

### Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses

	Respondent (Individual Representations)	Comment	Response	Action	Support in principle
01	R. & J. Ockleford	1. Design advice too vague- must relate to Silver End	1. Noted	1. None	YES
02	L. Young	1. Fears development of playing fields. 2. Concerns over vandalism in parking areas.	1. Playing fields are outside proposed development area 2. Section 8.2 recommends that vulnerable spaces should be visible from resident's windows.	1. None 2. None	YES
03	B. C. Webb	1. Would like enlarged library facility	1. Discussions with Library service indicates that no expansion in village is envisaged, but space for visiting van was requested and has been shown	1. None	YES
04	J.M. Pearce	1. Loss of parking opposed	1. Noted	1. Seek clarification on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.	NO
05	N. Chapman	1. Criticises lack of previous consultation. 2. Loss of parking for village hall and playing field "unacceptable".	1. Noted	1. None 2. Seek clarification on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.	NO

## Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses

	Respondent (Individual Representations)	Comment	Response	Action	Support in principle
06	M. Williams	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opposed to sale of site by BDC.</li> <li>2. Flats would cause over looking of nearby properties.</li> <li>3. Does not like Crossing Road scheme.</li> <li>4. Loss of parking opposed.</li> <li>5. If there are flats they should go to local single adults.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Section 8.1 requires no overlooking of residential neighbours</li> <li>3. Noted</li> <li>4. Noted</li> <li>5. Section 6.5 refers to discussions with housing association, which would hope to provide some units of this type.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None</li> <li>2. None</li> <li>3. None</li> <li>4. Seek clarification on parking for adj. uses and if necessary amend brief.</li> <li>5. None</li> </ol>	NO
07	A. E. Hardy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Criticises loss of parking for village hall and playing field. Not enough parking for existing demand plus flats.</li> <li>2. Opposed to 3 storey blocks, but supports one level of flats over shops for security.</li> <li>3. Supports traditional style akin to Silver End Hotel.</li> <li>4. Queries use of double glazing if rest of conservation area residents cannot have it.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Noted</li> <li>3. The adjoining Village Hall and the original Department Store were not designed in this style.</li> <li>4. Noted</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seek clarification on parking for adj. uses and if necessary amend brief.</li> <li>2. Re-assess the question of storey heights in light of other representations and parking.</li> <li>3. &amp; 4. None</li> </ol>	YES
08	Mr. & Mrs. Bruns	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Criticised lack of previous consultation and poor publicity for exhibition.</li> <li>2. Supports flats- but only above shops.</li> <li>3. Will flats be to rent or for sale?</li> <li>4. Concern over loss of parking for shops if flats are allowed at rear of site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Noted</li> <li>3. This will be determined by developer/housing association.</li> <li>4. Noted</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None</li> <li>2. None</li> <li>3. None</li> <li>4. To be considered with all parking.</li> </ol>	YES

### Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses

	<b>Respondent (Individual Representations)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
<b>09</b>	I. F. Hardy	<p>1. Supports rejuvenation of shops, but opposed to building on car park.</p> <p>2. Concern over effect on access to surgery for cars.</p> <p>3. Concern over loss of parking for village hall and playing field. Even now a football match results in a fully used car park.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p>	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. None</p> <p>3. Seek clarification on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.</p>	YES
<b>10</b>	A. H. Huckle	<p>1. Objects to loss of any parking- cites Saturdays when “all spaces are occupied”.</p> <p>2. Asks for additional parking to serve village hall and local organisations.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p>	<p>1. &amp; 2. Seek clarification on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.</p>	NO
<b>11</b>	S. Way & M.A. Manning	<p>1. Opposed to residential element. Resultant loss of parking for village hall, playing field and residential home would lead to increased danger.</p> <p>2. Opposes development of playing fields.</p> <p>3. Supports rebuilding shops.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Playing fields are outside proposed development area</p> <p>3. Noted</p>	<p>1. Seek clarification on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.</p> <p>2. &amp; 3. None</p>	YES

## Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses

	Respondent (Consultees)	Comment	Response	Action	Support in principle
12	Essex County Council -Historic Buildings and Conservation M. Hurst	<p>1. Document is very well produced and I am generally in agreement with guidance.</p> <p>2. Public toilets should be included.</p> <p>3. No objection to demolition of existing buildings but would ask for a condition to require that no demolition takes place before contracts are let for whole scheme.</p> <p>4. It would be desirable to conceal parking at the rear of the site. Any spaces at front should be landscaped.</p> <p>5. Parking should be provided within The Broadway itself.</p> <p>6. Soft boundary treatments are appropriate, but with walls around service areas.</p> <p>7. Public Art would be desirable.</p> <p>8. Three storeys would be overbearing.</p> <p>9. Meter boxes to be considered at design stage.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. These were considered, but there were no sources of funding for this facility.</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. A comprehensive landscaping scheme is required in 8.2 of design brief.</p> <p>5. On street parking already exists in The Broadway.</p> <p>6. Accords with requirements of section 8.2.</p> <p>7. Whilst this is true the money may be best allocated to high quality street furniture or specially designed bus shelter.</p> <p>8. Noted</p> <p>9. Noted</p>	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. None</p> <p>3. Insert note in section 5 to inform of council's intentions secure speedy redevelopment of site under provisions of section 17(3) and sec 74(3) of Planning (LB &amp; CA) Act 1990.</p> <p>4. None</p> <p>5. None</p> <p>6. None</p> <p>7. Insert statement on art/ street furniture</p> <p>8. Re-assess the question of storey heights in light of other representations and parking.</p> <p>9. Insert note re: meters in 8.4</p>	YES

## Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses

	Respondent (Consultees)	Comment	Response	Action	Support in principle
12	Essex County Council -Historic Buildings and Conservation Cont...	<p>10.TV aerials, satellite dishes, flues and refrigeration plant should out of sight of public.</p> <p>11. Domestic refuse store to be discrete.</p> <p>12. Sustainability to be balanced with need for design in conservation area. Solar panels should be unobtrusive.</p> <p>13. Option of reconstructing Department Store façade would be desirable to reinstate centre-piece of master plan.</p> <p>14.Not convinced that recessed balconies are appropriate on Broadway frontage.</p> <p>15. Appears to be very little parking at Village Hall- adding to parking on the streets, how would parking be managed?</p> <p>16. Guidance on residential element is fairly limited; maximum building depth of 7 metres is preferable.</p> <p>17. Images in brief should be for reference and guidance only.</p>	<p>10. Point is referred to in 5.1 and 8.4</p> <p>11. Noted</p> <p>12. Noted</p> <p>13. Noted</p> <p>14. Noted</p> <p>15. Noted</p> <p>16. Noted</p> <p>17. Noted</p>	<p>10. Insert note regarding flues and refrigeration plant in 8.5</p> <p>11. Insert note re: refuse stores in 8.4</p> <p>12. None</p> <p>13. None</p> <p>14. None</p> <p>15. Seek clarification on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.</p> <p>16. None</p> <p>17. None</p>	

## Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses

	<b>Respondent (Consultees)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
<b>13</b>	Silver End Parish Council	<p>1. Considers that there is insufficient public parking in the proposals –SEPC invested money for public parking on site which would be reduced.</p> <p>2. Public toilets should be included.</p> <p>3. Opposed to front servicing to Co-op-would cause congestion.</p> <p>4. Traffic would move towards surgery.</p> <p>5. Would only approve of 3 storey building if built in an Art Deco style.</p> <p>6. Any supermarket must include a post office.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted, but this is not proposed in any of the options.</p> <p>4. Traffic is not intended to extend any closer than at present.</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. This is part of the brief.</p>	<p>1. Seek clarification on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.</p> <p>2. None</p> <p>3. None</p> <p>4. None</p> <p>5. None</p> <p>6. None</p>	YES
<b>14</b>	Transco (Gas Transporter)	<p>1. No objections, but will require notice of works subsequent to grant of planning permission as apparatus in the area may be at risk.</p> <p>2. Caution suggested with regard to privately owned gas mains or networks which may be present in the area.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p>	<p>1. Insert note under 4.9</p> <p>2. insert note under 4.9</p>	YES

**Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses**

	<b>Respondent (Consultees)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
<b>15</b>	Braintree District Council – Environmental Services	<p>1. The brief does recognise the potential for conflict between commercial and residential uses.</p> <p>2. Within the design there must be adequate waste storage facilities for both types of use, with adequate access for collection and for separate storage of recyclable materials</p> <p>3. Provision for litter collection required.</p> <p>4. Final building design must incorporate ducting to remove odours from any food take-away units</p> <p>5. Stresses the possible need for sound attenuation measures to ensure that noise from air conditioning, ventilation, refrigeration, heating units and other machinery is not audible in residential units.</p> <p>6. Commercial deliveries/waste collection should be between 0700 and 1900 hrs.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p>	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. Amend existing note in 8.5</p> <p>3. Add note in 8.5</p> <p>4. Add note in 8.5</p> <p>5. Add note in 8.5</p> <p>6. Add note in 8.5</p>	YES

**Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses**

	<b>Respondent (Consultee)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
<b>16</b>	Cllr. James Abbott	<p>1. Agrees with points raised in summary, objectives and methodology. Welcomes local consultation that has taken place.</p> <p>2. Disputes that the village centre has lost some significance – it remains a very well used resource, having important facilities.</p> <p>3. Agrees that even areas with lighting, CCTV and that are well used can experience problem behaviour from relatively few youths. These measures should be accompanied by surveillance by new residents.</p> <p>4. It is vital that existing retail uses, leases etc. are protected.</p> <p>5. Asks for improved Bottle Bank facility.</p> <p>6. Not sure that the original department store justifies a 3-storey focal point. Flats at this height are unprecedented.</p> <p>7. Agrees with most of design criteria, but emphasises: need to calm traffic; to avoid unshielded and bright lighting (suggests wording for lighting specification), asks that solar energy be required rather than asked for.</p> <p>8. Supports Option 1 as appropriate for site, maintaining space at front, also likes composite except for 3-storeys.</p> <p>9. Does not see need for extra parking. Walking to shops to be encouraged.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. The need to take full account of leases and long term requirements of individual uses is identified and stipulated in Section 5.</p> <p>5. The bottle bank facility is located outside the area of the brief</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. Noted</p> <p>8. Noted, but solar energy cannot be required under policy, instead it is encouraged.</p> <p>9. Noted</p>	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. Add note to para 3.6 to effect that centre is still a well used resource.</p> <p>3. None</p> <p>4. None</p> <p>5. None</p> <p>6. Re-assess the question of storey heights in light of other representations and parking.</p> <p>7. Amend 8.3 to specify use of speed tables or other safety measures. Add note to 8.5 regarding lighting.</p> <p>8. None</p> <p>9. None</p>	YES

**Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses**

	<b>Respondent (Consultee)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
17	Colchester and East Essex Co-operative Society	<p>1. Supports the principles and welcomes opportunity to become involved.</p> <p>2. At present has no requirement to increase footprint of supermarket but if circumstances change guidance should allow for variation of floor areas.</p> <p>3. Essential that supermarket continues to trade through development process.</p> <p>4. A large part of the scheme's viability will lie in maximising the development potential for residential flats. Asks for flexibility in relation to affordable housing requirements of policy RLP 6.</p> <p>5. Objects to Option 1 on grounds of loss of visual aspect between Surgery and The Broadway, and mixing of service access to supermarket with pedestrian access to Surgery and Fish and Chip Shop. Arrangement could affect phasing and continued trading. Prefers Option 2 with careful consideration of design. Finds Option 3 impractical.</p> <p>6. Feels that the composite scheme reflects their thinking but should be used to set principles only and not be rigidly enforced on layout and design. Believe that with further consideration improvements can be made.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Section 5 emphasises that “the store must be able to function throughout the redevelopment period”.</p> <p>4. Policy RLP 6 requires that 30% of dwellings in schemes of more than 15 units or on sites of 0.5 ha. or more is affordable. A relaxation of this emerging policy would be required to withdraw the requirement.</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p>	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. Amend para. 5.1/5.2 to allow for a change in floor space due to commercial requirements.</p> <p>3. None</p> <p>4. None</p> <p>5. None</p> <p>6. None</p>	YES

**Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses**

	<b>Respondent (Consultees)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
<b>18</b>	Braintree District Council- Development Services (Local Plans) E. Dash	<p>1. HGV vehicles should be separated from pedestrians for safety reasons.</p> <p>2. Queries whether Critalls original concepts are being adhered to- lack of individual amenity space for dwellings.</p> <p>3. Concerned that the provision of flats “elsewhere in the site” leads to over development of the site.</p> <p>4. Queries the statement that cycle routes converge at the site.</p> <p>5. The bus shelter belongs to “Adshel” who are due to renew it later in 2005. Kerbs are being improved to assist disabled access to buses.</p> <p>6. Notes that existing parking also serves other playing field, village hall etc. Suggests that later in the brief this is overlooked.</p> <p>7. Supports assessment of important physical factors.</p>	<p>1. This is possible in Option 2 and the composite scheme, assuming that vehicles serving supermarket reverse into the service yard (as at present).</p> <p>2. This is a departure from the original concept as all the dwellings are flats rather than houses.</p> <p>3. The residential density at about 52 dwellings to the hectare is within the densities recommended in PPG 3, for making efficient use of land, but it is accepted that there are other uses on the site that compete with the residential element for parking, servicing etc.</p> <p>4. It is true that there are no formal cycle routes in Silver End, however the existing uses on the site make it a focal point for cyclists using local facilities and it is suggested that this means of transport should be recognised.</p> <p>5. It is suggested (para 10.4) that in the interests of good design, and the limiting of street clutter the bus shelter is designed specifically for the site. There may be opportunity to involve “Adshel” in this process.</p> <p>6. The brief has produced in accordance with the District Council’s intention to sell the site to a developer. It has been taken that the developer will not be in a position to provide parking for the uses outside the site, although there may sometimes be spaces available for these surrounding uses.</p> <p>7. Noted</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Amend para. 5.16 to inform of the situation regarding shelter and kerbs.</p> <p>6. Seek clarification on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.</p> <p>7. None</p>	

**Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses**

	<b>Respondent (Consultees)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
<b>18</b>	Braintree District Council- Development Services (Local Plans) Continued	<p>8. Retention/improvement of fish and chip shop has advantages.</p> <p>9. Supports removal of lock-up garages.</p> <p>10. Asks for 2 disabled parking spaces at surgery plus additional for shops. Asks for additional spaces to serve new residential in addition to existing spaces on this site which are “the village car park”. If not the use of facilities will decline to detriment of whole village. Council should not rely on flats using car parking in evening that shops, village hall etc. may still require.</p> <p>11. Because of mixed use/car park role of site densities in PPG 3 are not relevant here.</p> <p>12 Feels that scheme does not comply with RLP3 (scale and design to be in harmony) or RLP 11 (with reference to parking provision).</p> <p>13. No argument for raising storey heights above two and a half storeys.</p> <p>14. Options 1, 2, and the composite scheme are considered to be over development of site. Prefers option 3 in terms of scale and simplicity, but still feels that there is insufficient parking.</p>	<p>8. Noted</p> <p>9. Noted</p> <p>10. Noted</p> <p>11. and 12. The brief for this scheme has not been to retain a car park that is specifically a “village centre car park. The continued provision of this facility is likely to bring the feasibility of residential development into question</p> <p>13. Noted</p> <p>14. Noted</p>	<p>8. None</p> <p>9. None</p> <p>10. None</p> <p>11. and 12. <b>Seek clarification</b> on parking for adjoining uses and if necessary amend brief.</p> <p>13. Noted.</p> <p>14. Noted.</p>	

**Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses**

	<b>Respondent (Consultees)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
<b>19</b>	Braintree District Council – Landscape Services A. St. Aubyn	<p>1. Stresses importance of site in terms of location and also the garden village ethos- architectural and landscape designs should be developed hand in hand. Asks for substantial sized nursery stock and a reflection of large trees in vicinity. Hard landscaping to be of high specification.</p> <p>2. Objects to car parking element on Broadway frontage in Options 1 and 2. Prefers option 3 with area at front developed with substantial landscaping to act as a focal area.</p> <p>3. Stresses the importance of view from playing fields and need for substantial landscaping to soften view and “provide link with the surrounding countryside”.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>3. The importance of this aspect is stressed in 8.1 and 8.2</p>	<p>1. Amend 8.2 to give more weight to these requirements.</p> <p>2. None</p> <p>3. None</p>	YES
<b>20</b>	Environment Agency A. Dixey- Planning Liaison	<p>1. Pleased that sustainable construction and design is feature of brief.</p> <p>2. Suggests potential for use of Photo Voltaic systems, solar water heating and points to revenue that might be generated from PV system. Suggests glass conservatory type features for solar gain. Street lighting can be provided through renewables. Sustainable drainage systems feasible.</p> <p>3. Warns that part of site is within 250 metres of a closed landfill site.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Most of these opportunities have already been touched upon in 8.5.</p> <p>3. Noted</p>	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. Amend part of 8.5 to stress that these options should be incorporated wherever possible.</p> <p>3. Add note to section 4.</p>	YES

**Draft Development Brief for Silver End Shops Site- Schedule of Responses**

	<b>Respondent (Consultees)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Support in principle</b>
<b>21</b>	St. Lawrence Medical Practice, The Surgery, Silver End Dr. A. V. Purdie	1. Supports option 2. Think it is imperative that supermarket has its own service area to avoid blocking access to surgery and in view of risks of accidents. Vehicles turning around in front of surgery is unacceptable. 2. Concerned at overall loss of parking which may inconvenience users. Surgery has no funds for additional parking.	1. Noted  2. Noted	1. None  2. None	YES

**NOTE – 11 OBJECTIONS TO LOSS OF PARKING**

**6 OBJECTIONS TO 3 STOREY FLATS**