

Report on comments received to the Addendum of Focused and Minor Changes Core Strategy Submission Draft October 2010.	Agenda No: 8
<p>Corporate Priority: Business is encouraged and the local economy prospers Housing and transport meet local needs</p> <p>Report presented by: Alan Massow Senior Policy Planner</p> <p>Report prepared by: Alan Massow Senior Policy Planner</p>	
<p>Background Papers: Core Strategy Submission Draft published May 2010</p> <p>Addendum of Focused and Minor Changes to the Core Strategy Submission Draft October 2010.</p>	<p>Public Report Yes</p>
<p>Options: To note representations to the Consultation.</p> <p>To recommend to Council that officers are authorised to submit the Submission Draft Core Strategy and Focused Changes to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>To not recommend that Council authorise officers to submit the Submission Draft Core Strategy and Focused Changes to the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>Key Decision: NO</p>
<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>This report sets out a summary of representations made in response to the Addendum of Focused and Minor Changes to the Core Strategy Submission Draft.</p> <p>The table at Appendix One outlines the representations received.</p> <p>No further changes are proposed to the Core Strategy Submission Draft in response to the representations.</p>	
<p>Decision:</p> <p>To NOTE the comments received during the consultation on the Addendum of Focused and Minor Changes to the Core Strategy Submission Draft.</p> <p>To RECOMMEND that the Council resolves that planning officers are authorised to submit the Core Strategy Submission Draft plus the Focused Changes to the Secretary of State.</p>	

Purpose of Decision:

To note the representations received and allow officers to submit the Submission Draft Core Strategy and Addendum of Focused and Minor Changes to the Secretary of State.

Any Corporate implications in relation to the following should be explained in detail

Financial:	The Core Strategy will be examined by a Planning Inspector, with associated costs for the Inspector, Programme Officer and premises. Document printing costs
Legal:	The Core Strategy is a statutory document setting out planning policy for the District up to 2026.
Equalities/Diversity	An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken which forms part of the Evidence base of the Core Strategy.
Customer Impact:	As set out in the Core Strategy and addendum of Focused and Minor Changes
Environment and Climate Change:	As set out in the Core Strategy and addendum of Focused and Minor Changes
Consultation/Community Engagement:	Public Consultation on Addendum of Focused Changes between 7 th October 2010 and the 19 th November 2010.
Risks:	That the Core Strategy will not be found sound at the examination by a Planning Inspector, which would give rise to additional work on the Strategy and Evidence Base.
Officer Contact:	Alan Massow
Designation:	Senior Policy Planner
Ext. No.	2577
E-mail:	Alan.massow@braintree.gov.uk

1 Background

1.1 The Core Strategy Submission Draft was published on the 10th May 2010. The Council received a number of representations to this document. Following the consideration of changes in response to these representations, the LDF Panel recommended changes to the Core Strategy Submission Draft, which were approved by the Council on the 27th September.

1.2 As some of the changes were substantive and would result in what are known as Focused Changes, it was necessary to hold an additional period of consultation. In addition to the Focused Changes a number of minor changes were also published. However, these were for information rather than comment.

1.3 The Addendum of Focused and Minor Changes to the Core Strategy Submission Draft was published on the 7th October 2010 for a six week consultation period, which finished on the 19th November 2010.

1.4 In total 45 representations were received from 21 individuals or organisations. These representations are set out in Appendix One together with officer responses.

2 Future Steps

2.1 It is recommended that no further changes are made in response to the representations received. All of these representations have been added to those already made concerning the Submission Draft Core Strategy and will be passed to the Planning Inspector, who will examine the soundness of the Core Strategy.

2.2 Members are requested to recommend to the Council that they should authorise planning officers to submit the Core Strategy Submission Draft plus the Focused Changes to the Secretary of State. It is proposed that submission will take place in the first week of January 2011.

3 Petition from Friends of Braintree

3.1 The Friends of Braintree have submitted a petition signed by 101 persons objecting to the proposed Panfield Lane growth location, setting out reasons for their objections. It does not relate to the focused changes. They have asked that this is placed before the Planning Inspector who will consider the soundness of the Core Strategy. This petition will be added to the other objections submitted by the Friends of Braintree, which will be considered by the Inspector, following the submission of the Plan for examination in 2011.

Appendix One – Table of Representations Received Concerning Core Strategy Focused Changes

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
Francesca Shapland, Natural England		Whole document	Sound	We consider that the Core Strategy is still legally compliant and sound, we have no problem with the addendum changes.	Noted
Rachel Bust, The Coal Authority		Whole document	Sound	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.	Noted
Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd	Boyer Planning	Whole document	Sound	We agree with the District Council that the revocation of the East of England Plan does not alter the evidence base that identified a housing requirement of a minimum of 4637 additional dwellings to be provided between 2009 - 2026. It remains the case that the Core Strategy must be consistent with the housing objectives in PPS3. To this end the intentions through the Focused Changes and Minor Changes to recast the statues of the East of England Plan, whilst maintaining the level of housing based upon its evidence base - rather than any reduction- is the correct approach.	Noted
Mr Porth. Sturmer Parish Council		Whole document	Sound	Whilst our Parish Council is generally satisfied with the changes, we believe that in the light of the government spending review and its impact upon Local Authorities some objectives of the Core Strategy may not be achievable which in turn may result in legal non-compliance and non-soundness. These outcomes may require a further modification of the strategies.	Noted
Mr R. Ford, The Brett Group		Whole document	Unsound	The Cala Homes High Court decision, made on the 10 th November 2010, ruling that the Secretary of State's revocation of Regional Strategies (RSs) in July was unlawful, effectively reinstates the RSS's and their housing targets. Braintree DC should now give material consideration to the East of England Plan when assessing housing targets.	The Council has agreed to continue with the level of growth proposed in the RSS as it was considered appropriate for the District.

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
EEDA		Whole document	Unsound	We note that the plan has been amended to reference the revocation of the East of England Plan. The decision to revoke Regional Strategies has now been quashed by the High Court although the Secretary of State has reiterated his intention to abolish the regional tier. In the light of this High Court decision and the recent White Paper on Local Growth we would stress greater importance on relevant, appropriate and sound evidence to support policies and the approach to its delivery and implementation in the plan. We would be pleased to see the reinstatement on references to the East of England Plan and the Regional Economic Strategy.	Noted. It is not proposed to add back all references to the East of England Plan as this would require the publication of further focused changes, leading to delay and would only be temporary as the Government intend to abolish the Regional Plan in the Localism Bill.
Steve Price, Countryside Properties		Whole document	Sound	We find the following changes sound and legally compliant: Support addition of "B8" in the final bullet point of the "Spatial Strategy", Changes to paragraph 6.18, which adds B8 use to the list of uses for the strategic employment site at Great Notley, and states that B8 use will be restricted to 40% of the total floor area and the largest unit size restricted to 7,500 sq m. The addition of B8 in Policy CS4, Table, row 3, column 2 (and replacement of C2 with C1 use class). These changes reflect and respond to the changes we sought in regard to paragraph 6.18 and Policy CS 4 in our previous representations to the consultation regarding the Draft Core Strategy, submitted to you on the 8 July 2010, i.e. the need to include an element of B8 use within this growth location.	Noted
S. Walsh, Unex		Whole Document	Unsound	The "Cala Homes" successful challenge to the Secretary of State's attempt to set aside the Regional Spatial Strategy means that the RSS is still in place and therefore Braintree's Core Strategy should be in compliance with it.	Noted- the RSS housing requirement for the District remains unchanged.

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
Rivenhall PC		Executive summary	Unsound	Executive Summary BDC have added words . "In order to meet the evidence of local housing need which supported the previous East of England Plan requirements." This is not legally compliant as Braintree District Council has relied, as stated in this Focused Change, on exactly the same housing numbers as they derived from the RSS formulation despite the Government's announcement that the RSS is to be abolished. The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as the RSS is to be abolished and is no longer a material consideration.	The recent High Court decision means that the RSS has not been abolished. The Council considers the level of growth proposed in the RSS to be suitable for the District.
Mr R. Ford, The Brett Group		Para 2.1	Unsound		
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	Para 4.8/Key Diagram/ Appendix 3	Unsound	The Addendum to the Core Strategy at paragraph 4.8, on the Key Diagram and at Appendix 3 now seeks to alter the Settlement Hierarchy to include Great Notley as part of the urban area of Braintree. We similarly object to these changes on the basis they fail to recognise Great Notley as a separate settlement to Braintree. The inclusion of Great Notley as part of the settlement of Braintree is not Justified on the above grounds. Proposed Changes Include Great Notley as a 'Key Service Village' within the settlement hierarchy (or revert to its inclusion as an 'other village' as per the original Submission Draft).	It is appropriate to consider Braintree and Great Notley together. Great Notley does not meet the definition of a KSV because it does not serve a wider area of other villages, but rather is more reliant on Braintree itself.
Rivenhall PC		4.28/Inset 2a	Unsound	4.28/Inset 2A. This focused change is not legally compliant as it seeks to link the proposals map with the inset plans of the growth locations (including the Rivenhall GL) and the relationship with the Local Plan Review Proposals Map. This is a retrospective change. So the Council is now attempting a retrospective change to make the Core Strategy legally compliant but is stating that objections in principle to the Growth Locations and Inset maps will not be accepted at this stage.	The Council has corrected an error which had been made in the title of the growth location Inset maps in response to objections. Objections can only be made to the Focused Changes as part of this consultation. Previous

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
					objections will be considered by the Planning Inspector.
Redrow Homes (eastern) Ltd	Boyer Planning	5.26	Sound	We note the intention to include additional text within para 5.26 concerning economic viability being a material consideration, in determining the actual level of affordable housing. We drew attention to this in our representation to the Core Strategy Submission Draft and we welcome the inclusion of this text, as a means of ensuring a balanced approach to development economics in bringing schemes forward for development.	Noted
K. Fraser, Essex County Council		Para. 6.10 3 rd bullet point	Unsound	<p>It is acknowledged that the situation regarding Stansted Airport has changed from the previous Core Strategy consultation document. However, there remains a planning permission (Generation 1) to increase the capacity at Stansted to 35 million passengers per annum and 264,000 air transport movements. This expansion will still have a significant impact on Braintree and its future economic development prospects.</p> <p>At present the Core Strategy appears to validate the allocation purely on its physical location to Stansted and improved strategic road connections.</p> <p>ECC considers reference should be made to how the designation relates to delivering the aims and objectives of the District Economic Strategy 'Going for Growth, Investing in your future, 2009', and other objectives of the proposed Core Strategy. The Economic Strategy acknowledges the need to provide higher end jobs and higher job densities to help meet the District target for 14,000 additional jobs. This is considered essential given the historic imbalance between the provision of jobs and homes in the district.</p>	<p>The proposed growth location will not just be limited to economic growth associated with the airport but with the whole district.</p> <p>No objection to the suggested changes, but officers advise that publication of further focused changes would cause delay. Officers could raise no objection to suggest changes at the hearing.</p>

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	Table 1	Unsound	<p>Table 1 Summary. In our original representations to the Submission Draft, we raised a number of concerns regarding the data in Table 1, and the way the findings related to the subsequent assessment of the quantum of employment land proposed in the Core Strategy. The proposed amendments to Table 1 do not overcome the concerns raised in our previous representations, and indeed raise certain additional concerns.</p> <p>The consequences of moving to 2010 base data also however need to be applied consistently, and the provisions for both employment and housing should be extended to a 2027 end date.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has to provide housing for a 15 year period from the date of adoption, as it would be adopted in 2011 then end date would therefore be 2026 not 2027. Also early delivery of the site could compromise housing delivery later in the Plan Period. Similarly with the employment land supply the period for provision is until 2026.</p>
Silver End PC		6.14/Appendix 4 and Chapter 9 Table 2	Unsound	<p>The proposed focus change at paragraph 6.14 is not sound because it is not justified. Core Strategy support for a museum in the powerhouse as part of the Silver End Regeneration Area of the former Crittalls factory site, has been deleted. We dispute BDC's claim that is over prescriptive to include the museum as surely a village museum housed in one building is a very modest proposal on what is a sizeable regeneration area. The Core Strategy can be made sound in respect of this issue by re-instating the deleted wording.</p>	<p>The detailed uses of the site would be determined through a Master Plan. This level of detail is not necessarily appropriate for a Core Strategy. The Masterplan proposals and community gain will also need to be subject to a viability assessment.</p>
Rio de Souza, Highways Agency		Para 6.18	Sound	<p>The Highways Agency do not regard the proposed change as likely to be of any significance in terms of the impact of this site on the Trunk Road. However, as always, the Highways Agency should be consulted at such time as a Planning Application for this site comes forward, with a view to demonstrating that the impact of the proposed development is acceptable</p>	Noted

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
K. Fraser, Essex County Council		Para 6.18	Unsound	Essex County Council objects to the addition of B8 uses at the Great Notley growth location due to potential impact on the Country Park. Essex County Council would like to see the reinstatement of a paragraph which seeks to protect the setting and enjoyment of the Country Park and which requires the undertaking of necessary mitigation or compensatory measures to minimise the potential impact of development.	The Great Notley Growth Location will be subject to a Master Plan which will be adopted as SPD. The Council will seek to ensure that the development will have minimal impact on the park through this process.
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	Para 6.30	Unsound	Paragraph 6.30, Summary. In our original representations we objected to paragraph 6.30 on the basis that it failed to recognise that additional convenience retailing would be provided as part of the Panfield Lane growth area neighbourhood centre. The proposed amendment to paragraph 6.30 similarly fails to recognise the exception of Panfield Lane, and we therefore object to the amendments on the same basis. Proposed Changes - We consider that the proposed Amendment to the Core Strategy should be rejected, and the change to paragraph 6.30 in our original submissions be adopted.	The size and type of retailing would be determined through the Master Plan process for this growth location.
Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd	Boyer Planning	6.31	Sound	Para 6.31 - We note the intention to delete reference to the local centre at Maltings Lane as serving the adjoining Hatfield Road growth locations. As promoters of the Hatfield Road growth locations Redrow Homes do not object to this. The adjustment to the wording proposed to para 6.31 provides a degree of flexibility for the masterplan. Agree that community infrastructure be determined through the masterplan process.	Noted

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
Consortium of Landowners	AMA	Para.6.31 and 6.36	Unsound	<p>The Core Strategy Focused Changes do not take on board previous representations, made by AMA. There is no evidence to demonstrate that sufficient demand exists to support two neighbourhood/local centres in close proximity. AMA considers that these parts of the Core Strategy Focused Changes are not justified or effective and therefore fail the soundness test. The final sentence of paragraph 6.31 should be deleted and replaced with; "An appropriate size of food store should be provided within the Maltings Lane neighbourhood centre to serve both the Maltings Lane development and the adjoining Hatfield Road (Lodge Farm) growth location."</p> <p>In addition, the second sentence of paragraph 6.36 should be deleted and replaced with: "Local/neighbourhood centres are also planned as part of the Panfield Lane growth location, Braintree, and at the Maltings Lane development, Witham - the latter also serving the adjoining Hatfield Road (Lodge Farm) growth location."</p>	This is not an objection to a focused change. It is not appropriate to replace this wording. The first dwelling completions on the Hatfield Road development will not be constructed until 2017.
Sainsbury	Indigo Planning	CS6	Unsound	Policy - CS6 Comment on behalf of Sainsbury. The addendum to the Core Strategy shows that the Council propose to make changes to policy CS6 on Town Centre Regeneration and Retailing, most notably now with the inclusion of the "Marks Farm Neighbourhood Centre" as a designated District Centre. We have concerns with the proposed amendment to Policy CS6 as The Marks Farm site consists of a stand alone out-of-centre Tesco Store with surface level parking which would not meet the definition of a neighbourhood centre in PPS4 and is not supported by evidence. As such, we object to this proposal within the addendum to the Core Strategy, and reserve our right to give evidence at Examination in Public.	Noted.
Jo Hardwick, The Environment Agency		CS8	Sound	We support the focused changes which address our unsound representation on Policy CS8 regarding PPS 25 and the use of SuDS. We can confirm that we now withdraw these unsound representations and support Policy CS8.	Noted

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
K. Fraser, Essex County Council		Chapter 8 CS9	Sound	The change is supported, as it provides a suitable link on which suitable development management policies can be developed, which consider the implications and development of the District's rich and varied historic assets of local, regional and national significance. ECC also supports the amendment to bullet point 1 with reference to 'archaeological' sensitivity and the final sentence in relation to 'heritage assets'.	Noted
D. Greetham, Sport England		CS10	Sound	In response to the consultation, I would like to respond to the following part of the document: POLICY CS10: PROVISION FOR OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION. Support – Policy considered to be sound. Sport England are supportive of the amendments which have been made to the third criterion within Policy CS10: Provision for open space, sport and recreation, as the policy only allows development of part of an open space where there is an identified surplus.	Noted
Adrian Dunningham		Chapter 9 Delivering the Strategy	Unsound	Neither the original strategy nor update seem to clarify the plans for a sensible transport infrastructure to serve the Panfield Lane site. It will be the people who live off Panfield Lane, or nearby that will have to put up with the problems.	The transport evidence base indicates that the Panfield Lane growth location is suitable for the proposed level of growth
Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd	Boyer Planning	Chapter 9 Delivering the Strategy	Sound	We note the intention to include an additional sentence to require the infrastructure requirements for the growth areas to be assessed again, at the time of the preparation of the relevant SPD and/or at the determination of the relevant planning application. This approach allows for up to date consideration of infrastructure availability and potential mitigation measures and reflects a practical approach to the determination of major development proposals in any event.	Noted

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
Cllr J. Abbott		Chapter 6 , Chapter 9 , Appendix 4	Unsound	The proposed focus change at paragraph 6.14 is not sound because it is not justified. Core Strategy support for a museum in the powerhouse as part of the Silver End Regeneration Area of the former Crittalls factory site, has been deleted. We dispute BDC's claim that it is over prescriptive to include the museum as surely a village museum housed in one building is a very modest proposal, on what is a sizeable regeneration area. The Core Strategy can be made sound in respect of this issue by re-instating the deleted wording.	The detailed uses of the site would be determined through a Master Plan. This level of detail is not necessarily appropriate for a Core Strategy. It will be necessary to consider site viability before agreeing S106 requirements and also consider future management issues of community uses.
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	CS4	Unsound	<p>Proposed Amendments</p> <p>The amended text relating to the North-West Braintree growth area in policy CS4 is simply a description of the broad range of uses to be provided within the growth area as a whole and does not relate to the substance of policy CS4. The inclusion of the text in the form proposed creates a lack of clarity in the Plan's provision which in turn may impact upon its effective delivery. As such it should be amended as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend end date to 2027. • Amend description of "Growth Location" in column 1 as follows: "Braintree North West - Mixed-use residential led scheme" • Amend text in relation to "Type of Use" to "General employment (including site for Braintree football club)" • Amend text in relation to the description of the Proposed Growth Locations on page 36 as follows: " - Land to the north-west of Braintree - off Panfield Lane - A mixed use development including residential, employment with a site for Braintree Football club, community uses, education uses, health care and neighbourhood centre - Land to the west of the A131 at Great Notley - A strategic 	<p>The Core Strategy has to provide housing for a 15 year period from the date of adoption, as it would be adopted in 2011 then end date would therefore be 2026. Also early delivery of the site could compromise housing delivery later in the Plan Period.</p> <p>Suggested new end date and new name for growth location are new objections rather than objections to the focused change.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
				<p>employment site, alongside structural landscaping/wildlife corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land to the south-west of Witham - off Hatfield Road - Residential development including education uses and neighbourhood centre - Land to the north-east of Witham - off Forest Road - Residential development, including a neighbourhood centre" 	
English Heritage		CS9	Unsound	<p>Policy CS9 We note there have been minor amendments to policy CS9 to reflect some of the points we raised in response to the draft submission document concerning advice in PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment. While we support these changes we would like the outstanding points in English Heritage's representations on this policy to be carried forward.</p>	Noted. The outstanding points can be resolved through the Public Hearing.
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	Para 9.6	Unsound	<p>Para 9.6, Summary. In order to give greater emphasis to flexibility in timing for the growth locations (and to reflect the fact that once adopted the growth locations will no longer be "proposed") minor amendments are suggested to the text at the end of paragraph 9.6.</p> <p>The text to the final sentence of paragraph 9.6 be amended as follows:</p> <p>"Detailed infrastructure requirements and timing/phasing for the proposed growth areas will be assessed again at the time of the preparation of the relevant SPD and/or at the determination of the relevant planning application."</p>	Noted.

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	Table 2	Unsound	<p>Table 2 Representations</p> <p>Whilst supporting the amendments to Table 2 in respect of the deleted reference to Braintree College, this would appear to leave an anomaly in respect of the references to the "education hub" and adult learning in the 'all Braintree' section, which we had understood were linked to the relocated College. If so, though references would need to be deleted for the sake of consistency. Whilst supporting the amendments to Table 2 in respect of the deleted reference to Braintree College, this would appear to leave an anomaly in respect of the references to the "education hub" and adult learning in the 'all Braintree' section, which we had understood were linked to the relocated College. If so, though references would need to be deleted for the sake of consistency.</p>	Noted, If appropriate, the Council could raise no objection to this proposed change concerning reference to the education hub at the Hearing.
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	Appendix 3	Unsound	<p>The inclusion of Great Notley as part of the settlement of Braintree is not Justified. Proposed Changes</p> <p>Include Great Notley as a 'Key Service Village' within the settlement hierarchy (or revert to its inclusion as an 'other village' as per the original Submission Draft)</p>	Great Notley is significantly different from the Key Service Villages, as it is closely related to Braintree and does not provide services for a surrounding hinterland in the way that other Key Service Villages do.

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	Appendix 4	Unsound	We note that the Council has removed Braintree football club from the Table 2 schedule of key infrastructure, as per our previous objections to Table 2, which we support (although we should note that this should in no way be taken as indicating a lack of commitment to the provision of a new site for the club).However, the changes to Table 2 are not reflected in the changes to Appendix 4, and the football club is still shown as being provided between 2024-2026. Not only is Appendix 4 now inconsistent with Table 2, but the proposed phasing for the football club does not reflect our understanding of the common objective to make provision for the football club earlier within the Plan period. Therefore the deletion of the reference to the football club in Appendix 4 would not only render the Plan internally consistent, but would also remove a potential barrier to earlier delivery of the a site for relocating the club. Delete reference to Braintree football club from Appendix 4	Noted. The previous objection on this subject had not referred to Appendix 4. Reference to this in Appendix 4 is not an objection to the focused changes. If appropriate, the Council could raise no objection to this change to Appendix 4 at the Hearing.
Rio de Souza, Highways Agency		Inset Map 1b	Sound	The Highways Agency do not regard the proposed change as likely to be of any significance in terms of the impact of this site on the Trunk Road. However, as always, the Highways Agency should be consulted at such time as a Planning Application for this site comes forward, with a view to demonstrating that the impact of the proposed development is acceptable	Noted
Mersea Homes and Hills Group	JB Planning	Inset Maps	Unsound	Inset Map 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b. Summary: Growth area boundaries need to be amended to be contiguous with the existing urban areas. Proposed Change - Correct growth areas boundaries to be contiguous with the existing urban edge.	This is a new objection rather than an objection to a focused change.

Name of Respondent	Agent	Subject of Representation		Comment	Officer Response
Steve Price, Countryside Properties		Additional SEA/SA	Comment	We consider that, with proposed controls on the size and location of commercial units on this site, there should be no negative impact on the Country Park with an element of B8 use. The "Additional Appraisal" also states that depending upon the level of B8 use on the site, there may be negative impacts on both the recreational and biodiversity value of the Country Park, and on the three listed buildings at the southern edge of the growth location. We will ensure that through site design and master planning, by the setting of development parameters, informed by detailed ecological surveys and assessment of visual impact, we will mitigate against detrimental impacts where it is agreed with the Council that mitigation measures are required.	Noted . The County Council (who manage the Country Park) will be a consultee on the proposed Masterplan for the proposed employment growth location west of Great Notley.