Statement of Consultation
Part 1 Regulation 18 Consultation on the Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan

Braintree District Council

January 2014
Contents

1. Background
2. Introduction
3. Consultation Process
4. Consultation Responses Received
5. Summary of Main Issues and Officer Response

Appendix

Appendix 1
   a) Copy of the response form
   b) Copy of the guidance notes

Appendix 2
   a) Copy of the notification letter sent to statutory consultees
   b) Copy of the notification letter sent to non-statutory consultees
   c)

Appendix 3 List consultees

Appendix 4
   a) Copy of the advert placed in local newspapers
   b) Copy of the posters used to advertise consultation
   c) Example of a site notice

Addendum

Copy of agendas, reports and minutes of the LDF Sub Committees of the 26th March, 11th April, 8th May, 30th May, 13th June, 17th June, 11th July, 24th July 2013.
1. **Background**

In accordance with Regulation 22(1) (c) (i-iv) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012, this is a factual statement which sets out the following information:

(i) Which bodies and persons Braintree District Council invited to make representations under Regulation 18 on the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan

(ii) How these bodies and persons were invited to make representations under Regulation 18

(iii) A summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to Regulation 18

(iv) How representations made pursuant of Regulation 18 were taken into account.

2. **Introduction**

Braintree District Council adopted its Core Strategy in September 2011. This set out the overall spatial vision for the District and includes strategic policies in relation to housing, employment, retail, the natural and built environment, open space and infrastructure.

In order to complete the suite of documents which make up a Local Development Framework, work on a Site Allocations and Development Management Plan began soon after the adoption of the Core Strategy.

The purpose of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan is to provide further detail on the implementation of the vision and strategic policies set out in the Core Strategy. It includes detailed development management policies which will be used in the consideration of planning applications in the District, the allocation of non-strategic sites for housing, employment, retail and other community uses and reviewed development boundaries for towns, villages and employment sites.

If found sound at examination, the Plan will replace the remaining policies and maps in the Local Plan Review 2005.

This consultation statement sets out the way in which consultation was carried out under Regulation 18 on the draft Site Allocation and Development Management Plan, the results of that consultation including the numbers of responses and the main issues raised and how these comments were taken into account when completing the Pre Submission Site Allocation and Development Management Plan.

3. **Consultation Process**

The draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan was published for 6 weeks between 9th January and 22nd February 2013. The Council also consulted on a revised Statement of Community Involvement at the same time.
The development management part of the Plan included a proposed policy and also set out the alternative options which had also been considered. The Site Allocations part of the Plan included a proposed map and in most cases one or more alternative maps which included all the alternative sites which had been proposed for development and considered by the Council.

The Plan was published on the Council’s website through its online consultation portal, alongside the SA/SEA. It was also available to download from the website as a pdf, as was the full evidence base of the Plan. A hard copy of the Plan was available to view at the main Council offices in Braintree and libraries in the District had a copy of the Plan on CD. All statutory consultees were also sent a copy of the Plan on CD and paper copies were available on request.

A representation form and guidance notes on how to respond were also published on the website and were distributed in paper form on request, including at the exhibition events and these are included in Appendix 1a and b. Other written correspondence in the form of letters and emails were also accepted as representations.

All statutory consultees including Town and Parish Councils, neighbouring local authorities and major stakeholders such as the Environment Agency and Natural England were informed by letter of the consultation and sent a copy of the Plan on CD. Notification letters/emails were also sent to all those on the LDF consultation database which includes local people, special interest groups, land owners and developers who had been asked to be kept informed on the process. This was in the region of 2000 notification letters and emails. A copy of the letters sent to statutory consultees and non-statutory consultees can be found in Appendix 2a and b respectively. A list of the people who were notified of the consultation can be found in Appendix 3.

To order to ensure as wider public consultation and knowledge of the Plan and to stimulate local debate, a number of other publicity measures were undertaken by the Council. This included highlighting the consultation on the Council’s website, advertising the consultations in local papers and advertising the consultation on social media sites and in the Council’s electronic magazine. Posters were also produced which were distributed to local Parish and Town Councils and displayed on community notice boards. The Council also produced site notices which were displayed adjacent to all residential sites of 10 or more and all new employment allocations. A copy of the advert in local papers, posters and the site notices are included in Appendix 4a, b and c respectively.

The Council also held a series a public consultation events across the District. These were an opportunity for members of the public to find out further information on what was being proposed, discuss this with officers and provide feedback. The exhibitions were held in the three main towns (two sessions in Braintree and Witham) and in the six key service villages and Great Yeldham (Great Yeldham had the largest residential allocation of all the ‘Other Villages’ and is located further north than the key service villages). At least two officers from Planning Policy were available at all times during the consultation events. Each consultation event included site specific information relating to that town or village and maps for all the towns and villages were available for discussion with officers at every event. Set out below is a list of the days and times of the events held and the number of attendees;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15th January 1.30pm – 6.30pm</td>
<td>Earls Colne</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Witham</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Witham</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Great Yeldham</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Coggeshall</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Halstead</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Hatfield Peverel</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st January 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Sible Hedingham</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th February 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Kelvedon</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th February 2.30pm – 7.30pm</td>
<td>Silver End</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As well as the staffed exhibition, an unmanned display was also available at Braintree and Witham libraries for the full 6 week consultation period and at Halstead library between the 9th and 22nd February. Other libraries in the District had a copy of the document on CD which could be viewed during normal opening hours.

4. Consultation Responses Received

During the consultation period 1636 individual comments were received from 1007 separate consultees. Several petitions were also received. During the consultation there was the opportunity for land-owners to submit further sites for consideration. 54 such sites were submitted across the District.

All duly made representations were processed and added to the Council’s consultation database. This means that they in the public domain and available to view. Comments received were then considered in detail village by village and through the policy chapters by the LDF Sub Committee at their meetings on the 26th March, 11th April, 8th May, 30th May, 13th June, 17th June and 11th July 2013 and changes were recommended in response to those comments. The meeting on the 24th July included consideration of the comments on the SA/SEA. The agendas, reports and minutes of these meetings can be found in the addendum to this document.

Prior to each LDF Sub Committee meeting, Planning Policy officers notified those people who had commented on the sites, plans or policies which were to be considered at that meeting. Officers also informed the landowners of sites, the relevant Town or Parish Council and local ward members. The meetings were also generally webcast, enabling members of the public not able to attend in person, to view proceedings.

Of the comments that were received during the consultation period, around 24% were submitted directly to the online consultation portal, Objective, 22% were submitted by email and the remaining 54% were received by letter.
5. **Summary of Main Issues Raised**

The remaining part of the document includes a summary of the main issues raised through the consultation, chapter by chapter and village by village. For each there is a summary of the comments and issues raised during the consultation period and what changes have been made to the document following the public consultation period. It should be noted that this is a summary of the main issues raised, therefore not all representations will be referenced individually. All responses can however be read in full on the Councils website [http://braintree-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/](http://braintree-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/). The addendum to this document includes the reports and minutes of the LDF Sub Committees where the comments were considered in detail and changes were proposed and agreed.

**Introduction and Background**

There were 17 comments received regarding this section of the Plan. The majority of these expressed opinions that the plan positively assists the realisation of the Core Strategy and Vision for the District. Other comments regarded a desire to see the plan strengthen countryside protection, enforce the general role of village envelopes, and include specific policies on urban and suburban tree planting, landscape protection and telecommunications. One comment stated that BDC had poorly publicised the consultation event.

Changes Proposed: None

**Sustainable Development**

There were 26 comments received on this section of the Plan. General comments included a desire to see a re-wording to more closely reflect the NPPF and better align to the spirit of localism. Policy ADM1 received 6 comments and was praised in its commitment to growth and criticised for a perceived lack of detail in comparison to the NNPF. One comment regarded the lack of alternatives in light of a desire to see no additional growth in the District. A total of 15 specific comments were made to Policy ADM2 and regarded how the policy related to a presumption in favour of sustainable development, stated development boundaries should be reviewed, and sought more positive wording. Other comments praised reference to the protection of the historic environment, and also the importance of open space and biodiversity within boundaries.

Changes Proposed: Wording changes to ADM2 Development within Development Boundaries

**Housing**

A total of 86 comments were received regarding housing policy. General comments surrounded a higher provision of housing to meet an objectively assessed need, and also stated that current figures should be treated as a minimum to be exceeded. A recommendation was made that small housing units should be provided to free up larger housing units.

Policy ADM3 received 21 comments. These included a recommendation that phasing restrictions are removed, sought a different balance of provision across the Key Service Villages, and asked for more housing allocations in rural areas. Other comments stated a desire to see more employment, recreation and leisure uses in Key Service Villages in
response to a perceived over-provision of housing, called for more housing in Cressing, and looking at a new settlement to ease infrastructure issues in existing settlements.

ADM4 received 4 comments regarding a recommended change of wording placing an onus on scheme providers to demonstrate the necessity for cross-subsidy market housing, minimising visual and landscape impacts and suggesting a maximum limit to affordable housing exception sites in order to limit rural impacts.

Of the 3 comments received for Policy ADM5, one recommended the policy refer to the proximity of services by sustainable transport means. Other comments criticised a lack of care home provision in the Plan and stated that for older persons' accommodation, the healthcare impacts arising from such development should be identified and include appropriate mitigation in the form of new or improved healthcare infrastructure and/or funding.

Policy ADM6 received 3 comments supporting the use of the Essex County Council Market Position Statement to inform allocations and also the allocation of St Dominics Care Home in Kelvedon for additional Care Home facilities.

Policy ADM7 also received 3 comments highlighting a desire for the Plan to make specific allocations for enough Gypsy and Traveller sites to meet need, and a wish for a better dispersal of Gypsy and Traveller sites.

A total of 6 comments were received for Policy ADM8. These regarded a support for the protection of the historic environment, the effectiveness of the policy to achieve high quality development, and the flexibility of the policy in light of the NPPF paragraph 59. Other comments made related to a perceived incompatibility with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy, a recommendation that the requirement that all new dwellings would meet Lifetime Homes Standards be removed, that there should be an emphasis that such developments should be accessible by sustainable modes of travel, and that the phrase "appropriate standard of residential accommodation" be clarified and explained.

Policy ADM9 received no comments, however Policy ADM10 received one related to a perceived confusion and inconsistency between the two policies in regard to extensions of original dwellings.

Policy ADM11 received 2 comments related to a need for buildings of architectural or historic value and criteria to apply across all areas of the District and the need for a list of such features, that the policy should be expanded to include resilience measures for replacement dwellings in medium or high flood risk areas, and also to expand the criteria for rural worker’s dwellings beyond agricultural operations to include retirement homes for farmers and food processing activities.

Policy ADM12 received 1 comment supporting the wording of the policy but recommending that the section of the policy that deals with the consenting of temporary rural workers dwellings include an additional sentence which clarifies the position following a lapse of the initial three year period.

A total of 6 comments were received for Policy ADM13. These recommended that outbuildings should not be converted into housing, be more flexible in regard to infilling and
to include additional consideration for previously developed land. Other comments sought more consideration for infilling in rural communities to support services, stronger protection for hamlets and support for an alternative of reducing the threshold property numbers in hamlets for allowing infill plots.

Policy ADM14 received 2 comments; one supporting the policy and criteria looking to minimise impacts, and one objecting to the appropriateness of permitting garden extensions into the countryside as a material change of use.

Changes to Plan: Wording changes to policies ADM3 Housing Allocations, ADM4 Affordable Housing in the Countryside, ADM5 Specialist Housing, ADM6 Care Homes and Specialist Housing Allocations, ADM8 Housing and Density, ADM11 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside, ADM12 Rural Workers Dwelling in the Countryside ADM13 Hamlets, paragraph 3.17, 3.62 and 3.70. New policy and supporting text ADM13A, Previously Developed Infill Sites in the Countryside.

**Employment**

In total, 28 comments were made in response to the employment chapter of the Plan. General comments praised the approach and consistency with the NPPF.

Policy ADM15 received 9 comments. These included a preference for such matters to be decided through the NPPF, that the Local Plan Review Policy (RLP33) provides more comprehensive information, and that bulky retail goods, trade counters and retail warehouses should be allowed in Employment Policy Areas. Other comments requested the inclusion of site RIV3EAlt as part of the existing Eastways Industrial Estate, the removal of site SIB3E and reallocation for housing and that land west of the A131 at Great Notley should be included within the schedule of Employment Policy Areas.

Policy ADM16 received no comments, however Policy ADM17 received 1 comment specifying that site HEL2 should be removed as a business and industrial use and allocated solely for business in ADM16.

There were 3 comments received for Policy ADM18; one praising the policy in light of the NPPF, one supporting the inclusion of Site SIB3 for B1 Business Use and Leisure and another specifying that the site should be reallocated for housing.

Policy ADM19 received 1 comment related to a perceived lack of flexibility related to landscape management.

Of the 2 comments received for Policy ADM20, one supported the policy’s stance on reducing the need to travel, whilst the other believed the policy to be a possible deterrent regarding the delivery of employment land.

Policy ADM21 received 3 comments. These included support for the inclusion of marketing criteria, a desire to see criteria expanded to support residential conversion in the countryside, and a request for amendments regarding forthcoming changes to permitted development rights in respect of change of use from office to residential.

Policy ADM22 received 1 comment supporting the alternative of reliance on a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
Policy ADM23 received 3 comments. These praised the safeguarding of heritage assets, sought definitions for ‘remote’ and ‘acceptable locations,’ and recommended the first sentence be reworded to stress that locations remote from local services would not be supported.

Changes to Plan: Wording amendments to policy ADM15 Employment policy areas, ADM16 Business Uses, ADM17 Business and Industrial Uses, ADM19 Design and Layout of Employment Policy Areas and Business Uses, ADM21 Change of Use of Commercial Buildings in the B Use Class, paragraphs 4.6 and 4.7 and updated information in tables 3 and 4. Delete policy ADM20 Workplace Nurseries, ADM22 Promotion of Employment Clusters and ADM23 Rural Enterprise

Retail
The Retail chapter of the Plan received 24 comments in total. Policy ADM25 received 1 of these stating that reference to Local Centres was missing. Policy ADM26 received 2 comments, one supporting the policy’s threshold in regard to the NPPF and another stating that the policy wording could be clearer.

Policy ADM27 received 3 comments. These included praise to commitments regarding public realm improvements, a desire to see Local Centres given equal weight to those of towns, and a recommendation that additional wording be included on green infrastructure. Policy ADM28 received no comments.

Policies ADM29 and ADM30 received 1 comment each, both stating that the plan is unlikely to meet the assessed development and infrastructure requirements over the plan period, does not offer the most appropriate strategy as it unnecessarily discounts reasonable alternatives, and is unlikely to be deliverable due to the identification of retail sites which suffer from significant constraints. This comment was also received for Policy ADM33, with an additional request to replace land to the east of the High Street with Weavers Court.

Policy ADM31 received 2 comments stating that development should be allowed where there is no detriment to parking supply, and also that the car park at Braintree Retail Park and Freeport is being treated contrary to the NPPF and that forthcoming applications would not be treated on their own merits.

Policy ADM32 also received 2 comments. Of these, one stated that additional land should be identified for retail warehousing at land south of Millennium Way, and that the policy was inconsistent and contradictory with itself; and the other sought the proposed retail warehousing allocations for Swanvale and Maltings Lane to be replaced as employment use.

A total of 3 comments were received for Policy ADM34. These welcomed desired improvements to Witham, in particular regarding Newland Shopping Centre, and also recommended that the policy should exclude above ground decking or multi-storey car parking. A single response was received for Policy ADM35 requesting an amendment to include community uses.

Policy ADM36 received 5 responses. These welcomed the protection of the historical assets in part, and also stated constraints related cost, public opinion, lack of potential developers, biodiversity, archaeology, access, traffic, safety of nearby school pupils and its visual impact on the townscape. Other comments stated that the nature conservation value of the land has
not been adequately evaluated, that at there were tree preservation orders on site and that the site should be allocated as an educational, social and recreational resource. Policy ADM37 received 1 comment expressing support.

Changes to Plan: Wording changes to ADM24 Primary Shopping Areas, ADM25 District Centre, ADM26 Impact Assessments, ADM27 Town, District and Local Centre Improvements, ADM31 Car Parking – Freeport and Braintree Retail Park, ADM32 Retail Warehouse Development, ADN35 Comprehensive Development Area – Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre, Dorothy Sayers Drive, Witham, ADM36 Comprehensive Development Area – land to the east of the High Street, Halstead. To delete policy ADM29 Braintree Retail Park. To include new policy and supporting text ADM37A Broomhills Regeneration Site

Community Facilities
A total of 20 comments were received on the Community Facilities chapter. Of these, 3 were received for Policy ADM38. These included support, a requirement that some re-modelling and extension would be needed of existing schools and also one comment stating that the policy should be deleted as the new school falls within the extent of the North-West Braintree Growth Location which is relevant only to the Core Strategy.

Policy ADM39 received 1 comment stating that proposals would be difficult to assess in light of new government guidance and the absence of an up-to-date assessment of playing pitch needs.

Policy ADM40 also received a solitary comment stating that the Bocking site is unsuitable due to high water levels and those at Gestingthorpe and Witham would require a tier 1 risk assessment.

Policy ADM41 received a total of 4 comments. These stated that the requirement for community use is already established in the adopted Core Strategy, questioned whether developer contributions relate to a proposed pooled contribution, or to specific proposals, that the land at Oxford Meadow in Sible Hedingham should be included for Community Uses, that the policy should separate new and existing allocations, and that there should be a consistent approach to designation of community halls.

A total of 3 comments were received for Policy ADM42. These stated the importance of continued provision or improvement of existing facilities, and a request that an ‘additional policy’ within the Local Plan is included relating to Health Impact Assessments.

Policy ADM43 also received 3 comments. These professed support for the approach and also one stating that it is the role of NHSNE to commission all healthcare facilities in the plan area.

Policy ADM44 received 3 comments also. These requested Molly’s Wood, Sible Hedingham for inclusion, the retention of a buffer between two rear gardens on Witham River Walk and a recommendation that new community woodland be included at Silver End.

Changes to Plan: Wording changes to policies ADM38 Education Provision, ADM39 Educational Establishments, ADM40 Cemetery Extensions, ADM41 Community Uses, ADM43 Retention of Local Community Services and Facilities and ADM44 Community
Transport
The transport chapter of the Plan evoked 39 responses. Of these, 5 were received for Policy ADM45. These included requests for re-wording as to what criteria apply for different types of development, that plug-in charging points are not needed in all residential developments, that there be triggers for provision of additional public transport linked to increased population, and a more positive statement of intent regarding the provision of sustainable modes of transport, cycling and walking in new developments.

Policy ADM46 received 7 comments. One of these questioned the legitimacy of the policy as changes to CIL will make pooled s106 contributions unlawful and another stressed concerns that the policy would be inflexible in times of economic hardship. Other issues raised regarded the need for two bridging points on Witham River Walk, the request for a new policy promoting the provision of rural footways and cycleways, a desire for a cycle route between Coggeshall and Braintree, the reinstatement of a cycleway/footway designation for Little Braxted Lane, and provision for a cycle path along the disused railway track at the Premdor Rockways site in Sible Hedingham.

There were 3 comments received for ADM47. These sought the exclusion of a link road to Cut Throat Lane in Witham, and improvements on this side of the station to focus on cycling, walking, taxi and bus provision. Other comments recommended parking provision be on the Easton Road side of the station and questioned the legitimacy of the Council allocating Eckard House when it was privately owned.

Policy ADM48 also received 3 comments. These recommended the policy be more flexible in regard to potential uses of the site including residential, care home, residential and non-residential institutions, assembly and leisure and hotel uses. Other comments recommended applications include substantial planting and landscaping, hours of operation conditions, well designed lighting and a comprehensive environmental improvement brief.

Policy ADM49 received 19 responses. Regarding the Witham Station Access element of the policy, the majority opposed the access arrangements due to increased traffic and associated pollution, as well as flooding and heritage impacts. The A131 Halstead By-Pass proposal received comments stressing concerns on heritage and landscape, deliverability, relationship with other plans and programmes, funding, and impacts in Suffolk. It was also suggested that large scale housing proposals should pay the costs of necessary infrastructure improvements.

Changes Proposed: Wording changes to policies ADM45 Sustainable Access for All, ADM47 Parking Provision, ADM48 Transport Related Policy Areas, ADM49 New Road Schemes and paragraph 7.25 and 7.7.

Environment
A total of 62 comments were received for this chapter. General comments requested greater consideration of the historic environment, and a stronger policy stance regarding protection. Other comments supported the extension of the Dedham Vale AONB and the consideration of the Amphamstone and Lamarsh area for the same designation.
Policy ADM50 received 5 comments. There was support for the protection of ponds, rivers and woodlands, however recommendations that the policy be more aspirational in its enhancement of local character, the connection of habitats, the Stour Valley, heritage and the historic manmade dimension of the landscape. Further considerations were requested for National Red Data Book and Essex Red Data Book species and acknowledgement of the Water Framework Directive.

Policy ADM51 received 4 comments, predominantly related to the identification of impacts. Comments included a desire for local people to input into proposals, that ecological surveys and applications be undertaken by leading professionals and professional bodies, that ancient woodland requires further protection, that the Water Framework Directive should be referenced and that any negative impact should warrant immediate refusal. Regarding intensive livestock breeding, this element of the policy was deemed too restrictive in accumulation with a requirement for an EIA and that the word ‘intensive’ should be defined.

There were 9 comments received for Policy ADM52. These questioned whether the policy was overly prescriptive, did not cover floodlighting or heritage issues, and was not mindful enough of nearby residents. Further comments called for more weighting to bridleways, less weighting to traffic movements and an additional emphasis on chicken rearing/laying. The policy was also praised for its design criteria regarding new buildings. Policy ADM53 received no comments.

Policy ADM54 attracted a total of 9 comments. These praised the stance on Protected Lanes, called for more detail on natural features, sought additional statements regarding the reason for road repairs and emphasis that vehicle types are as important as vehicle numbers. There were also requests for an additional 9 lanes to be given Protected Lane status.

There were 4 comments received regarding Policy ADM55. These sought inclusion within the policy that schemes should not go over the requirements of the Building Regulations, energy efficiency measures and that there may be some difficulty in converting historic buildings to Code 3. The inclusion of references to reducing water consumption were welcomed.

Policy ADM56 received 5 comments. These largely supported the policy’s stance on historic buildings, renewable energy and impacts on water. Recommendations were made regarding a minimum requirement for renewable energy in all new builds, clarity around Flood Defence Consents and an acknowledgement that tree and hedge planting may have negative impacts on non-wooded areas of high wildlife.

There were 3 comments received regarding Policy ADM57. These requested further reference to heritage assets, archaeology, consultation with sewerage undertakers, and contamination and the phasing of remedial measures. Support was received for the policy’s inclusion of historical contamination.

Policy ADM58 received 2 comments. One favoured the alternative to ensure locations are appropriate and the other requested early engagement with the relevant Wastewater Company.
There were 4 comments received for Policy ADM59. These recommended a reference to the protection of heritage assets in terms of external lighting, a more prescriptive policy wording and that applicants should demonstrate the need for security lighting. There was also support for the policy’s comprehensiveness.

Changes to the Plan: Wording changes to policies ADM50 Landscape Character, ADM51 Protection of Biodiversity and Geodiversity, ADM52 Built Development in the Countryside, ADM54 Protected Lanes ADM55 Energy Efficiency, ADM56 Renewable Energy, ADM57 Contaminated Land, ADM59 External Lighting and paragraph 8.6, 8.16, 8.40 – 8.47, 8.55. New policy and supporting text ADM53A Redundant or Disused Buildings in the Countryside

**Design, Conservation and Listed Buildings**
The Design, Conservation and Listed Buildings chapter received a total of 29 comments. General comments recommended that the policy be extended to consider heritage assets at risk, that heritage assets not designated be recognised through a "Local List" and that good design should be compulsory for all design and access statements.

Policy ADM60 received 5 comments. These recommend that the Council be consistent with the Government’s zero carbon buildings and climate change adaptation policy and adopt nationally described standards, that the viability of some proposals would be jeopardised, reference to waste separation for recycling internally and externally, and reference to flood resilience and resistance. Comments also praised the policy’s aspirational objectives and reference to the Essex Design Guide.

There were no comments received for Policy ADM61. Policy ADM62 received 1 comments related to a desire to have protection for existing historic shop fronts and guidance on security shutters.

Policy ADM63 received 3 comments. These stated that reference to local conservation area appraisals and management plans would provide a more locally distinctive policy, that there was some prepetition with policy ADM60 and that Local Plan Review Policy RLP96 offered more detail.

Policy ADM64 received 1 comment recommending amalgamation with Policy ADM65 and the provision of guidance documents on shop front and adverts. Policy ADM65 received two comments supporting the policy and recommending down-lighting for frontages and signs.

There were 3 comments received for Policy ADM66. These stated better alignment with the NPPF and English Heritage guidance regarding enhancement, appropriate control and what constitutes ‘significance’ in the policy.

Policy ADM67 received 3 comments. These requested a demonstration that no viable use of the building can be found, or preservation secured through other means. Support was received for the month period to record a listed building prior support for demolition, however a recommendation was made that the policy require an appropriate historic building recording brief from the planning authority in order to ensure a permanent record of the historic building or structure is made.

There were 2 comments made for Policy ADM68. These sought better alignment with English Heritage policy regarding enabling development and also the wording within the
NPPF, the formulation of a Local List of buildings, and expansion to include the 7 tests set out in English Heritage guidance.

Policy ADM69 received 1 comment related to consistency with the NPPF regarding consultation of the relevant historic environment record.


Sport and Recreation
The Sport and Recreation chapter received 18 comments. General comments related to the absence of any allocations in the plan for new sports facilities and the inclusion of a policy which confirms the sites that will be allocated for meeting sport and recreation needs.

Within this chapter, Policy ADM70 received 1 comment of support and adherence to the NPPF. Policy ADM71 received 3 comment, which suggested the inclusion of a presumption against the artificial lighting of golf courses and driving ranges.

Policy ADM72 received 3 comments. These focused on a perceived omission of policy regarding the effect of noisy sports on other users of the countryside and also criteria involving recreational aircraft strips. Support was received for the Hatfield Peverel County Park.

There were no comments received regarding Policy ADM73. Policy ADM74 received 6 comments with a general consensus of support. There were concerns about traffic impacts, inclusive access for those without cars and also a request to move the location west in order to better define the Hatfield Peverel Village Envelope.

There was 1 comment made regarding Policy ADM75 which suggested clarification regarding how applicants are expected to 'demonstrate the need' for tourist development.

Changes Proposed: Minor wording changes to policy ADM71 Golf Courses and Driving Ranges, ADM72 Sports Causing Noise or Disturbance and ADM75 Tourist Development. New policy 75A on New Formal and Informal Recreation Allocations.

Delivery
The delivery chapter of the plan attracted 4 comments. These requested modifications to more accurately reflect the NPPF and The Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 in relation to Planning Obligations and CIL.

Changes Proposed: None

Glossary, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2
No comments received.

Proposals Map
A total of 54 comments were made to the Draft Proposals Map however these have been summarised on a village by village basis below.
Ashen
The inset map(s) for Ashen received 2 comments; supporting the plan and requesting an amendment to the village envelope.
Changes Proposed: Development boundary increased to the rear of Street Farm.

Belchamp St Paul and Belchamp Otten
The inset map(s) for Belchamp St Paul received 1 comment of support and rejection of the alternatives.
Changes Proposed: Amended extent of churchyard in Belchamp Otten, additional areas of visually important open space designated in Belchamp St Paul.

Birdbrook and New England
Two additional sites were put forward near New England for consideration as residential and community sites. The Parish Council were not supportive unless substantial community facilities and road improvements could be provided.
Changes Proposed: None

Black Notley
The inset map(s) for Black Notley received 7 comments; four in regard to the proposed map and 3 regarding alternatives. The proposed map attracted comment on visually open space restricting development for older persons accommodation, a desire to not see the village envelope extended and requesting improvements to Galleys Corner roundabout. Comments regarding alternatives stated that an alternative should be allocated, and supported the rejection of another due to impacts on protected species.
Changes Proposed: Boundary of visually important open space at Bedells Avenue amended.

Braintree and Bocking
The inset map(s) for Braintree and Bocking received 277 comments, 245 of which were on proposed allocations. General concerns related to a wish to see smaller and more affordable homes, and that the level of growth is too small and poorly located to stimulate required infrastructure and economic growth, need for further retail development and parking supply. English Heritage noted opportunities for enhancement of the Conservation Area from some allocated sites. Most comments related to site BON16H off Broad Road and were regarding traffic, loss of countryside and wildlife, impact on services, drainage, impact on public right of way, could set a precedent and its potential for open space. Support for the site was expressed by the developer.

Support for alternative sites were set out by landowners including housing need, use of brownfield sites, reflecting neighbouring character, sustainable locations and delivery of community facilities. Objections for alternative sites were submitted regarding loss of greenfields and trees, traffic issues, drainage and flooding, views and loss of recreation space.

Comments were submitted on BON5CH that there are heritage concerns and precedent by allocating more than the frontage of the site but there was also support expressed by the landowner. Comments on BRC7H including the access and traffic and impact on facilities.
Five new sites were submitted during the consultation period for consideration in Braintree and Bocking and one additional site at High Garrett.
Changes Proposed: BON16H off Broad Road was removed as a residential site of 10 or more dwellings, increased site area for residential site of 10 or more, BRE26H Braintree Tennis Club, allocate additional area of parking adjacent to Freeport Station and remove incorrect allocation of allotment at Dukes Road, informal recreation at Rifle Hill and education land at Lister Road.

**Bulmer**
The inset map(s) for Bulmer resulted in 3 comments being made in response to the alternative allocations. These supported the rejection of these sites on grounds of impacts on heritage assets, traffic safety, sewerage capacity, loss of open space, and a lack of capacity in local schools and healthcare.
Change Proposed: None

**Bulmer Tye**
The inset map(s) for Bulmer Tye resulted in 1 comment supporting the rejection of an alternative due to the site containing a small motte and bailey castle.
Changes Proposed: None

**Bures Hamlet**
The inset map(s) for Bures Hamlet resulted in 2 responses. One supported the rejection of alternatives on grounds of the capacity of local infrastructure, a lack of adequate retail facilities, traffic impacts and visual impacts. The other commented that an alternative should be allocated and Bures be designated as a Key Service Village.
Changes Proposed: None

**Castle Hedingham**
The inset map(s) for Castle Hedingham resulted in 5 comments, all surrounding the alternatives. Of these, 2 support their rejection on grounds of wildlife, habitat, historic and landscape impacts; however the majority felt that a number of the alternatives should be allocated for housing.
Changes Proposed: Amendment to development boundary at Nunnery Street

**Coggeshall**
The inset map(s) for Coggeshall had approximately 70 comments. Comments on COG12H were received regarding support for logical infill, room for parking and traffic generated would be minimal. Objections for housing submitted due to Conservation area, brownfield sites first, flood risk, sewers crossing the site, traffic, access and parking. Support for residential development from COG13Halt regards need for additional houses, off street parking proposed, green space proposed, no impact on neighbours. Comments objecting to residential development here included on intrusion of the countryside, archaeological interest, increase traffic, impact on heritage assets, flooding. Comments on alternative sites in the village included support from developers for sites and suggest review of development boundary, impacts on local wildlife site, increased surface water drainage issues, harm to historic assets, and to include the Dutch Nursery in the development boundary.
Changes Proposed: Vicarage Field changed to informal recreation, site COG20H Walford Way allocated for a residential site of 10 or more, COG21H Beaumont House allocated for a residential site of 10 or more.
Colne Engaine
The inset map(s) for Colne Engaine resulted in 1 comment. This objected to the dismissal of the alternatives, and wished the village envelope be expanded to include their allocation for housing and mixed-use development.
Changes Proposed: None

Cornish Hall End
The inset map(s) for Cornish Hall End received 2 responses stressing a lack of infrastructure to support development, an inadequate public transport system, and impacts on the character of the settlement.
Changes Proposed: None

Cressing and Cressing Tye
The inset map(s) for Cressing resulted in 4 comments being received, all regarding alternatives. Of these, most were supportive of the rejection regarding extensions of the village envelope into Greenfield land, coalescence with neighbouring settlements and impacts with predicted traffic congestion. Objections to the rejection of alternatives surrounded those on PDL, where they’d form a natural extension to Cressing, their proximity to services and their enhancement, and also the benefits of developer contributions and open space. Three additional sites were proposed for development.
Changes Proposed: None

Earls Colne Airfield
The inset map(s) for Earls Colne Airfield received 5 comments, 3 of which responded to proposed allocations. These generally supported allocations as Employment Policy Areas, with some requests that they be expanded to include further land, and one comment stating that development would further increase commercial traffic. Support for the rejection of alternatives was received due to impacts on a Local Wildlife Site.
Changes Proposed: Amend development boundary to the south and include site 9A and B as a B1-B8 uses.

Earls Colne and White Colne West
The inset map(s) for Earls Colne and White Colne West received 27 comments, 21 responding to proposed allocations. Comments stated that Earls Colne has recently seen development increase the size of the village by 10%, that housing need has been overestimated in the Plan and current capacity issues regarding healthcare, schools, sewerage, telecommunications and local roads. Further comments questioned the level of Greenfield development, the location of open space allocations and flooding issues. A large amount of comments were received regarding impacts on the Conservation Area and the countryside. Some support was expressed for both some of the allocations, especially the employment sites, and also the rejection of alternatives. There was some support also for an alternative site for housing.
Changes Proposed: Residential allocation of 10 or more at site EAR3H amended, structural landscaping added, amendment to informal recreation extent. Residential allocation of 10 or more at site EAR1N and EAR1S extended, informal recreation amended and structural landscaping added. Remove visually important open space at De Vere Road.
**Earsl Colne and White Colne East**

The inset map(s) for Earsl Colne and White Colne East received 8 comments; 4 each related to proposals and alternatives. These objected to the extension of the village envelope, that the site is too small for the level of development, that the allocation was contrary to the Village Design Statement, that there would be negative impacts on historic views, wildlife and tranquillity and that there would be pressure on local schools, doctors and local roads. There was some support for the proposal in relation to a modest supply of rural housing. The rejection of the majority of alternatives was supported, with support for one site stating its location and lack of impacts on neighbouring properties as a positive. An additional residential site was proposed in White Colne during the consultation period.

Changes Proposed: Residential site for 10 or more at WHC3H off Colchester Road was removed.

**Feering**

The inset map(s) for Feering received 162 comments with 128 of these responding to the proposed allocation at FEE10 Inworth Road. Objections were submitted as Feering is not a Key Service Village, outside development boundary, greenfield, no demand or jobs, traffic impacts, lack of footway, facilities are at capacity and overlooking. Anglian Water were concerned about the capacity of waste water treatment works and surface water network. Support was received from the landowner due to its sustainable location, links to village and contained landscape impact. Support representations were submitted to alternative sites from developers including their sustainable location and good links to the village and facilities.

Changes Proposed: Site FEE10H Inworth Road removed as residential site. Site FEE4H London Road added as a residential site of 10 or more.

**Finchingfield**

The inset map(s) for Finchingfield received 4 comments, of which 3 responded to the alternatives. These supported their rejection due to sites being located outside the village envelope, impacts on the historical character of the settlement, an inadequate public transport system to support development and increased traffic.

Changes Proposed: None

**Foxearth and Liston**

The inset map(s) for Foxearth and Liston received 2 comments, both regarding the alternatives. There was support for rejection due to potential impacts on an SSSI, flooding issues and poor transport infrastructure. Support was received for employment development in the area.

Changes Proposed: None

**Gestingthorpe and Audley End**

Two additional sites were submitted for consideration in Gestingthorpe and Audley End by the landowner, of which the Parish Council were not supportive.

Changes Proposed: None

**Gosfield and Airfield**

The inset map(s) for Gosfield and Airfield received 10 comments; 8 of which responded to alternative allocations. Of these, the majority supported rejection due to possible traffic problems, the type of housing, the destruction of the village’s nature, infrastructure issues,
Great Bardfield
The inset map(s) for Great Bardfield received 7 comments. Of these, 5 responded to the proposed allocations. Comments both objected to and supported the alteration of the village development boundary. Other comments involved a request to remove a Visually Important Open Space designation, supported the allocation of Local Wildlife Sites, and promoted a site for 12 properties to meet local need. The alternative map was supported, with comments citing impacts on the setting of the church and development detracting from the character of the village.
Changes Proposed: Area to the rear of the Town Hall designated as informal open space, area adjacent to the fountain as visually important open space

Great Maplestead
The inset map(s) for Great Maplestead received 33 comments; 17 of which responded to the proposed allocations and 16 to the alternatives map. Objections to allocations believed there to be no policies that support such inclusion of housing, that there is sufficient capacity inside the village envelope, that changes to the envelope will stimulate back fill applications, a lack of waste disposal facilities, inadequate access, landscape issues, drainage problems, a lack of facilities to support development and that development would be contrary to the Village Design Statement. The rejection of alternatives was supported in regards to a lack of facilities, congestion issues, noise pollution, poor gas supply and telecommunications capacity, drainage and sewerage issues, and lack of privacy. There was one instance of support for development at an alternative site, however only for a single dwelling of high quality design.
Major Changes: None

Great Notley
The inset map(s) for Great Notley received 4 comments; 3 of which responded to the alternatives map. Comments concerned the impacts of allocations in neighbouring Braintree would have on their educational and health resources, and objections were made to the rejection of alternative allocations that are perceived as highly sustainable.
Changes Proposed: None

Great Saling
The inset map(s) for Great Saling received 1 comment generally supporting the Plan.
Changes Proposed: None

Great Yeldham
The inset map(s) for Great Yeldham received 18 comments; 14 of these regarding the proposed allocations. Comments regarding the proposed allocations regarded issues such as drainage, impacts on listed buildings, the development of Greenfield land, the safety of the access proposals, loss of sunlight and privacy to neighbouring properties, noise
disturbance and flooding. Alternative sites received comments regarding safety of access, parking issues, loss of wildlife, congestion and noise pollution. A further site was proposed for housing that was previously safeguarded for employment which received numerous positive comments in support surrounding its inclusion of a surgery and a large playing field, the site being previously developed and visual improvements. A new site for residential development and regeneration of the employment area was submitted during the consultation for Hunnables Industrial Estate.

Changes Proposed: Amendment of residential site area GRY3H Nuns Walk Field and inclusion of community uses, Whitlock Green allocation changed from community uses to informal recreation, additional of informal recreation designation at corner of High Street/Toppesfield Road, designation of GRY5H as a residential site of 10 or more including a site for community uses, reduction in employment allocation at Hunnables Industrial Estate.

**Halstead**
The inset map(s) for Halstead received 35 comments; 19 regarding the proposed allocations and 16 on the alternatives. Comments regarding the proposed allocations including impact on countryside, overlooking, flooding issues, traffic impacts and parking. Specific representations were also submitted on the amount of care home places in the town, impact on open space and the impact of development on the listed building at Blamsters Farm. Objections submitted to development on land east of the High Street due to impact on historic assets and prominent site and alternative uses suggested such as open space and heritage centre. Various positions for and against the Halstead bypass were put forward.

There was support from developers for alternative sites due to employment land not being required and objections on wildlife impacts, overlooking, flooding, traffic and parking, creation of ribbon development. Three new sites for residential development were submitted as part of the consultation.

Changes Proposed: Amendment to site boundary of HTR6H to exclude footpath. Adjustment to development boundary along Ashlong Grove. To route of the proposed Halstead bypass shown as a corridor rather than a specific road proposal route.

**Hatfield Peverel**
The inset map(s) for Hatfield Peverel received 140 comments. Of these, 107 responded to the proposed allocations. General comments to on Hatfield Peverel were related to coalescence with Witham, traffic congestion, facilities cannot cope, impact on wildlife, noise of A12/railway line, impact on Arla Diary on village and there were specific highways concerns expressed on both the proposed housing allocations. Petitions were also received against HAT14H and WIS6 increase in numbers. Support representations were received from landowners setting out the deliverability, sustainable location, and potential link road from the sites. There were also some comments on whether the Arla Dairy site should be protected for employment uses and support for non-allocation of alternative sites.

Two additional sites were submitted for consideration for residential development and one for industrial/commercial development in Hatfield Peverel.

Changes Proposed: Removal of residential allocation of site HAT14H the Vineyards, increase in area of site HAT17H, Sorrells Field and addition of structural landscaping, formal recreation allocation of Cricket ground and adjacent allotments protected. Minor amendment to local centre boundary.
Helions Bumpstead
The inset map(s) for Helions Bumpstead received 4 comments; 3 of which responded to the proposed allocation. The majority of comments sought alternative sites to be included within the village envelope and as an allocation in the Plan, the inclusion of an allocated employment site and a site for affordable housing. Objections to allocations surrounded the demand and need for, and location of, allocated allotments. An additional site at Pale Green was put forward for inclusion within the development boundary.
Changes Proposed: Amend employment designation of site HEL2E, Pale Green to B1 uses only. To move the allotment designation from site HEL5Halt to land north of Slate Hall Farm

Kelvedon
The inset map(s) for Kelvedon received 37 comments of which 23 regarded the proposed allocations. Traffic and parking problems in the village were highlighted along with the pressure on local services and that employment areas should be provided. Anglian Water noted concerns on the waste water treatment works capacity and surface water network capacity. National Grid supported the non-allocation of other sites which could have a detrimental impact on the rail network. There was some support expressed by developers for alternative sites and the extension to St Dominics Care Home, however objections were also submitted to these sites because of impact on landscape, flood zones and character of the village. An additional site was proposed for residential development.
Changes Proposed: None

Lamarsh and Alphamstone
The inset map(s) received one comment regarding alternatives. This supported the rejection of all allocations due to flooding issues and a loss of amenity.
Changes Proposed: None

Nounsley
The inset map(s) for Nounsley received 10 comments of which 4 responded to proposed allocations and 6 to alternatives. These supported no development outside the village envelope and requests for both the Sportsman’s Arms PH for residential. The rejection of alternatives was generally supported on grounds of an unwillingness for Nounsley to expand, with one objection to include a site for housing. Two additional sites were submitted through the consultation period for residential development.
Changes Proposed: None

Ovington
The inset map(s) for Ovington received 1 comment in regard to an alternative. They supported the rejection due to impacts on a current dwelling that would be replaced, and suggested a redrafting of the village envelope boundary should the site become allocated for this reason.
Changes Proposed: None

Panfield
The inset map(s) for Panfield received 4 comments; 2 each to proposed allocations and alternatives. These comments sought the allocation of a number of Assets of Community Value, a request that the village envelope is not expanded, and that significant strategic level growth is already planned for the area. There was one comment that objected to an alternative site’s rejection.
Changes Proposed: To designate the allotment site as such. Show the Thistledown Planning Field and John Barr Playing Field as formal recreation.

**Pebmarsh**
The inset map(s) for Pebmarsh received 3 comments of which 2 responded to proposed allocations. Representations requested development boundaries be amended to include alternative sites, whilst one comment supported the rejection of the alternatives, and another stressed that a playing field would be gifted on inclusion allocation of an alternative.
Changes Proposed: None

**Rayne**
The inset map(s) for Rayne received 4 comments of which 3 related to the alternatives. These supported their rejection due to a loss of allotments, concerns regarding coalescence, and landscape impacts. There was support for one alternative site to be included as an allocation for 20 dwellings. Two new sites were submitted for residential development.
Changes Proposed: Amendment of development boundary on School Road to accommodate existing development.

**Ridgewell**
The inset map(s) for Ridgewell received 8 comments; 4 of which responded to the proposed allocations. The majority of these objected to allocations on grounds of perceived impacts on the Conservation Area, existing housing densities, an Ancient Monument, privacy, wildlife habitats, trees, safe access, flooding and the potential for contaminated land; however there was support citing accessibility to services and development on previously developed land. The rejection of alternatives was supported where issues of land ownership were highlighted. Three additional sites were submitted for consideration for residential development.
Changes Proposed: Removed designation of 10 or more dwellings and amend development boundary around site RID4H, Stambourne Road.

**Rivenhall**
The inset map(s) for Rivenhall received 7 comments. General comments sought the designation of numerous additional community uses, footpaths, cycleways and Protected Lanes. There was support for the rejection of all alternative sites, citing impacts on a Scheduled Monument, archaeological remains, a Local Wildlife Site and the identity of the village. Comments also respond to an already significant amount of planned growth in the area, issues of coalescence, the allocation of similar proposals nearby in Witham and safety of access to certain sites.
Changes Proposed: None

**Rivenhall End**
The inset map(s) for Rivenhall End received 2 comments on the proposed allocations. These sought corrections to perceived inaccuracies in some cycleway, Community Use and informal recreation designations.
Changes Proposed: Removed informal recreation north of village. Removed community use allocation from Henry Dixon Hall
Shalford
The inset map(s) for Shalford received 2 comments; both of which responded to the alternatives and supported their rejection based on impacts on trees, the suitability of further housing in the area and the character of the village.
Major Changes: None

Shalford (Church End)
The inset map(s) for Shalford (Church End) received 14 comments; 9 regarding alternatives and 5 responding to proposed allocations. There was support for some alternatives where the proposal would enhance the attractiveness of the area and support the primary school. Further comments supported the rejection of alternatives on ground of removing greenspace and trees, extending the village envelope, impacts on landscape, flooding issues, wildlife impacts and also impacts on neighbouring properties.
Changes Proposed: Remove development boundary alteration adjacent to Gables, increase development boundary adjacent to White Courts and addition of visually important open space

Sible Hedingham
The inset map(s) for Sible Hedingham received a total of 7 comments of which 5 responded to proposed allocations. General comments question the designation of Visually Important Space in one instance and recommend the additional designation of spaces and Community Woodlands and Orchards in others. They also state that the Village Envelope should not be amended, seek the allocation of a business and leisure use on one site and identify significant infrastructure improvements that would be needed to accommodate new development. Comments were also received supporting new growth, particularly at allocated sites for mixed-use development. One comment responded to housing being more suitable on an allocated employment site. The rejection of alternative sites was generally supported due to being outside the Village Envelope and impacts on the Conservation Area.
Changes Proposed: To allocate Mollys Wood as a community woodland/orchard. To allocate visually important open space between Swan Street and Grays Hall Meadow

Silver End
The inset map(s) for Silver End received 6 comments; 3 each to the proposed allocations and alternatives. General comments were received regarding a need for further parking provision with sites suggested. The allocations map received objection regarding impacts on housing density, the demolition of existing buildings, difficulties obtaining finance for the development and issues regarding deliverability. The alternatives map received objections regarding alternatives for housing, that the site is well screened, is partially previously developed and has suitable access including to sustainable transport. Contrary to this, support for the rejection noted issues regarding safe access, flooding and development into the countryside.
Changes Proposed: Environmental Improvement areas added to Valentine Way and School Road and identify allotments off Joseph Gardens.

Steeple Bumpstead
The inset map(s) for Steeple Bumpstead received 6 comments. These stated that the proposed allocation is partly within a Conservation Area, would have landscape impacts if developed, and has access difficulties. Conversely, comments were received that praised the suitability, deliverability and logical location of the allocation. The rejection of alternative
sites was objected to; noting benefits to parking, the provision of affordable housing and deliverability.

Changes Proposed: Amend development boundary at rear of Blois Meadow to reflect employment designation

**Stisted**
The inset map(s) for Stisted received 2 comments; 1 each for allocations and alternatives, and 127 separate comments on the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Twin Oaks. Objections on the site at Twin Oaks regarded the illegal use of the site, convenience for the Council, cost, concentration of pitches in a single area, sites should be in public ownership, smaller sites should be preferred, impact on local residents and infrastructure, access and highway safety, illegal activities on/adjacent to site. Support for the allocation was received from the agent representing the site regarding policy and pitch delivery and a suitable location.

Comments on Stisted village were an objection to visually important space at Sarcel and support for non-allocation of an alternative site in the village.

Changes Proposed: Removal of visually important open space designation at Sarcel.

**Sturmer East**
The inset map(s) for Sturmer East received 2 comments regarding the alternatives map. These objected to the rejection of a site citing its capability to meet local housing needs. An additional site was submitted for consideration for residential development.

Changes Proposed: None

**Toppesfield**
No comments were received on the Plan, however two additional sites were submitted for residential development which generated significant public objections following the closure of the consultation period.

Changes Proposed: None

**Wethersfield and Blackmore End**
No comments were received on the map(s) for Wethersfield, and Blackmore End received 1 comment stating that the two village envelopes are drawn in a manner that restricts infill development. In Blackmore End, two additional sites were submitted as extensions to the development boundary.

Changes Proposed: None

**Wickham St Paul**
The inset map(s) for Wickham St Paul received 1 comment responding to the alternatives map. This sought the allocation of an alternative site on the grounds that it would provide housing in a sustainable location with a good level of local services.

Changes Proposed: None

**Witham**
The inset map(s) for Witham received 114 comments. Of these, 83 responded to proposed allocations and 31 responded to the alternatives. Regarding WCH2Halt there was support for its designation as visually important open space due to its valuable contribution, close to existing open space and impact on wildlife site. A petition supporting this allocation was received. Comments from the land owner related to number of dwellings in Witham,
sustainable location, community benefits, most of site is hidden from view so cannot be visually important. A number of responses were on site WIS6 regarding the impact of increasing density, distance from facilities and coalescence with Hatfield Peverel. The developer objected to the phasing of the site but set out the density would be appropriate. ECC supported the increase as this would more easily support a new primary school.

Representations on other allocated sites in the town regarded access, congestion and parking, drainage, impact on landscape and wildlife, need for community facilities, sewerage, already being used as for retail and need for access road to Morrisons. Representations received from land owners of alternative sites included the allocation for car parking not justified, harm historic setting, overdevelopment and adjacent to the development boundary. Objection received on allocating visually important open space within housing estates in Witham as could restrict infill development.

Changes Proposed: Removed the proposed access road for site WIW1H, land at Teigh Drive and the structural landscaping adjacent to Blunts Hall Road. Allocate site WCH27H, the old Magistrates Court, as a residential site of 10 or more. To allocate Visually Important Open Space on Newland Street adjacent to site WCH27H. Allocated site WIS10H, Ivy Chimneys as a residential site of 10 or more and allocate visually important open space on Hatfield Road adjacent to the site. Amendment to the primary shopping area in Witham

Settlements that received no comments
The following settlements’ maps did not instigate any representations at public engagement: Belchamp Walter, Bradwell, Little Maplestead, Little Yeldham, Stambourne Chapel End Way, Stambourne Dyers End, Terling, Tilbury Juxta Clare and White Notley.

Changes Proposed: None

Landscape Character Areas
There were no comments received specifically on the Landscape Character Areas and no changes are proposed.
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Braintree District Council

January 2014
**Representation Form for Consultation on the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan**

Responses to the consultation on the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan are encouraged via the Council’s online consultation system available on the website. However this form can be returned electronically, or in hard copy if preferred. All responses must be sent to planningpolicy@braintree.gov.uk or Planning Policy, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree CM7 9HB and received by 5pm on Friday 22nd February 2013. Please read the accompanying guidance notes before completing this form.

If you wish to submit a new site for consideration which has not already been included in either the Core Strategy or Site Allocations process, please fill in a site submission form (also available on the website) and return to the same address.

If an agent has been appointed to act on your behalf please also fill in the agent’s details below.

**Personal Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agents Details (if applicable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that your representations will be available for public inspection and viewable on the website. Please provide your name and address as anonymous comments will not be considered. However to reduce the risk of identity fraud do not sign letters or forms with a signature. The Council reserves the right not to publish or take into account any representations which are openly offensive or defamatory.
1. To which part of the Site Allocations and Development Management Document is your comment referring? 

(Please write in policy or paragraph number or site reference number and map number as set out in the accompanying guidance notes).

2. Is your comment;
   • Supporting the draft plan? 
   • Objecting to the draft plan? 
   • Commenting on the draft plan? 

3. Please set out your comments below
   (additional pages may be attached if required but if you are intending to submit a separate document which details your responses please summarise your comments in relation to the specific part of the document set out in question 1)

4. Please set out any changes to the document that you think are necessary
### Monitoring Information

Please complete the monitoring form and return it with your representation. This allows us to monitor which groups are participating in the Local Development Framework process and which may need further support. The data will be detached from your representation and separated from any other information that could link it to you.

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 and under</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Do you have a disability?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White – British</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Irish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed – White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed – White and Black African</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed – White and Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Pakistani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British - Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – African</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group, please specify below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read these guidance notes before submitting your representations.

The draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (together with a Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment) has been published for a 6 week public consultation period. The Council is inviting responses and comments on the draft document, before a final version of the document, known as the Submission Draft, is published later in the year and submitted to a Planning Inspector for examination.

The document can be seen in full on the Council’s website and a paper copy is available to view at the Council’s main office at Causeway House in Braintree and at the libraries in Braintree and Witham. Copies of the document on CD are also held at the other libraries in the District during normal opening hours. Copies of the document on CD can be purchased from the Council at a cost of £10. The supporting documents and evidence base prepared in support of this document are available on the website and copies of specific documents on CD can be purchased if required.

As this is a draft plan, it sets out the Council’s preferred approach to the document and also the reasonable alternatives which have been considered by the Council in the formulation of the document. The Council would welcome your comments on the preferred approach and also on whether you think the Council was right in not supporting the alternative options which are set out. You can also suggest new options and allocations if you believe they are reasonable, which have not yet been considered.

The Plan contains a series of land allocation policies and maps which show the proposed development boundaries and draft land allocations for each of the Towns, Villages and Industrial areas in the District for:

- Housing developments of 10 dwellings or more
- Land which will be used for employment
- Open space and land set aside for recreation and allotments
- Land for retail development and boundaries for town centres and primary shopping areas
- Land for community uses, education or cemetery/churchyards

The maps also show information on Conservation Areas, Mineral Safeguarding areas and designated sites such as Local Wildlife Sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Ancient Monuments. Areas outside of development boundaries are classed as countryside and are shown on the Proposals Map.

In this draft document there are usually two maps for each settlement with a development boundary where alternatives have been submitted.

The first shows the Council’s preferred option and proposed allocations for the settlement.

The second map (where applicable) shows sites which were suggested by landowners or their agents for development of any kind. Most of these sites have not been included by the Council as preferred option development sites.
You are invited to comment upon the Council’s preferred option and on whether you support any of the alternative sites.

All the sites have a specific reference number which is shown on the maps and which should be used in question 1 on the response form to identify which site you are commenting on.

On the draft site allocation plan this reference number is made up of;

The prefix for that area e.g. KEL for Kelvedon or FEE for Feering;
A number; and
A letter which denotes what the site has been allocated for e.g. H for Housing, E for Employment.
So for example the full reference would be KEL8E

On the alternatives draft site allocation plan the reference number is made up of;
A prefix and number as set out above;
A letter which denotes what the site has been allocated or put forward for consideration for; and
ALT which denotes it as an alternative site or site use.
So for example the full reference would be FEE4HALT

The Development Management Policies will apply across the whole District, once approved and are used by the Council when deciding whether to approve planning applications. The policies are separated into 8 chapters which deal with;

- Housing
- Employment
- Retail
- Transport
- Design Conservation and Listed Buildings
- Environment
- Sport and Recreation
- Community Facilities

Each gives more detail and local context to the Government’s guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, and the strategic policies already approved as part of the Core Strategy.

The policies provide criteria against which all types of large and small planning applications are assessed and form the basis of our approval or rejection of those applications. Each policy is numbered and begins with the prefix ADM.

This draft document also suggests reasonable alternative policies or approaches which have been considered. In some cases no reasonable alternative options were identified and this is set out. Each alternative policy has a paragraph number and this should be quoted when commenting on the option.

The Council would encourage all responses to be made through the Council’s online consultation system which is available on the website or by following this
In order to submit your comments, if you are not already registered, you will need to click on login/register and then follow the links to register as a consultee. It is necessary to provide a valid email address to use the system. Please remember your username and password as you will need this to access the system.

The online system will allow you to click on each map, policy or paragraph and comment directly upon it. However a response form is also available on the website and in hard copy as requested, which can be filled in and submitted online or via the post. Both the online consultation system and the response form require answers to the same questions.

A separate representation form is required to be submitted for each representation where it relates to a different policy, paragraph, map or site.

If you wish to submit a new site which has not yet been considered through the Site Allocations or Core Strategy processes you should download and return the site submission form which is available on the Council’s website. Alternatively this can be found on the online consultation system at the start of the Draft Proposals and Inset Maps section. This asks for details of the site which you wish to be considered, including a map/s of the site and what you wish the land to be considered for e.g. housing or employment. The site submission form and all accompanying maps and information must be received by the 22nd February.

Guidance on how to fill in each question of your representation form is set out below

**Contact Details**

Please fill in your full contact details in the spaces provided. Representations which are submitted without a valid name or address cannot be accepted. Please supply an email address if you have one as it will allow us to contact you electronically. All representations will be published in full on our website but address and contact details of individuals will be removed (only the name will be included).

Everyone who submits a representation will be added to our consultation database (if not already included) in order that we may keep you updated on the progress of the plan. If you do not wish to be contacted please state this clearly on the form.

If an agent or consultant has been engaged to act on your behalf please fill in only your name then the agent’s details in full. All correspondence will then be sent directly to the agent, unless otherwise specified clearly on the form. If you are a landowner with an agent acting on your behalf please ensure that your agent knows the site name and reference number which your site has been given.

Please note that your representations will be available for public inspection and viewable on the website. Please provide your name and address as anonymous comments will not be considered. However to reduce the risk of identity fraud do not sign letters or forms with a signature. The Council reserves the right not to publish or take into account any representations which are openly offensive or defamatory.
Question 1: To which part of the Site Allocations and Development Management Document is your comment referring?

If your comment is relating to a paragraph or policy please write the number in the box (e.g. para 4.32 or ADM5).

If your representation relates to an alternative option to a policy please state the paragraph number in which the alternative is considered.

However if you are suggesting an alternative option for a policy which has not yet been considered please write in the policy number of the preferred policy. If you wish to suggest a whole new policy area for example a policy on houses of multiple occupation please put the chapter number you think the policy would fall under.

If you are commenting on a map as a whole, the development boundary proposed for the area or an area which has not been considered for development, please put the Map Inset Number (found in the top right hand corner of each map). If you wish to comment on a specific site, either preferred or alternative please use the site reference number as shown on the map (and discussed in more detail on the previous page).

Question 2: Is your comment

- Supporting the draft plan?
- Objecting to the draft plan?
- Commenting on the draft plan?

Please tick in the relevant box as to whether you consider your representation supports the Council’s preferred approach, objects or disagrees with the Council’s preferred approach (i.e. supports one of the alternative options identified or is suggesting a further alternative) or if you are commenting on the plan (neither objecting or supporting)

Question 3: Please set out your comments below

Please set out in detail, your comments relating to the specific paragraph, policy, map or site that you have specified in question 1. Please use further sheets if required. Whilst not encouraged if you are submitting a separate document detailing your representations please complete a summary of the comments in this box. Please also send 2 hard copies and an electronic version of this document to the Council.

Question 4: Please set out any changes to the document that you think are necessary

If you are not supportive of the Council’s preferred approach as set out in the document please use this space to clearly set out what changes you want made to the plan to make it acceptable. This could include new wording to policies or paragraphs, changes to development boundaries or different or new sites being allocated for development. Please use additional sheets if required.

Please fill in the monitoring information to help the Council to monitor which groups are participating in the Local Development Framework process and
which may need further support. The data will be detached from your representation and separated from any other information that could link it to you.

If you have any questions about filling in the representation form please contact planning policy at Braintree District Council on

Telephone 01376 551414 ext 2567
Email planningpolicy@braintree.gov.uk

Planning Policy
Causeway House
Bocking End
Braintree
CM7 9HB

All representations must be received by no later than 5pm on Friday 22nd February.
Public Consultation on the Braintree District Council Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) and on the draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement.

I am writing to inform you that the Council is preparing a Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and has published a draft Plan for a period of six weeks public consultation, commencing on 10th January 2013. This Plan sets out proposed areas for development in the District up to 2026. It accompanies and supports the strategic development proposals in the Core Strategy approved in 2011. The Council would welcome your views on the draft proposals and representations about what a plan with that subject ought to contain. The Council is also publishing a Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment, which accompanies the Draft Plan and a Draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement, which sets out how the Council proposes to consult on planning proposals, upon which comments are also sought. I enclose a CD which contains the Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan, the draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement and the response forms and guidance notes. The SA/SEA will be available on the Council’s website in approximately one weeks time.

The Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan sets out land allocations for future development on maps for each town, village and industrial area in the District, which have a development boundary. The maps shows the boundary of areas that can be developed. Outside these areas, land is classed as countryside, which is protected from most development. The maps identify specific areas of land proposed for:
- Housing developments of 10 dwellings or more
- Land which will be used for employment
- Open space and land set aside for recreation and allotments
- New retail development and boundaries for town centres and primary shopping areas
- Land safeguarded for community uses, education or cemetery/churchyards.

As this is a draft document, it contains two maps for most settlements. The first is the Council’s preferred option for the development boundary and land allocations in the settlement and the second shows other sites that have been proposed by landowners so far, for consideration for new development which have not been supported by the Council as part of the draft plan. Further development sites may also be suggested as part of this public consultation.

Please note that the principle of the strategic growth locations, as well as the regeneration sites (at Premdor/ Rockways Sible Hedingham and former Crittalls/Finishing Company Silver End) were approved as part of the Core Strategy document in 2011 and are not part of the current consultation.

The strategic growth locations are:
- NW Braintree off Panfield Lane, Springwood Drive 600 houses and 15ha employment
- West of A131 at Great Notley 18.5ha employment area
- SW Witham north of Hatfield Road, 600 houses
- NE Witham off Forest Rd in Rivenhall Parish 300 houses

The plan contains the draft Development Management policies, which are used by the Council
when deciding whether to approve planning applications. There are over seventy policies in the
document, which deal with issues including: Housing, Employment, Retail, Transport, Design
and Conservation, the Environment, Sport and Recreation and Community Facilities. As this is
a draft document, it also contains alternative approaches or policy wording, which the Council
has considered, but has not selected as its preferred approach.

The Council is seeking your comments not only on the preferred approach but also on the
alternative options which have been suggested. There is also the opportunity to suggest
reasonable alternative options, which you think the Council has not yet considered and to
submit new sites for consideration for development through a site submission form.

The Council is holding a series of public exhibitions where officers from Braintree Council will be
on hand to answer any questions you may have. All exhibitions will have copies of the maps for
all parts of the District available to view.

- Tuesday 15th January  Earls Colne Village Hall 1.30pm – 6.30pm
- Wednesday 16th January  Witham Public Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Thursday 17th January  Witham Public Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Monday 21st January  Braintree Town Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Tuesday 22nd January  Braintree Town Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Wednesday 23rd January  Great Yeldham Reading Rooms 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Thursday 24th January  Coggeshall Village Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Monday 28th January  Halstead Queens Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Wednesday 30th January  Hatfield Peverel Village Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Thursday 31st January  Sible Hedingham Baptist Church 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Wednesday 6th February  Kelvedon Institute 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Thursday 7th February  Silver End Congregational Church 2.30pm – 7.30pm

The document and all the studies, which support it are available on the Council’s website
www.braintree.gov.uk by following the links to planning policy and the LDF.
Hard copies of the plan are available for reference at the Council’s offices at Causeway House
in Braintree and at Braintree and Witham libraries. The plan will be available on CD at other
libraries throughout the District. The CD may be purchased from the Council at a cost of £10
plus postage.

Consultation responses are encouraged directly via the Council’s online consultation system,
which can be accessed from the website. Alternatively a response form is available to download
from the website and in hard copy on request. Please read the accompanying guidance notes
before completing the form.

All responses must be received by 5pm on Friday 22nd February and sent to;
planningpolicy@braintree.gov.uk or
Planning Policy, Causeway House, Bocking End Braintree CM7 9HB

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact us on 01376 551414 and ask for
planning policy or planningpolicy@braintree.gov.uk

Yours Sincerely

Emma Goodings
For Planning Policy Manager
Dear

Public Consultation on the Braintree District Council Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Sustainability Appraisal /Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) and on the draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement.

I am writing to inform you that the Council is preparing a Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and has therefore published a draft plan for a period of six weeks public consultation, commencing on 10th January 2013. This Plan sets out proposed areas for development in the District up to 2026. It accompanies and supports the strategic development proposals in the Core Strategy approved in 2011. The Council would welcome your views on the draft proposals and your comments about what a local plan with that subject should contain. The Council is also publishing a Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment, which accompanies the Draft Plan and a Draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement, which sets out how the Council proposes to consult on planning proposals, upon which comments are also sought.

The Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan sets out land allocations for future development on maps for each town, village and industrial area in the District, which have a development boundary. The maps show the boundary of areas that can be developed. Outside these areas, land is classed as countryside, which is protected from most development. The maps identify specific areas of land proposed for:

- Housing developments of 10 dwellings or more
- Land which will be used for employment
- Open space and land set aside for recreation and allotments
- New retail development and boundaries for town centres and primary shopping areas
- Land safeguarded for community uses, education or cemetery/churchyards.

As this is a draft document, it contains two maps for most settlements. The first is the Council’s preferred option for the development boundary and land allocations in the settlement and the second shows other sites that have been proposed by landowners so far, for consideration for new development which have not been supported by the Council as part of the draft plan. Further development sites may also be suggested as part of this public consultation.

Please note that the principle of the strategic growth locations, as well as the regeneration sites (at Premdor/ Rockways Sible Hedingham and former Crittalls/Finishing Company Silver End) were approved as part of the Core Strategy document in 2011 and are not part of the current consultation. The strategic growth locations are;
- NW Braintree off Panfield Lane, Springwood Drive 600 houses and 15ha employment
- West of A131 at Great Notley 18.5ha employment area
SW Witham north of Hatfield Road, 600 houses
NE Witham off Forest Rd in Rivenhall Parish 300 houses

The plan contains the draft Development Management policies, which are used by the Council when deciding whether to approve planning applications. There are over seventy policies in the document, which deal with issues including; Housing, Employment, Retail, Transport, Design and Conservation, the Environment, Sport and Recreation and Community Facilities. As this is a draft document, it also contains alternative approaches or policy wording, which the Council has considered, but has not selected as its preferred approach.

The Council is seeking your comments not only on the preferred approach, but also on the alternative options which have been suggested. There is also the opportunity to suggest reasonable alternative options, which you think the Council has not yet considered and to submit new sites for consideration for development through a site submission form.

The Council is holding a series of public exhibitions where officers from Braintree Council will be on hand to answer any questions you may have. All exhibitions will have copies of the maps for all parts of the District available to view.

- Tuesday 15th January Earls Colne Village Hall 1.30pm – 6.30pm
- Wednesday 16th January Witham Public Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Thursday 17th January Witham Public Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Monday 21st January Braintree Town Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Tuesday 22nd January Braintree Town Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Wednesday 23rd January Great Yeldham Reading Rooms 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Thursday 24th January Coggeshall Village Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Monday 28th January Halstead Queens Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Wednesday 30th January Hatfield Peverel Village Hall 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Thursday 31st January Sible Hedingham Baptist Church 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Wednesday 6th February Kelvedon Institute 2.30pm – 7.30pm
- Thursday 7th February Silver End Congregational Church 2.30pm – 7.30pm

The document and all the studies, which support it are available on the Council’s website www.braintree.gov.uk by following the links to planning policy and the LDF. Hard copies of the plan are available for reference at the Council’s offices at Causeway House in Braintree and at Braintree and Witham libraries. The plan will be available on CD at other libraries throughout the District. The CD may be purchased from the Council at a cost of £10 plus postage.

Consultation responses are encouraged directly via the Council’s online consultation system, which can be accessed from the website. Alternatively a response form is available to download from the website and in hard copy on request. Please read the accompanying guidance notes before completing the form.

**All responses must be received by 5pm on Friday 22nd February and sent to;**
planningpolicy@braintree.gov.uk or
Planning Policy, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree CM7 9HB

You have been sent this letter, as you have asked to be placed on the database, are a landowner who has submitted a site, or has previously commented on a planning document such as the Core Strategy. If you do not wish to continue to receive these correspondences in the future, please let us know at the contact details above. Alternatively if you wish to receive these notifications by email please provide us with an email address.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact us on 01376 551414 and ask for planning policy or planningpolicy@braintree.gov.uk

Yours Sincerely

For Planning Policy Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.P.T.</th>
<th>Great Waltham Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancer Spa (Midlands) Ltd</td>
<td>Haverhill Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglian Water Services Ltd</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arqiva</td>
<td>Home Builders Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkins Telecom</td>
<td>Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh District Council</td>
<td>Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreham Parish Council</td>
<td>Housing Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree Association of Local Councils</td>
<td>Hutchinson 3G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree Fire Station</td>
<td>Kedington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Gas Connections Ltd</td>
<td>Langford &amp; Ulting Parish Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Telecom</td>
<td>Lindsell Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Telecom</td>
<td>Little Baddow Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Little Bardfield Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bures St Mary Parish Council</td>
<td>Little Braxted Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire County Council</td>
<td>Little Cornard Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Camps Parish Council</td>
<td>Little Waltham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Parish Council</td>
<td>Long Melford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappel Parish Council</td>
<td>Maldon District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford City Council</td>
<td>Marks Tey Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Parish Council</td>
<td>Messing Cum Inword Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Borough Council</td>
<td>Mobile Operators Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect (Quadrant Pipelines Ltd &amp;</td>
<td>Mount Bures Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Pipelines Ltd)</td>
<td>Mowlem Energy Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency Office</td>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copford &amp; Easthorpe Parish Council</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Education &amp; Skills</td>
<td>One2One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Transport</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Development Agency</td>
<td>Passenger Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England LGA</td>
<td>Saffron Walden Constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England LGA</td>
<td>South Cambridgeshire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Strategic Health Authority</td>
<td>Sport England, Eastern Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>St Edmundsbury Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Stebbing Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPN South Highway services</td>
<td>Stoke by Clare Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES Pipelines Ltd</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex &amp; Suffolk Water</td>
<td>Taxi Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Ambulance Service</td>
<td>Technical Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County Council</td>
<td>The National Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Fire &amp; Rescue Service</td>
<td>The Planning Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Police</td>
<td>Tiptree Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Police</td>
<td>T-Mobile (UK) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted Parish Council</td>
<td>Uttlesford District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.T.C.</td>
<td>Virgin Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glemsford Parish Council</td>
<td>Vodafone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great &amp; Little Leighs Parish Council</td>
<td>Wakes Colne Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Braxted Parish Council</td>
<td>Wixoe Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Cornard Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Sampford Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr D R Miller
Mr David Galley
Mr Roger Odell
Mr Michael Hargreaves
Mr George Ellis
Mr Steve Arthur Mason
Mr Robin Pleasance
Mr Rob Dobson
Ms Jan Gardner
Mr Mark Hidge
Mrs Diana Jacobs
Mr Ken Wiltshire
Annie Gordon
Messrs Jack and Guy Agazarian
Mr Gerry Johnson
Mr Chris Howard
Mr Graham Went
Mrs Jane Sexton
Mr Paul Mitchell
Mr Greg Howell
Mr Jeremy White
Mr and Mrs Lily and Bruce Vickers
Mr Matt Lee
Ms Emma Ousbey
Clr Tom Cunningham
Clr Stephen Canning
Clr Miss Vanessa Santomauro
Clr Robert Wright
Clr Mrs Collette Gibson
Clr Ms Lyn Walters
Clr Chris Cadman
Clr Mrs Susan Wilson
Clr Mrs Julia Allen
Clr Stephen Kirby
Clr Mrs Jennifer Sutton
Clr Derrick Louis
Clr Hylton Johnson
Clr Peter Tattersley
Clr Julian Swift
Clr Philip Barlow
Clr Mrs Corinne Thompson
Clr Patrick Horner
Clr Mrs Cheryl Louis
Clr William Rose
Clr Mrs Iona Parker
Mrs Brenda Baker
Mr Richard Ford
Ms Angela Lock
Mr Jim Bailey
Ms Sharon Smith
Ms Loraine Kelly
Mr Mark Merchant
Mrs R Lawes
MRS TINA HODGE
MRS TINA HODGE
Georgina Challis
Mr Paul White
Ms Donna Marino
Mr David Barker
Mr David Lewis
Ms Emma Deighan
Mr Christopher Warder Smith
Ms Verity MacMahon
NATS
Mr Sam Mott
Kathleen Ford
Janet Mizzen
Marjorie Timms
J G Nicholls
Mr & Mrs Barber
Sally Pulfer
Mr David Flood
Mrs Linda Sadler
M Bates
Mr & Mrs Root
Jean Frost
K R Wheeler
Mr Brian Frost
Iris Blackery
B H Johnson
Dorothy Fraser
Mr Eric R Childs
Flo Greeves
Marion Hills
L E Brown
Mr & Mrs Lunn
Mr John Chapman
Gladys Freswater
Mr & Mrs Muffett
Iris Calvo
Mr & Mrs Cooper-Cocks
Mr David Stevens
Mrs W Miller
Mrs Joyce Hall
Mary Smith
Lord A E Cann
Mr Albert Dowdall
E M Layer
Mr Robert Shaw
Mr & Mrs Heath
Mr & Mrs Green
Debbie Page
R Hume
Phil
Mr & Mrs Richardson
Mr George Devall
Mr Joe Davies
Maltings Academy
J E Fox
Mr John Irving
Mr B Miller
Ms Suzanne Emery
Mr Alexander Brady
Ms Anne Wiles
Christina Squibb
Willcock

deadline
Mr P E Pawsey
Mr Alvar Digby
Mr Peter Williams
Mr Gerald Wisby
A M Stimpson
Mrs Jenny Claydon
Mrs G Warner
Mr David Edwards
Mr Neil Dinwiddie
Mr Chris Hunnable
Mrs J Oliver
Mr Steve Landridge
Mr Ben Allen
Mr Mark Norman
Dr Caroline Davies
Mrs Doris Gowers
Mrs Margaret Drysdale
Miss Ilinca Diaconescu
Mr Edward Keymer
Mr David Broddle
Mr Richard Foulsh
Mr Steve Langridge
Mr Duncan Perry
Susanne Chung
Mr Richard Playle
Kelly Weeks
Dr Annie Gordon
Mr Stuart Grout
Natalie Drewett
Mr Robin Carpenter
Teresa O'Connor
Mr Crispin Downs
Sandra Bissett
Mr Page
Mr Timothy Knight
Mr Paul Mcqueen
Mr Robert Lappin
Mr Michael Eley
Mr Tony Bradley
Mr David House
MR DONALD MCWATT
Mr Richard Gray
Mrs Julie Mahoney
Mrs Catherine Irving
Mrs Susan Held
Mr Wright

Mr John Irving
Mr Kevin Faulkner
Miss Ilinca Diaconescu
Mr Andrew Fairbairn
Cllr Lynette Bowers-Flint
Cllr Martin Green
Cllr Francesco Ricci
Mrs Sherry Webb
Mr Mike Lambert
Mr Robert Gardiner
Mr Andrew Martin
Mr Peter Sullivan
Sarah Kirk
Mrs Sheila Fullbrook
Mr Matthew Lee
Mrs J Elles
Mrs Rosa Etherington
Dawn Brailsford
Ms Patricia Nott
Mr Jack Parish
Systemafter Ltd
Construct Reason Ltd & Mr D Jones
TLC Care Homes Ltd
Braintree South Alliance
Mrs Fiona Waugh
Royal Masonic Benevolent Institution
Franciscan Sisters
C F E Hill
Trustees of St Mary's Field,
Redding Park Development Company
Barratt Homes (Eastern Counties)
E Hobbs (Farms) Ltd
W G Developments
Fitchway Settlement
Mr A Bonnett
Woodland Group
Forwarding Investment Properties
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
Bellway Homes & The Raven Group
James Development Company Ltd
Mr Gordon Fulcher
G Fulcher & Morray Engineering
Mr D'arcy
East of England CoOperative Society
Mrs P Hennessy
Mr R Turpin
Mr and Mrs M Gerhart
Mr Courtauld
Franciscan Sisters
Mr GVS Nott
Mr J Nott
Mrs Grimwood-King
JWS Wright and Sons
Mr T Barker
Mr John Boon
Mrs Ann Rolls
Mrs S Bonner
Mr David Ball
Mr & Mrs Pudney
Mr Neil Coughlan
Mrs J Whittle
Joan Smith
Betty Beal
Mrs B O'Hare
M Nunn
Mrs Juliet Walton
Thea Campbell
Mr Simon Churly
Brenda Freshwater
Mr N Harrington
Miss Susan Carlisle
Marianne Hatwell
Miss Valerie Watson
Mrs S Drury
County Manager
Kate Lowry
The Manager
Mr & Mrs G & A Burroughs
Mr Gary Price
Mrs M R Chapman
Mrs M Waring
Pam Cook
Ms Mary Johnson
Colchester Quaker Housing Association
Mr Derek Payne
Community Information Point/Chelmsford Library
Tracy Corcoran
Mrs Jean Murphy
Mrs D Brooks
Mrs Kickols
Mr & Mrs John & Lucille Van Geest Place
Mrs Christine Deal
Mrs Marilyn Clark
Tracey McCormack
Mr P Whitehead
Aderyn Gillett
Barbara Morrison
Disability Essex
Kym Page
Mrs Pauline Marlow
Mrs Jill Lloyd
Farleigh-in-Brantree
Hazel Edridge
Brendan Walsh
Lynne Zwink
Friends of Bocking Windmill
Mrs Shirley Rose
Mrs J Roughton
Annette Leary
Jane Beven
Veronica Harman
Julia Smith
Mrs N Sebastian Dunn
Mrs Brigitte Haig
Mrs Gaby Chick
Mrs Margaret Stewart
Ms Anita Sartain
Mrs K Butler
Christine Barrett
A Joy
Interact
Mr Clive Ramsden
Pat Kent
Mr A F Shelton
Mr K Radley
Ms M Houlding
Mr Matt Matthews
Mr Geoff Pattenden
Mr Hardisty
Mrs C Pegley
Sue Stephens
Mr A Short
Mrs Marina Metson
Chris Jenkinson
Mr David Fremlin
Mr John Parfitt
Karen Collop
Mr Nigel Oldacre
Mr Malcolm Batty
Mr Terry Rockall
Mrs P Harrington
Georgina Rhymes
Susan Clubley
Mr Clive Norris
Jean Simmons
Mrs Lorraine Francis
Ms Jayne Kennedy
Jacqueline Wilson
Mrs Maggie Hughes
RAD (Centre for Deaf People)
Mrs Joyce Bryant
Mr Jeff Dorley
Miss Pilgrim
Jackie Clarke
Mr Colin Strong
Nick Shuttleworth
Ms Diane Harding
Mr John Hillman
Miss Carrie Appleby
The Samaritans
Marie Smith
Peggy Keeble
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Berry</td>
<td>The Vicar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sue Stelfox</td>
<td>Mr R Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Valerie Goddard</td>
<td>Rev B Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Shirley Blacketer</td>
<td>Rev J W R Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthea Cooper</td>
<td>Fr Anthony McKenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Valerie Ahern</td>
<td>Mr C Keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Wilson</td>
<td>Mrs A Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Ripper</td>
<td>Mons A Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jack Norwood</td>
<td>Father J Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Leak</td>
<td>T &amp; S Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W A Watson</td>
<td>Mr D Mann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Riley</td>
<td>Rev J Blore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Eve Newell</td>
<td>Mrs Jane Coates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Lorriane Smith</td>
<td>Mr Reginald David Meade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Sandra Howell</td>
<td>Mr John Daldry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Murfitt</td>
<td>Mrs Patricia Sally Cheek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr T Walker</td>
<td>Mr Terence Nicholass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Ratnage</td>
<td>Mr Nicholas Edmonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P G Conway</td>
<td>Mr Brooks Newmarket MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Bellehewe</td>
<td>Mr Martyn Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Sue Reichert</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Jemison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A G Shaikh</td>
<td>Mr Roy Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints &amp; St Marys Rayne &amp; Panfield</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Murkowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs T Ferguson</td>
<td>Mr Allan McCoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev J Richardson</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev S Northfield</td>
<td>Ms Adelaide Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev P Meader</td>
<td>Mr John Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Education &amp; Skills</td>
<td>Mr Tony Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev J E F Jasper</td>
<td>Mr Britten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev Father J Corbyn</td>
<td>Mrs Frances Lindsay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev J Hall</td>
<td>Mrs Sherri Beresford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd J Donaldson</td>
<td>Mr Colin Bayliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Harvey</td>
<td>Mr Walter Petchey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev P Grinyer</td>
<td>Mr Ian Halliday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev M Child</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Cope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J F Williams</td>
<td>Mr Geoff Tipping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev C.A.J Jones</td>
<td>Mr Donald Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr K P Taylor</td>
<td>Dr Richard Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C B Bamforth</td>
<td>Mr Nigel Bolland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Vaidva</td>
<td>Mr Roy Belsham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amog Havajra</td>
<td>Mr John Pollard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev N Warner</td>
<td>Mr Anthony Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church Methodist &amp; United Reform Church</td>
<td>Mr P Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev D Thompson</td>
<td>Mr A Bourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Pearson</td>
<td>Cllr James Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earls Colne Baptist Church</td>
<td>Mr Philip Barlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Andrew Knight</td>
<td>Cllr Mrs J C Beavis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Church</td>
<td>Cllr Elwyn Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev D E Ivey</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Bolter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulkbourne Parish Church</td>
<td>Cllr Robert Bolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Healey</td>
<td>Mrs A Balcombe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Smith</td>
<td>Kerin Boylan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halstead Baptist Church</td>
<td>Mr Barry Broyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattfield Peverel Methodist Church</td>
<td>Cllr Graham Butland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ancient Monuments Society
The Council for British Archaeology
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
The Georgian Group
The Victorian Society
The Twentieth Century Society
Mr Graham Fernandez
IFF (GB) Ltd
Mr S Heading
David Walker Chartered Surveyors
Mr Andrew Hull
Mr Alex Anderson
A D Brown
Mrs Nicki Burton
Mr John Palombi
Mr John Chase
Kirsty Walker
Mr Gwynn Stubbings
Mr Derek Stebbing
Mr Anthony Dawson
Mr A Goody
Mr Doug Kibblewhite
Ms Melanie Jones
Laura Ross
Mr Paul Bird
Essex Wildlife Trust
Mr K Taylor
Community Commander
East of England Strategic Health Authority
Mr Graham Seward
Mr Jack Sweeney
Mr Eric Smith
Agnes Bishop
Mr Malcolm Bryan
Marion Williams
Rev David Dickens
Ms K Mansfield
Mr D Anthony
Mrs G Argue
Ms Brenda Baker
Ms F Bodle
Ms C Bradshaw
Mr D Meechan
Mrs V Hackett
Mr D Forrest
Mr J Brace
Mr A Smith
Mrs J Green
Mrs C Edwards
Mrs J Bartley
Mrs J Wright
Mr A Wright
Mr D Iles
Mr A Richbell
Mr A Horne
Mrs M Disley
Mrs A Daisley
Mr J Baker
Mr C Duncan
Ms M Trappitt
Mr G Olney
Mrs K Roebuck
Mrs A Mitchelson
Mrs A Green
Mr A Jones
Mr P Anderson
Mr J Smith
Mrs M Nicholls
Mr S Young
Miss K McGrory
Miss R Cowles
Mrs M Rumsey
Mr G Pocock
Mrs J Herring
Mrs B Ferland
Mrs S Spittlehouse
Mrs P Smith
Mr Tony Charles
Clare Hutchinson
Lindsey Backster
Mr D Bigg
Janet Brown
Canon John Brown
George Burrows
Robert Carter
Abbi Coldwell
Mrs Lorraine Collins
Mr Lee Crabb
Mr Graham Eavery
Zoe Middleton
Mrs Norma Huxter
Helena Goodwin
Dorothy Lodge
Mr Tim Lucas
Mr J Macgregor
Mr Joshua Marks
Mr Alan Mickley
Ms Leanne Mills
Mr P Mitham
Rachel Parratt
Ms K Radley
Ms Eve Reid
Pat Roberts
Ross Saxton-Davis
Mr Mark Sexton
Mr David Sharp
Mrs Joy Sheppard
Mr Robert Taylor
Mr T Steed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Stollar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Sutton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Verghese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms P Whitney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Alaba Banjo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Pamela West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Seakins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Aimee Cannon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jason Lindsay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eilish Loftus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Papworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mike French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ben Gibson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gary Duncan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Sarah Webber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Vilma Walsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Anne Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Jennings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs S J Mott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs Ramsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Kate Matthews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs D Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs S Threadgold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD Police Headquarters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inland Waterways Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Waterways Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hughie Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help The Aged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrys Rampley Rampley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Pennell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms S Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Vanderberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhi Huynh-Ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Ambulance Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms N Blaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Michael Wilks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs B Raybould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mike Murkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J F Sheldrake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Hallhide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss J Simmons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs C Carlisle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs B Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Corder-Birch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Turner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coggeshall PC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs H Waterfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs F J Wells</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms L Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The RSPB
Fields in Trust
Mrs J Beavis
Mrs H Fraser
Diane Jacob
Mrs J Clemo
Mrs P O Player
Miss S E Mann
Mrs Teresa Ulrich
Mrs L Rowe
Mr I P Bradley
Mrs Jessica Dawson
Mr Colin Robertshaw
Mr Roger Upward
Mr P J Watson
Mrs S Parker
Mrs R Leeder
Mrs B Fry
Mrs L White
Dr B Yallop
Mrs D George
Mr M Fitt
Mr J Quick
Mr Gordon Mussett
Mr Will Austin
Mrs T Nicholl
Mr Chris Turner
Ms M Farrant
Mrs Claire Ebeling
Mr Chris Turner
Mr Rich Cooke
Ms Karen Syrett
Mr Derek Lawrence
Mr Stewart Patience
Mr Paul Morris
Carol Horlock
K Adams
Mr Henry Aldridge
Mr Ernest Andrews
Ms. H Archibald
D. K Athanasiadis
S Attenborrow
Mrs J Ball
Mr Banyard
Mr David Barclay
A P Bulpin
Mr P T Tyrie
Mr Paul Foster
Jamie Kemp
Mr P Baxter
Mr C Beard
Katharine Fletcher
Mr J Cornwell
Mr B Bell

S Butler-Finbow
Mr R Belsham
N Belton
J T Bendall
Rev Will Newman
Father C Maher
Mr R Bucknell
Rev P Need
Mr L Horsnell
Mons G Read
Rev Father D S Reynish Bed
Mr Cyril Bamforth
Mr Roderick Lane Lane
Rev S Lloyd
St Peter's Church
The Rev'd Philip Banks
St Bartholomew C of E Church
The Vicar
Mr Bill Brown
The Chapel
Edna Chalmers
Rev P A Andrinatos
Mrs H Crysell
P Blios
White Notley Parish Church
Mrs A Coleman
Mr D Malins
Mr Brian Morgan
Diocese of Chelmsford
Mr Andrew Fido
J B Wicks
Granta Housing Society Limited
Sanctuary Housing Association
Mr Charles Nash
Mr Peter Biggs
Mr Arthur Hedges
Littman & Robeson
Mr S J Staines
Blackwater/Anglia Housing Association
Mr Peter Court
Mrs P Bowers
G A Boyle
Braintree Electroplaters Ltd.
Mr J Still
Mrs C Burden
Mrs L Button
Mr J Grange
Mrs Karen Gregory
Mr & Mrs Griffiths
Mr Dave Gronland
Mr J Gunn
Mrs J Hadley
G. Sansum
Mr S. Saward
Mr P. Schwier
James Sims-Williams
Mr Dan Skeates
Mr M. L. Smith
Mrs J. Smith
Mr David Smith
Mr Colin Smith
Mr Richard Smith
Mr C. A. Richardson
C. Storey MRICS.
Springboard Housing Group
Mr Liam Boyd
Mr I. W. Steel
Mr B. J. Fleet
Mr H. Parkinson
Mr D. B. Gale
Mr P. Nicklin
G. S. Oliver
The Right Reverend John Gladwin
Mr D. Glasson
Mr Kevin Godfrey
Mr J. Capworth
Ms D. Carson
Dr G. E. Chapman
Mr Clark
Suffolk Housing Society Ltd.
Mr D. Sullivan
Mr J. M. Summerskill
Mr V. Swallow
R. Sweetman
Mr R. B. Tattersall
Miss L. Nelson
Miss M. J. Eskins
Mr G. W. Tickner
T. D. Harbord
Mr C. Tivey
Mr Provan
Mr Trundle
Mrs T. Tulley
Ms A. Turner
Mr Andy Lawson
B. P. Walker
The Ven. A. Cooper
Planning Policy
Mrs Margaret Dennis
Katherine Blake
Mr Ken Squibb
Mr Sean Millar
Mr Brian Tann
Mr Anthony Meyer
Mrs Elizabeth Edey
Cllr John McKee
Cllr Lene Shepherd
Mr Malcolm Dunn
Mr David Hume
Cllr David Bebb
Mr Fred Swallow
Ms Rosemary O’Shea
Cllr Sandra Howell
Cllr John Elliott
Cllr Janet Money
Ms Lucy Barlow
Mr Stephen Lambourne
Mr Trevor Mcardle
MR TERRY DIXON
Moiz Khanbhai
Mr Graeme Free
T Brown
Mr Bruce Hanley
Mr Phil Benns
Mrs Christine Ann Eliason
Phil Sturges
Mr & Mrs K Green
Mr Ian Anderson
Marks Tey Consortium
Town and Country Development (Essex) Ltd
L. Boxall
Andrew Martin Associates
Mr Adam Smith
Mr Jim Holder
Mr Stephen Austin
C/O Lisa Arber
Maurice Young
Angela Schembri
Mr Stephen Rolph
Mr Kevin Fraser
Ms Sara King
Mr Ian Robottom
Mr Ian Hawkins
Mr D Gowers
Mr Jon Clay
Mr Paul Ryland
Mr David Alton
Mr Chris Strickland
Countryside Properties Plc.
Mr Andrew Dodgson
Mssrs Ramsey
Dean Byford & Sarah Charlton
Sam Cook
Mrs Steed
Mrs Susan McCrea
Mr and Mrs A Thornton
Mrs C Bateman
Mr and Mrs K and P Ahearn
Mr Adrian Dunningham
Mr VJ Townsend
J A Fuller
G Crow
Mr B Wilkinson
Mr ML Ciame
Ms Josie Roel
Mr and Mrs Rowe
The Rev’d & Mrs C W Danes
Mr and Mrs Smith
Miss Amy Potter
Mr John Elison
Mrs W Runham
Mrs R Hall
AC Harrington
Mr Stephen John Bolter
Miss Davinia Venton
Mr Robert Wright
Cllr Eric Lynch
Ms S Roper
Ms Alison Talkington
Ms Cheryl Gerald
Mrs Karen Scott
Ms Lynn Green
Mr Michael Leach
Mrs Jane Coleman
Mrs V Bruce
M. V Anderson
M Prime
Cllr. Mike Banthorpe
Mrs C McCarthy
Mr R Wiltshire
Mrs Sian Derbyshire
Mr Richard Tunnicliiffe
Mr. Francis Thompson
Mr Steve Hancocks
Mrs L Warwick
Countryside Properties Limited
John Pease
Mr John Benson
Mr John Schonert
The Trustees of the Northern Estate Trust
Exors of Nigel Vaizey & Co Owners
The Trustees of the Martlets Estate
Mr C Porter
Unknown
P J French
R R & E S Ward
Mrs T Lee
Mr & Mrs Fancy
Mr D J Hosford
Mr Paul Brown
Mrs Daryll Golding c/o Boydens
Mr Philip Howorth
Construct Reason Ltd
Mr David Cooper
Capel House Property Trust Ltd.
Mr & Mrs Clayden
Fairview New Homes
Mr W Fisher
Mr B Goodson
C Doe
Mr R J Suckling
Mr Richard Long
Mr Paul Hales
Mr G Tanner
Mrs Nicola Bickerstaff
CHELMSFORD Diocese Board Of Finance
Mr Bethell
Messrs Smith & Turpin
Mr & Mrs Gerhard
Mr P M Ratcliffe
Executors of Late Robert Hills
Strutt and Parker (Farms) Ltd
Robert Brett & Sons Ltd
Unknown
Mr R Hunt
R F Chapman
Mr James Thompson
The Trustees of St Mary’s Field
Mr H Ralling
Ms Deborah Ruffel
Mr James Thompson
Client839
Mr Stephen Norris
Harold Good Farm Trust
Granville Developments
Bellway/Raven/CML/Chehmsford Diocesan Board of Finance
Elderly Housing and Care Home Providers
Land Securities Trillium
Tesco Stores Ltd
Unknown
Mr S Wildman
A Cockrell
Colne Valley Golf Club
R W Spencer and Son Ltd
Tarmac Ltd
Mr S Mortimer
Unknown
Webber/Dixon/Smith
Messrs Wiffin
Messrs J N & D Cousins
Messrs Price
Cressing Park Holdings
Messrs Hubbard
East Essex Hunt
Mrs Z Napier
Strutt and Parker (Farms) Ltd
Newton Family
Repairbrook Ltd
Mrs S Brierly
Mr Cork
Mr Goodchild
Mr W Buckley
Mr Stuart Cock
Mrs Hayden
Hunwick Engineering Ltd
Mr DJ and RHA Pannell
Braintree Leisure Ltd
Galliard Homes Ltd
Greene King
Mr Billie Hayes
Mr Stuart Cock
Mrs Pauline Hennessey
Mid Essex Primary Care Trust
Construct Reason Ltd
Mr G Bober
CHELMSFORD Diocese Board Of Finance
C F E Hill
Premdor
Tesco Stores Ltd
Consortium of Landowners in respect of Maltings Lane
Tesco Stores Ltd
Swan Hill Homes
Braintree Leisure Ltd
James Developments
Higgins Homes Ltd
Mr C Young
Cemex
Bermac Properties plc
Mr J Andrews
Mr C S Gosling
Mr G Lanza
Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd
Swift Developments
Ulting Overseas Trust
Galliard Homes Ltd
The Crown Estate Office
Mr N Barton
Mr and Mrs Thompson
Councillor Barbara Collar
Ms Marie Hodds
Mr Iain Ashford
Mr Patrick Pawsey
Mr & Mrs J White
Councillor Diana Garrod
Miss H Bonnington
Ms Angela Melia
Mr B Callow
Mr Dennis Hodds
Mrs Linda Palmer
Ms J Ward
Mrs Clements
Mrs C Woodhouse
Mr and Mrs J Conner
Ms Sandra Frost
O'Neil
C Reynolds
Margaret Somerville
Mr and Mrs Van Gelder
Mrs D McIlroy
Mrs P Percival
unknown
Mr Stephen Percival
Mr Dean Tabone
Mr Karl Healey
Mr Rod Lane
Mrs J Bonnington
Mr Gary Goodhew
Mrs I R Collett
Mr R Chaplin
Georgina Grayland
Mrs D Hunt
Mr and Mrs Keeble
Mr and Mrs Jack Prime
A Phillips
Mrs Pauline Ellis
Dr Lesley Cooper
Mr Kevin Willcox
Mr D Leverett
Mrs J S Cain
Mr David Harvey
Mr J A Clarke
Mrs Beverley Steel
Mr Tony Strudwick
Miss Emilie Bills
Mr Moiz Khanbhai
M R W Button
Mr and Mrs Ellison
Ms Kathleen Cole
Mr Steven Miller
Ms Sue Spinks
Mr E A White
Mr C Taylor
Mr Brian Hagan
Mr Iain Paton
Mr Paul McConnell
Mr Chris Long
Mr S Goodfellow
Ms Jemma Ferridge
Mr Stuart Anderson
Mrs T Plane
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Camp</td>
<td>Mrs L A Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Nicola Little</td>
<td>Mr A T Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Bonnington</td>
<td>Mr Carl Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs M L Gardner</td>
<td>Karen Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Paul Hart</td>
<td>Mr Howard Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Roger Duffin</td>
<td>R G Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Katy King</td>
<td>Mr W P Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Getty</td>
<td>Mrs L O Leary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Adam Holland</td>
<td>Mrs D Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cressing Park Holdings</td>
<td>Mr S Brailley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Karl Gibson</td>
<td>Mr R Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Linda Portch</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Irene Bainbridge</td>
<td>Mr A Ryman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr William Palmer</td>
<td>Denise Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Norton</td>
<td>BM &amp; J Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs C Beavis</td>
<td>Mr A Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr George Worster</td>
<td>Mr David McCartney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Winifred Thomas</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Tushaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Scott Billson</td>
<td>Mrs Stephanie Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr JA Beavis</td>
<td>Ms Natasha Agombar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lee Harding</td>
<td>Riddleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Vernon Rolls</td>
<td>W J Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sophie Ansell</td>
<td>Mr Philip Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Williams</td>
<td>L A Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Wright</td>
<td>Mr A Bonnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Clifford</td>
<td>Mr Jonathan Wicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Y P McDonnell</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs P and A Culling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Robinson</td>
<td>Mrs Emine Weaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Pailter</td>
<td>Mr Graham Legg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bateman</td>
<td>Braintree LSP Executive Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Gladden</td>
<td>Mrs Gina Legg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jeffrey</td>
<td>Robert Hill, Executors of Late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Peacock</td>
<td>Mr John Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Holland</td>
<td>Banbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Austin</td>
<td>Gemma Grimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R D Chinnery</td>
<td>Mr D Porth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Keith Newbitt</td>
<td>Mr T A Raybould</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Valerie Ockelford</td>
<td>Mr Alan Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Dorothy Watson</td>
<td>Cllr A W Hayward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Lee</td>
<td>Mrs A Howes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms B G Rice</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Temperton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wilson</td>
<td>Mrs Julie Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Huggett</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Spurling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs S Allfrey</td>
<td>Mr Terry Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mark Fisher</td>
<td>Unex Technical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Andrews</td>
<td>Miss Ann Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr and Mrs Field</td>
<td>Mr Kenneth Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Blaylock</td>
<td>Mrs Susan Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms L Hockley</td>
<td>Mr P Ogburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Fisher</td>
<td>Mr Richard Ramsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Rachel Whitfield</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Spry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Brian Joscelyne</td>
<td>Mr Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S Braster</td>
<td>Mrs Jennifer Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ashley Spurling</td>
<td>Cllr Chris Siddall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms & Mr Smith & Passfield
Clive Walker & Michelle Leading
Mr David Higgins
Mrs Tyler
Mr Adrian Dunningham
Halstead Residents Association
Sarah Allison
Countryside Properties
Mr Peter Sale
David Paul
Brian Wright
Mrs Joan Watson
The Owner/Occupier
J M & J E Rayner
The Owner/Occupier
The Owner/Occupier
Mr George Harris
The Owner/Occupier
The Owner/Occupier
Miss Katy Humphreys
The Owner/Occupier
Mr Stanley Barrett
Mr & Mrs Webb
Mr & Mrs Murton
M Eymere
Mrs Melanie A'Lee
The Owner/Occupier
Mr James Stevens
Mr Denis Elavia
Mr G R Nield
Mr Jonathan Mills
Mr Colin Pharoah
Mr Peter Cook
Mr and Mrs Romeli-Lee
Mr Jay Coleman
P J Brazier
Mrs Patricia Singleton
Mrs Nicola Bryant
B Bastiaansen & G Gildea
Mr John James
Yvonne Game
Mrs S M Dowd
Mrs S D Harris
Mrs Louise Youngman
Mr Derek R Middleton
Miss Susan Burton
Mr & Mrs P Sillis
Mrs Ann Jones
Mr & Mrs Gordon-Hancock
Mrs Olive Crabtree
Mrs Patricia Sullivan
Mrs Lynn Orrin
Mr John Hopkins
Mr & Mrs Dover
Mrs Janet Duncan
Mr & Mrs Cruickshank
DJ & JG Barnes
Mr Neil Hodges
Mr & Mrs Watson
Mrs J M Parker
Mr & Mrs Thorogood
Mrs K Guimas
Mrs Nicola Blyth
C A Twohey
Mr Anthony Wren
Miss Laura Davies
Mr Graham Roper
Mr Richard Quinnell
Mr David Newman
Mr & Mrs B V Collins
Mr & Mrs Brothers
Amanda Game
K J Owen
RJ & BM O'Brien
Miss Burlford Mr Bowler
Mr Derek Ray
Mr Anthony White
Miss Charlotte Ward
Mr & Mrs Plumb
Mrs F Hawkswell
Mr & Mrs Merton
Mr Warren Gray
Mr & Mrs Plumb
The Occupier
Mr T Milburn
Mrs S Butcher
Mr Alan Bodfield
N & S Wischhusen
Mr M A Hill
Mrs Jenny Wilson
Ms Gail Jackson
Miss Diane Leech
Mr & Mrs P Warren
Mr T Robinson
M Wyatt
Keeley LeBan
Miss M A Geeves
Mr Paul Woodridge
Sharon Leader
Mr Paul Belton
Mr J D Darrell
Mrs Burgess
Mr & Mrs Teeder
Mr Ian Marsden
Mr D Hills
T J Sheppard
Mr Mike Barritt
Mr Mike Cole
Mr PG Ratcliff
Donna Wickhamwickham
Secretary of State for Transport
Mr Dino Athan
S A Pearman
Clr Patricia Lee
Mrs Emma Frankish
Mr Johnathan Hodgkin
Mr Graham Hughes
Mr John Hills
Mr Nye
Mr P J Cole
Mr Anthony Middlebrook
Mr David Golding
Mr John Nash
Mr Tim Bluff
Mr Carl Hockey
Ms Jane Turner
Mr John Lefever
Mr James Cutting
Mr Robert Frost
Mr Mark Wells
Mr Mike Goodson
Mr Akin Durowoju
Ms Susan Ramage
Mr Terry Fuller
Chelmer Canal Trust
The Church Commissioners
Mr Tony Middleton
Health & Safety Executive (Essex)
Fields in Trust
Women's National Commission
Mr Geriant Hughes
Priti Patel
Mrs Jean Burnside
Ms Hannah Bizounis
Mr Jay Coleman
Mrs Lorraine Pearson
Mrs Karen James
Mr David Hill
Mr David Nichols
Mr Tony White
Miss Katy Eggleton
Mrs Ann Brench
Mr Steve Draper
Mrs Ellen Game
Mr David Game
Mr Bernard Palmer
Mr Michael Perry
Ms Angela Melia
Mr Roger Jenkins
Mr Eric Saltmarsh
Mrs Jacqueline May
Mr Jeremy R Spalding
Mr & Mrs S Uden
Mr Timothy Leahy
Miss Karen Boroughs
Mrs Nicky Wyatt
Mrs Beryl Bailey
Mr Martin Arnold
Mrs Maureen Bodfield
Miss Heather Turner
Miss Beverley Wallman
Mr Nicholas Scales
Mrs Christine Bealer
Arqiva
Mr David Uffindell
Mr Colin Shead
Mr Joseph Devenny
Mr Anthony Pitt
Mrs Mary Devenny
Mr Luke Merriman
Mr John Chambers
Mrs Joan Chambers
Mrs Veronica Crowe
Mrs D Callow
Miss Lucy Burton
Mr Kim Burton
Mr Kieran Burton
Miss Lindsay Branch
Mr Frederick Twindell
Mrs Pamela Twidell
Mr David Steel
Miss Charlotte Steel
Mrs Pamela Sawyer
Mr Eric Sawyer
Mr Kenneth Steel
Mrs Audrey Steel
Mr Robert McBurney
Mr Russell Thompson
Mrs Toni Williams
Mrs Margaret Wren
Mr Terence Sheehan
Miss Catherine Hayward
Mr Donald Harvey
Mr Stephen Archer
Mr Paul Goold
Witham 1st Scout Group
Friends of Braintree
Mr Ernest Griffin
Mr Kenneth Gair
Mrs Shirley Gair
Mr Connor Gair
Mr Callum Gair
Mr Kevin Goodwin
Mrs Diane Fletcher
Mr & Mrs R Moriarty
Mr & Mrs G Money
Ms Sarah Lewis
Julie Amsden
Mr & Mrs Eldridge
Mr G J Trew
Mr Ian Smith
Mr Martyn Richardson
Mr Tony Isaac
Susan Betts
Mr & Mrs Pluck
Mr & Mrs B Barrett
N Wing
Mr & Mrs Caplen
Mr Ron Kidman
Marie Southwell
Mr Anthony Boast
Carly Bradshaw
Mr Robert Brown
Gary and Caroline Martin
Mr G S Gillman
Mr & Mrs Cooper
Mr & Mrs David and Anna Game
Ian and Sally Slack
Mr Stephen Dormer
Mr Stanley Perry
Patricia Wood
Mr A P Gardner
Mr Roger Dodman
Mr Jon Hinchliffe
Mr Graham Harmer
Mr P Drury
Mr James Waller
Mr Terence Cooper
Mr Ray Ranns
Maud Instone
Ann and David Spalding
Mr John Tapsfield
Mr John Ahsley
Mr Peter Collins
Mr Peter Game
Mr Neil Worledge
Mrs Jenny Worledge
Helen Beard
Mrs Jill Champion
Mr Stephen Johnson
Katrina Barker
Mr Robin Copus
Valarie Wood
Barbara Wilson
T A Pierce
Mr & Mrs Pateman
Mr John Grant
Mr Trevor Johnson
Mr David Mortimer
Mr John Ashley
HSBC CRE
Mr Jim Konig
Mr Tom Hyde
Mr Simon Dixon Smith
Mrs Jacqueline Smith
Geraldine Tate
Mrs Humphreys
Mrs S M Lam
Pam Beckwith
Park Stores
Grove House
CB Richard Ellis
Trigina Ltd
Mr A Pearce
Essex Strategic Health Authority
Ramsden Mills
Mrs Carolyn Johnson
Mr David Game
Mr Ian Coward
Ms Mary J Waite
Mr Peter Mercer MBE
Mr George Kasabov
Mr Tony Bishop
OB: for NHS veteran Mala

PASSIONATE supporter of the NHS, who was once in charge of the site of Braintree and Witham resi-
nants, has been recognised in the 2018 Honours List.

Professor Mala Rao, 88, held various high posts before exporting the values
of the NHS to India.

The former public health director for
Witham, Braintree and Halstead
to Trust has been given an OBE, for
services to public health.

She said: "I was overwhelmed with emotion when I received the news, and
utterly thrilled as well.

We all of us working in public health, are just amazing.

Dr Rao, who grew up in India, came
to UK for postgraduate studies and
after meeting and marrying Ted
united, who was a long-serving GP in
in Colchester.

During her career, she was also public
health director for the North Essex
South Essex care trusts and the
Public Health Network.

Mrs Rao, of Elmrow Hall Road, Col-

esbury, later went to the Department of
Health as head of the public health
workforce and capacity building.

She was benchmarked by the Indian
government to set up the first Institute
of Public Health in Hyderabad.

In 2011, the mother-of-three and
grandmother-of-two became a professor
for international health at the University
of East London.

Mrs Rao said: "I’m deeply proud and
feel very privileged to have been part of
the NHS since 1971."

"It’s the best system in the world –
very few countries have such an equity-
oriented system.

“The principles the NHS is based on –
fairness and justice – are just amazing.

DEDICATED: Professor Mala Rao, who has been awarded an OBE for services to public health.
## Proposed Future Housing and Growth

### Public Exhibitions

Site Allocation and Development Management Plan: Come along & Have Your Say

**Come along to our public exhibitions in January and February**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues 15th January</td>
<td>Earls Colne Village Hall</td>
<td>1.30pm - 6.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 16th January</td>
<td>Witham Public Hall</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 17th January</td>
<td>Witham Public Hall</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 21st January</td>
<td>Braintree Town Hall Centre</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 22nd January</td>
<td>Braintree Town Hall Centre</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 23rd January</td>
<td>Great Yeldham Reading Rooms</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 24th January</td>
<td>Coggeshall Village Hall</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 8th January</td>
<td>Halstead Queens Hall</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 30th January</td>
<td>Hatfield Peverel Village Hall</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 31st January</td>
<td>Sible Hedingham Baptist Church</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 6th February</td>
<td>Kelvedon The Institute</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 7th February</td>
<td>Silver End Congregational Church</td>
<td>2.30pm - 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the draft plans and tell us what you think.

Comments on the draft Plan should be received no later than Friday 22nd February. For more information please visit the Council’s website [www.braintree.gov.uk/planning](http://www.braintree.gov.uk/planning).
NOTICE
PUBLIC CONSULTATION
10th January 2013 to 22nd February 2013
Local Development Framework
Publication of the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan

Braintree District Council are consulting on the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan which will allocate sites for housing, employment and other land uses and detail policies which will be used to determine planning applications. Former Garage site, South Street, Braintree (reference BRC36H) has been proposed in the draft plan as a housing site of 10 or more dwellings.

You can view a copy of the draft plan in the local libraries and at www.braintree.gov.uk
A public exhibition will be held on Monday 21st and Tuesday 22nd January at Braintree Town Hall from 2:30pm to 7:30pm where you will be able to meet with officers. Please see website for the full list of exhibitions – www.braintree.gov.uk

How to respond to our consultation:
• Online: public consultation programme at:
  http://braintree-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/
• Email: planningpolicy@braintree.gov.uk
• Post: Planning Policy, Braintree District Council, Causeway House, Braintree, CM7 9HB

*If responding by email or post please use consultation form available on website - www.braintree.gov.uk*
All consultation responses must be received no later than 5pm on Friday 22nd February.