

**Local Development Framework Sub-Committee  
25th July 2012**



<p><b>Report on Preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Draft Allocations to be included in that Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Agenda No: 6</b></p>
<p><b>Corporate Priority:</b> Environment is clean and green, business is encouraged and local economy prospers, housing and transport meet local needs</p> <p><b>Report presented by:</b> Emma Goodings, Alan Massow</p> <p><b>Report prepared by:</b> Emma Goodings, Alan Massow</p>	
<p><b>Background Papers:</b> Local Plan Review Village Inset Plans. Correspondence from landowners and agents proposing development sites. Correspondence with Parish Council's discussing draft Village Inset Plans. Planning Committee report of 22.5.12 on planning application 12/00739/FUL at Blackmore End.</p>	<p><b>Public Report</b></p>
<p><b>Options:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To approve or not approve the recommendations set out in this report relating to site allocations in Castle Hedingham, Greenstead Green, Helions Bumpstead, Sturmer, Coggeshall Hamlet, Cressing and Blackmore End Wethersfield as part of the preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.</li> <li>2. To amend the recommendations.</li> <li>3. To request further discussion with Parish Councils, or other persons, on the draft allocations.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Key Decision:</b></p> <p>No (There will be a recommendation to Council to approve the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan for public consultation in its entirety, when the whole of the draft plan, supporting evidence and SA/SEA has been prepared).</p>
<p><b>Executive Summary:</b> This report sets out recommendations concerning proposed allocations in seven settlements, together with the views of Parish Council's on these sites. These conclude the consideration of draft village site allocations, (apart from a request to reconsider the proposed allocation of land off West Street, Coggeshall, which is awaiting the views of the Parish Council.)</p>	
<p><b>Decision: To approve the recommendations relating to allocations for inclusion in the draft Site Allocations Plan, which will be subject to public consultation.</b></p>	
<p><b>Purpose of Decision:</b> The draft allocations will form part of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan which, together with the Core Strategy, will allocate development sites and protect other areas in the District from development over the next fifteen years.</p>	

<b>Corporate implications [should be explained in detail]</b>	
<b>Financial:</b>	Costs of LDF Evidence and Site Allocations and Development Management Plan Preparation and Examination. Land values relating to development proposed. New Homes Bonus payment is related to housing development. Infrastructure costs. S106 and CIL payments will be related to future development.
<b>Legal:</b>	Plan preparation and adoption process follows legal procedures
<b>Equalities/Diversity</b>	Proposed development and protection of the environment have an impact upon equality/diversity
<b>Customer Impact:</b>	Impact of planning proposals and future planning decisions
<b>Environment and Climate Change:</b>	Report makes recommendations relating to development of land and protection of land for open space, allotments and other uses which will have effects upon the environment and climate change.
<b>Consultation/Community Engagement:</b>	Parish Councils and local ward members have been consulted on the preparation of Village Inset Maps. The public will be consulted when the draft plan has been prepared, subject to the draft plan being approved by the Council.
<b>Risks:</b>	Risk of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan not being adopted.
<b>Officer Contact:</b>	Eleanor Dash
<b>Designation:</b>	Planning Policy Manager
<b>Ext. No.</b>	2563
<b>E-mail:</b>	eleanor.dash@braintree.gov.uk

## **1. Background**

1.1 The Site Allocations and Development Management Plan is required to provide site allocations and planning policies for the District and must be in conformity with the Core Strategy. It should contain Proposal Map Inset Maps for each town, 'key service' and 'other village' in the District, which will replace the Inset maps in the Local Plan Review. The Council should allocate 'non-strategic' sites for development on these Inset Maps, identify development boundaries of settlements and designate sites, such as recreation areas, to be protected from development.

1.2 The adopted Core Strategy, the Proposals Map and the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan when adopted will together replace the 2005 Local Plan Review. This report makes recommendations on sites in seven rural settlements, some of which have already been discussed by this Sub-Committee, but have been the subject of correspondence from landowners or other persons. The Core Strategy requires the provision of sites for a minimum of 300 dwellings in the 'other villages' (ie not key service villages). As there have already been more than 300 dwellings either built, or with permission in the 'Other Villages' this means that there is no requirement to allocate more dwellings in these villages, if the Sub-Committee does not think that this is appropriate.

1.3 When the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan has been prepared, there will be a period of 6 weeks of public consultation during which members of the public, landowners and developers will be able to object to the allocations in the draft plan and to suggest other sites for development, if they wish to do so, as objections to the draft plan. These objections will then be considered by the

LDF Sub-Committee who will decide whether to amend the plan in response to objections.

## **2. Castle Hedingham**

**Core Strategy Proposals:** Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village

### **Background:**

2.1 Castle Hedingham site allocations were considered by the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee on the 7<sup>th</sup> December, when a draft inset map for the village was approved by Members, this is Map 1 set out in Appendix 1.

2.2 However, several issues have come to light, which require further consideration by the LDF Sub-Committee, relating to proposed recreation areas, Nunnery Farm and the development boundary north of Nunnery Street.

- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers which are to be reconsidered here (Sites are shown on Map 2a and 2b):**

<b>Sites</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>CAS1</b> Land rear of 118 – 132 Nunnery Street	Proposed development of land for housing.
<b>CAS4 A</b> Playing field off Sudbury Hill	Proposed development of land for housing 0.75ha.
<b>CAS4 B</b> Field to the rear of Church Lane adjacent to village hall	Replacement recreation facility and/or allotments.
<b>CAS6</b> Land rear 108 – 132 Nunnery Street	Proposed development of land for housing.
Not formally submitted: Land to the rear of 106 – 110 Nunnery Street	Proposed development of land for housing (2 dwellings). 0.11ha.

2.3 The owners of Hedingham Castle own a number of other sites within the village itself including site CAS4A, the recreation ground off Sudbury Hill, and CAS4B, land adjacent to the village hall. It was felt it may be necessary in the future to ensure the financial stability of the Castle, that the site CAS4A may need to be redeveloped for residential development. In this case, the land owners offered to create a new village area of open space in area CAS4B adjacent to the village hall. This was to ensure that the village residents still had access to a suitable area of open space. At the LDF Sub Committee on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011 and following the Parish Council views, it was resolved to allocate both CAS4A and B for informal recreation.

2.4 The landowner has since contacted the Council and stated that they wish the informal recreation allocation to be removed from both CAS4A and B. In the case of the current recreation ground, CAS4A, the site is currently rented by the Parish Council on a quarterly basis for public use. There is no longer a lease on the site and the public access can be terminated with 3 months notice. At CAS4B there is currently no public access and as such the delivery of informal recreation on this site would be impossible.

2.5 At the LDF Sub- Committee meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> December the village boundary to the south of Nunnery Street was amended to remove the farm buildings at Nunnery Farm, which were within the village envelope in the Local Plan Review, with the village envelope proposed to run no further than the boundaries of properties 87 – 95 Nunnery Street. However, following further consideration and discussions with the landowner, the Parish Council have now stated that they support a village envelope, which includes the farm buildings on the frontage of Nunnery Street.

2.6 In addition, the District Council has had correspondence from a concerned resident regarding land included within the development boundary to the north of Nunnery Street. The resident states that the boundary should be drawn along the rear of garden boundaries adjacent to the 'Piggeries' as suggested in a Planning Appeal decision.

#### **Parish Council Views:**

2.7 Following receipt of views of the landowners, which were discussed at their meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> June, the Parish Council has decided to withdraw it's request for the Church Lane site (CAS4B) to be a) designated as informal recreation land and b) it's request that all of the site should be outside the village envelope.

2.8 As expressed at their meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> April, the Parish Council reconsidered the issue of Nunnery Farm and following consultation with the landowner, recommends that the village envelope line should now be drawn around the farmyard wall, which would include some of the farm buildings including a modern barn within the village envelope.

2.9 As set out in the original November response to the consultation, the Parish Council was not supportive of sites submitted for residential development to the rear of properties on the north of Nunnery Street, CAS1 and CAS6, but requested that the village boundary be located 5 metres to the north of the existing residential property boundaries.

#### **Officer Comments:**

##### Informal Recreation

2.10 The land at the corner of Sudbury Hill and Bayley Street has been included in the village envelope as public open space, since the first village envelope for Castle Hedingham was put together in 1986 and includes a site for children's play equipment. It was leased to the Parish Council. This site, with reference CAS4A, was submitted for consideration as a residential site, with site CAS4B off Church Lane, put forward as an alternative public recreation facility to compensate for the loss of the playing field. However, the draft Inset Map for Castle Hedingham approved by the LDF Sub Committee of the 7<sup>th</sup> December includes both site CAS4A and CAS4B as informal recreation and additionally adds a part of the field currently unallocated within the current village envelope, as informal open space outside of the village envelope.

2.11 The landowner has stated that in order to guarantee the future financial stability of the Castle, it may be necessary in the future to bring forward development on the current recreation ground and therefore wishes that the informal recreation allocation be removed from this site. Whilst at present the land is rented to the Parish Council in order to use the site for public use, this may not continue in perpetuity. The removal of the informal recreation allocation will leave a large area of 0.75ha without allocation within the village envelope, which may lead to pressure for redevelopment.

However, it is considered that keeping the informal recreation allocation may not be deliverable, as the land owner could remove public access at any time. It is therefore considered that both these allocations should be removed from the draft Inset Map for Castle Hedingham. This does not affect the informal recreation land adjacent to New Park, which is owned by the District Council.

2.12 The site owners also request that the village envelope at Church Lane should be put back to how it is at present in the Local Plan Review, which includes the area adjacent to the village hall, which could allow future development on the site to come forward through a planning application. This is a small site located close to the centre of the village near the facilities, which could allow a small amount of new residential development to take place in the village. However, the site is in the Conservation Area and has a narrow access road, which could restrict the number of dwellings on the site.

### Nunnery Street

2.13 The village envelope as set out in the 2005 Local Plan Review includes a large extent of farm buildings at Nunnery Farm. At the LDF Sub Committee on the 7<sup>th</sup> December the officer recommendation was that these buildings should be removed from the village envelope, which was supported by the Parish Council. The LDF Sub Committee approved the recommendation. However, following correspondence with the landowner, the Parish Council have set out their support (see above) for the front part of the farmyard to be included within the village envelope. The buildings which the Parish Council propose to be included within the village envelope include a large brick built barn at the front of the site and two buildings to the rear of the farmyard, which are all grade 2 listed and a large modern agricultural barn. Farm buildings by their nature are not normally included within a development boundary as they are generally within the countryside. It is considered that the inclusion of this area within the village envelope could lead to pressure for the whole site to be redeveloped for residential use and it is therefore considered that the recommendation of the LDF Sub-Committee on the 7<sup>th</sup> December should stand and that the Nunnery Farm farmyard should be located outside the development boundary. The Nunnery Farm buildings are also located within flood zone 2 where there would be a policy objection to the construction of new residential buildings.

2.14 At the LDF Sub Committee on the 7<sup>th</sup> December the village envelope to the north of 132 – 118 on the north side of Nunnery Street was set at 5m beyond the houses rear boundaries at the request of the Parish Council. This slightly increased the area to the rear of 132 Nunnery Street, which was included within the village envelope. However, neither the Parish Council nor officers were supportive of sites CAS1 and CAS6 which are located in this area and were put forward for residential development. The land is an overgrown site with a variety of ramshackle structures on it. An appeal in 2005 was dismissed for the creation of a single dwelling in this location and the inspector questioned why the village envelope had been drawn away from property boundaries. It is considered that a planning application for a dwelling/s in this location would still be refused due to backland development and part of the site is located within an area at risk of flooding. The village design statement which was completed in 2008 specifically states in its guidance for Nunnery Street that the village envelope should be drawn to ensure that backland development does not take place and should be maintained on its existing line and definition. Therefore it is considered that the boundary should be amended to run alongside the garden boundary of properties to the north of Nunnery Street as shown on Map 3.

## **Recommendations**

- 1. To remove the designation of informal recreation from site CAS4A, the current recreation field.**
- 2. To remove the designation of informal recreation from site CAS4B, to the rear of the village hall on Church Lane.**
- 3. To reinstate the village envelope boundary adjacent to the village hall on Church Lane, as it is currently set out in the Local Plan Review 2005 Inset Map.**
- 4. To amend the village boundary to the north of Nunnery Street so that it runs along the rear garden boundaries of 118 – 132 Nunnery Street.**
- 5. To not change the village envelope to the south of Nunnery Street from that agreed at the 7<sup>th</sup> December LDF Sub-Committee i.e. to exclude the barns at Nunnery Farm from the village envelope.**
- 6. To approve Map 3 as the draft inset map for Castle Hedingham.**

### **3. Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural – proposals on the edge of Halstead**

#### **Core Strategy Proposals:**

Greenstead Green - Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village

Halstead – Main Town

#### **Background:**

3.1 The LDF Sub Committee considered a report on the Greenstead Green village envelope at its meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> December. This included consideration of the site GRG6 land to the south of the village, to the east of Grange Hill.

3.2 The LDF Sub Committee considered a report on Halstead at its meeting on the 1<sup>st</sup> March. This included considering the sites put forward in the Halstead Trinity and Halstead St Andrews wards. In order to meet the strategy identified in the Core Strategy a minimum of 68 dwellings needed to be allocated in Halstead and this was achieved through the allocation of HRT6A and B the Senior Citizens Centre, HAS7 land at Fenn Road, HAS28SHLAA Fenn Road Depot, HAS11 Central Park and the redrawing of the village envelope at Sloe Hill. This is in addition to changes to land allocated within the envelope for employment, retail, community uses and recreation.

3.3 However, there are a number of sites submitted for consideration as part of the Allocations DPD, which whilst being located on the edge of the current built up area of Halstead, are actually located within Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish. These sites have not been considered by either the Greenstead Green or Halstead report and so are considered below.

**Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

<b>Sites</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>LDF Site Ref:</b> GRG1 <b>Site Address/Name:</b> Land adjoining the cricket ground, Sudbury Road	<b>Gross Site Area Ha:</b> 11.10 <b>Type of Development:</b> Residential <b>Summary of Proposals</b>
<b>LDF Site Ref:</b> GRG2 <b>Site Address/Name:</b> Land to the South of Oak Road	<b>Gross Site Area Ha:</b> 6.22 <b>Type of Development:</b> Residential <b>Summary of Proposals:</b>
<b>LDF Site Ref:</b> GRG3 <b>Site Address/Name:</b> Land to the south of Bluebridge Industrial Estate	<b>Gross Site Area Ha:</b> 2 <b>Type of Development:</b> Employment <b>Summary of Proposals:</b>
<b>LDF Site Ref:</b> GRG5 <b>Site Address/Name:</b> Land at the corner of Oak Road and Mount Hill	<b>Gross Site Area Ha:</b> 7.57 <b>Type of Development:</b> Residential <b>Summary of Proposals:</b>

**Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Map:**

3.4 This was sent to Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council for comment. It includes the amended town development boundary of Halstead taking into account the decision made by the Panel at their meeting on the 1<sup>st</sup> March.

**Parish Council Views:**

3.5 Halstead Town Council did not wish to comment on the sites as they are within the Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish.

3.6 Greenstead Green Parish Council do not support the allocation of sites GRG1, GRG2 or GRG5 for residential development as they are greenfield sites, which are highly visible.

**Officer Comments:**

**GRG1 – Land adjoining the cricket ground, Sudbury Road**

3.7 This is a large site located to the north of the town in an area of high landscape value. It is almost entirely separated from the Halstead Town Development Boundary by site HAS5, which was not considered suitable for development and therefore is not suitable for development as it would represent a large area of development distinct from the main town.

**GRG2- Land to the south of Oak Road**

3.8 This site is located on the southern edge of Halstead off Oak Road. This part of Oak Road is quite narrow and after the junction with Three Gates, has a more rural feel as it moves away from the built up area of Halstead. This area has a high sensitivity to change and as such it is not considered a suitable location for new development.

**GRG3 – Land to the south of Bluebridge Industrial Estate**

3.9 This land is proposed for employment and is located to the south of the existing Bluebridge Industrial Estate, separated by the disused railway line, which is a footpath and is allocated for informal recreation. This would make access to the site difficult. The route of the proposed Halstead bypass is through this area and the

south of the site is an area at risk of flooding. For all these reasons it is not considered a site suitable for development.

**GRG5 – Land at the corner of Oak Road and Mount Hill**

3.10 This site is located adjacent to the southern boundary of Halstead at Oak Road and Mount Hill and is opposite dwellings along Oak Road. As the site borders the main A131 access road into Halstead from the south of the District, it is a very prominent gateway into the town and currently long views are available to the site, due to its elevated position. It is not considered a suitable site for growth due to its large size and it would lead to an extension of Halstead into the countryside.

**Recommendations**

1. To *not* allocate GRG1, GRG2 and GRG5 for residential development.
2. To *not* allocate GRG3 for employment development.

**4. Helions Bumpstead**

**Core Strategy Proposals: Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village**

**Background:**

4.1 The inset map of the Local Plan Review for Helions Bumpstead currently identifies two large areas of visually important open space at the centre of the village and the area around St Andrew’s Church as Cemetery/Churchyard. A large part of the village lies within the Conservation Area. The village has a hall, church, recreation grounds and a pub with a community post office at Pale Green. There is also a gospel hall to the north of the village.

There are around 20 houses located on Haverhill Road to the north of the village, known as Pale Green.

**Representations for sites put forward so far by landowners/developers:**

Sites proposed by landowners/developers	Details
<b>HEL1</b> Willowmead, Sages End Road	Proposed development of land for housing. 1.04ha
<b>HEL2</b> Land north of Slate Hall, Pale Green	Proposed development of land for housing. 0.86ha
<b>HEL3</b> Land south of Chestnut Lodge, Haverhill Road	Proposed development of land for housing. 0.3ha
<b>HEL4</b> Land north of Water Tower, Haverhill Road	Proposed development of land for housing. 0.28ha
<b>HEL5</b> Land north of Hilltop Villa, Haverhill Road	Proposed development of land for housing. 0.63ha



<b>HEL6</b> Land south of Slate Hall, Pale Green	Proposed development of land for housing. 0.51ha
<b>HEL7</b> Land at Mill Road	Proposed development of land for housing. 1.96ha
<b>HEL8</b> Land adjacent to Rolls Farm	Proposed development of land for housing. 1.75ha
<b>HEL9</b> Land adjacent to Upper House, Church Hill	Proposed development of land for housing. Suggested for 2-3 properties.

### **Helions Bumpstead Map 1 :**

4.2 This was sent to Parish Council for comment and includes existing Local Plan Review village envelope, representations so far from landowners/developers and questions about allocations.

### **4.3 Parish Council Views:**

- Recognises the need for small scale development and therefore does not wish to keep the village envelope as set out in the Local Plan, but feels any development should provide some ancillary benefit to the village e.g. social housing/allotments.
- Supports small scale employment development on site HEL2 and has no objection to the development of sites HEL3 and HEL4. Has no objection to some of site HEL9 being allocated for development, but would like the area between the village green and the existing house to be allocated as Visually Important Open Space.
- Does not support the development of sites HEL1, HEL5, HEL6, HEL7 and HEL8. The Parish Council wishes to discuss with the landowner the provision of allotments on HEL5.
- Supports a new section of village envelope to include the sites along Haverhill Road, up to the entrance of Haven Farm.
- Does not support the extension of the village envelope to include the existing properties along Camps Road or the land between The Old Vicarage and Moss' Farmhouse.
- Wishes the recreation ground to be formally designated as formal recreation.

**4.4 Helions Bumpstead Map 2:** Proposed Parish Council changes to the Local Plan Review Inset. Please see **Appendix 1**.

### **Officer Comments:**

4.5 Helions Bumpstead is a small rural village, although it does benefit from some facilities, public transport is limited. It is recognised that the Parish Council are supportive of changes to the village envelope for small scale development.

4.6 HEL1 is located behind existing properties on Sages End Road and as such is considered backland development in an area where the prevailing development character is of a linear nature. Sages End Road is narrow, often with vehicles parked on it and is a protected lane to the west of the site, therefore is not considered

suitable to serve a relatively large area of new housing. In addition, at present there seems to be no access to the site without the demolition of existing dwellings, or extending the site to include land to the rear of properties owned by Greenfields Community Housing, where access could then be gained through the existing garden or parking area. It is therefore not considered a suitable site for inclusion within the village envelope.

4.7 The settlement known as Pale Green is approximately 160m away from the Helions Bumpstead village envelope and located within the countryside. This cluster of development feels quite separated from the main part of the village and is itself separated by various fields and open areas. However, the Parish Council have identified a number of areas for development within this settlement and therefore a village envelope would be required to identify new areas for growth. Officers consider that a development boundary could be provided around Pale Green, but the boundary proposed by the Parish Council could be amended to exclude the undeveloped area to the south of Haverhill Road opposite site HEL2. This is a large field in current agricultural use and its inclusion within a development boundary could lead to ribbon frontage development, which would decrease the gap between Helions Bumpstead and Pale Green.

4.8 HEL2 is an area of agricultural buildings, which seem to be little used. The Parish Council support opportunities for small scale employment activities on this site, which is considered would help to keep the village sustainable. However any employment use/s would need to respect the neighbouring land uses and the local road network.

4.9 HEL3 is a large area of garden, mainly laid to lawn which is open to Haverhill Road. There is no objection to this land being included within the village envelope for residential development.

4.10 HEL4 is a field located between housing on the north side of Haverhill Road, which is in current agricultural use. Due to its position between housing fronting onto the road, there is no objection to this area being included within the envelope for housing.

4.11 HEL5 and HEL6 are located at the east and west ends of the settlement of Pale Green on agricultural land. It is considered that the inclusion of these sites within the development boundary at Pale Green would create more ribbon development and in the case of HEL6 reduce the separation between the main part of the village and Pale Green. The Parish Council wish to pursue part of site HEL5 for allotments, which could be included as a community gain for the residential development at HEL3 and HEL4 as these are also in the same ownership.

4.12 HEL7 is a large site in a visually prominent position on the edge of the village on a slope. The current village boundary is well screened by trees and could make development on this site feel separate from other dwellings in the village.

4.13 Agree with the Parish Council that site HEL8 is too far from the main part of the village to be considered for development

4.14 HEL9 is located at the centre of the village behind existing development on the corner of Church Hill and Camps Road. It is wholly located within the conservation area. Agree with the Parish Council that the area between the existing visually important open space and the current dwelling is important to the setting and the character of the village and the conservation area and therefore should be protected as visually important open space. It is considered that whilst development on part of

the rest of HEL9 could be appropriate providing a suitable access can be created, the development site should exclude the part of site HEL9 which goes beyond Ash Lawn Cottage. This is also the part of the site that is most heavily vegetated.

**4.15 Helions Bumpstead Map 3:** Draft Inset Map identifying the proposed amendments to the village boundary. Please see Appendix 1.

### **Recommendations**

- 1. To approve a new development boundary to include current dwellings in Pale Green and including sites HEL3 and HEL4 as set out on Map 3.**
- 2. To allocate site HEL2 for B1 – B2.**
- 3. To allocate the area between the village green and Upper House as an area of Visually Important Open Space as set out on Map 3.**
- 4. To amend the development boundary at the rear of Church Hill as set out on Map 3.**
- 5. To designate the recreation ground as formal recreation.**
- 6. To approve Helions Bumpstead Map 3 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.**

### **5. Sturmer (including Sturmer West – Haverhill Business Park)**

#### **Background:**

5.1 The village of Sturmer was previously considered by the LDF Sub Committee on the 1<sup>st</sup> March, where it was agreed to allocate East Town Country Park, Lion Meadow, Stour Brook and Sturmer Common, Coupals Road as informal recreation. However, the Council has been contacted by the owners of Stour Brook/Lion Meadow who have stated that the land is within private ownership, with no public access except along public footpaths. The owner therefore requests that the informal recreation designation be removed from Lion Meadow/Stour Brook.

#### **Sturmer – Map 1 (Please see Appendix 1)**

5.2 This map was agreed by the Parish Council and the LDF Sub Committee as the proposed inset map for Sturmer. Lion Meadow/Stour Brook is the informal recreation site located to the north of the village

#### **Parish Council Views:**

5.3 Wished for the areas of open space identified in the Braintree Green Spaces Strategy to be allocated. However, they have not commented following the landowners request that this area should not be allocated as informal recreation.

#### **Officer Comments:**

5.4 The site owners have confirmed via email that they do not allow public access to the site and do not wish for the site to be designated as informal recreation. As such it is considered that the allocation of informal recreation on Stour Brook/Lion Meadow is undeliverable and should therefore be removed.

## Recommendations

(In addition to those agreed by the Local Development Framework Sub Committee on the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2012)

**To remove the informal recreation allocation from Lion Meadow/Stour Brook.**

**To approve Sturmer Map 1 minus the informal recreation at Stour Brook/Lion Meadow as the draft inset map for Sturmer.**

## 6. Coggeshall

**Core Strategy Proposals:** Key Service Village

### **Background:**

6.1 Coggeshall site allocations were considered by the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011 when a draft inset map for the village was approved by Members.

**Representations for sites put forward so far by landowners/developers:**

<b>Sites proposed by landowners/developers</b>	<b>Details</b>
Existing allotment site – Kelvedon Road Coggeshall Hamlet	An existing site with approximately 39 allotments of various sizes.

### **Parish Council Views:**

6.2 The Parish Council do not object to the site being identified on the inset map for Coggeshall as allotments.

**Coggeshall: Map** Please see **Appendix 1**.

### **Officer Comments:**

6.3 An existing allotment site in Coggeshall Hamlet was not included on the draft inset map for Coggeshall. It is proposed to identify this site on the inset map as shown on the Coggeshall map in the Appendix.

### **Recommendation**

**It is recommended to allocate the site on Kelvedon Road Coggeshall Hamlet as allotments, as shown on the Coggeshall map in the Appendix.**

## 7. Cressing

### **Background:**

7.1 The LDF Sub Committee considered a report on the Cressing Site Allocations at the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2012. This included consideration of the site CRE11 at Shelleys Lane. Concern had been expressed during Question Time by the Agent for the site that the Parish Council may have mistaken its location and it was suggested that the Parish Council's views should be clarified. Officers have therefore re-consulted the Parish Council and this report sets out their views.

Sites proposed by landowners/developers	Details
CRE11	1 Oak Corner, Shelleys Lane, Braintree Road, Tye Green, Cressing. Residential development. 0.8ha.

**Cressing:** Map of CRE11 Please see Appendix.

**Officer Comments:**

**CRE11 – Parish Council Views/Development Status**

7.2 Two issues were raised at the LDF Panel meeting of the 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2012 regarding site CRE11. The first issue was that Cressing Parish Council comments seemed to indicate that they were referring to a different site to the one at CRE11. (Previous Parish Council comments were *CRE11 – Existing scrap yard. Currently it is brownfield but with identified contamination and village boundary issues.*) It was therefore agreed that officers should clarify the views of the Parish Council. The Parish Council therefore discussed the site again at its meeting of the 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012. Their revised views are set out as follows and clearly show that they do not support the allocation of this site for development.

**Revised Parish Council Views on CRE11:**

7.3 Parish Councillors apologise for their mis-understanding of the actual site relating to CRE11 and wish to thank you for the opportunity of submitting a corrected set of comments. Parish Councillors were wholly opposed to the approval of this suggested site for a wide range of reasons - in short:

- The site is outside the Village Envelope and forms part of the Brain Valley which is a designated area.
- The access track to the site is very narrow and is already over-used and often requires drivers of HGV's to reverse on to the main road having met on-coming traffic.
- The track is also co-incident with a Public Footpath.
- The track is unable to support a separate Public walkway and road traffic owing to the narrowness of same.
- Some of the land enclosed by the red line on the plan appears to be outside the ownership of the applicant.
- The proposed use for housing would substantially increase traffic volume which is already considered excessive by those living nearby.
- There seems to be no way in which the access could be improved to safely support an increase in traffic flow.
- The track joins to a highway that is already considered to be working at "over capacity".

**Officer Comments**

7.4 The second issue raised by the agent was concerning the development status of the site. The report said that it was a greenfield site (as it was an agricultural use) and this was contested by the agent for the site, who stated that the site was used for haulage and was therefore a previously developed brownfield site.

7.5 There have been a series of applications for use of land for agriculture and erection and use of buildings related to agriculture. The buildings were erected for

the purposes of agriculturally related uses, according to the planning history. Planning application BTE/04/1061/AGR was for the erection of storage for tractors and implements, hay and food store, farm machinery repair, permission not required. This indicates Greenfield classification. There is also a record of a sequence of applications for retention of a mobile home in connection with agricultural use of land there, which from the an appeal statement at one point appears to have been some chickens and goats, but considered insufficient by the Council to merit permission of a permanent dwelling. However, because of a legal technicality, which seems to be that the Council had permitted retention of a porch, which was development, as well as the mobile home, on legal advice the Council allowed the permanent dwelling and because of the route by which the case was established it was not conditioned to agricultural occupancy. Building work commenced in 2010, and the dwelling is still under construction with the most recent inspection being in April 2012.

7.6 As Environmental Health officers objected to a permanent dwelling because of the proximity to the scrap yard, it is likely that they would not support a larger allocation as in CRE11.

**Recommendation**

**That site CRE11 at Shelleys Lane, Tye Green Crossing should not be allocated for residential development.**

**8. Blackmore End - Wethersfield**

**Background**

8.1 Blackmore End does not have a development boundary in the Local Plan Review 2005 and is therefore currently part of the countryside. The LDF Sub Committee considered site allocations at Blackmore End at the meeting of the 24<sup>th</sup> January 2012. Members approved a village envelope around the main group of dwellings in Blackmore End, together with an area of formal recreation, cemetery/church yard and two areas of visually important space. These are shown on the first map of Blackmore End in the Appendix.

8.2 Members of Planning Committee refused an application in School Green at Blackmore End at their meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 and their decision was minuted as follows:

*“In refusing this application, Members of the Committee requested officers to review the use of the site as part of the current Local Development Framework site allocation process.”*

Application Site	Details
Brandon Coaches, Blackmore End, Wethersfield - Planning Application 12/00448/FUL (Refused by Planning Committee - 22/05/12).	Refused planning application for demolition of former bus garage and associated outbuildings and the erection of two storey detached dwelling and associated garage and alteration to highway access. (0.2ha – Single residential unit).

8.3 The Brandon Coach site is shown on the second plan of Blackmore End in the Appendix. It is located approximately 45 metres away from the main body of the village in a small group of dwellings consisting of six properties known as School Green. The site is not within any current or proposed village envelope.

8.4 The site contains a building which is approximately 300 sqm with an eaves height of 4 metres and a ridge height of approximately 6.5 metres, a second building is at the rear of the first and has a footprint of roughly 50 metres. The site was used as a coach/bus garage, but is now appears to be used for storage and occasional vehicle parking. The application proposes the demolition of the existing buildings and the clearance of the site. A dwelling would then be erected on the site with a garage, hardstanding and gardens. The application site is located within the countryside and as such it is relevant to note that policy CS5 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review 2011 states that development should only be supported where it relates to an appropriate rural use. No evidence of the necessary 'effort to secure a suitable employment or community re-use' has been provided.

8.5 Policy RLP16 allows for the erection of dwellings within hamlets of 10 or more dwellings within a defined nucleus. The cluster of properties known as School Green is not sufficient in number or density to be considered a hamlet under the terms of this policy and as such no support can be found for the proposal in relation to that policy. As the site is not currently in use, policy RLP35 – Non-Conforming and Un-neighbourly Industry does not apply because it does not currently detract from the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.

### **Site Allocation and Development Management Policy Issues**

8.6 Officers consider that it would be inappropriate to define a village envelope around School Green, as this is only made up of about six dwellings and the nature of built development at this location is not of a sufficient density to warrant its own envelope.

8.7 The issue of the re-use of redundant buildings outside of development boundaries will be given consideration in the preparation of the Development Management policies document.

### **Recommendations**

- 1. That there should not be a village envelope designated at School Green, Blackmore End, Wethersfield.**
- 2. That the issue be noted and that consideration of an appropriate Development Management policy covering the circumstance where the replacement of redundant rural buildings could be acceptable should take place at a later committee meeting as part of the consideration of Development Management policies and officers will report back to Planning Committee on the outcome.**