

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Janet Nuttall	Natural England	Designated Sites and Biodiversity - Development is unlikely to have an adverse effect on statutorily designated sites as none are located in close proximity to the master plan area. However, impacts on local wildlife sites and wider biodiversity should be considered as part of a detailed ecological assessment, which in turn should inform mitigation and enhancement proposals. The developer is encouraged to consult Natural England's standing advice for protected species regarding survey and mitigation requirements for protected and biodiversity species. Development should seek to retain existing habitat and Green Infrastructure (GI) as possible and this should form the framework for the rest of the wider development. This should seek to maximise opportunities for enhancement and contribution to local Biodiversity targets (BAP).	Noted. This issue can be considered as part of the preparation of the planning applications for the site. An ecological survey will be required as part of any future planning applications.
Janet Nuttall	Natural England	Green infrastructure - Welcomes proposals which seek to enhance public transport, cycling and pedestrian access as part of the development and to incorporate public open space and green links to off-site services, including strategic open space. Incorporation of on-site green infrastructure (GI) is important to minimise the effects of increased recreational pressure on more sensitive areas. NE believes GI should be an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities and should be a primary consideration in the design of new development. One important function of GI is the provision of new opportunities for access to open space. Natural England's "standards for accessible natural green space" (SANGS) provides a set of benchmarks, which should be used to ensure new and existing housing has access to nature. On-site GI should seek to contribute to the objectives and targets of the local Green Infrastructure Strategy, as far possible. The local GI partnership should be contacted for further advice.	Noted.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Janet Nuttall	Natural England	Soils - Consideration should be given to the quality of soil resources on development sites and ensuring their protection through the development process. Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, poorer quality land should be used in preference to that of higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability consideration. Paragraph 112 of NPPF is relevant when considering the protection of BMV agricultural land. The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) provides a method of assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use.	Noted. However the issue of agricultural land quality was addressed at the Core Strategy stage.
Janet Nuttall	Natural England	Additional Comments - We would encourage the implementation of multi-functional SUDS as part of the development; this should be developed and managed to provide multi-functional benefits, including enhancements for biodiversity, amenity and landscape, as far as possible. As far as possible development should incorporate sustainable design and construction and demonstrate both adaptation to and reduction in the contribution to climate change, including the incorporation of sufficient, appropriately designed and managed green infrastructure. Development should also promote sustainability and reduce energy consumption throughout the natural and built environment. A landscape character approach should be used to underpin and guide development and this should build-in and ensure that consideration is given to the wider landscape. Assessment should be based on guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	Noted. The development will incorporate SUDS. The other issues on sustainable design and construction are too detailed for the Master Plan stage and will be addressed as part of the planning application process.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Roy Warren	Sport England	<p>Braintree Town Football Club - The principle of identifying land within the master plan for relocating Braintree Town FC is welcomed, as this would offer potential for the club to develop a facility which meets their current and future needs and could overcome the constraints that exist on their current Crossing Road site. The location of the land within the master plan that has been identified is supported in principle for the reasons set out in the consultation document. If the site is progressed as a new ground for the football club it will be essential that it is planned and designed to meet the club's current and future needs. As well as the facility requirements of the stadium, consideration will need to be given to training pitch requirements and therefore before the master plan is finalised it should be checked that sufficient space exists on the land that has been identified for the stadium, the required ancillary facilities (such as parking, clubhouse, offices etc) and any on-site training pitch needs. This is pertinent as the football club's existing site has on-site training pitches. Furthermore, Sport England will be a statutory consultee on any future planning application for the redevelopment of the club's existing site. If redevelopment was proposed, any proposal that did not make provision for replacing both the stadium and training pitches would be contrary to our playing fields policy. It is therefore recommended that Braintree Town FC are fully engaged in the master plan process (if they are not already) and that their views are used to influence this element of the master plan before it is finalised. Sport England would wish to avoid a scenario where after the master plan is finalised it becomes apparent that the site is not large enough for meeting the club's needs and consequently the potential to relocate the club to the site has been prejudiced.</p>	<p>Noted. It is intended that the area provided will meet the needs of the club in both the short and longer term. The training pitch does not necessarily need to be next to the Football Club's ground.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Roy Warren	Sport England	<p>Open Space, Sports and Leisure - The proposal for providing a large area of open space towards the centre of the site is welcomed in principle as this would provide opportunities for accommodating a range of outdoor sports facilities. The location would have the advantage of being close to the new residential area and being accessible for potential users from the existing urban area of Braintree. The mix of sports facilities proposed on this area should be informed by local needs assessments and consultations with stakeholders.</p> <p>One area of potential concern is the proposal for the open space to be severed into two areas by the link road between Panfield Lane and Springwood Drive. If both areas were to be proposed for formal sports use this would present some challenges because the ancillary facilities (pavilion, car parking etc) to support the use of facilities such as playing pitches would have to be located on one of the areas. This may necessitate users of the facilities having to cross the link road to access facilities on the other open space area (i.e. to walk from a pavilion to a pitch) which would be of concern from a safety perspective as a large proportion of users would be expected to be young people, many of which may not be supervised. This would also present challenges from a facility management perspective and users of facilities such as playing pitches prefer facilities to be concentrated on the same open space area to help facilitate supervision and club development e.g. a junior football club may have several teams playing on a site at the same time and it is therefore desirable for all of the pitches to be located together.</p>	<p>The line of the link road is predetermined by the presence of a water main. ECC Highways have confirmed that they would not have an issue with a pedestrian crossing subject to the findings of a safety audit, and this will be sought as part of the planning application.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Roy Warren	Sport England	To address these challenges, it is recommended in the first instance that consideration be given to focusing all of the formal sports facilities (playing pitches, courts etc and ancillary facilities) on one of the open space areas and the other could then be used for other open space types such as parkland, allotments etc. As formal open space such as playing pitches have a relatively large land take compared to other open space types and due to the need for ancillary facilities, it is suggested that one of the open space areas be larger in size than the other so it can accommodate all of the sports facilities in one area. This may necessitate a review of the location of the link road. If the two areas of open space are to be retained as shown on the master plan, consideration will need to be given to how these challenges could be overcome such as through safe pedestrian crossing measures between the two open spaces. I would also advocate that consideration is given to provide safe pedestrian links between the open space and land identified for relocating Braintree Town FC as users of the club's facilities may also use the open space and vice versa.	Noted However the line of the link road is fixed.
Roy Warren	Sport England	Before the masterplan is finalised, I would advocate that it is checked that the open space areas proposed for formal sports are suitable in terms of both size and shape for accommodating a range of pitch types in order to ensure that the areas are sufficiently flexible for meeting a range of potential needs e.g. can the areas accommodate a senior cricket pitch or two senior/junior football pitches as well as ancillary pavilion and parking facilities. Sport England has had experience of similar master plans being prepared where subsequent planning applications have not been able to accommodate the required outdoor sports facilities due to insufficient consideration of the areas required for different sports at the master planning stage. Sport England's Comparative Sizes – Pitches and Courts guidance document may be helpful in this regard www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/design_and_cost_guidance/other_design_guidance.aspx .	The current Master Plan is indicative only, the precise layout of the will be a matter for a future planning application. However, the area that has currently been identified as Community Sports and Play facilities is not large enough for an adult football pitch. The report recommends that the Master Plan should only be approved subject to this area being enlarged to accommodate an adult pitch, plus the required run-off area around the pitch.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Roy Warren	Sport England	No reference is made to how the additional indoor sports facility needs generated by the residential development would be met. Consideration should be given to whether it is more appropriate to secure a financial contribution through a planning obligation or CIL towards off-site provision (e.g. consideration could be given to making a contribution towards new or enhanced facility provision on the leisure centre site adjoining the development area) or whether on-site provision should be made which may have implications for the master plan. If on-site provision is considered to be desirable the option of providing a community centre that is designed for indoor sport (i.e. with a hall that is designed to accommodate a one court badminton hall) should be explored.	The development would be expected to provide for recreational provision as required by the Council's Open Spaces SPD. A S106 agreement will be required setting out the recreation provision as part of the planning application.
Sue Ball	Anglia Water	The developer has consulted with Anglian Water on water supply and the position of existing apparatus within the boundaries of the site and I confirm the masterplan reflects the results of the pre development enquiry. With regard to foul drainage, again, the developer has consulted with Anglian Water and as result a Detailed Impact Assessment has provided a potential satisfactory drainage strategy. I confirm the document accurately summarises this.	Noted.
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>Positive changes from Exhibition at Tabor</p> <p>Hedgerow extended. The extension of the retained hedgerow from Panfield Lane north to the whole length of the existing hedgerow is positive, as it will provide a wildlife corridor as well as reduce the impact of the new development on the existing residents of Panfield Lane.</p> <p>Replanting of hedge. The current hedge is in poor condition towards the south and so the undertaking to replant the thin parts is also positive as it will improve the visual barrier for the existing residents.</p> <p>Wider green corridor. Widening the hedgerow with the inclusion of a ditch and a cycleway/footpath will move the new properties further away from Panfield Lane and also reduce their visual impact on the existing houses.</p>	Noted.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>Negative changes from Exhibition</p> <p>Neighbourhood Centre Despite the lukewarm feedback in the questionnaires to the NC, this has increased in size by about 50%.</p> <p>The location of the NC has moved from the south side of the Southern Primary Road to the north side. This has affected our properties.</p> <p>The NC has now grown into a mini-employment area. The questionnaire feedback questions the need for the existing plan employment development with the number of brown field opportunities in Braintree (Springwood Ind Est, Braintree Business Centre).</p>	<p>The local centre has not increased in size, an element of employment has been added in the form of employment provision to offset a slight under provision in the size of employment provided off Springwood Drive. The Master Plan restricts the employment at the local centre to B1 office uses which is a compatible with the local centre.</p>
G & S Howlar- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>• Neighbourhood Centre (NC)</p> <p>The Core Strategy states that the NC is only “Desirable”.</p> <p>Furthermore, the LDF Sub-Ctte (23/5/12) – Report on Panfield La Master Plan Public Consultation stated that the Questionnaire responses gave mixed views on the NC and reported only that a surgery was supported. Based on this feedback, the only option should be to reduce the size of the NC and, at the most, provide a surgery and a corner shop. It is unacceptable that the NC has in fact grown and now includes A2, A3, A5, C3 uses.</p> <p>The NC has grown because of the Developers have not provided 15Ha of Employment Land. Instead of the massive upheaval of re-arranging the border between Employment and Residential to accommodate an increase in area, the Developer appears to have taken the easier option of increasing the size of the NC to include B1 Employment. It is inappropriate to have both employment land in the residential area and, by adding this extra area into the NC, the NC is compromised by being split into 2 zones, separated by the retained hedgerow.</p> <p>It is better for the NC to be adjacent to the employment land and possibly close to the bus gate, giving extra patronage from Springwood Ind Est and the new employment area as it is developed. The NC will also enjoy the benefits of the local and through traffic passing along the Northern Primary Road which will</p>	<p>The neighbourhood centre would have an element of employment in the form of B1 office uses which would be compatible with the neighbourhood centre and residential uses. The neighbourhood centre would have to provide parking of a sufficient standard in order to comply with the Council’s adopted parking standards. This would be addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The design, proposed number of storeys and concerns regarding safety of the area, this again would be a matter for a detailed planning</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
		<p>otherwise not be attracted to use the NC.</p> <p>The NC needs to be reduced in size and only provide facilities that the residents will support eg surgery, corner shop (ideally the relocated Panfield Lane Post Office).</p> <p>There needs to be appropriate parking space provided to avoid on street parking creating issues eg. Challis Rd.</p> <p>The design of the NC needs to be appropriate, including any flats above the units. The Master Plan illustrated an ugly development as an example and the Council needs to ensure that the design is aesthetically pleasing at the same time as being sympathetic to the existing residents.</p> <p>If the NC is located adjacent to Panfield Lane, the Council needs to ensure that its visual impact on existing residents is minimised. In addition to the above point of being aesthetically pleasing, the units should be a maximum of 2 storeys and the distance from the road increased by locating the car parking in between and it should be screened from the road to reduce the impact of headlights and noise.</p> <p>In both phase 1 and the B1 phase of the NC, the plans show minimal parking. Adequate parking must be mandated in order to prevent on-street parking. Queen St parade only comprises a couple of shops that are open simultaneously, has lay-bys on both sides of the road and still it is difficult to pass parked cars at times.</p> <p>The draft Master Plan states that the “NC will provide a place for congregation”. This must be “quality” congregation and not allowed to be a place where the youth hang around at night time and potentially unsettle residents.</p> <p>The draft Master Plan allows for C3(Residential) use in the NC. The Developer must be restricted to C3 in above ground floor commercial properties.</p>	<p>application.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>Link Road</p> <p>The initial development was planned with no link road. The first plans showed a single link road that joined Panfield La near Kings Rd. The Core Strategy introduced the split link road with a T-junction near 240 and a roundabout at Churchill Rd.</p> <p>The Core Strategy states that the spine road will be “for local traffic only”. It has always been stated the Link Road will not be a through road/”rat run”. There is no information in the Master Plan to demonstrate that this is still a commitment and how it will be guaranteed. The feedback from the questionnaires included numerous people who believe that traffic from the north side of Braintree and further afield already uses Coldnailhurst and so will use the new Link Road and access this via Panfield La.</p>	<p>In the Core Strategy, Table 2 - Infrastructure requirements outlines the requirement for a spine road. The Core Strategy says that a Spine road from Springwood Drive to Panfield Lane is critical and that it should be designed for local traffic only.</p> <p>The route will have a HGV restriction, but will also have to be useable by public transport. The actual design of the road would have to satisfy both BDC and ECC Highways when a planning application is submitted.</p>
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>The phasing of the development introduced in the Master Plan states that the Southern Primary Road will be built in Phase 1 and it appears that the Northern Primary Road may not be built until later. This is unacceptable because the volume of traffic from the new houses and the inevitable through traffic, as well as existing local traffic, will be totally unsuitable for the dangerous junction between the Southern Primary Road and Panfield Lane. The Churchill Rd roundabout will be a more suitable junction for larger traffic flows and so the Council needs to stipulate that the Northern Primary Road is included in Phase 1. This was pointed out in the Questionnaire response from Panfield Parish Council and has been ignored.</p>	<p>The development is phased; it is unlikely that the northern link road would be deliverable until later phases have started. The actual layout for the junctions is a detailed matter which will be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>In order to deter “through traffic”, measures need to be guaranteed to positively discourage this form of traffic. Adopting 20mph speed limits on Panfield Lane, the Southern Primary Road and the Northern Primary Road will increase the journey time and deter traffic. Other traffic slowing measures (but not “sleeping policemen”, which are likely to damage adjacent properties) eg chicanes, raised sections of road with block paving, etc need to be stipulated and provided by the developer.</p> <p>The Council needs to be proactive and transparent by undertaking and publishing traffic censuses now and as each phase of the development is completed. If traffic predictions are exceeded, the Council needs to ensure that the developer is contractually committed to taking corrective measures</p>	Highways restrictions will have to be considered at a more detailed stage of planning and in response to any concerns that the Highways department may have. Evidence would have to be provided showing that traffic can be effectively managed at the planning application stage and any remedial measures required would be addressed at a more detailed planning application stage.
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	The Link Road has always been stated as will not carry HGVs and that a width restriction will be installed, with a barrier to enable buses to circulate around the new development eg. Preliminary Master Plan, March 2012 states “bus gate and width restriction” and includes a photo of a bus passing through a width restriction. There was a worrying alternative discussed in the committee meeting on 25/5/12 where the barrier was proposed to be replaced by a weight restriction. This is a bad suggestion because it is not guaranteed to eliminate HGVs and relies on monitoring. Who will pay for monitoring – the Council?	Noted. The method of restricting HGV use of the link road will be determined as part of the planning application when detailed highway assessments have been undertaken.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>Dangerous Road Junction</p> <p>The Southern Primary Road appears to have its junction with Panfield La at a dangerous position opposite the path down to Bailey Bridge Road. The proposed T-junction appears to have good sight lines to the north; however, in the southerly direction, the road turns and traffic is blind. This poor safety was pointed out in the Questionnaire responses (233 & 251) but has been overlooked.</p> <p>The Southern Primary Road will have to accommodate all the local and un-deterred car traffic but also the bus route returning into back into the new development. This will necessitate a right turn, against the oncoming traffic flows out of town, into a narrow (6.75m) estate road. Sight lines will need to be good for this manoeuvre to be made safely.</p> <p>The safest option would be to only have one Primary Road and for it to have a junction with Panfield Lane at the northern proposed mini-roundabout at Churchill Rd.</p>	<p>The Master Plan shows an indication of where a junction could be located. The actual location would be the subject of a detailed planning application and would have to satisfy a highways safety audit before been deemed acceptable.</p>
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>The only safe location for a second Primary road is opposite Kings Rd and this is where the initial plans of a single spine road showed it joining Panfield Lane. This position is relatively straight and better than the curving nature of Panfield Lane to the south (see photo on p07 of the draft Master Plan).</p> <p>If the Developer wishes to compromise on safety and still wishes to a Southern junction for the Primary Road, the safest location for this junction is opposite Flanders Close. Here, sight lines are not good but are extended in both directions and there is already an existing minor road junction.</p>	As above.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>Overlooking existing dwellings</p> <p>At the Exhibition at Tabor, the type of houses on the development was discussed with the Hills representative. He stated that the houses would be a maximum of 2 storey houses and cited that bigger houses were not popular with purchasers. The Master Plan is now stating that 2.5 and 3 storey properties will be built. If these higher dwellings are to be included in the development, the Council needs to ensure that they are located sympathetically and are not near Panfield La where their height will be higher than the hedgerow and cause overlooking of existing housing.</p> <p>The cross-section through the new development published in the Master Plan is incorrect and misleading – hopefully, not deliberately. The Council must force the developers to be honest and show that current height of the development site is 1.0m above Panfield La and that the properties in this area are 0.5m below the height of the road.</p>	<p>A degree of flexibility in building height would be desirable in order to produce an interestingly design site. A range of housing types and sizes would be encouraged by the Council in order to meet the housing needs of residents. Any design would have to be agreed by the Council and should be in accordance with local plan policy and guidance in the Essex Design Guide, in particular guidance on the protection of residential privacy and amenity.</p>
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>The cross-section in the Master Plan also shows a large NC property adjacent to Panfield Lane. This is insensitive to the existing residents on the opposite side of Panfield La and the Council needs to stipulate that the developers are not allowed to put any dwellings close to Panfield Lane that are visually obtrusive and cause overlooking. In most places, these properties should ideally be 1.5-storey, or at most 2-storey properties or less. At the same time, windows that overlook the existing residents should be minimised.</p> <p>Where the existing Panfield Lane properties are below the level of Panfield Lane, this should be recognised and the new properties should be less than 2 storey buildings.</p> <p>In order not to block daylight for existing residents, the positioning of the properties, their height and the angle of the roofline should be arranged to minimise the impact on the properties on the opposite side of Panfield Lane.</p>	<p>As above.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>When the new properties overlook existing residents, the upper storey windows need to be arranged sympathetically so as not to permit direct overlooking.</p> <p>The screening effect of the hedgerow will be minimal in the winter and so supplementary screening needs to be stipulated. This can take the form of an aesthetically pleasing wall or alternatively wooden fencing with concrete posts. To avoid this feature being over-powering, in areas where there is no overlooking (eg. opposite an estate road) the wall/wooden fence can be replaced by a picket fence.</p>	As above.
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>Residential Properties Total number of homes The Core Strategy states that the development will provide a “minimum of 600 homes”. In order to prevent the Developer from gradually adding small numbers of houses, the Council needs to stipulate and ensure that the Developer cannot build more than 600 homes.</p> <p>Car Parking The Draft Master Plan states that ECC standards will be adopted and only 2 spaces will be provided for a 3- or 4-bed house, plus 0.25 for visitors. The Council must have learnt from the lessons of Great Notley Village and Clay Pits where inadequate provision of parking spaces and/or inconveniently located parking has resulted in unacceptable on-street parking that makes access for emergency vehicles challenging.</p>	The Council cannot stipulate a maximum housing figure as this would be contrary to the adopted Core Strategy requirement. The exact number of houses will be determined through the planning application process. Parking on site will be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted car parking standards which were revised in 2009 and now require more parking spaces than set out in the previous standards. The level of parking proposed is in accordance with the current standard.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	Date of Commencement The Plan states that Phase 1 homes will commence building in 2017, for completion from 2018 onwards. In deference to the existing residents, the Council is requested to ensure that the Developer cannot start build earlier than 2017 and not complete until 2018 to delay the impact of the development on the existing residents.	As the development is phased the developer will not be able to bring houses forward early.
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>Physical separation from Panfield Lane The existing hedgerow provides a basic screening function in summer only to reduce the visual impact of the new development on the existing residents on Panfield Lane – it will reduce overlooking from the ground floor windows of the new properties and reduce the impact of car headlights on the new estate.</p> <p>The hedgerow will never be a continuous barrier, even in summer. In order to prevent people who are walking along the footpath/cycleway parallel to Panfield Lane from creating a shortcut to Panfield Lane through the hedgerow, a physical barrier will need to be provided. A chain link fence or picket fence will not act as a visual barrier. As suggested above, the wall/wooden fence would also perform this function.</p>	A barrier or fence would not be supported by the Council as this would have a negative impact on the street scene and would not support biodiversity and the environment as a whole.
G & S Howell- B& D Harris Glenda Brown I & C Collar Fred Bowler J & C Beavis N & Body	Residents	<p>Miscellany Road names – Please do not adopt the policy that was used in Droitwich Spa where that acknowledged the services of a former councillor by naming 4 roads after him : Showell Rd, Showell Close, Showell Grove and Showell Green. It was a nightmare for visitors and the postman!</p>	The roads will be named in accordance with the Council's road naming policy.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Mr Neil Dinwiddie	Environment Agency	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be needed to support any future planning application, which will need to address the appropriate management of surface water drainage. We have been involved in discussions with the drainage consultants over the flood risk on site.</p> <p>Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management (SUDS). SUDS are an approach to managing surface water run-off which seeks to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on or near the site as opposed to traditional drainage approaches which involve piping water off site as quickly as possible. SUDS involve a range of techniques including soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, green roofs, ponds and wetlands. SUDS offer significant advantages over conventional piped drainage systems in reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of surface water run-off from a site, promoting groundwater recharge absorbing diffuse pollutants and improving water quality. Ponds, reedbeds and seasonally flooded grasslands can be particularly attractive features within public open.</p>	Noted. The Master Plan includes the provision of SUDS.
Mr Neil Dinwiddie	Environment Agency	The variety of SUDS techniques available means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles and provide multiple benefits, reducing costs and maintenance needs. We are pleased to note the reference to incorporating SUDS into the Masterplan and that the site will include some permanently wet SUDS features (including ditches and ponds) will be beneficial to aquatic ecology.	Noted.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Mr Neil Dinwiddie	Environment Agency	<p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>We support the approach of maximising green infrastructure in the Masterplan as part of the open space and ecological enhancement areas. As identified there are many benefits associated with green and blue infrastructure and the adaptation to the impacts of climate change, including:</p> <p>Reducing the impact of urban run-off by reducing surface flow; Safeguarding areas for biodiversity and creating or retaining links between urban and rural areas; Improving water quality and attenuation; Providing shading for buildings and outdoor spaces.</p> <p>Establishing ecological corridors and networks helps to form more ecologically resilient landscapes. The ability to design a joined up strategic green and blue infrastructure network can provide important connectivity to allow species to move around which will be important in the adaptation to climate change.</p>	Noted.
Andy Bourne	Xpect leisure	<p>We own and operate Xpect Health and Fitness at the far end of Springwood Drive and have concerns about future traffic flows and congestion when the development is completed. From the plans we can see that Springwood Drive will be extended and there will be link roads through the new housing development to Panfield Lane.</p> <p>I am sure you are aware, at peak times there is already considerable congestion at the roundabout junction of Springwood Drive and Rayne Road. At times it can be between 30 and 40 minutes to leave the industrial estate and I believe further congestion will be detrimental to our business. I anticipate that the new residents will use Springwood Drive to access the main trunk roads out of Braintree, particularly the A120, rather than using Panfield Lane.</p> <p>I respectfully ask if you or the County Council highways section have any plans to upgrade Springwood Drive and the already busy junction with Rayne Road?</p>	Off site highways improvements are required. This would include improvements to the roundabout at Springwood Drive and Rayne Road.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Martin Friend	Vincent and Gorbings Planning Associates	<p>These representations have been made by Vincent and Gorbings Planning Associates on behalf of the owner of land at Springwood Drive. The land lies immediately adjacent to, but outside of, the current North West Braintree Masterplan area. It is adjoined by the existing leisure centre to the west, and the area of the masterplan to the north and east. It is undeveloped land that has clear development potential, given that it was historically allocated for employment in the previous Local Plan.</p> <p>We raise objection to the Masterplan on the basis that it has failed to take account of, or make any proposals for, this land. It is crucial that the future of this land is resolved as part of this masterplanning process. If the Masterplan is not comprehensive in this regard the land will be left as blighted urban fringe, adjoining the new development, and will clearly become a planning problem. Although the land was historically allocated for employment, the Masterplan shows that in the future it will be juxtaposed with residential use and the neighbouring school extension. Only a minimal landscaped buffer is shown between the site and these proposed land uses.</p>	<p>The site is outside the boundary of the growth location and is currently identified on the Local Plan Inset Map for Braintree as a site for employment uses. Any future use of the site should be considered through the employment land review and subsequent allocations DPD.</p>
Martin Friend	Vincent and Gorbings Planning Associates	<p>The site has previously been marketed for employment, to no avail, and it is clear that the development of these environmentally sensitive land uses in close juxtaposition will render any development for employment impossible to achieve. The site would therefore be most appropriately developed for housing purposes. The land has its own means of access, but in terms of the proper planning of the strategic development at North West Braintree, infrastructure and community facilities should take account of its development potential. Our client is willing to collaborate with the promoters of the development and the Council as appropriate in this regard.</p> <p>In summary</p> <p>(i) The land at Springwood Drive should be recognised and included within the Masterplan, not left as undeveloped 'white land' between the masterplan area and the existing built up area.</p> <p>(ii) The masterplan should assume its development for residential purposes</p>	<p>This land will not be left unallocated as white land in the Site Allocations Plan. See above.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Usman Majid	Marine Management Organisation	<p>Please can you inform the applicant that they may require a licence under the Marine and Coastal Access Act (2009).</p> <p>Therefore please can they submit a licence enquiry via the Marine Licensing web portal below so we can inform them to whether a marine license is required or not. The licence enquiry link is on the left hand side of the webpage.</p>	Noted.
Adrian Galley	Residents	<p>While I am pleased some of hedgerow on Panfield lane is going to now stay I am very disappointed that 600 homes will be built, this is far too many, for this area of Braintree, why? Why did you not build more near a bypass it is just common sense but this has been overlooked it just seems to me and many others that Panfield Lane was the only option you ever really looked at and I think local people have not been treated very well at all its as if you do not care about us at all.</p>	<p>The number of dwellings to be provided is in accordance with the Council's Core Strategy. Alternative locations were considered during the preparation of the Core Strategy. The location selected is considered to be "sound" by the Planning Inspectorate and is supported by a robust and credible evidence base.</p>
Helen Bloxsome	Residents	<p>I am very worried about traffic using Church Street, Bocking as a short cut to the A120 and the A131. This is a narrow residential road and already dangerous.</p>	<p>Noted. Traffic impact was originally assessed through the Core Strategy which concluded that the area would be able to accommodate the development proposed. Further highways assessments will be required to support a future planning application and any remedial action identified.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Graham Dalby	Residents	I live in Rayne and drive down Springwood Road most days. The volume of traffic going down Springwood Road to the Rayne Road roundabout will increase greatly and whatever is done to improve the roundabout won't help during the busy evening period, when the traffic backs up along Rayne Road going into Braintree, causing the roundabout to become blocked. This already makes it difficult for traffic to get from Springwood Road, on to the roundabout.	The proposed development is required to make provision for improvements to the Rayne Road/Springwood Drive roundabout.. The spine road would also provide some relief for Rayne Road and access to Bocking which could help improve traffic flow in the wider area.
Sara-Jane Claydon	Residents	<p>I want to express my concern about the Panfield Lane development.</p> <p>Braintree's Road's are not sufficiently developed to support more traffic. The Marks Farm roundabout has been poorly redesigned and on most days the journey from Broad Road to Marks Farm can take up to 15 minutes to complete.</p> <p>Adam Schwalm at the Highways Agency can tell you more: The A131 McDonalds roundabout coming from Stansted between 4 - 6, is tail backed for a mile.</p> <p>As a resident of Bocking I have serious concerns that people will use the internal roads and these will become potential rat runs. This has health and safety considerations.</p> <p>I understand that there are the requirements for new houses, but Braintree and the surrounding villages need far better regular bus and train services. The main roads need more surveys to ensure the traffic flows smoothly. If Braintree is to become a commuter town then to enable those commuters to get to work safely and on time then more thought must be given to how this will happen.</p> <p>My other concern is that Braintree and the surrounding villages will become a sprawling mass of urbanisation and that is not why some of us choose to live where we do.</p>	<p>The Highways Agency deals with the trunk road network, primarily the A12 and A120 and were consulted on the Core Strategy growth location proposals. The relevant highways authority for this development is Essex County Council who has been communicating with the sites developer.</p> <p>The proposed development would include cycle ways, footpaths and public transport.</p> <p>The provision of new employment will also help boost the economy and help to create new jobs.</p> <p>By allocating this site the Council has protected the</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
		<p>I really do hope you listen to what we have to say, we need to be able to move around in a timely and safe fashion during peak hours. The economy requires optimum output from us all and that can only be achieved if planners consider the implications of developments.</p> <p>Spend some money improving other forms of transport and you just might get what you need to support the economic growth of the area.</p> <p>I am very happy to be involved more in this consultation.</p>	<p>district from speculative applications for housing development which would have a negative impact on the District.</p>
Steve Archer	Residents	<p>Nice layout & interesting. Worried about the words "minimum 600 houses" - this is too vague, surely is should be maximum.</p> <p>Why no mention of: 1- supply of water sustainability 2- supply of electricity & gas sustainability.</p> <p>Not convinced your road improvements & transport points will allow the traffic to flow</p>	<p>The Water Cycle Study considered supply of water to this location. Energy suppliers are consultees. The master plan makes provision for sustainable drainage.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
John Bloxsome	Residents	I am worried about the amount of extra traffic that will be using Church Street, Bocking, as a short cut to the A120 and the A131. This is a narrow residential street and already is dangerous.	Noted. Traffic impact was originally assessed through the Core Strategy which concluded that the area would be able to accommodate the development proposed. Further highways assessments will be required to support a future planning application and any remedial action identified.
Stephen Walsh	UNEX	<p>The extension to Springwood Drive should continue Northwards to meet the Southern boundary of the former Towerlands Centre.</p> <p>In the future if further growth was required the former Towerlands site would provide a natural expansion. The Springwood Drive link road should be designed to allow future access into the former Towerlands site because it would be short-sighted and poor planning to design the road in a manner which would prevent this.</p> <p>Braintree District Council have also expressed their support for the redevelopment of the former Towerlands site for conference and exhibition use and for associated hotel accommodation. It would make sense for traffic related to these uses to be able to bypass Panfield Lane by utilising the extension to Springwood Drive.</p>	Noted. The Council's Local Development Framework Sub Committee, has agreed in principle that the Towerlands site should be identified for a commercial/leisure use. As the Master Plan is indicative, if the Towerlands site requires an extension of the spine road to its boundary to provide access from Towerlands to to Springwood Drive, then this could be considered at the planning application stage.
L Thurston	Residents	I object to the application due to how near the expansion will be to other houses that have been there before. The dynamics of the area, which is heavily congested with traffic already and with too many children in the area being unable to attend local schools. The area is riddled in anti social behaviour and problems which a new development will not address and only move the problem to the new area. The effect that it will have on house prices and why should we have our views spoilt.	The traffic impact of the Core Strategy growth location has been assessed and road improvements that are required have been identified. Other traffic issues will be addressed at the planning application stage.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
			No one benefits from the right to have a view.
Brenda Willsher	Residents	As a resident in Church Street, Bocking I am very concerned at the probability of even more traffic using our street as a short cut to the A120 and the A131. It is already a dangerous street, being narrow and having the pupils of two schools needing to cross it at regular times.	Noted. Traffic impact was originally assessed through the Core Strategy which concluded that the area would be able to accommodate the development proposed. Further highways assessments will be required to support a future planning application and any remedial action identified
Stuart Curtis	Residents	I wish to register my objections to the development. Further development of the Springwood Ind. Est. is not required, based on the considerable amount of vacant units there and on other sites in the area. Braintree Football Club could be relocated to Great Leighs which already has much of the infrastructure required. The need for additional housing could be accommodated on the area of land next to the A131, or preferably on other Brown Field areas within the District. The website does not provide detailed information or plans, particularly where they impact directly on existing local residents of Panfield Lane. There continues to be a policy of development by stealth with minimal communication with those directly affected.	The Core Strategy has allocated 15 ha of employment land as an extension to Springwood Drive to meet future needs for employment up to 2026. The football club do not want to relocate to Great Leighs. Detailed information and plans will be required in support of a planning application and are not appropriate for the Master Plan which deals with principles.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Philip Need	Residents	I am very concerned about these plans because of the extra traffic which this development will bring to Bocking. Church Lane and Bocking Church Street are already congested and extra cars using Bocking as a thoroughfare will make it a busier and, I fear, more dangerous place for schoolchildren and others going about their daily lives. Can the cars from the new homes not be taken out the other way onto the Industrial Estate and into town that way, thus stopping Bocking from becoming a place where fast cars and probably lorries will be thundering through Bocking and making it an unpleasant place to live.	Noted. Traffic impact was originally assessed through the Core Strategy which concluded that the area would be able to accommodate the development proposed. Further highways assessments will be required to support a future planning application and any remedial action identified.
Mr G Conley	Residents	It would be good if you could stop the water tankers filling up along Springwood Drive when it is connected to Panfield Lane, as this will cause traffic problems.	A HGV restriction is proposed to prevent heavy vehicles from using the spine road to access Panfield Lane.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Ann Bright	Residents	<p>The traffic impact in various areas worries me:-</p> <p>1 While HGV access may be prevented onto Panfield Lane, other vehicles will see the new roads as an exit route on to the Halstead Road causing congestion in Bocking Church Street, already narrow and dangerous.</p> <p>2 The Panfield Lane junction with Aetheric Road is already very busy and will be carrying most on the into town traffic from the estate.</p> <p>What plans are there for alleviating this?</p> <p>The only aspects mentioned are the roundabout on Rayne Road and the immediate proposed estate.</p> <p>I feel that it is unrealistic to ignore the wider impact at this stage and wait for the evaluation when applying for planning permission - the whole town impact should be fully explored now and plans made to accommodate the knock on effects</p>	<p>The wider traffic impact has not been ignored as the growth locations traffic impact has been assessed through the Core Strategy evidence base which indicated that the growth location would be able to be accommodated in the existing traffic network with some changes to the road system.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Mr C Lowe	Residents	<p>I am writing to you to appeal against the Panfield Lane development. I strongly disagree with this development as I have mentioned in my previous appeal for all the same reasons.</p> <p>I know my opinion will not count, as you wish to continue with the development anyway and our opinion's as local residents do not count. But if you do go ahead with this I believe you should make it a little special and count the Panfield Lane area as a (new village) as Great Notley has been with a separate name. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Little Panfield' 'Little Bocking' 'Great Bocking' 'Bocking Hamlet' 'Panfield Hamlet' <p>I believe this would improve the development.</p>	<p>The principle of the development has been agreed through the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The developers could select a name for this neighbourhood as you suggest.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Cllr D Mann	Councillor	<p>Thank you for the opportunity that you have given to local people to further comment on the proposals.</p> <p>I have written to you before - below are views shared with me since the exhibition, not my own, which remain open. Some may repeat views that I have already passed on to you.</p> <p>The green buffer zone has wide approval, together with any attempt to keep traffic down on Panfield Lane itself. Want existing screening to be enhanced and additional screening where ever possible. Existing residents don't want to see new houses!</p> <p>The two main issues of concern reported to me are traffic and housing mix.</p> <p>The size of the roundabouts proposed are questioned. A couple of people have asked about the possibility of extending 20 mph to Panfield Lane itself, and ask you to raise this with Highways. Correspondents want emphasis on use of Springwood Drive as the main traffic bearer, rather than Panfield Lane itself, which they see as both dangerous (speed) and inadequate (width, on-street parking, existing volume of traffic. Strong support for anti-rat run measures of any kind including direct vehicle restrictions.</p>	<p>This schedule of the comments has been passed on to ECC highways.</p> <p>It is the view of ECC that the spine road is a relief road for the junction of Aetheric Road and Rayne Road. They would have an issue with some types of traffic calming as this would potentially restrict bus access (i.e. speed bumps). They would also want the speed limit to be 30mph.</p> <p>The precise nature of traffic measures will be a matter for the detailed planning application stage.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Cllr D Mann	Councillor	<p>As regards the mix of housing, local people do not want a repeat of Great Notley - beyond the price range of Braintree and Bocking people and heavily marketed in London, with the vast majority of residents coming from London and other out of District locations. Desire to see housing for local people, especially the young, first time buyers, with affordable and social housing to address local needs.</p> <p>Some expressed concerns about the proposed community area - want it to be modest, two storey maximum and to fit street scene. Still lack of agreement as to what actually should go there.</p> <p>Phasing supported to spread any construction disruption over a longer period.</p> <p>Lot of misinformation out there despite your efforts - belief that the golf course and Towerlands will somehow be included in the area.</p>	<p>A range of housing types will be sought as well as affordable housing provision. The LDF Sub committee has agreed that the Towerlands site could be used for commercial/leisure type uses.</p>
C Turner	Residents	<p>My previous comments about traffic using the new development and Bocking (Church Street) as a way of avoiding the daily Galleys Corner and Marks Farm queues appears to have fallen on deaf ears. Does the traffic modelling know how many cars currently travel along the A120 through to Halstead? I think not. Again I urge you not to allow any traffic other than public transport through the development. It's obvious to me as a road user, that cutting through Springwood, and up Church Street (not Church Lane!) will greatly reduce journey times for both rush hour periods. Since the catastrophic changes to the Marks Farm roundabout, this will not only be during the rush hour, but for most of the day as well. This quiet and picturesque village will be a nightmare to negotiate, or is that what you are hoping for, to create a natural deterrent. I have to live there, so I certainly hope not.</p> <p>It would only take a small amount of additional traffic to have a drastic effect on Church Street and the Four Releet junction. This small amount would be insignificant to the A120 throughput, but hugely significant to Bocking.</p>	<p>ECC and the Highways Agency are considering amendments to the recent changes at Marks Farm roundabout. The Core Strategy lists highway improvements that will be required to support this growth location.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Cllr M Thorogood	Councillor	I had a meeting with a few residents from Panfield Lane last night , we would like you to consider the link road from Springwood on the new area as one-way from Springwood . If it is two- way, it will get used as a rat run like other roads within the Braintree District, and there is too much traffic on Panfield Lane , Having more cars will bring more danger to an area which is used by lots of children walking and biking to the schools. We also think the road should come out opposite Flanders Close, as there is a clearer view there rather than the other location near the path that takes you to Bailey Bridge Rd. We must work with everyone on Panfield Lane that it affects on both sides off the road as they have to live there and they do care about the area.	The comments about a one-way road have been passed to ECC Highways. However, a one-way road would not relieve existing traffic congestion at the Aetheric Road/Rayne Road junction.
Hana Case	Residents	Why is it so that when men see some green unused land they have to "destroy it" by building something on it? Have you walked on the field next to BMX track looking towards the land behind Panfield? Have you seen the vast amount of green that comforts the eyes? I truly can't imagine I will look at houses in few years and all the green land will be gone!!! My partner and I have been happy living on the edge of town where it is quiet with not much traffic and where we can walk our dog. Looking at your building plans I really cannot be excited about the development at all. The traffic rate will increase as well as noise.	The Council have to provide for the future housing and employment needs of the District.
Hana Case	Residents	I dare to say that even criminality in this area will increase. It is sad to see that houses on Panfield Lane are for sale, which I can understand. Who would want to live on the road where it won't be quiet anymore and the green from the other side of the road will disappear?! By building the new complex you unfortunately de-value the present properties. The location will lose its uniqueness and potential house sellers their money. I can imagine that I will be probably one of the small group who will have their say against the whole concept, but I just simply do not agree with this idea. I would be OK with the football pitch part but destroying the whole piece of nature down the Panfield Lane can be avoided.	The Council has to identify land in order to meet its housing land requirements. All options for growth around the town were considered through the Core Strategy and this site was deemed to be the most appropriate site based on the evidence collected.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
John Hills	Essex Police	Nowhere in the planning documents/master plan have the words SECURITY or SAFETY appeared. Sustainability is mentioned but it only refers to drainage and materials...No development can be sustainable if it is not safe and secure. Crime has a carbon footprint. What is being done to address this issue? A crime free environment is a sustainable environment. Crime and the fear of crime are material considerations within planning... are these being addressed? I would recommend that the whole development, housing, retail, leisure, business all achieve Secured by Design (SBD) certification. Where necessary BREEAM and CfSH also be implemented. Sec 17 Crime & Disorder requires local authorities to take into consideration Crime & Disorder when carrying out any of its functions. That includes planning. Mersea Homes and Hills Residential can and must build to SBD standards.	Noted. The issue of design for safety and security will be addressed at the detailed planning application stage.
Cllr J Baugh	Councillor	Since the original planning study by external consultants there has been "mission creep" on numbers and heights of houses (from 450-500 2 storey to a "minimum 600 houses" of "up to 2 1/2 to 3 storey" in the Draft Master Plan dated June 2012. There should be a limit of 600 houses with a storey maximum as an occasional occurrence near the centre of the site only. Since the site is 1.5 m above most existing properties on the east side of Panfield Lane, proposed dwellings fronting these should be no more than 2 storey high, dropping down to 1 1/2 storey to provide variation and harmonise with existing cottages.	The increase in housing numbers (from 500 to 600) was as a result of Braintree College deciding not to re-locate. This was discussed at the Core Strategy hearing and the change consulted on. The Council's housing figure is expressed as a minimum. The Master Plan should not specify details such as storey height. This will be a matter for subsequent planning applications.
Cllr J Baugh	Councillor	The neighbourhood centre with a small shop and GP provision is a welcome feature, but if this is to include a café as mentioned in the Master Plan then perhaps the location of the NC would be most appropriate near to the playing fields as an additional amenity.	The local centre is intended to serve the whole development. Its proposed location is the most likely place that the development would be viable.
Cllr J Baugh	Councillor	Expansion in size of the neighbourhood centre between the Feb and June Plans (With inclusion of A1 office accommodation) is inappropriate. Any additional employment land should be located on the fringes of the main employment land	The previous Master Plan did not identify sufficient employment land to meet the

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
		provision off Springwood Drive.	Core Strategy requirement. The spine road-cannot be moved due to the location of the water main. The LDF Sub Committee can decide whether to agree to a reduction in total of the employment land if the neighbourhood employment is removed.
Cllr J Baugh	Councillor	The link road must be width restricted to ensure only family cars and buses can use it. A single pinch point of one car width would be ideal. Signage and traffic orders alone simply do not work. As the Town Centre and also the top of Panfield Lane prove conclusively. A bus gate is absolutely essential if buses are allowed through the estate.	The nature of the HGV restriction will be determined through a future planning application and in consultation with ECC Highways. Bus access will be provided.
Cllr J Baugh	Councillor	The Southern Link Road access onto Panfield Lane is clearly dangerous, with no visibility. To work, the (admittedly poor quality) hedgerow and bank would need to be moved back to provide a vehicular site splay regarding oncoming traffic and a new tree/hedge screen of indigenous species replanted. Alternatively the road could be re-aligned. An alternative access point further towards Tabor Science college would give better visibility, but destroy high quality tree screening.	The precise location of the junction will be determined by a planning application and will be subject to a safety audit.
Cllr J Baugh	Councillor	Maintaining and improving ecological diversity and habitat is important and some tree belts could be improved - especially that between existing properties and the new development. This would reduce risk of overlooking and gain habitat.	Noted. The development would be expected to maintain and improve natural features where practical to do so. The preservation of many existing hedgerows is indicated on the draft Master Plan.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
A R Luxon	Residents	<p>What is the logic and reasoning behind the decision to develop the Panfield Lane site when the entire significant road infrastructure and also many of the public amenities are on the opposite side of Braintree and several other possible development sites would have much better access to this infrastructure?</p> <p>The proposals will strain the existing road network. The flow of traffic should be improved along the A120, Fowlers Farm, the development is on the wrong side of town and should have access to the A120 and associated amenities.</p>	<p>All locations around the town were considered through the Core Strategy evidence base. The highways impact of the development was also assessed as part of that process.</p> <p>In terms of improvements to the wider road network such as the A120, this is outside the scope of this growth location. The Council is continuing to work with the Highways Agency to explore possible solutions to Galleys Corner congestion and the A120.</p>
F Sheldrake	Friends of Braintree	<p>Although the Friends and Residents of Braintree have been unable to ask every resident in Panfield Lane to sign the enclosed "One Voice Petition" it was obvious that without exception that nobody felt that any consultation had taken place. Only two residents refused to sign the petition; not because they disagreed with its content but because they felt it had no purpose; "nobody listens and nothing will change" they said. Although the planning team have complied with a minimum requirement under planning legislation; it was clearly illustrated that the exhibition regarding the development of the Panfield Master Plan site held at Tabor School after the Inspectors decision, left many of the residents asking why that venue wasn't used earlier as part of your consultation?</p> <p>Many of those I spoke with have sympathy with the need for houses, but the concern regarding the inevitable increase in traffic was overwhelming. The only solution is to have NO access into the site from Panfield Lane and have the Springwood Drive as the only access point for the proposed development. It remains clear that if the main reason for this site is "to prevent out-commuting"</p>	<p>Braintree District Council wrote to 2800+ addresses in the local area in order to get as many views on the draft master plan as possible. Where appropriate these views have been taken on board and the Master Plan altered. The Plan also received significant press coverage and a very well attended public exhibition.</p> <p>Prior to that the Core Strategy was also consulted on extensively and in excess of</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
		the choice of site remains flawed.	<p>what is required by regulation, this included an exhibition at Tabor College.</p> <p>The site was fully assessed through the Core Strategy and the most appropriate location for development was selected. This selection was found “sound” at the public hearing.</p> <p>Having no access onto Panfield Lane is not supported and would have no benefit to the wider area.</p>
F Sheldrake	Friends of Braintree	<p>Petition Questions (Signed by 98 people)</p> <p>1 – the number of houses initially mentioned in the Core Strategy was 500; this was increased to 600 [Without any consultation], the article in the BWT says “at least 600”. Let us agree that the original 500 should not be exceeded.</p> <p>2 –Let us agree that “green buffers” should be a feature similar to those at Notley Garden Village, this would maintain the privacy for existing residents as well as protecting new houses from traffic noise.</p> <p>3 – Let us agree that existing field boundaries be the basis of houses designed in courts and that all trees; especially the many Oak trees have Tree Protection Orders [TPO’s] placed on them.</p> <p>4 – Let us agree that there should only be a single road leading to the development from Panfield Lane, this would minimise the likelihood of traffic using the route between Springwood Drive and Panfield Lane as a “rat run” for traffic wishing to avoid Rayne Road.</p>	<p>The total number of houses proposed for the growth location was discussed at the Core Strategy hearing, the change was made as Braintree College had decided not to re-located to the growth location. It was also consulted on with all comments reported directly to the planning inspector.</p> <p>Tree Preservation Orders will be put on trees which require protection.</p> <p>Having a single access onto Panfield Lane is not</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
		<p>5 – Let us agree that there will be open spaces as well as allotments for new residents to benefit from.</p> <p>6 – Let us agree that all footpaths and rights of way be retained and the locations remain unaltered.</p> <p>7 – Finally let us agree that the proposed new Football Stadium be located near the bypass or trunk road system allowing traffic to arrive and leave with the minimum of disruption to all Braintree residents.</p>	<p>supported and would likely result in significant traffic problems for the area.</p> <p>Open spaces will be provided in accordance with the Councils Open Spaces SPD.</p> <p>The site has one public right of way which is shown as being retained in its existing location.</p> <p>The site includes provision for a re-located football club, due to the nature of this use, any disruption would be limited to a Saturday afternoon or a weekday evening. The football club could choose to relocate and the land identified for the club on the Master Plan could revert to employment uses.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Jean Simmons	Panfield PC	<p>The concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of houses being increased from 500 to 600, and the words ‘at least’ indicating that there could be more (I think this stems from how it was reported in the local press). • provision of green buffers • TPOs for existing trees & existing field boundaries being the basis of houses designed in courts • the development of a rat- run between Springwood Drive & Panfield Lane • adequate open spaces for the new residents • the proposed football stadium to be located near the bypass allowing traffic to arrive & leave with minimum disruption to Braintree residents • increased congestion on Panfield Lane, Churchill Road, Bocking Church Street & Coldnailhurst Avenue • worries over Towerlands being used for housing & thus encroaching on Panfield 	<p>The total number of houses proposed for the growth location was discussed at the Core Strategy hearing, the change from 500 to 600 was made as Braintree College had decided not to re-locate to the growth location.</p> <p>Tree Preservation Orders will be put on trees which require protection.</p> <p>The Towerlands site is not part of the growth location. The LDF Sub committee has previously agreed a commercial/leisure use for the site. Residential uses are not proposed.</p> <p>Further comments may be made at a Parish Council meeting on the 10th September and will be reported verbally to the LDF Sub Committee.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Lee Harding	Braintree Town FC	<p>Thank you for providing us with the latest draft Masterplan of the Panfield Lane Growth Location for our comments and observations.</p> <p>Generally, we at the Football Club continue to appreciate the Council's support for our relocation to part of this site - the new proposed facilities are fundamental to the Club's aspirations to consolidate at its current level and its long-term aspirations to join the Football League. However, we note that there have been some significant changes to the part of the site allocated for our use in the latest draft.</p> <p>The first draft (issued in March this year) indicated the possible inclusion of three pitches (including the main stadium) and this was welcomed by us - but this appears to have been reduced to two pitches in the latest plans.</p>	<p>Noted. This is in order to provide flexibility as to what type of sports provision could be provided. For example if the club re-located to a different site, then we would not wish to restrict open space provision unnecessarily. A training pitch could be provided at a separate location as is the case with many other football clubs if necessary.</p>
Lee Harding	Braintree Town FC	<p>As you know, our existing site off Cressing Road already provides two full size pitches for us - the main stadium and the adjacent training pitch - and we had hoped to see the new location include a third that would be an all weather surface that we would be keen to share through our expanded Football in the Community programme with the local schools and community.</p> <p>We had originally indicated that we would like to occupy approximately 14 acres to accommodate the three pitches, associated facilities, car parking, etc. Relocation to the new stadium was/is to be a catalyst for a major uplift in our Football in the Community Programme as we seek to expand our involvement with both the Council and County Council in local schools and colleges. The latest proposed reduction to just two pitches is similar to the space we currently have and would lead to a restriction in the sides and activities we could organise in the future.</p>	<p>The precise details for the site would be the subject of a subsequent planning application and is too detailed a consideration for the Master Plan which deals in general principles.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
Lee Harding	Braintree Town FC	We you may already know, are launching our Football Academy this September and that will dictate a greater use on our existing training pitches. The Academy side will also be playing along side our first team, reserves, women, supporters and the historically affiliated Crittall work sides. It was our hope that the main stadium would be for first team use, while a second stadium/pitch - developed to meet The FA's ground grading requirements for step 5 - would cater for the other sides - leaving the third (all weather) pitch for training and community use.	As above.
Lee Harding	Braintree Town FC	You kindly provided a copy of Sport England's representations on the Draft Masterplan and there are many comments therein which we would support and make sense for all parties. In particular, we are mindful of the access road for the employment use land that will run between the two/three pitches. You and I have already discussed this and you kindly advised that this route was favoured as it would provide access to (mains water/sewerage?) services below. While understanding that, we have previously (and again) suggested that either a pedestrian crossing or foot bridge is installed to provide for safe ingress and egress between the two/three pitches.	Noted. A pedestrian crossing can be provided subject to a safety audit by ECC highways.
Harvey Lay	Henry Davidson Developments	We have been reviewing the Braintree North West website with interest and particularly the plans for the neighbourhood centre that is well placed to serve the new housing and existing housing stock. A preliminary retail report has been provided which we would like to have considered through the consultation.	The Council is currently updating its retail evidence base which will advise on an appropriate size for the retail element of the local centre as well as wider provision in the District.
Brian Polson	Residents	Infrastructure - Ingress and egress to site. All the existing roads are already on occasions severely over stretched, i.e. Rayne Road/Panfield Lane/Coldnailhurst surely this will only be under more pressure.	The traffic impact of the development has been assessed through the Highways Study that accompanied the Core Strategy. The development would require off site improvements to highways infrastructure. A subsequent planning application would be supported by a highways

Name	Organisation	Comment	Response
			impact assessment and what would be needed to addressed as part of the planning application.
Brian Polson	Residents	Provision of utility services, water, gas and electricity. Can the existing sewage works cope with a further 600 dwellings? Similar with other services.	The issue of services was considered through the selection of the growth location. Anglia Water have been discussing requirements with the developer.
Brian Polson	Residents	Schools. Is the proposed area adjacent to the Tabor Academy to be a primary/junior facility or as an extension to Tabor?	The Core Strategy identified 2ha for educational uses. ECC has not yet specified which is required.
Brian Polson	Residents	Public Open Spaces/Braintree Football Club. The areas shown again raise serious concerns over traffic.	The football club is unlikely to have a significant impact on traffic in the area at its peak time.
Brian Polson	Residents	In the original plans it was suggested that further factory units would be built on the Springwood Drive estate. Is this still an option? This would add further concerns to traffic using the existing roads. As someone who has lived in my existing property some 40 odd years plus an ex employee of a large developer. I consider the proposed plans should be re-visited.	The Growth Location includes an extension to Springwood Drive employment area plus an employment area at the local centre totalling 15 hectares of employment land.