2 below.

Stage 2 Determining which sources of sites will be included in the Assessment

1.16 The assessment **includes** the following sources of supply:-

- Existing housing allocations in the Braintree District Local Plan Review, which had not been developed by April 2009.
- Unimplemented/ outstanding planning permissions for housing.

- Planning permissions for housing that are under construction.
- Two vacant regeneration sites (designated as employment policy areas in the Braintree District Local Plan Review), which the Council has proposed for regeneration, in the draft Core Strategy, with mixed use redevelopment for housing and employment. (At Sible Hedingham and Silver End Key Service Villages).
- Previously developed land and vacant employment sites, which are no longer fit for purpose in the 3 towns and 6 key service villages. (Coggeshall, Earls Colne, Hatfield Peverel, Kelvedon Sible Hedingham and Silver End)
- Surplus public sector land/ buildings.
- Some land in non-residential use that is suitable for redevelopment for housing, where this is not required for future employment purposes.
- Additional housing opportunities in established residential areas.
- Rural exception sites.
- Greenfield sites in the 3 towns and 6 key service villages, which would be a logical rounding off of these settlement boundaries.
- Proposed growth locations, set out in the draft Core Strategy, north-west of Braintree, south-west of Witham and to the north-east of Witham.

1.16 The schedule of large sites, with accompanying plans, sets out details of sites with a capacity of 10 dwellings or more. Small sites of less than 10 are included, which have outstanding planning permissions for housing.

1.17 The assessment **excludes** the following sources of supply:

- Greenfield sites which are outside the current development boundaries of settlements, (other than rounding off of the three main towns and the six key service villages and the proposed growth locations and rural affordable housing exception sites.)
- New free standing settlements.
- Windfalls.
- Sites with identified constraints that are not considered to be achievable.
- Sites required for future employment purposes.

- Sites required for community purposes, including education, recreation, allotments and open space.

Stage 3 Desktop Review of Existing Information

1.18 Sources of information:

- Braintree District Local Plan Review allocations
- The Urban Capacity Study (2007), which sought to identify potential development sites in the three main towns and six largest villages in the District.
- Annual residential land availability survey of the District
- Employment Land Review
- Ordnance survey maps
- Safeguarding records
- Aerial photographs
- Sites which were submitted to the Council for land to be considered for residential development were also included in a preliminary list of sites to be assessed. (Not all of these sites have been included in the SHLAA.)

Stages 4 -7 Determining which sites and areas should be surveyed, carrying out the survey, estimating housing potential and assessing when and whether sites will be developed, their suitability, availability and achievability.

1.19 Potential sites were visited, development progress was assessed and constraints to development were noted.

1.20 The locations of all sites of estimated capacity of over 10 dwellings were mapped and a schedule drawn up identifying constraints. Sites were eliminated where constraints meant that these were unlikely to be achievable. These sites are listed in Appendix 2. Where it was considered that constraints could be overcome in the future, the timescale for development was adjusted accordingly.

1.21 Site ownership was investigated based upon planning histories, submissions of sites to the Council and land registry information. Sites with a large number of owners were excluded, as they were not considered to be achievable for development.

1.22 Site owners and agents of potential SHLAA sites, with an estimated capacity of 10 or more dwellings, were contacted (excluding sites already under construction) and asked to confirm that they owned, or were agents for this land and whether they wanted their sites to be developed for housing. Sites were excluded from the SHLAA where owners indicated that they did not want their land to be developed during the plan period: These excluded sites are listed in Appendix 2.

1.23 Housing capacity was based partly upon existing planning approvals and pre-application meetings with agents and developers.

1.24 Site owners and agents were also asked to give an estimate of dwelling capacity and proposed timing of development. However, some suggested timings, where it was suggested that development would commence within a short timescale, did not seem to be realistic. In these cases, the timings have been reviewed by planning officers to ensure that they are realistic and allow sufficient time for approval of the Allocations Document/ planning permission, as required.

1.25 Planning Development Control officers were consulted on the suitability, capacity, constraints and timing of all the potential large SHLAA sites, apart from those sites which already had planning approval.

1.26 Where owners or agents were unable to estimate the site capacity, this was estimated by the planning survey team, based upon the density of adjoining housing areas, the character of the area and site constraints and noted in the schedule as being an estimate by planning officers.

1.27 Independent advice was sought on the viability of sites.

Stages 8 and 9 Review of the Assessment and Identifying and Assessing Housing Potential of Broad Locations

1.28 An initial review of the amount and timing of housing development that could come forward on SHLAA sites, other than broad growth locations, was undertaken prior to the publication of the Core Strategy Preferred Options. This indicated that there was a shortfall of housing supply that was required to meet the Regional Strategy requirement for Braintree District. Broad growth locations were identified in the Core Strategy Preferred Options, which provided a total of 1400 dwellings. It was intended that the housing provision identified in the growth locations could be increased or decreased if necessary when the final results of the SHLAA were available.

1.29 A further review of the supply identified in the draft SHLAA has confirmed that a total of 1400 dwellings in the growth locations is sufficient to meet the housing requirement. The proposed phasing of these greenfield growth locations has been included within the draft SHLAA. Development of these new growth locations is phased towards the latter part of the plan period, to ensure that there is a rolling five year housing land supply throughout the plan

period. This timing will allow time for the approval of masterplans and provision of infrastructure in these locations and is aimed to provide a realistic annual rate of development, which can be realistically marketed.

Stage 10 Determining the Housing Potential of Windfalls

1.30 The SHLAA is based upon specific sites and broad growth locations. It does not include a windfall allowance.

Consultation on the Draft SHLAA

1.31 Consultation will be undertaken in respect of the draft SHLAA with the Housing Market Partnership and key stakeholders. A list of persons and organisations who will be consulted is set out in Appendix 1. The draft SHLAA will be made available on the Council's website.

Appendix 2 - Summary Schedule of Identified Supply (subject to amendment)

Appendix 3 – List of Persons Consulted

Position	Company/Organisation
Senior Design & Planning Executive	George Wimpey East London
Development Director	Higgins Homes Plc
Managing Director	Bellway Homes Essex
	First Grosvenor Properties Ltd
Director	Parkland Developments Ltd
Managing Director	David Wilson Homes
Land Manager	J S Bloor (Sudbury) Ltd
Business Development Manager	Flagship Housing Group
Head of Business Development	Flagship Housing Group
Development and Regeneration	Chelmer Housing Partnership
Manager	
Project Manager, Development Team	Home Group
Regional Head of Development	Hastoe East
Development Manager	Hastoe East
Project Manager	Colne Housing Society Ltd
Associate	Bidwells
Project Officer	Family Mosaic
Managing Director	Iceni Homes Ltd
Assistant Director of Development &	Swan Housing Association Ltd
Regeneration	
Managing Director	Knight Developments
Development Director	Persimmon Homes Essex Ltd
Managing Director	Mersea Homes
Housing Research and Development	Braintree District Council
Manager, Strategic Housing	
Planning Policy Manager	Babergh District Council
Planning Policy Manager	Colchester Borough Council
Director of Sustainable Communities	Chelmsford Borough Council
Planning Policy Manager	Maldon District Council
Senior Planning Policy Officer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Principal Planning Officer	Uttlesford District Council
Planning Policy & Specialist Services	St Edmundsbury Borough Council
Manager	
Development Manager	Greenfields Community Housing
The Clerk	Coggeshall Parish Council
Parish Clerk	Cressing Parish Council
Parish Clerk	Earls Colne Parish Council
Parish Clerk	Halstead Town Council
Parish Clerk	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council
Parish Clerk	Kelvedon Parish Council
Parish Clerk	Rayne Parish Council
Parish Clerk	Sible Hedingham Parish Council
Parish Clerk	Silver End Parish Council
Parish Clerk	Witham Town Council
Strategic Planner	Home Builders Federation
Senior Planning Manager, Essex,	GOEast
Southend and Thurrock Team,	

Position	Company/Organisation
Development & Infrastructure Division	
Planning Liaison Officer	Environment Agency
Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team	Essex County Council
Senior Network Manager	Highways Agency
Regional Director - East of England	Homes and Communities Agency
Four Counties Government Team	Natural England

Appendix 4 - Table of Responses to the Draft SHLAA Consultation.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
1	Environment Agency	Stage 2 – Determining the source of sites	<p>The document states that sites with identified constraints that are not considered to be achievable will be excluded from the assessment, however it has not been clarified what these constraints are. PPS25 considers flood zone 3b inappropriate for residential development. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should identify these areas.</p> <p>Development should only take place in zones 2 and 3a if a sequential test shows no other areas being available.</p>	<p>The Council will set out a list of identified constraints, which have been taken into account in the SHLAA, which include flood risk. The SHLAA has only included sites outside zone 1, which already benefit from planning permission but have not yet been completed. (eg Bocking Mill) These sites received permission before the revised guidance was issued in PPS25. Several larger sites, including Premdor and Gimsons, include a small area at risk of flooding. However, this would not be included as part of the built-development area of the site. The suggested density of the site would reflect the exclusion of this part from built development.</p>	<p>Add list of constraints used to exclude sites to text in Stage 2 and add reference to these in site records and appendix of excluded sites, where not already included.</p>
2	Environment Agency	Stage 3 – Desktop review of existing information	<p>Planning Policy and planning history will be important for the study. For example, many sites which have been through the planning process have been supported by site specific Flood Risk Assessments, which provide</p>	<p>The level of flood risk has been identified for each of the sites.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>information on the nature of flood risk that will be valuable in the testing stages. Furthermore policy may prevent some sites being appropriate e.g. residential development in Flood Zone 3b.</p>		
3	Environment Agency	Stage 7 – Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed	<p>With regards to informing the suitability and deliverability of the sites, we consider the following environmental criteria should be a consideration;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk (all sources of flooding) • Contaminated land and risk to controlled waters • Ecology/designated sites • Water quality: sewage infrastructure and network • Water resources/supply <p>We note that some of these have been included on the site record sheets.</p> <p>The requirement of PPS25 to apply a sequential test to all planning applications may make</p>	<p>The Council's Water Cycle Study does show which areas are more suited to development but does not indicate any areas where development would be impossible due to water or sewage constraints. Where areas are identified which require more significant changes to the water and sewage network, development would be phased to enable this to take place.</p> <p>Sites which are within or partly within flood risk zones either already benefit from planning permission or exclude the part at risk of flooding from the area for built development. The dwelling capacity has been amended to reflect this constraint.</p>	Noted.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			sites in the flood zone unachievable in the foreseeable future if you identify a significant number of sites outside the flood risk area which are reasonably available and suitable for housing. We note some of the sites included in the study do fall within areas of flood risk.		
4	Essex County Council (Planning)	Table 1 Page 3 – Housing Requirement	<p>We consider the net dwelling stock change for 2008/9 as follows;</p> <p>Gross Completions – 415 Loss of residential to residential – 73 Loss of residential to no residential – 4 Net dwelling stock change – 338</p> <p>Consequently completions over the 2001 – 2009 period amounts to 4984 and outstanding requirement 2009 – 2026 is 4641 dwellings.</p>	Agree	Draft dwelling stock change figures were included in the draft SHLAA. Amend table to reflect finalised 2008/9 figures
5	Essex County Council	Para 1.15	Include a direct link to website where sites can be viewed.	Agree	Add suggested web link.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
	(Planning)				
6	Essex County Council (Planning)	Stage 3 – Desk top Review of Existing Information	Reference should be made to other relevant LDF studies which have been used to assess the suitability/deliverability of potential SHLAA sites.	Agreed – these include the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Water Cycle Study, Urban Capacity Study, Employment Land Review and Landscape Character Assessments.	Add suggested references.
7	Essex County Council (Planning)	Stages 4 – 7	Reference should be made to coverage of the SHLAA. Explanation should be provided as to why any settlements have not been surveyed.	Stage 2 Determining Sources of Supply sets out the criteria for inclusion of sites. This explanation can be amplified and if necessary also included in later stages of the study.	Agreed to expand explanation.
8	Essex County Council (Planning)	Stages 4 – 7	There is no schedule outlining the assessment criteria used for site suitability, availability or deliverability etc. – it will be necessary to demonstrate that each site has been treated/assessed against similar criteria. A standardised assessment checklist should be used and/or referenced in the methodology.	Agree	The standard assessment criteria that were applied to each site will be included
9	Essex County Council (Planning)	Stages 4 – 7	Any national designations or local policy considerations which automatically preclude a site should be identified and reasons provided (Eg. SSSI, Flood Risk	Agree	Add references to national designations and local policy considerations as

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			Zone) a paragraph outlining these key assumptions would assist clarity		suggested.
10	Essex County Council (Planning)	Paragraph 1.25	Refers to consultation with DC officers regarding suitability, capacity, constraints and timing of development – as mentioned above this should have been a similar schedule to show how all sites were assessed.	Agree	Clarify paragraph 1.25 and include as part of schedule.
11	Essex County Council (Planning)	Paragraph 1.26	The wording suggests an ad hoc approach to identifying unknown site capacity has been undertaken. A more definitive and structured set of density multipliers may well have been used, but should be demonstrated to ensure consistency. Clearly this may well change on a site by site basis given unique circumstances (i.e. constrained areas mixed uses etc).	Agree	Further details will be included to clarify approach to site capacity and site density used.
12	Essex County Council (Planning)	Paragraph 1.27	Clearer and more detailed explanation of site viability is required. How has this been undertaken?	Agree	Expand paragraph to say what advice was sought on site viability.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
13	Edward Gittins & Associates	LDFCRE11 Shelleys Lane, Braintree Rd, Cressing Tye	We consider this site could, with minor improvements to the existing access, provide a maximum of 5 dwellings and could be developed at any time during the plan period.	The threshold for sites within the SHLAA is 10 units. As this site is for 5 units it should be considered through the Allocations Development Plan Document process.	None
14	Andrew Martins Associates Olivier Spencer	LDFRIV2 Forest Road Proposed Growth Location	Bellway Homes and the Raven Group support the preparation of the Braintree SHLAA, which will inform the Core Strategy. While the draft SHLAA methodology accords with the DCLG Practise Guidance, the site specific appraisal of land off Forest Road would benefit from supplementary information. Various additional information with regard to detailed sites table for LDFRIV2.	Noted.	Update table for LDFRIV2 at appropriate sections.
15	Andrew Martins Associates Olivier Spencer	LDFRIV2 Forest Road Proposed Growth Location	It is noted that BDC intend to phase the delivery of new growth locations towards the latter part of the plan period, to ensure there is a rolling five year housing land supply throughout the 2011-2026 period. While there may be a need for some broad phasing to avoid front-loading completions,	The Core Strategy and SHLAA indicate that the 5 year housing can be met until 2016. The housing land supply will be monitored annually and if expected sites do not come forward the phasing of growth locations could be adjusted as necessary. At present although the economic recession has reduced net site completions down to 338 in 2008-	None at present, but to be monitored.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>'over-delivery' in housing numbers is unlikely to occur in the early years of the plan period for economic reasons. Given the importance placed on delivery and future uncertainties in the market, it would be advisable for BDC to maintain as much flexibility as possible in the phasing of new growth locations. The sooner development at the growth locations can commence, the sooner planning contributions can be obtained for works that will address both existing infrastructure shortcomings and the additional demand generated by new development. In the case of land off Forest Rd, this could help fund highway improvements at the A12 junctions, and B1018/Rickstones Rd/Cypress Rd double mini-roundabout, as well as a new foot/cycle bridge crossing at Motts Lane. Phasing of growth area should therefore be bought forward with 150 units being built in 2016-2021 and 150</p>	<p>9, this is still above the annual level required for the Regional Spatial Strategy and there is a need to ensure a 5 year housing supply at all times throughout the plan period. As such this site is not required until post 2016 at present, but this need will be monitored annually.</p>	

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			between 2021 – 2026.		
16	Natural England	1.17 – 1.18	<p>The SHLAA could more explicitly acknowledge nature conservation assets as drivers in determining which sites will be included in the assessment. The SHLAA lists certain sources of supply which are to be excluded from the assessment. Nature conservation assets could be envisaged within the category ‘sites with identified constraints that are not considered to be achievable. However, these constraints are not defined. Sites which are explicitly designated as having nature conservation interest should be excluded from the SHLAA. We consider that county wildlife sites (CWS) and local wildlife sites should be viewed as clear cut designations alongside the specific mention of sites of special scientific interest. The desk top review should ensure all information on designated sites of nature conservation value is up to</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.17 outlines the broad areas where sites have been excluded. Where part of a site has a nature conservation area the estimated dwelling capacity would be adjusted to reflect non-development of this part of the site. In situations where sites would be wholly affected by nature conservation designation they would have been excluded.</p>	None

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			date.		
17	Natural England	Stage 6	The Council should ensure that they consider the requirements of open space when estimating the housing potential of each site, together with provision of local nature reserves.	This is reflected in the final estimated capacity of the site. This will be clarified.	Site capacity estimates will be explained in more detail.
18	Natural England	Stage 3	The SHLAA has generally correctly identified nature conservation sites as constraints, however there do seem to be some anomalies. The northern-most of the sites BRS01, 03 and 04 overlap with Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) BRA33 Fritch Way and the wildlife site is not identified under constraints. SIB22 Premdor site overlaps with LoWS BRA22 Hedingham Station Marsh, here the LoWS has been identified but it is still put forward for consideration. A thorough approach to the exclusion of LoWS as suitable for housing at this stage will also assist the Council in meeting targets under National Indicator 197.	Noted. However site densities estimated taking into account constraints and the assumption that the LoWS part of the site would not be developable. SIB22 would not involve development on LoWS BRA22.	Add LoWS to list of constraints for BRS01, 03 and 04 and clarify the fact that development excludes the wildlife site.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
19	Natural England	Stage 7a	We are not aware that the SHLAA conflicts with any SSSI, however we have not exhaustively cross checked every site. If this has been overlooked we oppose it. The Councils approach is therefore generally consistent with DCLG guidance.	Noted. The SHLAA does not affect any SSSI.	None
20	Natural England	General	The coding used to identify LoWS suggests the SHLAA has not been referenced against the most recent data set which uses the "BRA" prefix.	Noted	Update LoWS reference numbers.
21	Pegasus Planning Group	LDFBLA5 Land east of London Road, Great Notley	It is considered that due to the current review of the East of England Plan and the necessary response required by the Braintree Core Strategy, anticipated in March/April 2010, there will be an increased requirement for additional housing in Braintree and therefore it is a short-sighted approach of the SHLAA to include only minimal strategic sites within the identified housing supply. The objection sets out details of the	The draft Core Strategy is based on the current requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy. (RSS) The current review of the RSS to 2031 is still in progress and the housing requirement for this District will not be determined until the RSS Review is adopted. This requirement will not be included in the current draft Core Strategy. The SHLAA will be regularly updated and reviewed and can take account of the RSS Review requirements in the future when these are known. Government guidance does not require	None

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>RSS scenarios and contends that the future growth of the District, to meet the RSS Review requirements, can be achieved in the form of a planned sustainable urban extension at Braintree, rather than a new settlement. All sites, at this stage, should be included within the SHLAA, rather than separated into those included and not included in the SHLAA forecast.</p> <p>It is necessary to ensure there are adequate sites for the Core Strategy and the Site Specific Allocations Plan in the context of the East of England Plan to 2031.</p>	<p>that all suggested SHLAA sites put forward in the District should be included. The extremely high number of sites put forward throughout the District would make the assessment of all sites time consuming, expensive and would delay the preparation of the SHLAA and Core Strategy considerably, which would be contrary to Government advice to adopt the Core Strategy as soon as possible.</p>	
22	Pegasus Planning Group	LDFBLA5 Land east of London Road, Great Notley	<p>It is considered that the SHLAA is not in accordance with the DCLG guidance as it too narrowly lists sites which are deemed/assumed to exhibit the potential for development in the period to be covered by the EEP/Core Strategy. The role of the SHLAA is to list all available sites and then the Core Strategy and Site</p>	<p>Government guidance does not require that all suggested SHLAA sites put forward in the District should be included. The extremely high number of sites put forward throughout the District would make the assessment of all of these time consuming and expensive and would delay the preparation of the SHLAA and the Core Strategy considerably, which would be contrary</p>	None

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>Specific Allocations DPD can assess their suitability and compliance with planning guidance both in the short and longer term. It is essential that the Core Strategy is flexible enough to deal with changing Regional requirements and the possible failure of some predicted sources as per their expected trajectory. Therefore a SHLAA which encompasses all sites will set the framework for a flexible Core Strategy. This will then allow for all options to be explored during the course of the Core Strategy process and does not prejudge or commit the Council to particular allocations.</p>	<p>to Government advice to adopt the Core Strategy as soon as possible. The SHLAA will be regularly updated and reviewed.</p>	
23	Highways Agency	SHLAA	<p>Of the 69 sites in the SHLAA 24 have been identified as being of potential concern, however cumulatively there may be significant impact upon the A12 and A120 trunk road network.</p>	<p>Further assessment of highway impact is being carried out by Mouchel, which will include the cumulative impact of the larger SHLAA sites upon the trunk road network.</p>	<p>Need for changes to be assessed when further highway study results are available.</p>
24	Highways Agency	BRS26	<p>Although a number of sites are of potential concern none are</p>	<p>The highways impact of the Heathlands site has already been assessed, as</p>	<p>None</p>

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			regarded to have an impact on the A120. However due to capacity issues at A120/B1018 Galleys Roundabout the Healthlands sites may have a significant impact on that junctions.	part of the information informing it's planning approval.	
25	Highways Agency	WIS04 LDFWIS6 WIS19	Three sites in Witham have the potential for significant or major impact on the A12 Witham south Junction 21. These include Maltings Lane, Lodge Farm and Land between Constance Close and A12 bypass. However planned improvements at this junction may provide more capacity to support these additional developments.	The highways impact of the Maltings Lane development has already been assessed prior to the grant of planning consent for that site. The further Mouchel highways assessment , currently underway , will assess the potential impact of Lodge Farm and Constance Close proposals.	Need for changes to be assessed when further highway study results are available.
26	Highways Agency	SHLAA	The Highways Agency recommend that if the Council wish to pursue any of these sites then the potential traffic and transport implications of them should be assessed to an appropriate level of detail.	Mouchel transport assessment in progress. Additional transport assessments will be provided to inform applications for major developments.	Noted.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
27	Bidwells John McLarty Andy Butcher	Methodology	We wish to express disappointment that the content, process, methodology and outcomes of the Braintree SHLAA appear weak. We do not consider the assessment and analysis of sites have been sufficiently rigorous in the District and we do not consider that the draft as currently presented, conforms to good practice guidance and examples put forward by the Planning Officers Society.	The SHLAA has been founded on a robust and credible evidence base and site selection is appropriate in the context of the Draft Core Strategy. It provides sufficient evidence to show it is deliverable and is also flexible and easy to update annually. It follows the DCLG guidance.	Changes have been suggested in response to other objections, which should clarify the way that constraints and capacity have been calculated.
28	Bidwells John McLarty Andy Butcher	5 year land supply	The SHLAA should be a database that lists all the potential sites that could be developed for housing, providing information including a site plan. It would be useful if the SHLAA was ordered to make a distinction between those sites that form the five year supply and sites which will not come forward until later in the plan period. Also the phasing of the sites is unclear and it is not clear which sites the Council is intending to meet its five year	The site details schedule shows how many units on the site are to be built in which year. This is shown as a yearly delivery for the 5 year supply with additional fields showing site delivery post 2011 until the end of the plan period. The Core Strategy and Annual Monitoring Report will also provide a housing supply trajectory setting out the 5 year supply sites.	If it is possible to further highlight the 5 year supply sites in the SHLAA, this will be done.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			supply with.		
29	Bidwells John McLarty	Growth Locations	It is not made clear why growth locations have been included within the SHLAA. DCLG guidance assesses such sites only when it is clear that they are needed to ensure the supply of land for housing.	Paragraph 5 of the DCLG guidance allows the SHLAA to identify broad areas of growth. It is clear that the growth locations are required to ensure there is sufficient land supply for housing. The current 5 year supply does not rely on the early delivery of growth locations as identified in the Core Strategy but they will be required later in the Plan period.	Growth locations will be identified separately in the SHLAA, following the assessment of other housing land supply and the conclusion that these are required to ensure sufficient land supply for housing.
30	Bidwells John McLarty	Growth Locations	The draft SHLAA as published gives very little detail on the deliverability of its growth locations site nor developability, particularly as growth locations were identified before infrastructure such as suitable access have been considered in detail. Little assessment of the Panfield Lane growth location appears to have been carried out. Sufficient consideration has not been given to alternatives, leaving the SHLAA deficient in	Additional information on the Panfield Lane growth location will be included as suggested. Noted.	Further details on the deliverability and developability of the Panfield Lane growth location will be included

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			terms of full consideration of possible sites.		
31	Bidwells John McLarty	Growth Locations	It is implicit in the Planning Officers Society SHLAA guidance that the decision as to which sites outside settlement will be assessed should be made by the study partners and not the planning authority alone. We do not consider this has been the case in Braintree. Sufficient sites outside existing settlement boundaries should be included to enable the authority to be as confident as possible that enough developable sites will be identified to meet the housing targets and to provide for the genuine consideration of alternatives as part of the plan making process.	The planning authority has followed DCLG guidance on SHLAA preparation closely. The authority considers that sufficient sites have been included to enable it to be confident that it will meet housing targets. It is aware that several agents and developers consider that all the sites put forward by landowners, agents and developers should have been assessed, but this was not possible due to time and cost constraints and was not required by the DCLG guidance.	None
32	Bidwells John McLarty Andy Butcher	Lack of Partnership Approach	The production of the SHLAA has not sought to properly engage with stakeholders and consultation response timescales have been short and opportunities for engagement limited. This contradicts DCLG	The Council has sought to engage with stakeholders; site developers and land owners were contacted and requested to provide information on the deliverability, capacity, timescales and constraints affecting their sites early on in the study. The Council had concerns	None

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>guidance, which stresses the importance of a 'partnership approach' with key stakeholders. Many local authorities have established working groups to engage key stakeholders to validate assumptions (eg density, mix, viability) and achieve consensus.</p> <p>Paragraph 12 of the DCLG guidance state that key stakeholders should be involved at the outset of the Assessment so that they can help shape the approach taken, 'in particular housebuilders and local property agents should provide expertise and knowledge to help the partnership to take a view on the deliverability and developability of sites and how market conditions may affect economic viability.'</p>	<p>over using developers or agents to assess sites which might be in competition with sites that they were promoting and did not adopt that approach.</p> <p>Consultation on the draft SHLAA took place with key stakeholders including the development industry in August/September. These comments are the outcome of that consultation and changes are being suggested to the SHLAA in response to that consultation. Although the consultation period was fairly short, additional time to reply was agreed for stakeholders who requested it and it is felt that the responses set out the views of key stakeholders.</p>	
33	Bidwells John McLarty Andy Butcher	Lack of Partnership Approach	We do not consider that the methodology and process employed by the Braintree	Stakeholders were not consulted on the methodology because the Council followed the methodology set out in the	None

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>SHLAA has utilised the knowledge and expertise of stakeholders in preparing the SHLAA . Importantly, stakeholders were not consulted on the methodology used for the SHLAA (as was the case for neighbouring authorities) and hence stakeholders were unable to help shape the proforma that the Council are using to assess sites. By not allowing stakeholders to comment on the methodology and proforma used, consultation at this stage is of limited value. We consider that the proforma used by the Council was weak and the current consultation is a token exercise of little merit. Consultation with stakeholders should have come much earlier in the process. We do not feel that the Braintree SHLAA is consistent with the process checklist set out in the DCLG guidance 'the methods, assumptions, judgement and findings should be discussed and</p>	<p>DCLG guidance. The reference to neighbouring authorities is interesting, Chelmsford Borough is currently undertaking a SHLAA, which is believed to follow this approach. However, this is only now being prepared, and Chelmsford did not have a SHLAA to inform their Core Strategy. The feedback from this consultation, including feedback on the proforma, will inform decisions on the final SHLAA and is not a token exercise. There was earlier consultation with stakeholders in relation to their own sites.</p>	<p>The Assessment report will provide further explanation of the methods and</p>

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			agreed upon throughout the process in an open and transparent way and explained in the Assessment report.'		assumptions.
34	Bidwells John McLarty	Lack of Due Process	The Flitchway Settlement has not been considered seriously despite being voted by the LDF Panel to be retained for further consideration, as potential growth locations if the SHLAA identifies a shortfall of sites with housing potential. Also some of the proforma needs updating.	The Flitchway site can still be considered within the SHLAA if a shortfall in sites is identified.	Update Flitchway site proforma where appropriate.
35	Bidwells John McLarty Andy Butcher (apart from reference to The Flitchway)	Reasons for Exclusion	The SHLAA report should set out clearly why sites have been ruled out. Sites should only be excluded where there are clear cut constraints or designations that cannot be overcome in the plan period. Sites with constraints that could be removed through mitigation or investment should be included in supply even if they will probably come forward in later time phases. The report should include an explanation as to why particular sites or areas	The DCLG guidance acknowledges that the scope of sites in the SHLAA is not unlimited as it would not be possible to assess all potential sites within the District. In addition paragraph 1.17 of the SHLAA outlines the reasoning behind sites being excluded from the study. The Council does not have unlimited resources, or time to assess all potential sites in the District.	None

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>have been excluded from the Assessment. The reasons given within the proformas is very limited and lacks sufficient depth and understanding of the sites. The SHLAA is a technical study looking at theoretical potential of sites for housing, it does not constitute planning policy and therefore should not be wary of giving consideration to sites that are not currently or due to be allocated for housing. Reasons for excluding the Flitchway are not appropriate. Including alternative Greenfield sites to fulfil long term supply would not pre-judge or prejudice the LDF process.</p>		
36	Bidwells John McLarty	Assessing Developability	The Flitchway Settlement has demonstrated it is an appropriate site for housing and also that there is a reasonable prospect of it coming forward in the plan period. It is therefore not clear why it is considered not developable in PPS3 terms by the	The Flitchway Settlement was excluded from the SHLAA because it was not required to meet the RSS housing requirement.	None

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>SHLAA. The SHLAA should go into more detail on all sites in terms of delivery and suitability.</p>		
37	Bidwells Andy Butcher	LDFHAS11 Central Park and former Bluebridge Garage Site, Halstead	<p>It is incorrect to exclude the Central Park Site at Halstead from the SHLAA, as it meets the requirements for inclusion having regard to DCLG guidance and Planning Policy Statement 3. PPS3 requires specific deliverable sites to deliver housing in the first 5 years. To be deliverable a site needs to be available, suitable and achievable. (DCLG guidance-achievable is when there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed). Bidwells suggest that this refers to economic viability and the capacity of the developers to complete the housing over a certain period. Extensive evidence has been gathered in respect of Central Park site which</p>	<p>Figure 4 of the DCLG guidance includes employment sites, but only those which are no longer required for that use. The Council is keen to ensure that there is a better balance between the provision of employment and housing and therefore wishes to retain this employment site.</p>	None

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>is relevant to consideration of this site as part of the SHLAA. We consider that the site could accommodate not less than 69 dwellings and is immediately available, deliverable and developable almost immediately from grant of planning permission. The comments for excluding the site are not appropriate in terms of justification and lack sufficient understanding of the site and the technical work that has been undertaken to date to demonstrate how development of the site can be delivered. More over the comments do not conform to the available DCLG Practice Guidance in considering land allocated for employment. This includes' land in non-residential use which may be suitable for re-development for housing'. The fact that the site is currently used for employment is not a reason to exclude it. Paragraph 21 of the DCLG</p>		

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			<p>guidance states 'the scope of the Assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development'. Paragraph 34 of the guidance states 'where it is unknown when a site could be developed, then it should be regarded as not currently developable.' This is not the case for Central Park. The comments refer to the Urban Capacity Study and Employment Land Review and suggest that the latter excluded Central Park from its calculation for the amount of employment land that needs to be provided in the future which contradicts the approach taken in the SHLAA.</p>	<p>The Employment Land Review did not include this site as part of the future employment land supply, as it was already in employment use.</p>	
38	Bovis Homes Ltd	WCC74 Gimsons, Witham	<p>Various factual alterations regarding the site known as "Gimsons". Also estimated site capacity on site of approximately 8 acres would be 90 dwellings rather than 35 as suggested in SHLAA, taking into account need</p>	Noted.	Update proforma where appropriate.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			for open space, trees on site and that a small area lies within the flood plain.		
39	Andrew Martins Associates Lisa Skinner	BON32 Christy House and Chantry House, Church St, Bocking	The site has been estimated for 10 units for C3 uses. The current application is not considered to be a C3 use by the applicant.	Category C3 covers dwelling houses in the use classes order. The applicant considers this to be a Care Home rather than free standing dwellings. Guidance from DCLG indicates that monitoring of dwelling unit numbers can be based upon physical provision rather than the application description.	None
40	Andrew Martins Associates Lisa Skinner	SVE14 Crittall Works, Silver End	Whole site should be included in SHLAA and would equate to a total area for the Critall site of 3.54 ha. and could accommodate more than 70 dwellings on site if the area was increased. Also site has full services available.	Agree. Whole site to be included in the SHLAA. Update proforma to show site size as 3.54ha. Site capacity would assume that half the site would be for residential use with the remainder being reserved for community (Special School) or employment use as a mixed use regeneration site as outlined in the draft Core Strategy. Assuming a dwelling density of 40 dph on the residential portion of the site (1.77ha) would give a capacity of 70 dwellings.	Update proforma for SVE14 where appropriate. Also update with regard to services available on site.
41	Andrew Martins Associates	SVE14 Crittall Works,	The site is available to be developed now and broad discussions have already been	The development period refers to when the housing is required. The development of the rest of the site for	None.

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
	Lisa Skinner	Silver End	held with the Council. it is understood that the Parish and District Council would like this site brought forward sooner than later. The site development period should be brought forward from 2016-2021 to 2009-2014.	either employment or community purposes is outside the scope of the SHLAA.	
42	Andrew Martins Associates Lisa Skinner	SVE14 Crittall Works, Silver End	The final section of comments is unclear as to whether this is the Council's view or other third party views regarding rear parking for Valentine's Way. It is not considered acceptable to insist on rear parking for Valentine's Way.	The Council would wish to explore the possibility of providing access for rear parking to Valentine's Way once local residents have been consulted on their wishes.	Amend comment to say "Explore the need to provide access..."
43	Essex County Council	LDFBOB02 Lyons Hall Primary School, Deerleap Way	This part of the site is too small for permanent school accommodation. It is currently not required in terms of the schools current needs and the forecast for the number of pupils living in the area indicates that there would be no need to expand the school in the future.	Noted	Change forecast dwelling for site to 2013/2014 to enable continued school use until 2012.
44	Earls Colne	LDFFEAR1A Halstead Road, Earls Colne	We have looked at the documents on line and note that the land at Halstead Road, Earls Colne which is a possible area	This site can be included in the SHLAA as it could comprise either a rural exception site, or a logical rounding off of a key service village.	Add LDFFEAR01 in SHLAA

No	Organisation	Section	Comment	Response	Change
			where a small development could take place has not been included		

Corporate Implications				
Financial:	Preparation of the SHLAA and involvement of the Housing Market Partnership in the preparation of the SHLAA is a requirement for a proportion of future Housing and Planning Delivery Grant payments. (This requirement has been fulfilled)			
Legal:	N/a			
Equalities & Diversity:	N/a			
Customer Impact:	Provision of future housing			
Environment & Climate Change:	Effects of provision of new housing			
Consultation/Community Engagement:	Consultation with landowners, agents, developers and key stakeholders including the Housing Market Partnership	✓	Partners	✓
	Public	✓	Staff	
Key Decision:	No			
Public/Private Report:	Public			
Officer Contact:	Eleanor Dash			
Designation:	Planning Policy Manager			
Ext No:	2563			
Email:	eleda@braintree.gov.uk			

	Total sites of 10+ included in forecasts			3,939	368	248	231	269	249	233	229	237	182	180	185	185	205	270	248	240	180	
	small with pp at April 09			427	50	60	60	60	60	60	60	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Other small sites identified (shlaa/ucs. Rla wopps, subsequent pp's)			278	0	0	0	16	9	9	10	20	22	22	22	24	24	25	25	25	25	
	Total supply identified in forecasts			4,644	418	308	291	345	318	302	299	274	204	202	207	209	229	295	273	265	205	