

**Local Development Framework Panel
24th January 2012**



<p>Report on Preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Draft Village Inset Plans to be included in that Plan</p>	<p>Agenda No: 5</p>
<p>Corporate Priority: Environment is clean and green, business is encouraged and local economy prospers, housing and transport meet local needs</p> <p>Report presented by: Juliet Kirkaldy, Susanne Ennos, Alan Massow, Eleanor Dash</p> <p>Report prepared by: Juliet Kirkaldy, Susanne Ennos, Alan Massow, Eleanor Dash</p>	
<p>Background Papers: Local Plan Review Village Inset Plans. Correspondence from landowners and agents proposing development sites. Correspondence with Parish Council's discussing draft Village Inset Plans.</p>	<p>Public Report Yes</p>
<p>Options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To approve or not approve the draft Village Inset Plans and proposals for the Key Service Village of Hatfield Peverel and for the Other Villages of Nounsley, Bulmer, Bulmer Tye, Feering, Rivenhall, Rivenhall End, White Notley, Wickham St Paul, Belchamp Walter, Birdbrook, Gosfield, Great Yeldham, the Hennys, Middleton and Twinstead, Little Yeldham, Ovington, Tilbury Juxta Clare, Bures Hamlet, Great Bardfield, Great Saling, Shalford and Shalford Church End, Stisted, Wethersfield and Blackmore End to be included in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. 2. To amend the draft village Inset Plans. 3. To request further discussion with Parish Councils, or other persons, on the draft Village Inset Plans. 	<p>Key Decision: No (There will be a recommendation to Council to approve the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan for public consultation in its entirety, when the whole of the draft plan, supporting evidence and SEA has been prepared .)</p>
<p>Executive Summary: This report sets out the purpose and content of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. It specifies the amount of housing land and employment that the Plan should provide, to be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy. It sets out proposed village inset maps for one 'Key Service Village' and 'Other Villages', together with the views of Parish Council's on these and upon sites that have already been suggested for development in these villages. (It is likely that further development sites will be put forward by landowners/ agents when there is public consultation on the Site Allocation and Development Management Plan.)</p>	
<p>Decision: To approve the draft Village Inset Plans for Hatfield Peverel, Nounsley, Bulmer, Bulmer Tye, Feering, Rivenhall, Rivenhall End, White Notley, Wickham St</p>	

Paul, Belchamp Walter, Gosfield, Great Yeldham, Little Yeldham, Tilbury Juxta Clare, Bures Hamlet, Great Bardfield, Great Saling, Shalford and Shalford Church End, Stisted, Wethersfield and Blackmore End. To approve retention of Birdbrook, Gosfield airfield, Henny's, Middleton, Twinstead and Ovington as settlements/ locations without an envelope and to approve the specific recommendations set out in this report relating to each of these settlements for public consultation.

Purpose of Decision: The draft Village Inset Plans will form part of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan which, together with the Core Strategy, will allocate development sites and protect other areas in the District from development over the next fifteen years.

Corporate implications [should be explained in detail]

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

Background

The Site Allocations and Development Management Plan is required to provide site allocations and planning policies for the District and must be in conformity with the Core Strategy. It should contain Proposal Map Inset Maps for each town, 'key service' and 'other village' in the District, which will replace the Inset maps in the Local Plan Review. The Council should allocate 'non-

strategic' sites for development on these Inset Maps, identify development boundaries of settlements and designate sites, such as recreation areas, to be protected from development. It should also define town centre and retail area boundaries.

The adopted Core Strategy, the Proposals Map and the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan when adopted will together replace the 2005 Local Plan Review.

Members considered reports on allocations for five of the key service villages and fifteen other villages at the Panel Meeting on 7th December. This report makes recommendations on the sixth key service village and twenty-six further rural settlements.

Housing and Employment Requirements

The Core Strategy sets out the minimum number of future dwellings that should be provided in each category of settlement between 2009 to 2026, set out in Table 1. These dwellings should be provided at the strategic growth locations already allocated in the Core Strategy, at housing sites of 10 or more dwellings, which should be allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and on smaller infill sites (which will not be specifically identified) within the development boundaries for towns and villages, within which infill development is acceptable in principle (subject to planning approval when detailed matters of access, design and amenity are considered). Areas outside the development boundaries are protected by countryside policies.

Table 1 Braintree District Core Strategy Housing Provision

Settlement	Minimum Housing Provision dwellings
Braintree excluding growth locations	1300
Braintree north-west Growth Location West of Panfield Lane	600
Witham excluding Growth Locations	800
Witham south-west Growth Location North of Hatfield Road	600
Witham north-east Growth Location off Forest Road	300
Halstead	300
Key Service Villages	600
Other Villages	300
Total	4800

Table 2 identifies the number of dwellings completed between 2009 to 2011 and the number of dwellings that have been granted permission and have not yet been built. It identifies the housing number required in the Core Strategy for each settlement type and deducts the dwelling numbers already identified in the Core Strategy at Growth Locations, an estimate of dwellings that could

be provided at regeneration areas and the number of dwellings already completed and that have been granted permission. This leaves in the last column the minimum number of dwellings that the Site Allocations must allocate in each town and the total remaining dwellings to be provided in total in the 'Key Service Villages' and in the 'Other Villages.'

This identifies a requirement for 600 dwellings to be provided in the Key Service Villages between 2009-2026 of which 99 remain to be allocated. At the LDF Panel Meeting on 7th December, Members proposed the allocation of one housing site in Coggeshall and three housing sites in Earls Colne, which it is estimated could accommodate in total around 120 dwellings.

As Members will note, there have already been more than 300 dwellings either built, or with permission in the 'Other Villages' which means that there is no requirement to allocate more dwellings in these villages, if the Panel does not think that this is appropriate.

Table 2

	Dwelling Completions 2009-2011	With planning permission outstanding at April 2011 (net dwellings)	Dwellings built plus permitted	CS1 Dwelling provision 2009-2026	Core Strategy Growth location and Regeneration sites already identified	Remainder of dwellings still to be allocated as at April 2011
Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley	404	560	964	1900	600	336
Witham	199	288	487	1700	900	313
Halstead *	66	166	232	300	0	68
Coggeshall	23	13	36		0	
Earls Colne	5	3	8		0	
Hatfield Peverel	10	3	13		0	
Kelvedon	27	6	33		0	
Sible Hedingham	5	28	33		230	
Silver End	20	8	28		120	
Total Key Service Villages	90	61	151	600	350	99
Other Villages	119	187	306	300	0	-6
District total	878	1262	2140	4800	1850	810

Village Inset Plans

This report sets out proposed development boundaries for one Key Service and Other Villages, together with proposed development sites and areas to be protected from development. Parish Councils and ward members have been consulted on the village inset plans. They have been asked to consider whether they wish to retain or amend existing development boundaries, for their views on sites that have already been suggested for development by landowners and developers, and whether they wish to suggest any other site allocations.

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

Hatfield Peverel

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently identifies the employment policy area off Station Road, the car park at Hatfield Peverel station, Strutt Memorial recreation ground off Maldon Road, informal recreation adjacent to library and The Green off Maldon Road as visually important space. The school off Church Road is also identified. An ancient monument to the south of Hatfield Peverel is identified and 'The Priory' south of De Vere Close is identified as a registered park and garden.
- Hatfield Peverel has a hall, primary school, post office, grocery store.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: HAT1 Site Address/Name: Land East of Gleneagles Way, Hatfield Peverel	Gross Site Area Ha: 2.57 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of site for residential use. Potential to provide a landscaped buffer which could include an element of open space to provide a 'soft' fringe to the eastern (and if necessary southern) boundary.
LDF Site Ref: HAT2 Site Address/Name: Land to the south of Stone Path Drive and West of Church Road, Hatfield Peverel	Gross Site Area Ha: 4.6 Type of Development: Residential, remove special landscape area allocation Summary of Proposals: Proposed allocation of land and inclusion within the development boundary for residential use. 2 options – either 4.6ha residential use, or 2.6ha residential plus 2.0ha recreation land.
LDF Site Ref: HAT3 Site Address/Name: Land to west of Hatfield Peverel and East of Hatfield Place, Hatfield Peverel	Gross Site Area Ha: 6.34 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of a single country house in parkland.
LDF Site Ref: HAT4 Site Address/Name: Land at Woodend Farm , Hatfield Road, Witham	Gross Site Area Ha: 22.63 Type of Development: Mixed Use Summary of Proposals: Proposed land for sustainable mixed-use development at Woodend Farm Hatfield Road Witham.
LDF Site Ref: HAT5 Site Address/Name: Land at Graceland, The Street, Hatfield Peverel	Gross Site Area Ha: 5.12 Type of Development: Mixed Use Summary of Proposals: Mixed-use sustainable development on land at Grace Land The Street Hatfield Peverel.

<p>LDF Site Ref: HAT6 Site Address/Name: Barn at Woodend Farm, Witham</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 0.03 Type of Development: Change of Use to B1/Occasional Accommodation Summary of Proposals: Change of use of Barn at Woodend London Road Witham for B1/occasional accommodation.</p>
HAT 7 – WITHDRAWN	
<p>LDF Site Ref: HAT8 Site Address/Name: Peverel House, Maldon Road, Hatfield Peverel</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 0.06 est. Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of Peverel House, Hatfield Peverel for residential use.</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: HAT9 Site Address/Name: Allotment Gardens, Off Church Road, Hatfield Peverel</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 1.28 est. Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of allotment gardens adjacent to cricket ground on Church Road Hatfield Peverel for residential use.</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: HAT10A Site Address/Name: Allotment Gardens, rear of Spinney House, Church Road, Hatfield Peverel</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 0.57 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed residential development of allotment gardens to rear of The Cross Keys Public House, Ulting Road</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: HAT10B Site Address/Name: Allotment Gardens, rear of Spinney House (extending to rear of The Cross Keys P.H.), Church Road, Hatfield Peverel</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 1.28 est. Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed residential development of allotment gardens to rear of The Cross Keys Public House, Ulting Road</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: HAT12 Site Address/Name: Land between Hatfield Peverel and Witham, South of the A12 Promoter/Landowner: Ulting Overseas Trust</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 69.91 Type of Development: Residential/Public Open Space Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of land North of Hatfield Peverel for housing and public open space.</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: HAT13 Site Address/Name: Land south of the Street (rear of William Boosey P.H.), Hatfield Peverel</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 10.50 (2.8 commercial / residential, 2.27 open space, 3.86 residential, landscaping – around 270 dwellings) Type of Development: Comprehensive Development Summary of Proposals: Proposed residential, employment, commercial and open space use on land to the south of The Street and Stone Path Drive</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: HAT14 Site Address/Name: Land at and adjoining Waycott, Hatfield Peverel</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 7.59 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within village development boundary.</p>

LDF Site Ref: HAT 15SHLAA Site Address/Name: Universal Garage, The Street	Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: 13 dwellings (planning app 07/0038)
LDF Site Ref: HAT 16SHLAA Site Address/Name: Station Road	Not included in forecasts. Access and multiple owner constraints.

- **Hatfield Peverel - Map 1, 1a, 1b and 1c**

These maps were sent to the Parish Council for comment and include the existing Local Plan Review village envelope, representations so far from landowners/developers and questions about allocations.

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- Support continued allocation of the proposed Hatfield Peverel country park.
- Do not support HAT 1, HAT 2, HAT 3, HAT 4, HAT 5, HAT 6, HAT 8, HAT 9, HAT 10a, HAT 10b, HAT 11, HAT 12, HAT 13, HAT 15, HAT 16
- Support small organic development (HAT 14) as an extension of the Vineyard area.
- HAT 15SHLAA has now been developed.
- Support allocation of a cycle/footpath along Maldon Road/Wickham Bishops Road.
- Support allocation of Keith Bigden memorial grounds as formal recreation.
- Support access road into the Arla Dairy off the A12 slip road.
- Support allocation of Arla Dairy as a 'mixed use' employment/residential area.
- Support allocation of allotments and burial ground adjacent to St Andrews Church.

- **Hatfield Peverel - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset and Map 2a proposed country park allocation.

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

Proposed Country Park – Officers support the Parish Council. Essex County Council have confirmed they are actively pursuing reinstatement of the former quarry site for a country park (public access/use) as detailed in the s52 agreement attached to the original planning application and therefore support the continued allocation of the country park on the proposals map. The s52 agreement illustrates the boundary of the proposed country park. The Local Plan Review boundary is incorrect and should be amended to accurately reflect the map attached to the s52 agreement.

HAT 1 – Officers support the Parish Council. Development of this site would reduce separation between Hatfield Peverel and Witham. Officers consider that it would be preferable to allocate previously developed land, rather than green field sites to meet future development needs in Hatfield

Peverel and are therefore supporting redevelopment of the Arla site rather than these peripheral greenfield extensions to the envelope.

HAT 2 – Officers support the Parish Council. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as having ‘medium to high sensitivity overall due to strength of the rural area.

HAT 3 – Officers support the Parish Council. The Site Allocations DPD does not consider isolated single dwellings. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as having ‘medium to high sensitivity overall due to strength of the rural area. Hatfield Priory also contributes strongly to the setting’.

HAT 4 – Officers support the Parish Council. The site proposed is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the existing village envelope. (This site of over 20 hectares could accommodate over 600 dwellings). Development of this site would reduce the separation gap between Hatfield Peverel and Witham.

HAT 5 – Officers support the Parish Council. Officers consider that it would be preferable to allocate previously developed land, rather than green field sites to meet future development needs in Hatfield Peverel and are therefore supporting redevelopment of the Arla site rather than these peripheral green field extensions to the envelope.

HAT 6 – Officers support the Parish Council. The Site Allocations DPD does not consider isolated single dwellings/business units.

HAT 8 – Officers support the Parish Council. The site is partially within the existing development boundary for Hatfield Peverel. The Site Allocations DPD does not consider isolated single dwellings.

HAT 9 – Officers support the Parish Council. Inclusion of this site within the village envelope would allow an awkward amendment of the existing envelope allowing protrusion into the open countryside. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as having ‘medium to high sensitivity’ overall due to strength of the rural area. Hatfield Priory is Grade 2 star listed building and is identified as a registered park and garden which contributes strongly to the setting.

HAT 10a – Officers support the Parish Council. Inclusion of this site within the village envelope could have a detrimental impact on the adjacent registered park and garden.

HAT 10b - Officers support the Parish Council. Inclusion of this site within the village envelope could have a detrimental impact on the adjacent registered park and garden.

HAT 12 – Officers support the Parish Council. The site proposed is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the existing village

envelope. Development of this site could reduce the separation gap between Hatfield Peverel and Witham. The visual impact as you approach Hatfield Peverel from A12 could be harmed, as it would provide a 'hardened' fringe to the edge of Hatfield Peverel.

HAT 13 – Officers support the Parish Council. The visual impact as you approach Hatfield Peverel from The Street could provide a 'hardened' fringe to the edge of Hatfield Peverel. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as having 'medium to high sensitivity overall due to strength of the rural area. Hatfield Priory also contributes strongly to the setting'

HAT 14 – Officers support the Parish Council in providing a small extension of the village envelope to allow some development at HAT14, of approximately 1 hectare, which could accommodate about 30 dwellings. (This is a small part of the 7.59ha site proposed by the landowner.) However this would be subject to assessment of highway issues. Hatfield Peverel is a key service village so can accommodate some growth.

HAT 15 SHLAA – site has now been developed therefore a technical amendment to remove the site from the SHLAA.

HAT 16 SHLAA– officers accept that this site should be deleted due to constraints with access and multiple land ownerships which would make deliverability difficult.

Officers support allocation of a cycle/footpath along Maldon Road/Wickham Bishops Road as this would promote sustainable transport reducing the need to travel by car. Allocating the path would assist in securing future s106 monies from nearby developments to provide the path.

Officers support allocation of the Keith Bigden memorial grounds as formal recreation as it contributes to the open space provision in Hatfield Peverel.

Officers support an access road into the Arla Dairy off the A12 slip road, as this would reduce the amount of HGV's travelling through the village, reducing congestion.

Officers support allocation of Arla Dairy (3.5 ha est) as a 'mixed use' to include employment/residential area. Although there appears to be no immediate plans for Arla Dairy to relocate in the next 5 years, there is a 15 year plan period. Officers are concerned that if Arla Dairy did leave Hatfield Peverel during this period it could leave a large site within the village envelope. A mixed use to include employment to provide local jobs would be sought.

Officers support an allocation of allotments and burial ground adjacent to St Andrews Church.

▪ **Officer Recommendations**

- To approve an extension to the Village Envelope to include an allocation of a housing site of approximately 1 hectare at HAT14.
- To allocate a cycle/footpath along Maldon Road/Wickham Bishops Road
- To allocate the Keith Bigden memorial grounds as formal recreation.
- To identify an access road into Arla Dairy off the A12 slip road.
- To allocate Arla Dairy as a 'mixed use' area.
- To allocate allotments and burial ground adjacent to St Andrews Church.
- To approve the revised boundary for the proposed country park identified on Map 2a.
- To approve Map 2 as the draft Site Allocations Inset for Hatfield Peverel.

Nounsley

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village

- **Background:**

There are limited services and facilities in Nounsley. There are no specific allocations within Nounsley on the proposals map of the Local Plan Review 2005. There is a registered park and garden to the north east of Nounsley and a protected lane to the west of Sportsman Lane.

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

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: HAT11 Site Address/Name: Land to south-east of Sportsman's Arms P.H., Sportsmans Lane, Nounsley	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.14 est. Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed residential development of land adjacent to 22 Sportmans Lane, Nounsley.
LDF Site Ref: HAT 15 Site Address/Name: Land adjacent to Badgers Oak, Nounsley Road.	Type of Development: 0.13ha Residential Summary of Proposals: Erection of 1 dwelling.

- **Nounsley - Map 1**

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

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- Do not support extension or amendment of Nounsley village envelope.

- **Nounsley - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

HAT 11 – Officers support the views of the Parish Council. The village envelope does not currently extend north of Sportsman Lane. Inclusion of this site north of Sportsman Lane within the development boundary would allow an awkward protrusion of the village envelope into the countryside. The proposed site is also in close proximity to the registered park and garden.

HAT 15 – Officers support the views of the Parish Council. The village envelope does not currently extend south of Nounsley Road. Inclusion of

this site south of Nounsley Road within the development boundary would allow an awkward protrusion of the village envelope into the countryside.

▪ **Officer Recommendations**

- To approve Nounsley Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.

Bulmer

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The Conservation Area covers most of Bulmer Village it includes The Street, Andrews Road and Vicars Orchard. The cemetery/churchyard, informal recreation and the historic lane south of Sarecroft is also identified on the proposals map. Bulmer has a hall and post office. Bulmer has a Village Design Statement and Parish Plan.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: BUL1 Site Address/Name: Land East of St. Andrews Rise, Bulmer	Gross Site Area Ha: 1.2 est. Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within the development boundary for residential use.

- **Bulmer - Map 1**

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

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- BUL 1 – Do not support development of this site. This area has an important open space that provides views from many locations to the Grade I listed church of St Andrew’s at the heart of Bulmer. Comments during the Parish Council consultation have included, *“it should be made an area of outstanding natural beauty”*. Access to the site is poor. The site was proposed for affordable housing some time ago and was strongly opposed by local residents.
- There are no suitable sites for gypsies/travellers.
- There are no further amenity/play spaces to identify.

- **Bulmer- Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

- BUL1 – Officers support the Parish Councils concerns regarding the impact on the views to/from the Church if this site was developed. The Landscape Character Assessment refers to features such as church towers as being distinctive in this area and the skyline of the valley slopes as visually sensitive, with potential new development being highly visible within views across and along the valley floor. Although Bulmer has a post office, hall and school in nearby Bulmer Tye it does not provide a grocery store or local employment and is not identified as a key service village. Therefore development of this site for 12 or more dwellings would be unsustainable.

- **Officer Recommendations**

- To approve Bulmer Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.

Bulmer Tye

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:**
Bulmer Tye has two village envelopes. To the north is a village envelope which incorporates about 25-30 dwellings and the school. To the south the village envelope incorporates slightly more dwellings, allotment gardens and The Fox PH. St Andrews Church of England Primary School (located off Old Church Lane) which includes part of the adjacent field identified as nursery.
The allotment gardens off Church Road and the protected lane south of the A131 are also identified on the proposals map.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: BUL2 Site Address/Name: Land (works) opposite Blacksmiths Lane, Bulmer Tye	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.32 Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within the development boundary for residential use.
LDF Site Ref: BUL3 Site Address/Name: Land at Keys Barn, Church Road, Bulmer Tye	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.61 est. Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within the development boundary for residential use.
LDF Site Ref: BUL 4 Site Address/Name: Land at Bulmer Tye – adjacent to Church Road and A131.	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.41 est Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within the development boundary for residential use.

- **Bulmer Tye- Map 1a**

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

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**
- The Parish Council stated that the *‘Village Design Statement (VDS) gives strong guidelines and views on how the village should be developed and the landscape of open fields and the trees retained. Parishioners’ most frequent response was that they wished to stick to the VDS, and therefore objected to all four areas being developed. On page 13 of the VDS, a potential site for development is identified.’*

- BUL 2 – Do not support development of this site. The access into the site is poor and many accidents have occurred here due to excessive speed limits. Local residents are opposed to this site.
- BUL 3 – Do not support development of this site. Sewage services are stretched in Park Lane.
- BUL 4 – Do not support development of this site. Concern about access issues. The site is thought to contain an earth work of ancient origins. The woodlands are also visually important.
- There are no suitable sites for gypsies/travellers.
- There are no further amenity/play spaces to identify.
- The Parish Council have indicated where the school car park, wildlife area is.

Bulmer Tye- Map 2a – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

Please see **Appendix 1**.

▪ **Officer Comments**

- Village Design Statement states *‘A potential exception site identified by residents for affordable housing, subject to further consultations and survey: -Between Havenground and Bulmer Tye at the southern end of Church Rd between the Housing Association properties and Park Lane’*. Exception sites for affordable housing would not need to be identified as part of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document. Discussions could take place separately with the Parish Council and Housing Officers.
- BUL 2 – Officers support the Parish Council views. The site does not adjoin the existing village envelope it would therefore be difficult to amend the boundary to include the site without a large area of potential infill. There are also access concerns onto the A131.
- BUL 3 – Officers support the Parish Council views. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies the area as having a relatively high sensitivity to change. Although Bulmer Tye has a primary school and pub it does not offer any other key facilities/services. Therefore it would be an unsustainable site to put forward for development of 12 or more dwellings.
- BUL 4 – The proposed site is not recorded as an ancient monument nor is it identified as a visually important space. However, the site does

appear to be covered by trees and contributes to the setting and approach into Bulmer Tye. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies the area as having a relatively high sensitivity to change. Although Bulmer Tye has a primary school and pub it does not offer any other key facilities/services. Therefore it would be an unsustainable site to put forward for development of 12 or more dwellings.

▪ **Officer Recommendations**

- To amend the boundary of the 'educational use' designation on Map 2a for the school car park and school wildlife area to correctly identify these areas.
- To approve Map 2a as the draft village inset plan for Bulmer Tye.

Feering

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** Although Feering is situated in close proximity to Kelvedon it is a separate Parish with its own Parish Council. Feering is dissected by the railway line with two village envelopes. There are no allocations on the proposals map of the Braintree District Local Plan Review 2005 for residential development. The Threshelfords business park is identified as an employment area. On the proposals map the green off Coggeshall Road has been identified as an open space. Ancient Monuments are shown to the east of World End Lane and the west of Coggeshall Road.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
<p>LDF Site Ref: FEE1 Site Address/Name: Land at Feering Hill, Feering (Access via John Raven Close or World End Lane)</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 11.72 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of site within defined development boundary.</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: FEE2 Site Address/Name: Land at Feering Lodge, Feering</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 4.86 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within the development boundary for development.</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: FEE3 Site Address/Name: Land at Feering/Kelvedon (<i>between Railway and River Blackwater, east of Coggeshall Road, Feering</i>)</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 8.5 est. Type of Development: Not specified Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within the development boundary for development.</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: FEE4 Site Address/Name: Land at Feering/Kelvedon (<i>between London Road & A12/between A12 and Prested Hall</i>)</p> <p>Please note this includes various parcels of land including land to east/west of Inworth Road and a smaller parcel of land (4.2ha) south of London Road.</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 57.45 est. Type of Development: Not specified Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within the development boundary for development.</p> <p>Smaller parcel of land south of London Road (4.2ha) - Fee 4 Crown Estates- up to 148 dwellings and open space.</p>
<p>LDF Site Ref: FEE5 Site Address/Name: Land to Rear of the Vicarage, Feering Hill, Feering</p>	<p>Gross Site Area Ha: 2.65 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of land for residential use</p>

LDF Site Ref: FEE6 Site Address/Name: Land to the rear of Wills Green, Feering	Gross Site Area Ha: 1.50 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed residential development on land to the rear of Wills Green Feering on a site of approximately 1.5 ha.
LDF Site Ref: FEE7 Site Address/Name: Land to west of Marks Tey	Gross Site Area Ha: 301.94 est. (total in Braintree District and Colchester Borough- 510 ha) Type of Development: New settlement - minimum 5,000 dwellings. Summary of Proposals: Promotion of an expansion to Marks Tey Market Town, which involves land within Braintree District.
LDF Site Ref: FEE8 Site Address/Name: Land at The Street (west of Hanover Square), Feering	Gross Site Area Ha: 5.70 Type of Development: Residential / Mixed use - Residential/office/retail Summary of Proposals: Development of site for residential or mixed used residential/office/retail.
LDF Site Ref: FEE9 Site Address/Name: Land at London Road (west of New Lane), Feering	Gross Site Area Ha: 16.96 Type of Development: Mixed use Summary of Proposals: Up to 230 dwellings incorporating open space, pedestrian cycle link to Coggeshall Rd and potentially an expansion to the cemetery and sports pitches.
LDF Site Ref: FEE10 Site Address/Name: Land at Inworth Road (south of Kings Gardens), Feering/Kelvedon	Gross Site Area Ha: 1.99 Type of Development: Residential / Mixed Use - residential/office/retail Summary of Proposals: Proposed development for residential or mixed-use residential/office/retail.
LDF Site Ref: FEE11 Site Address/Name: Land at Kelvedon Bridge, Feering	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.89 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of land for residential use
LDF Site Ref: FEE13 Site Address/Name: The Feering Triangle, London Road	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.98 Type of Development: Employment Summary of Proposals: Employment B2-B8 general industry- warehousing

- **Feering - Map 1, Map 1a**

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

Please see Appendix 1.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- Do not support development of FEE 1/FEE 2/FEE 3/FEE 4/FEE 5/FEE 6/ FEE 7/FEE 8/FEE 9/FEE 11
- Support part of FEE 10 for development but only if they are under pressure to provide a site. Access could be gained from Inworth Road.
- Support identification of FEE 11 as 'Visually Important Space'.
- Support identification of FEE 1 and FEE 4 as sites of 'special archaeological interest'.
- Technical amendment – extension to the cemetery exists and should be shown on the map.
- Support allocation of the two cricket pitches as formal recreation.
- Support allocation of 'The Green' and 'The Taylors' as visually important space.
- Support allocation of FEE 13 as an employment site subject to access issues resolved and sympathetic design.

- **Feering - Map 2, North Feering Map 2 – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:**

Please see **Appendix 1.**

- **Officer Comments**

Fee 1 Land at Feering Hill – Officers support Parish Council comments. The site is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the village envelope. The site also includes a recorded Ancient Monument in the centre. Development of this site could have an impact on the setting of this Ancient Monument.

Fee 2 Land at Feering Lodge– Officers support Parish Council comments. The site is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the village envelope. This site is of a growth location size and would need to be considered during a review of the Core Strategy.

Fee 3 – Land off Coggeshall Road - Officers support Parish Council comments. The site is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the village envelope. The site is nearly wholly within the flood zone therefore would be unsuitable for most types of development. It is also situated on the

other side of the railway line and would therefore be physically removed from the village of Feering.

Fee 4 – Officers support Parish Council comments that the site should not be developed. The site in its entirety is too large to be considered as a minor extension of the village envelope. Officers do not support the Parish Council's views that the site should be identified as an Ancient Monument. The Council records identify the Ancient Monument in FEE 1 and not FEE 4.

Fee 5 – Land rear of Vicarage - Officers support Parish Council comments. The site is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the village envelope. The site is wholly within the flood zone therefore would be unsuitable for most types of development.

Fee 6 – Land rear of Wills Green - Officers support Parish Council comments. The site is located some distance from existing services and facilities in Feering and therefore would be an unsustainable location for further development.

Fee 7 – Marks Tey Eco Town - Officers support Parish Council comments. This site is part of a proposed new settlement, of a growth location size and would need to be considered during a review of the Core Strategy.

Fee 8 – The Street - Officers support Parish Council comments. The site is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the village envelope. The site is located some distance from existing services and facilities in Feering and therefore would be an unsustainable location for further development.

Fee 9 – London Road - Officers support Parish Council comments. The site is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the village envelope. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies this northern area as having medium to high sensitivity overall due to the strength of rural character and contribution to setting of the historic core of Feering north of the railway line.

Fee 10 – Inworth Road - It is noted that the Parish Council are only prepared to identify this site for development if they are under pressure to do so. Although Feering is not a key service village it is in close proximity to Kelvedon which is. There is a railway station, school and employment opportunities in close proximity. Officers support an extension of the village envelope to include this site. Access to the site off Inworth Road would appear to be acceptable, although this is subject to further highway assessments.

Fee 11 – Lady Meadow - This area of land was discussed with Kelvedon Parish Council and at the previous Local Development Framework Panel in December 2011 where Members agreed that it should be allocated as Visually Important Space.

Fee 13 – The Feering Triangle, London Road - The Parish Council have raised no objection to the allocation of this site for employment uses. Officers suggest that a decision on this matter is deferred until we have the results of

the employment land review. Officers have also consulted with the Highways Agency considering the proximity to the A12 slip road and await their reply.

Officers support the technical amendment suggested by the Parish Council that the extension to the cemetery exists and should therefore be reflected on the proposals map.

Officers support allocation of the two cricket pitches as formal recreation. And support allocation of 'The Green' and 'The Taylors' as visually important space.

▪ **Officer Recommendations**

- That FEE 10 should be identified as a proposed residential site.
- That the two cricket pitches be identified as formal recreation.
- That 'The Green' and 'The Taylors' be identified as Visually Important Space.
- That the cemetery extension be identified.
- To defer consideration of Fee 13 - The Feering Triangle, London Road until the employment land review has been completed and the views of the Highways Agency have been received.
- To approve Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Map for Feering.

Rivenhall

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently identifies the open spaces between Beech Road and Oak Road as visually important space. The existing village envelope includes the residential development but excludes the church, school and playing field. A monument is also identified on the proposals map to north east of the village.
- Rivenhall has a hall, primary school, post office, grocery store.
- Rivenhall has a Village Design Statement.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: RIV1 Site Address/Name: Rivenhall Country Park	Gross Site Area Ha: 147 ha Type of Development: Country Park Summary of Proposals: Proposal for water based leisure and recreational activities and open space following extraction of sand and gravel from just under half of the site (access via Colemans Bridge A12 interchange).
LDF Site Ref: RIV2 Site Address/Name: Land northeast of Witham	Gross Site Area Ha: 16.8 Development Capacity (units/floorspace): 300 dwellings and associated community infrastructure Type of Development: Urban extension already allocated in Core Strategy.
LDF Site Ref: RIV3 Site Address/Name: Burghey Brook Poultry Farm and Land Adjoining, Between A12 and Railway Line, Witham	Gross Site Area Ha: 6.18 Type of Development: Employment Land Summary of Proposals: Proposed urban extension to the land North East of Witham to include the expansion of Eastways Industrial Estate
LDF Site Ref: RIV4 Site Address/Name: Rickstones Farm, Rivenhall	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.63 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Removal of existing commercial uses and redevelopment for housing.
LDF Site Ref: RIV5 Site Address/Name: Parkgate Farm, Rivenhall	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.78 Type of Development: Employment; Live/Work or Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of live/work units or residential development.

LDF Site Ref: RIV 6 – DELETED (Superseded by amendment to RIV 2)	
LDF Site Ref: RIV7 Site Address/Name: Glebe Farm, Rectory Lane, Rivenhall	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.89 est. Type of Development: Residential/Mixed Use Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of land for residential or mixed use.

- **Rivenhall - Maps 1, 1a, RIV 5- Map 1, Durwoods Hall – Map 1**

These maps were sent to the Parish Council for comment and include the existing Local Plan Review village envelopes, representations so far from landowners/developers and questions about allocations.

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- Support allocation of visually important space on western side of Oak Road.
- Support allocation of the primary school as educational use.
- Support allocation of playing field (currently outside of village envelope).
- Support an employment boundary around the former Polish campsite (but should be drawn tight to existing buildings).
- Do not support an allocation at Rickstones Farm.
- Do not support an allocation at Durwoods Hall.
- The area of open space at St Marys Road, currently with play equipment should be identified as informal recreation.
- The garages at Tusser Close should be allocated for affordable housing.
- The Parish Council have in the past endeavoured to obtain access to the privately owned allotment site on Oak Road next to Hoo Hall Cottages but to no avail. If other land became available for allotments the PC would express an interest.
- Support allocation of visually important space between the area of land north-western side of Rickstones Road between John Ray Walk and 301 Rickstones Road.
- The Rickstones Academy Playing Field should be designated as 'formal recreation' (outside Witham's development boundary).
- Do not support RIV1, RIV 2, RIV 3, RIV 4, RIV 5, RIV 6, RIV 7.

- **Rivenhall - Map 2, Map 2a, RIV 5 - Map 2, Durwoods Hall – Map 2–**
 proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

Please see **Appendix 1**.

▪ **Officer Comments**

RIV 1 – *Rivenhall Country Park - proposal for sand and gravel extraction and a water based leisure and recreation activities and open space.* This is a matter for the Essex County Council Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document.

RIV 2 – *Land northeast of Witham – proposed urban extension.* Allocated in the adopted Core Strategy as a growth location.

RIV 3 – *Burghey Brook Poultry Farm – proposed urban extension.* This site was considered during the preparation of the Core Strategy. It was not allocated as a strategic site in the Core Strategy as sufficient employment land had been identified to meet the District's requirements.

RIV4 Rickstones Farm is a small site south of Rivenhall village, there is a business operating here. The landowner who has put forward the site is suggesting it for live/work units or residential units in the redundant barns. These proposals are not a matter for the Allocations Development Plan Document to consider as it would not be appropriate to identify a development boundary around units at a specific farm.

RIV 5 – *Parkgate Farm – proposed live/work units or residential.* Officers consider that this is an unsustainable location. It cannot be considered as a minor extension to existing village envelope. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as being within the Silver End Farmland Plateau and this character area has moderate to high sensitivity to change.

RIV 7 - *Glebe Farm, Rectory Lane – proposed development of land for residential.* Officers consider that this is an unsustainable location. It cannot be considered as a minor extension to existing village envelope. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as being within the Silver End Farmland Plateau and this character area has moderate to high sensitivity to change.

Officers support identification of the grass verges on Oak Road (*which Parish Council manage as a biodiversity wildlife site*) and between 451 Rickstones Road and John Ray Walk (90 metres west of 451 Rickstones Road) as visually important spaces as these areas contribute to the attractive setting and approach into Rivenhall.

Officers are in agreement that the primary school should be identified as 'educational use', playing field as 'formal recreation' and the area of open space at St Marys Road should be identified as 'informal recreation'.

Tusser Close – Officers are in agreement that the garage site could be suitable in principle for an affordable housing scheme, subject to highway issues. However development proposals would be subject to the agreement of the landowner, Greenfields and this site is unlikely to be

large enough to be identified as a site for 10 or more dwellings. Officers will notify Greenfields and the Housing Research and Development Manager of the Parish Council's suggestion.

Please see separate report on employment boundary for the Polish campsite.

KEL 6 Durwoods Hall is a large site situated between Rivenhall and Kelvedon off the A12. This was discussed by the LDF Panel on 7th December when Members resolved that an employment boundary should not be supported here.

▪ **Officer Recommendations**

- To allocate the primary school, playing field and Rickstones Academy playing field, open space, allotment land and visually important spaces at Rivenhall.

- To approve Map 2 as the draft village inset plan for Rivenhall

- To approve Map 2a for Rivenhall.

- To approve Map 2 – RIV 5

Rivenhall End

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** There are no specific allocations on the proposals map of the Braintree District Local Plan Review 2005.
- Rivenhall End has a village hall, pub, petrol station and hotel.
- Rivenhall has a Village Design Statement.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers together with Parish Council and officer views on these are set out in report on Rivenhall:**
- **Rivenhall End - Map 1**

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

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**
 - Do not support extension or amendments to existing village envelope.
 - Do not support inclusion of car park at The Fox Inn within the development boundary.
 - Support allocation of the open space off Foxmead.
 - Support allocation of Henry Dixon Hall as community use.
 - Support allocation of amenity space/open space on Henry Dixon Road.
 - Support allocation of a cycle/footpath from Motts Lane at the Colemans Interchange along to the boundary with Kelvedon Parish.
 - There are no sites within the parish which are considered suitable for gypsy/traveller sites.
 - Support allocation of 1 additional travelling show persons site at existing site off Braxted Road.
- **Rivenhall End - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

The Parish Council have stated that they do not support extension or amendments to existing village envelope. Officers are in agreement with

this. The existing village envelope would be difficult to extend due to physical constraints such as the A12, river and coalescence with Witham.

The Parish Council do not support inclusion of the car park at the Fox Inn within the development boundary. Officers are in agreement with this. Due to the close proximity to the A12, the type of development which could take place here would be limited due to noise and access issues. Built development on the car park would also reduce the gap further between Rivenhall End and Witham.

The Parish Council have suggested that amenity space on Henry Dixon Road and the open space off Foxearth should be allocated. Officers are in agreement with this as they are an important contribution to the open space provision in Rivenhall End and were identified during the open spaces audit.

The Parish Council have suggested that Henry Dixon Hall should be allocated as 'community use'. Officers support this. The hall is used for a variety of purposes by the local community and is an important asset which should be protected.

Officers are in agreement with the Parish Council that a cycle/footpath should be allocated (along existing path) from Motts Lane at Colemans Interchange along to boundary with Kelvedon Parish. Allocation of the cycle/footpath would assist in securing future s106 monies from nearby developments to provide improvements to the path.

The allocation of one additional travelling show person's site adjacent to the existing site on Braxted Road is supported by officers and would assist in meeting the requirements of the Core Strategy. It should be noted that the site has not been put forward by the landowner. Therefore the Council would need to discuss allocation of this site with the landowner and travelling showpersons to establish if they were in agreement with the proposal.

▪ **Officer Recommendations**

- Allocate informal recreation off Foxmead and Henry Dixon Road.
- Allocate Henry Dixon Hall as community use.
- Allocate cycle/footpath from Motts Lane at Colemans Interchange along to the boundary with Kelvedon Parish. Investigate the provision of 1 additional travelling show persons site adjacent to existing site off Braxted Road.
- To approve Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Map for Rivenhall End

White Notley

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** White Notley has a Conservation Area, allotments, school, burial ground and visually important space as shown on the existing inset map of the Local Plan Review 2005. White Notley has a primary school, pub and a hall.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: WHN 1 Site Address/Name: Land off Station Road, White Notley	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.13 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of land for residential

- **White Notley - Map 1**

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

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- Do not support extension or amendment of the village envelope.
- Do not know of any areas which should be identified as amenity/play space.
- Have no comment to make regarding site representation WHN 1 submitted.

- **White Notley - Map 2 – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:**

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

Officers support the views of the Parish Council. The flood plain to the north constrains any extension or amendment of the village envelope here. Development to the east of White Notley is also constrained as the Conservation Area extends to a large part to include the vicarage. Development here could have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area. WHN 1 is not situated immediately adjacent to the existing village envelope for White Notley and is divided by a large area of flood plain. It is also located within the Conservation Area. The access from Station Road is poor and is single track with passing places. It would therefore be inappropriate to put further development here.

- **Officer Recommendations**

No change or amendment to the existing village envelope.
To approve Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Map for White Notley.

Wickham St Paul

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently identifies 'The Green' a large area located in the centre of the village as 'visually important space'. The burial ground is also identified.
- Wickham St Paul has a village hall, pub, post office and grocery store.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: WIC1A LDF Ref: 1644 Site Address/Name: Land off Church Road (opposite Winton Cottage), Wickham St Paul	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.10 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed inclusion of land within the development boundary for residential development.
LDF Site Ref: WIC1B LDF Ref: 1644 Site Address/Name: Land off Church Road (opposite Winton Cottage/Beverleigh), Wickham St Paul	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.40 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed development of land for village housing at land adjacent 1 Church Road, Wickham St Paul.
LDF Site Ref: WIC2 LDF Ref: 1684 Site Address/Name: Land at Rectory Lane, Wickham St Paul	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.4 Type of Development: Residential Summary of Proposals: Proposed residential development on a 0.4 ha site on land at Rectory Lane Wickham Saint Paul.

- **Wickham St Paul - Map 1**

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

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**
 - Do not support extension or amendment of the village envelope.
 - Do not know of any areas which should be identified as amenity/play space.

- **Wickham St Paul - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

Please see Appendix 1.

- **Officer Comments**

Wickham St Paul is largely focused around the large green which is used for a multiple of activities. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies the area of countryside around Wickham Farmland Plateau as having a relatively high sensitivity to change. Officers agree with the Parish Council comments that extension of the village envelope to accommodate a cluster of residential development would harm the character of the existing village. Although Wickham St Paul has a village hall, pub, post office and grocery store it does not have a local school within the village and does not provide many employment opportunities or much public transport, therefore it would be an unsustainable location to promote further growth.

- **Officer Recommendations**

- No change to the existing village envelope.
- To approve Map 2 as the draft Site Allocations Inset Map for Wickham St Paul.

Belchamp Walter

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently illustrates an area of visually important space adjacent to the village hall and a Conservation Area around the central crossroads of the village.

Belchamp Walter has limited key services/facilities although there is a village hall and a Church situated outside the main part of the village.

- **There have been no representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers.**
- **Belchamp Walter – Map 1**

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

See **Appendix 1**.

Parish Council Views:

- The designated visually importance space does not have any significance. It is privately owned and is of no special importance within the village.
 - Do not support the extension of the existing village envelope for a new area of residential development.
 - Do not own any land within the village and hence has none to allocate for use as allotments.
 - Cannot recommend any small sites that would be suitable for gypsy and traveller pitches.
- **Belchamp Walter - Map 2 – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:**

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

Belchamp Walter is a small village in an isolated rural location in the north of the District. The village envelope encloses around 50 dwellings and the village hall. There are no other facilities and it is not considered a sustainable location for new growth.

The area currently designated as a visually important space adjacent to the village hall is partly used as a parking area with the remaining area laid to grass. Officers support the view that this is not a visually important open space and has no objection to the removal of this designation.

▪ **Recommendations**

- Remove the current allocation of visually important open space adjacent to the Village Hall
- To approve Belchamp Walter Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.

Birdbrook

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

Background: Birdbrook is a village which does not have a village development boundary. The majority of the village is designated as a Conservation Area.

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

Sites	Details
LDF Ref: BIR1A Site Address/Name: The Street, Birdbrook	Gross Site Area Ha: 2.9 est. Summary: Re-instatement of previous village envelope, which was defined in Local Plan adopted 1995, but deleted in the Local Plan Review adopted 2005.
LDF Ref: BIR1B Site Address/Name: Moat Road, Birdbrook	Gross Site Area Ha: 1.5 est. Summary: Re-instatement of previous village envelope and inclusion of land at Ricmar for residential development.

- **Birdbrook Map 1:** This was sent to Parish Council for comment and includes representations so far from landowners/developers and questions about allocations.

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- Birdbrook does not have the infrastructure to support even just one more house.

- Oppose development on the 'Ricmar' site.

- **Birdbrook Map 2:** Proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset, which identifies any proposed Parish Council changes to Local Plan Review Inset.

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments:**

The village of Birdbrook originally had two village envelopes defined in the Braintree District Local Plan adopted 1995: one around the historic core of the village envelope (The Street and part of Moat Road) and one to the east of The Moat which encompassed a small cluster of dwellings. The village envelopes were removed as part of the Local Plan Review which was adopted in 2005.

The Inspector's Report in 2004 considered whether the village envelope should be re-instated and extended to include the site at Ricmar. The Inspector concluded that the main purpose of designating village envelopes is 'to indicate where some infill development may be appropriate' and 'there are virtually no opportunities in either of the two elements of the village'. He went on to say that 'the opportunities that might exist, mainly in the smaller of the two elements, would unacceptably consolidate ribbon development'. There have been no specific changes in Birdbrook since this decision and Officers are of the opinion that the above view still stands.

▪ **Recommendations:**

- To approve Birdbrook Map 2 (without a village envelope).

Gosfield (Including Gosfield Airfield)

- **Core Strategy Proposals – Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village**
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently illustrates the Local Nature Reserve to the east of Greenfields, Greenways and Edmund Green, a registered park and garden to the west of the village, Gosfield Primary School and four areas of visually important space; two along The Street (one on the corner of The Limes and one to the front of The Firs) and two within The Limes.

The Conservation Area is also illustrated which includes a large proportion of the village and the registered park and garden.

The 2011 Braintree District Council Rural Services Survey show that Gosfield benefits from the following Key Services: a hall, 2 public houses, 3 primary schools and a post office.

There is a Gosfield Parish Plan for 2011 to 2021

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

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: GOS1 Site Address/Name: Land at Gosfield Airfield (South), Gosfield	Gross Site Area Ha: 7.88 Summary: Proposed inclusion of land within existing employment area.
LDF Site Ref: GOS2 Site Address/Name: Land to the South of The Limes, Gosfield	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.6 Summary: Proposed development of housing with associated Community green.
LDF Site Ref: GOS3	Removed from Consideration
LDF Site Ref: GOS4 Site Address/Name: Land at Gosfield Airfield (North), Gosfield	Gross Site Area Ha: 1.36 Summary: Proposed employment area.
LDF Site Ref: GOS5 Site Address/Name: Land North of Meadway, Gosfield	Gross Site Area Ha: 7.95 Summary: Proposed inclusion of land within village development boundary for residential use and amenity land.

LDF Site Ref: GOS6 Site Address/Name: Land at Gosfield Airfield (west of Air Blast East Anglia Ltd)	Gross Site Area Ha: 2.4 Summary: Proposed allocation as industrial land.
LDF Site Ref: GOS7 Site Address/Name: Land at Gosfield Airfield (southeast of Building Movement Svs Ltd)	Gross Site Area Ha: 4.27 Summary: Proposed allocation as industrial land.
LDF Site Ref: N/A Site Address/Name: Land to the East of The Street, Gosfield	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.65 Summary: Proposed residential development of eco-friendly affordable housing.
LDF Site Ref: N/A Site Address/Name: Land at Gairsay House (also known as Cherrytree Cottage), Hedingham Road, Gosfield	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.15 est. Summary: Extend boundary to include property

- **Gosfield – Map 1**

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

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- Do not support GOS2 as it is a sensitive landscape area, parking and access of The Limes would be an issue and there would be an impact on existing trees.
- Do not support GOS5 due to the scale of development proposed.
- Do not support Land to the East of the Street as access onto The Street is problematic and it is considered to be backland development.
- Do not support the inclusion of Land at Gairsay House, Hedingham Road into the village envelope as it would be illogical just to include this one plot.

- Supports the designation of the verge on the right of The Street, south of Edmund Green as a visually important open space.
 - Wishes for 'The Grove' to be designated as community woodland.
 - Does not support the designation of the allotments to the rear of Saltdean as it is privately owned.
 - Request that 'The Spinney' is designated as informal recreation.
 - Do not support employment designation of Gosfield Airfield.
- **Gosfield - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

The proposed allocations at Gosfield Airfield (GOS1, GOS4, GOS6 and GOS7) and the designation of an employment area are not supported as it is considered to be an unsustainable location where employment uses would not be encouraged.

GOS2 Land south of the Limes lies to the south of the existing village envelope boundary and is mostly within the designated Conservation Area. It also contains a group of trees which are subject to Tree Preservation Order. Officers agree with the Parish Council that for the above reasons this is a sensitive site which should not be included within the village envelope.

GOS5 Land North of Meadway is too large to be considered as a minor extension to the village envelope. Gosfield is not a sustainable location for major growth. Furthermore, the Landscape Character Assessment identifies this area as having a relatively high sensitivity to change.

Land East of The Street is situated entirely within the designated Conservation Area and the rear of properties within The Street. Furthermore, access onto The Street would be problematic. Officers support the view of the Parish Council that this site should not be included within the village envelope.

The request for Gairsay House to be included within the village envelope is not supported as just including one house would be illogical and extending the village boundary up to this site would allow for significant development, which for the reasons set out in GOS5 would not be considered acceptable.

The Parish Council suggest the proposed designation of informal recreation at The Spinney (to the south of The Limes) and community

woodland at The Grove (north of Hall Drive). Officers are supportive of these proposals.

The verge on the right of The Street, south of Edmund Green is a positive feature within the street scene and Conservation Area and therefore should be protected as such.

▪ **Recommendations**

- That the verge on the right of The Street, south of Edmund Green be designated as a visually important space.
- That the Spinney (to the south of The Limes) be designated as informal recreation.
- That the Grove (to the north of Hall Drive) be designated as Community Woodland.
- To approve Gosfield Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.

Great Yeldham

- **Core Strategy Proposals** – Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently illustrates the Conservation Area, an employment area off Toppesfield Road, St Andrew’s Primary School, an area of informal recreation at Little Hyde Road and the Playing Field which is designated as being a visually important space.

Great Yeldham has a better range of service and employment than many of the other villages in the District. The 2011 Braintree District Council Rural Service Survey shows that Great Yeldham benefits from the following Key Services: a hall, 3 public houses, a primary school, a post office, 2 village stores and planning permission for a Doctors Surgery.

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

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: GRY1 Site Address/Name: Land at junction of High Street & Toppesfield Road, Great Yeldham	Gross Site Area Ha: 1.38 Summary: Proposed development of site for residential use and possible site for a doctors surgery
LDF Site Ref: GRY2 Site Address/Name: Beards Field, Highfields, Great Yeldham	Gross Site Area Ha: 2.2 Summary: Housing with a central open space and ‘a permanent soft edge to the village’ (presumably through landscaping.) Access is proposed via the Highfields Estate.
LDF Site Ref: GRY3 Site Address/Name: Nuns Walk Field, Great Yeldham	Gross Site Area Ha: 2.0 Summary: Proposed site for village housing and open space (including a buffer of open space along the main road frontage which would provide a physical and visual connection with Bowtells Meadow) in association with the transfer of Bowtells Meadow for open space and amenity purposes. Could also consider making provision for some form of community building or use in the corner of the site nearest the police station.
LDF Site Ref: GRY4 Site Address/Name: Land south of Toppesfield Road, Great Yeldham	Gross Site Area Ha: 1.83 est. Summary: Extension of village development limit and inclusion of land for residential development.

- **Great Yeldham – Map 1**

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

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

- Supports GRY3 but not GRY1, GRY2 or GRY4 and does not want any other dwellings included within the village envelope
- Supports the designation of the recreation ground as formal open space
- Wish to allocate Bowtells Meadow as formal recreation.
- Are not aware of any sites which may be suitable for gypsy and traveller pitches.

- **Great Yeldham - Map 2 – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:**

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

GRY1 is located between the main A1017 and the industrial estate on the corner with Toppesfield Road. It benefits from two potential access points; however, it is poorly related to existing built development in the village. The edges of the site are also heavily wooded. There would be a concern about the loss of the tress and the impact this may have on the character of the area and the proximity of any residential use to the industrial area if this site were to be developed. For the above reasons this site is not supported by Officers.

GRY2 is located to the rear of the main residential area of the village and is currently in agricultural use. The site abuts the village envelope adjacent to Highfields, but along Tilbury Road, is separated by 'Beards'. There is a public footpath which runs the northern boundaries of the site. The site is also adjacent to a large area up to Tilbury Juxta Clare which benefits from a tree protection order. The allocation of this site would leave a gap of unallocated land and would alter the edge of village character of this area and is therefore not supported by Officers.

GRY3 is situated to the north of Whitlock Drive, the front of the site is within the Conservation Area and the road to the frontage along Church Road is within the Flood Zone. This site is the closest to the village amenities and is not prominent in longer views. As it is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area design will be important in any development, however this will be dealt with at a later stage. An advisory

letter by Intermodal Transport has been submitted which considers the viability of the site for redevelopment from a highway and transportation perspective, which indicates that a suitable access is likely to be able to be provided and that the road network could cope with any additional traffic. The suitability of the access and other highway matters will be dealt with in detail as part of any future planning application, in consultation with Essex County Council Highways. However, from the information received it appears that the deliverability of the site it unlikely be compromised by significant highway issues. This site is supported by the Parish Council and Officers, subject to a Flood Risk Assessment and Environment Agency comments, as any access is likely to be through the Flood Zone so it would need to be demonstrated that safe access and egress can be achieved during a flood situation.

GRY4 is remote from the main village centre and is poorly related to existing residential development. This site is therefore not supported by Officers.

The Green Spaces Strategy identifies a number of small areas of green spaces throughout the village. The Parish Council does not wish for these areas to be allocated as Open Space. Whilst the allocating these areas for open space would give them extra protection, they are small areas which are unlikely to be suitable for development.

▪ **Recommendations**

- Extend the village envelope to include GRY3 for proposed residential use.
- Allocate Bowtells Meadow as formal recreation.
- To approve Great Yeldham Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.

The Henny's, Middleton and Twinstead Parish Council

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

Background: The Henny's, Middleton and Twinstead do not have designated village envelopes. All villages are situated within the Special Landscape Area and have limited facilities.

- **There have been no representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers in the Henny's or Twinstead. The following representation has been put forward for Middleton:**

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: MID1 Site Address/Name: Land on South Side of Rectory Road, Middleton	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.5 Summary: To define a development boundary for the village of Middleton and to allocate land on the south side of Rectory Road for residential use (3 to 4 houses) within the village envelope.

- **Middleton – Map 1**

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

See **Appendix 1**.

Parish Council Views:

- Wish to retain the current status of not having a village envelope
- Objects to the proposal to develop the suggested site in Middleton

- **Officer Comments**

The Henny's, Middleton and Twinstead are small villages situated close to the border with Babergh Council, which lack key services and facilities.

Further development should not be supported as the villages are in an unsustainable location. Furthermore, the villages are situated in the Stour River Valley, which the Landscape Character Assessment defines as having a relatively high sensitivity to change.

- **Recommendations**

- To retain The Henny's, Middleton and Twinstead as villages without a designated village envelope.

Little Yeldham

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently illustrates the churchyard and the village envelope which defines an area around the village green.

Little Yeldham has limited key services/facilities although there is a village hall and a Church.

- **There have been no representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers.**
- **Little Yeldham – Map 1**

This map was sent to the Parish Council for comment and includes the existing Local Plan Review village envelopes and questions about allocations.

See **Appendix 1**.

Parish Council Views:

- Wish to amend the village envelope at the rear of the Village Hall to include an area of proposed car park.
 - Wish to designate the recreation ground as formal recreation and keep it outside the village envelope.
 - Do not support the designation of the allotments as they are currently not well used and do not wish to allocate further land for allotment provision.
 - Do not wish to extend the village envelope.
 - Wish the Village Green to be designated as visually important space.
 - Are not aware of any sites which are suitable for gypsy and traveller pitches.
- **Little Yeldham - Map 2 – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:**
See **Appendix 1**.
 - **Officer Comments**
 - Little Yeldham is a small village in a rural location. The village envelope encloses approximately 40 dwellings, the village hall

and the Church. There are no other facilities and it is not considered a sustainable location for new growth.

- The intention of the proposed car park is that it would not only serve the Village Hall but also the village as a whole, including use by the nearby Church. Officers have no objection to this allocation.
- The village green is a positive feature within the street scene and therefore there is no objection to its designation as a visually important space.

▪ **Recommendations**

- Designation the Village Green as a visually important space.
- Designate the recreation ground, School Road, as formal recreation.
- Reposition the village envelope boundary to include an area of car park to the rear of the Village Hall.
- To approve Little Yeldham Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.

Ovington

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village
- **Background:** Ovington is a small village which does not have a designated village envelope. It also has limited facilities.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
LDF Site Ref: OVI1 Site Address/Name: Land north of Upper Farm, Ovington	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.70 ha Summary: Proposed development of site for residential use.
LDF Site Ref: OVI2 Site Address/Name: Land adjacent to Upper Farm, Ovington	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.28 est. Summary: Proposed development of site for a single residential dwelling.
LDF Site Ref: OVI3 Site Address/Name: Land north of Chestnut Cottage, Ovington	Gross Site Area Ha: 0.05 est. Summary: Proposed development of garden for a single residential dwelling.

- **Ovington – Map 1**

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

See **Appendix 1**.

Parish Council Views:

- Feel that there is scope for small scale housing development e.g. infills; individual dwellings.
- Agreed that they do not want a village envelope around Ovington.
- Did not comment on individual sites put forward by landowners/developer due to a conflict in interest.

- **Officer Comments**

Ovington is a small village situated to the north of the District, to the east of Ashen, it lacks all key services and facilities.

Further development, even for one dwelling, should not be supported as in the village as it is an unsustainable location. Furthermore, the village is located in the Belchamp Farmland Plateau Landscape Area which the Landscape Character Assessment defines as having a moderate to high sensitivity to change.

- **Recommendations**

- To retain Ovington as a village without a designated village envelope.

Tilbury Juxta Clare

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Other (i.e. Non Key Service) Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently defines only the village envelope.

Tilbury Juxta Clare is an extremely small village with no facilities. Apart from the grouping of houses enclosed by the envelope, most dwellings are located in a ribbon fashion along roads, particularly on the road to Great Yeldham.

- **There have been no representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers.**
- **Tilbury Juxta Clare – Map 1**

This map was sent to the Parish Council for comment and includes the existing Local Plan Review village envelope and any questions about allocations.

See **Appendix 1**.

Parish Council Views:

- Wish to retain the existing village envelope
- Do not wish to encourage any growth in the village
- Do not wish to include land to the south/south east of the village into the village envelope

- **Tilbury Juxta Clare - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

The village envelope encloses around 20 dwellings which are for the most part large houses situated in large plots. Given the small size of the village envelope and the lack of any village facilities this is not a suitable location for new growth.

The inclusion of the land to the south/south east of the village would allow for growth, which given the unsustainable location would not be supported.

- **Recommendations**

- To approve Tilbury Juxta Clare Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.

Bures Hamlet

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map for Bures Hamlet includes a Special Landscape Area, Conservation Area, Village Envelope, Car Park, Visually Important Space and flood Zone.
- Bures Hamlet is adjacent to Bures St Mary which is within Babergh District Council. Both Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary have a range of services which serve the local population, these include doctor's surgery, shop and primary school. The village also benefits from an hourly bus service as well as a railway station. Bures St Mary has been identified as one of ten "Core Villages" which serves a number of satellite villages including Bures Hamlet in the Babergh Submission Draft Core Strategy. Although no proposals for Bures St Mary are included in this document it states that the growth and development of the village will be planned and co-ordinated with Braintree District Council and others. Housing proposals for the Brantham Regeneration and Core & Hinterland villages are estimated at 2500 for the period to 2031. Details of how this will be divided amongst the villages and the regeneration area at Brantham are not available at this time.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
BUR1 Land rear of Windy Ridge, Colne Road	0.7ha (Agent suggests site could accommodate 38 dwellings at 50 dws per ha.)
BUR2 Colchester Road	1.5ha proposed for residential development.

- **Bures Hamlet - Map 1**

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

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

'Bures Hamlet Parish Council does not support the outline proposals for residential development on either proposed site because our village facilities make development of this scale unsustainable. The primary school is already operating at full capacity and the lack of adequate retail facilities means that all but the basic shopping must take place elsewhere. Also the village surgery would be unable to expand to cope with such a large influx of patients.

We also have long-term concerns over the amount of traffic currently using the B1508 and its speed through our village and we would not want to see this volume increased.

Both sites and in particular “Site 1” would have access safety issues and “Site 2” would have a particularly unwarranted detrimental visual impact on the countryside of the Stour Valley.

A fundamental consideration is however that Bures St Mary already has plans for some developments on its side of the river on more suitable sites and as we exist as one village we need to be considered accordingly.

With reference to identifying Gypsy sites, although we have an established site for two pitches in our village, for which planning permission was granted on appeal, we remain opposed in principle to this development and would certainly not welcome further intrusions into the countryside outside our Village Envelope.’

Note – Several letters have also been received from the public which reiterate the points made by the Council.

- **Bures Hamlet - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

Although neither BUR 1 and 2 has any particular overriding constraints, neither development site would be supported by the Parish Council on the grounds that local infrastructure is insufficient to cope with further development. The area does have some local services, however these are considered to be of a limited scale (and do not include a secondary school), which would be unlikely to support any wide scale growth.

It is proposed to change the extent of the Visually Important Space at Cambridge Way, this is because an area of car parking was included within the original extent which is not correct, as it is not visually important.

- **Officer Recommendations**

-To approve the removal of the area used for car parking from the area designated as Visually Important Space at Cambridge Way, Bures Hamlet.

-To approve Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Map for Bures Hamlet.

Great Bardfield

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently identifies; Protected Lane, Special Landscape Area, Flood Zone, Conservation Area, Village Envelope, Education, Visually Important Space, Formal Recreation, Church/Cemetery.
- Great Bardfield is reasonably well served by facilities, but lacks a doctor's surgery. The area has limited employment opportunities.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
GRB1	Land at Brook Street Great Bardfield. (0.8ha - residential use).

- **Great Bardfield - Map 1**

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

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

GRB1 – the area known as Glebe Meadow should be designated a Special Landscape Area as it forms a significant part of the street scene in the Conservation Area. It is also outside the Village Envelope and should never be considered for development.

Village Envelope – The village envelope should be tightened up to protect other vulnerable areas including Glebe Meadow.

(i) The large plot of land adjacent to GRB1 containing properties known as Songsters and Green Acre be excluded from the envelope to protect this site (which BDC has refused an application on) and the possibility it could be linked to GRB1 at some future time

(ii). The envelope line which runs through the garden of Place House – the subject of a recent contentious planning issue – be brought in to help protect the grounds of this listed grade II* property.

Housing – My Council feel they are being proactive regarding housing needs and working with English Rural Housing, have recently had an application for a small development of affordable housing approved by BDC. They look forward to this meeting the needs identified through consultation.

- **Great Bardfield - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

See **Appendix 1**.

▪ **Officer Comments**

GRB1 – Glebe Meadow is proposed for housing by the landowner. It is situated within the conservation area and is adjacent to the Grade I listed Church, The Village Design Statement for Great Bardfield recognises the importance of Glebe Meadow and that it should continue to be protected from development. Development of the Glebe Meadow would be detrimental to the setting of the listed Church and to the character of the conservation area. Glebe Meadow is protected from development as it is outside the village envelope. The Parish Council refer to its location within the special landscape area. However, as the special landscape area designation has now been replaced by Countryside Character designations, Glebe Meadow cannot be identified as special landscape area in the Site Allocations Plan. It is therefore suggested that this land is designated as a Visually Important Space to further protect it from development.

Village Envelope - The proposed amendment to the boundary to the south west of the village would exclude part of the land to the rear of the listed Place House and the neighbouring dwellings. Planning permission has already been granted for a small infill development for one dwelling on the site adjacent to the road (11/00347/FUL). The Parish Council strongly opposed this planning application. The removal of the land at the rear of Place House and adjoining dwellings should prevent proposals for development in depth in this location.

With regard to the proposed removal of the envelope around Songsters and Green Acre; these dwellings are set back from the road, with a gap between Songsters and the grade II listed Fountain Terrace. The removal of Songsters and Green Acre from the envelope should protect this gap from development and therefore also protect the setting of the listed Fountain Terrace. Trees on this land also contribute to the character of the conservation area.

Other minor adjustments to the village envelope are proposed at Mill Close in order to better reflect the built up area of the village. No development proposals are associated with these changes.

▪ **Officer Recommendations**

To amend the village envelope for Great Bardfield:-

- To exclude Songsters and Green Acre
- To exclude garden land to the rear of Place House and adjoining property.
- To amend the envelope at Mill Close and adjacent to Great Bardfield Primary School, as shown on Great Bardfield Map 2.

To identify the area of land GRB1 as Visually Important Space as shown on Map 2.

To approve Great Bardfield Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Plan.

Great Saling

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently identifies the following. Village Envelope, Visually Important Space, Special Landscape Areas, Conservation Area, Historic Parks & Gardens.
- Great Saling has very limited services as it only has a village hall and a public house.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
GRS1	Boxted Wood - Not shown on map as this site would be a strategic development for a new eco town and not a suitable site for the Allocations DPD.
GRS2	Land adj to Oak View (Blake End). Residential development (1.5 ha)

- **Great Saling - Map 1, Blake End – Map 2.**

These maps were sent to the Parish Council for comment, they include the existing Local Plan Review village envelopes, representations so far from landowners/developers and questions about allocations.

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

The Parish Council do not support the site proposed site GRS2 as shown on Map 2, which is located adjacent to Oak View at Blake End. The Parish Council does not think that Blake End needs a development boundary at the present time. The Parish Council suggests the industrial site at New Pasture Lane (Marked on Map 1 as GRS PC1) should be developed as a housing site.

The Parish Council would support an extension to the conservation area to include both sides of the avenue as you enter Great Saling from Blake End, and to extend the area to include the village hall and car park and round Piggotts Lane past the pond on the corner opposite Orchard House.

The Parish Council are also concerned about the flood plans on the maps.

- **Great Saling - Map 3 – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:**

- **Officer Comments**

Blake End is not suitable for any development due to a lack of local services (apart from a frequent bus service). Any development would be limited by the identified flood risk in the area. If development were to be sought at this location a development boundary would have to be identified, which the Parish Council do not support at this time. As no sites are being recommended for allocation, a boundary would not be necessary at this time.

The Piggotts Lane site suggested by the Parish Council is in active employment use by Silverton Aggregates who specialise in sand, gravel, topsoil products for both the commercial and domestic markets. The site has a lawful development certificate, however there is an outstanding enforcement issue regarding retail sales from this site. The whole site is approximately 3 ha in size, however the parish council have indicated an area of 0.8ha for residential use. If the smaller area was developed for residential use then the remainder of the site could still be used as per its permitted use. If the whole site were to be developed for residential use it could accommodate up to 90 dwellings assuming a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. If the 0.8ha part was developed then it could accommodate approximately 24 units.

Development in this location would comprise of a stand alone housing development, which would not be related to the main village of Great Saling 150m away. It would also be adjacent to an existing aggregates operation making it unsuitable for a residential use. (Other adjoining land has a lawful use for commercial warehousing and storage which could also negatively impact upon any adjacent residential uses.) The site would have an impact on the adjacent conservation area and the registered park and garden at Saling Grove as well as the grade II listed lodge and gates. The site has not been submitted by the landowner for development, so there is a question of whether or not the site could be deliverable. It is recommended that Piggotts Lane should not be allocated for residential use.

In terms of the Parish Council comments on the Conservation Area and Flood Zone. The Conservation Area can not be changed as part of the Allocations DPD process. The relevant piece of legislation which would allow a change is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This can happen independently to the LDF process. The extent of the Flood Zone is determined by the Environment Agency. The current extent of Conservation Areas and Flood Maps will be shown on the proposals inset maps in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 12.

- **Officer Recommendations**

To approve Map 3 as the draft Allocations Development Plan Document Inset map for Great Saling.

Shalford and Church End

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently identifies the following; Special Landscape Area, Village Envelope, Visually Important Space, Protected Lane.
- Shalford and Church End have limited services and relatively poor public transport links. Available services include a primary school, village shop and a sports field.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
SHA1	Land between Old Fox Cottage and Little Gables, Church End Shalford – Proposed residential, (0.14ha).
SHA2	Land at The Penthouse, Shalford – Proposed residential development, (0.65ha).
SHA3A	Levelly Church End – Residential development, (2.44ha).
SHA3B	Levelly Church End – Landscaping Associated with residential development at SHA3A.
SHA4	Land south of Sandy Lodge, Church End. Development type not stated, (0.56ha).
SHA5	Field south of “land south of Sandy Lodge (SHA4), Church End, (1.42ha).
SHA6	Grubbs Cottage, Church End, land for inclusion within Village Envelope, (0.16ha).

- **Shalford and Shalford (Church End) - Map 1 and Map 2**

These maps were sent to the Parish Council for comment and included the existing Local Plan Review village envelopes, representations so far from landowners/developers and questions about allocations.

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

Shalford Parish Council as part of their response outlined a history of the village including recent developments. It also highlight concerns regarding local service provision, infrequent public transport and traffic congestion, speeding, indiscriminate parking and absence of footpaths.

Specific site comments area as follows;

SHA1 – This could be sympathetically developed in keeping with the nature of the neighbouring properties. The Parish Council would not object to inclusion in the village envelope.

SHA2, – SHA2 is currently used as a paddock which lines the approach to the historic village church of St Andrews. Development of this land would detract from the appearance of the church and its surroundings and we believe that its significance is such that we recommend that the area is classified as a “Visually Important Space”. The Parish Council would strongly oppose inclusion in the village envelope.

SHA3A, SHA3B SHA4 and SHA5 – Development of any of all parts of these parcels of land would significantly alter and detract from the rural nature of the Parish of Shalford and as such the Parish Council would strongly object to their inclusion in any development allocation.

SHA6 – this is a copse behind Grubbs Cottage which is subject to a number of TPO’s and a woodland management scheme, the Parish Council see no value in including it in the village envelope.

Stondonfield –The Parish Council would like to include Stondonfield into the village envelope as marked on the plan. (Officer note – This is a recently constructed rural exception site on Braintree Road currently adjacent to the existing village envelope).

The Parish Council provided a break down of recent housing completions and approvals in the Parish which they feel contributes more than fairly to the Braintree development target. These figures indicate a 5% increase in the number of dwellings in the parish. The Parish Council recognises that some future residential development may be required within Shalford, but believes that this should be small developments of one or two properties. Only SHA1 fulfils this criteria.

The Parish Council go on to state that they are very proud of its open spaces and green fields. Any development of green field sites will continue to be resisted by the Parish Council.

Recreation and Village Green – The Parish Council would support the proposals to identify the highlighted areas as “for recreation” and “village green”.

Traveller Sites – The Parish Council cannot identify any locations that would be suitable for Traveller sites.

- **Shalford - Map 3** – Agreed with Parish Council

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Shalford (Church End) Map 4** – Agreed with Parish Council

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

SHA1 – The site is adjacent to a grade II listed building, (on the north-east boundary) and there is an existing access to the field. The site would have a development potential for about 4/5 units. The site is supported, as it is a small site which provides for modest growth in keeping with the relatively few facilities provided in the village. It also has the support of the Parish Council.

SHA2 – Agree that SHA2 should be identified as visually important space because of its importance to the setting of the adjacent church.

SHA3A, SHA3B, SHA4, SHA5, – Agree with Parish Council that these should not be allocated. Wide scale development in Shalford would be inappropriate at this time as Shalford is not a key service village.

SHA6 – This site was submitted with no further details other than the principle of moving the development boundary. The existing village envelope currently reflects the built area of the village and if it were moved any resultant housing development would be inappropriate backland development. The rear part of the site is also protected by a group TPO and the building to the front is grade II listed.

Stondonfield – Agree with Parish Council that the village envelope should be altered to cover the built extent of the village.

Recreation and Village Green – Both sites are in existing use for formal recreation and informal recreation which should be identified on the Inset Map.

- **Officer Recommendations**

To identify Visually Important Space on land adjacent to St Andrew's Church as shown on Map 3;

To identify recreation land for formal recreation (Existing recreation area and Hall) and informal recreation at the junction of Braintree Road and Church End as shown on Map 4;

To extend the development boundary to include Stondonfield as shown on Map 4;

To extend the development boundary to include SHA1; Land between Old Fox Cottage and Little Gables, Church End.

To approve Map 3 and 4 as the Draft Allocations Inset Maps for Shalford and Shalford (Church End).

Stisted

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently identifies the following. Village Envelope, Special Landscape Areas, Education, Conservation Area.
- Stisted has limited services as it only has a village hall and a public house.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
ST11	Land fronting Rectory Lane (south of Stisted Lodge), Stisted, proposed for residential use – Braintree Golf Club (0.28ha).

- **Stisted - Map 1**

These maps were sent to the Parish Council for comment, they include the existing Local Plan Review village envelopes, representations so far from landowners/developers and questions about allocations.

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**

Support for controlled further development in the village, with unanimous support for Site STI 1.

Support for allocation of other areas- i.e. recreation uses/allotments/other community uses.

- **Stisted - Map 2** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:

See **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

ST11 is to the north of the village off Rectory Road, adjacent to Stisted Lodge and the golf course. It is estimated that the site could accommodate between 5 and 7 dwellings.

A planning appeal for two residential dwellings was dismissed on this site in 1980 (Application number - BTE/1536/80, Appeal reference T/APP/5210/A/81/05094/G9), The Planning Inspector concluded:-
'In my opinion, it would extend development undesirably in ribbon form away from Stisted village along the western side of Rectory Road, forming an undesirable intrusion into attractive open country. In my opinion, it would not

form 'filling in' in the sense of filling in a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage. I consider that the dwelling (renovated cottages) on the south side of the appeal site forms a suitable terminating feature at present to village development. I recognise that to the north of the site there is an existing dwelling..... but this is well-established from a time when protection of the countryside was not so strictly controlled. I recognise also that further to the north there is the former Rectory, an old established large house set well back behind woodland, and there are other scattered dwellings in the area. I note that the appeal site is shown as outside the village envelope and is within a Nature Conservation Zone and Special Landscape Area. In my opinion, the grassland and tree-planted site in front of the golf course and wooded background form an attractive piece of open country and is of visual amenity value to the general public in their enjoyment of the beauty of the countryside. In my view, the retention of the site in its present open character and appearance merits strong support. It was established at the inquiry that it would be possible to construct a new vehicular access with appropriate visibility in both directions at a point towards the northern end of the site frontage. Rectory Road, a Class III road, has a narrow carriageway without footways, however, I would not have ruled out the proposal on highway grounds alone...'

The Council is currently reconsidering the village envelope boundary and there are no longer any special landscape areas or nature conservation zones. However, the open character and attractive appearance of the site is still relevant. Officers are therefore reluctant to recommend that this site should be included within the village envelope, despite the unanimous support of the Parish Council.

Currently Stisted has no visually important space identified on its inset map, however several amenity green space areas are identified in the Council's Open Spaces Strategy. It is proposed to include these as Visually Important Space on the inset map in order to better protect them from inappropriate development. It is also proposed to identify the Church Yard/Cemetery at All Saints Church as we have done with other village church yards.

In line with the Parish Council's view it is proposed to identify the current allotments site to the north of the village and the formal recreation area to the rear of the Onley Arms, The Street as shown on Map 2.

▪ **Officer Recommendations**

To identify Visually Important Space at the junction of Rectory Road and Kings Lane.

To identify Visually Important Space adjacent to 10 Brickwall Farm.

To identify Visually Important Space at Sarcel.

To identify Visually Important Space adj to All Saint's Church/Columbia House.

To identify All Saint's Church as Churchyard/Cemetery.

To identify the existing Allotment Garden adjacent to Little Oaks Rectory Road as Allotments.

To identify the existing recreation area to the rear of the Onley Arms as Formal Recreation.

To approve Map 2 as the Draft Site Allocations Inset Map for Stisted.

Wethersfield

- **Core Strategy Proposals-** Non Key Service Village
- **Background:** The inset map of the Local Plan Review currently identifies the following: Special Landscape Area, Conservation Area, Cemetery/Churchyard/Visually Important Space, Village Envelope, Protected Lane, Flood Zone.
- Wethersfield and Blackmore End have a limited level of services including a doctor's surgery and primary school, post office and public halls.
- **Representations for sites put forward by landowners/developers:**

Sites	Details
WET1	Land between West Drive and Braintree Road. Residential development 1.35ha.
WET2	Land between playing field and Parsonage Farm, High Street. Residential 0.96ha.
WET3	Land at Owls Hall, Blackmore End. Residential development 0.49ha.
WET4	Land near Russells Farm, adjacent to Silver Street. Residential 0.24ha.
WET5	Land at Silver Street. Residential development 0.34ha.

- **Wethersfield - Map 1, Blackmore End – Map 2.**

These maps were sent to the Parish Council for comment, they include the existing Local Plan Review village envelopes, representations so far from landowners/developers and questions about allocations.

Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Parish Council Views:**
 1. The Parish Council would not want development in Wethersfield.
 2. None of the proposed sites would be supported.
 3. The Parish Council have no alternative sites for development.
 4. Wethersfield and Blackmore End each have a playing field as a defined recreation area.
 5. Blackmore End would be grateful for a defined development boundary/village envelope.
 6. Regarding Gypsy and traveller pitches, the Parish Council would not wish to nominate any small sites for such use.
- **Wethersfield - Map 3 and Blackmore End - Map 4.** – proposed Draft Site Allocations Inset:
Please see **Appendix 1**.

- **Officer Comments**

Sites WET1 and WET2 would be large scale greenfield site allocations, which are not suitable for a smaller scale village with more limited services than the Key Service Villages or towns. The level of service provision in Blackmore End is even more limited than it is in Wethersfield (for example the only public transport available is a Wednesday bus service which would not provide a viable alternative to private motor vehicle use), as such WET3 is not supported for allocation. WET4 and 5 are of a smaller scale, however development at this location would not be a natural rounding of off the existing village. The site is also not supported as it slopes and is located on a road bend.

The Parish Council have requested that a village envelope should be designated for Blackmore End. A suggested boundary is shown on Map 4. As this is an unsustainable location for anything other than minor infilling, the development boundary has been drawn tightly around the existing defined built area of the village. It is likely that some infill sites may come forward as a result, however these would be of a relatively minor nature and probably no more than single dwellings. It is also prudent to identify several areas of Visually Important Space, Cemetery/Churchyard and an area of formal recreation as shown on Map 4.

The existing recreation area in Wethersfield to the south of the High Street on the eastern side of the village is proposed to be shown on the Inset map as formal recreation as shown on Map 3.

- **Officer Recommendations**

To approve the definition of a village envelope for Blackmore End as set out on Map 4.

To approve Map 3 and Map 4 as the draft Allocations DPD Inset maps for Wethersfield and Blackmore End