

#### Panfield Parish Council:

- Advantageous to residents of Panfield if new housing could include cycle path which links Panfield's footpaths to the new roads linking Panfield lane and Springwood Drive/Rayne Road.
- Section of Braintree Road from Ashdon's Corner to Towerlands is narrow, full of blind bends and has no verge or footpath – makes cycling dangerous for cyclist and to vehicles using road. Panfield residents discouraged from walking or cycling into Braintree for these reasons.
- Increased use of bicycles to access Braintree would reduce vehicle emissions, use of fuel and traffic flow on Braintree Road, as well as contribute to health and wellbeing of cyclists and to a cleaner, less polluted environment.
- PC endorse views of Anne Cole who contributed comments at exhibition at Tabor College, namely that if the new roads were to be put in place as a priority, and were in use before the actual house-building commences, this would reduce congestion on Panfield Lane/Aetheric Rd/Rayne Rd and provide easier access for traffic coming from Panfield and other villages (Shalford, Wethersfield, Finchingfield, etc)
- Light pollution: Panfield cherishes its rural nature, and absence of street lights is part of village ambience. PC would be grateful for assurance that issue of light pollution has been taken into consideration, and that steps have been taken in planning process to avoid possibility of any light pollution affecting Panfield.

#### Braintree Town Football Club:

We're happy with the site and space allocated for our main stadium and two training pitches but, given the road that runs through the site, we would suggest a pedestrian crossing be placed on the road that runs between. This would facilitate the easy transfer of pedestrians between the main stadium site and the two adjacent training pitches. This would be especially important if the two training pitches were to share changing and social facilities at the main stadium.

#### Essex County Council (Environment, Sustainability and Highways)

1. A general perusal of the masterplan appears to identify that the masterplan at this stage is in general conformity with aspects contained within the Core Strategy.
2. Modelling work has been undertaken which demonstrated that growth could be accommodated in NW Braintree subject to the necessary transport mitigation measures, both on and off site. I note that the Statement of Common Ground (signed by ECC/BDC/Mersea Homes and Hills Residential) identified that the developer agreed to provide the necessary infrastructure as identified in Table 2 of the adopted Core Strategy in relation to the proposed development at Panfield Lane. This included

- Provision of land to enable education provision (2ha) - Required
  - A spine road from Springfield Drive to Panfield Lane designed for local traffic only. This will enable residential traffic to travel to and from the south and west via Pod's Brook Road and A120, without travelling through Braintree Town Centre. This also has wider benefits for traffic circulation within the town centre. Restrictions will be put in place to prevent commercial traffic movements from the Industrial Estate through the development, and this is referred to in the masterplan. - Critical
3. The modelling work also indicated that the spine road would help the operation of the Rayne Road / Pod's Brook Road junction, however capacity improvements would still be required at this junction to mitigate growth in north west Braintree. Proposals are for increasing the capacity of the roundabout by increasing the junction size and widening some approaches. I am under the impression that the proposed improvements can be undertaken within highway land.
  4. It was agreed by the developer to fund this through developer contributions. There appears to be no mention of these junction improvements in the masterplan, but there was a commitment in the Statement of Common Ground for the developer to provide these improvements. This is regarded as critical to the scheme progressing. I acknowledge these improvements are not 'on site' but should not be forgotten as a requirement of the developer.
  5. Separate comments to be submitted regarding education (Blaise Gammie (Education) has had a meeting with the developer and BDC (Monday 19th March), at which some additional views were made aware to the developer).
  6. Colleagues in transportation had an initial meeting pre-masterplanning with the developer, but nothing of late. They would appreciate a meeting with the developer as appropriate to progress the masterplan in more detail.

Alan Massow - Senior Policy Planner, Braintree District Council

1. Officers propose to submit a report to the LDF Panel, on the draft Master Plan proposals together with a summary of the public consultation responses, when this is available. The LDF Panel will then provide the formal Council response to the draft Master Plan.
2. Officers have the following responses to the draft Master Plan:-
  - The draft Master Plan is broadly consistent with the Council's Core Strategy. However, it contains insufficient detail for a Master Plan and should identify specific land uses and highway layouts and more information on the local centre.

- Clearer reference should be made to the phasing requirements of the Core Strategy – that subject to sufficient housing development in the District housing completions on the site would be phased between 2018 and 2026.
- The local centre should not form part of the 15 ha employment land provision, as it provides infrastructure and services that are required for the residential development.
- Locations for open space and allotments should be identified within the residential areas, as part of the Master Plan.
- The Master Plan should identify a cycleway/footpath network throughout the residential and employment areas, which links to existing footpaths and cycleways and to schools, the proposed football ground and uses adjoining the growth location.
- The developer should develop a Masterplan in line with the SuDs planning process (CIRIA, 2010). In broad terms, the topography and geology of the site should be the first consideration and this will lead to an understanding of opportunities and constraints within the site. The Masterplan should show where SuDs features are to be located and this would include recreational opportunities around ponds, swales, etc.
- It is unclear why the developer (7) is stating that these would be “a preponderance of family housing”. The Council would require a mix of tenures and types in line with policy RLP8 – Housing Types.
- The proposed bus route information should be shown in more detail.
- Mention of £5 million of New Homes Bonus money is inappropriate.
- Landscape Issues - Retention of the existing hedgerow network is welcomed. However, a key point is the need for a structural landscape buffer along the full length of the growth location along Panfield Lane to protect and improve the existing hedgerow and to provide a green corridor to protect biodiversity and to minimise impact on existing residential dwellings along Panfield Lane. This could be made up of a strip of land wide enough to protect the existing hedgerow and to provide a green corridor of linear open space on the western side of the hedgerow, which could include a footpath/cycleway.
- Roads/Cycleways should be adjacent to hedgerows to reduce management conflict with residents. Also having some kind of buffer between roads and hedges would make it more wildlife friendly.
- Planting should be adjacent to the sports fields to help create new wildlife corridors.
- The field boundary which runs through the employment area should be retained.
- The woodland to the north of the area should be extended and connected to wildlife corridors, a bigger area would make the existing wood more viable.

- The habitat survey highlights the importance of the wet ditch that runs through the E2 area, which adds great weight to retention of this field boundary, connecting the mature woodland to the land to the east.
- The survey proposed provision of a pond and dipping platform for community use. This could tie-in with the woodland extension mentioned, possibly on land south of the mature woodland area. This would also be close to the wet ditch, making its location there more appropriate.
- An area of ruderal vegetation adjacent to the Enterprise Centre is identified as having reptile potential. The current plan sees the loss of this area and, even if retained, it would be relatively isolated. Consideration could be given to retaining this habitat and its links with the countryside in some form, particularly if the recommended reptile surveys reveal there is a significant population present. This location may also be suitable as a community wildlife area if the site mentioned above is not feasible.
- Affordable Housing Issues - The Preliminary Master-Plan proposals indicate the requirement, through the Council's Core Strategy, for 30% affordable housing. We would like it noted that we require a mix of property sizes broadly in line with the overall development – with a relative mix of flats and houses that reflects the overall mix of the development as a whole. We also expect the homes to match the market homes in terms of number of parking spaces and environmental features. We will seek "Lifetime Homes Standard" and would expect design and quality standards in line with Homes and Communities Agency requirements at the time of the development.
- Our Affordable Housing Strategy identifies our aim to secure 5% of affordable housing as suitable for wheelchair users. We will seek to negotiate a mix of unit types to meet this requirement.
- Our Strategic Housing Marketing Assessment recommends 70% rented and 30% intermediate tenure.