

**Braintree District Council Site Allocations and Development  
Management Policies Development Plan Document**

**Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment**

**Environmental Report: Addendum – Note on Site Allocation  
Appraisals**

**February 2013**



## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background .....	1
1.2	The SA/SEA Environment Report accompanying the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan .....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Clarification of Impacts in Site Proforma</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1	Clarification of Sustainability Objective 5 – Criterion: ‘Loss of high quality agricultural land’2	
<b>3</b>	<b>Changes of Impacts / Site Information</b> .....	<b>3</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1: Changes of Impacts / Site Information .....	3
--	---



## **1 Introduction**

### **1.1 Background**

Braintree District Council commissioned Place Services (formerly part of Essex County Council's Braintree District Council commissioned the Strategic Environmental Assessment Team of Essex County Council to undertake an independent Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan forming part of their Local Development Framework (LDF).

This document is an Addendum to the Environmental Report concerning the site appraisals contained within 'Annex D – Appraisal of Site Allocations' and the 'Addendum to Annex D – Appraisal of Further Site Allocations'.

### **1.2 The SA/SEA Environment Report accompanying the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan**

Since the publication of the SA/SEA Environmental Report of the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, further information to accompany sites has become available. In addition to this, a number of impacts associated with sites in the original Environmental Report (and Annexes) have required clarification.

## **2 Clarification of Impacts in Site Proforma**

The Site Proforma that was included within the SA/SEA Environmental Report ‘Annex D – Appraisal of Site Allocations’ and the ‘Addendum to Annex D – Appraisal of Further Site Allocations’ detailed the criteria used to assess the sustainability of the Site Allocations within the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, as well as a description of those factors that merit certain impacts.

It is acknowledged that within the SA/SEA Site Proforma, clarification is needed to explain some of the factors that determine certain impacts. These are outlined below in the following sub-paragraphs. Please refer to the information in this Addendum Note when considering the information outlined in the SA/SEA of Site Allocations detailed in ‘Annex D – Appraisal of Site Allocations’ and the ‘Addendum to Annex D – Appraisal of Further Site Allocations.’

### **2.1 Clarification of Sustainability Objective 5 – Criterion: ‘Loss of high quality agricultural land’**

Sustainability Objective 5 (To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth) looked at the ‘Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1 & 2)’ when appraising Site Allocations.

It is worth clarifying that impacts in the SA/SEA were determined by the Agricultural Land Classification of sites, which detail the best and most versatile soil, and were not highlighting land that is being used for agricultural purposes.

Negative impacts associated with this criterion are therefore not necessarily representative of a loss of land being used for agriculture, but are highlighting a loss of versatile soil under the Agricultural Land Classification.

### 3 Changes of Impacts / Site Information

A number of the impacts highlighted in the SA/SEA of the Site Allocations (within ‘Annex D – Appraisal of Site Allocations’ and ‘Addendum to Annex D – Appraisal of Further Site Allocations’) have changed. This is due to errors in the information used to appraise the sites previously, which have since been identified and rectified.

In addition to this, some typographical errors have also been identified regarding the referencing of sites and their proposed land uses.

The following table details these changes. Please note that these revised impacts, references and site information details replace those in the SA/SEA Environmental Report Annex D – Appraisal of Site Allocations, and the SA/SEA Environmental Report Addendum to Annex D – Appraisal of Further Site Allocations for the sites in the following table. Those changes to impacts highlighted below will be integrated into the Submission version SA/SEA Environmental Report for all relevant Site Allocations and Alternatives.

**Table 1: Changes of Impacts / Site Information**

Village	Site Reference - Issue	Change
Belchamp Otten	BLO4 - Conservation Area impact	BLO4 should have a negative (-) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10.
Castle Hedingham	CAS3 - Flood zone impact	CAS3 should have an uncertain (/) impact on the Flood Risk criterion in Sustainability Objective 13 as per the site proforma (numerous zones).
Coggeshall	COG10 – (Paragraph 2.11.2) title and reference incorrect	COG10 should not be referenced as ‘Colne Valley Railway, Castle Hedingham’ but ‘Cricket Ground, land south of West Street, Coggeshall.’
	COG18 – (Paragraph 2.11.10) title and reference incorrect	COG18 should not be referenced as ‘Colne Valley Railway, Castle Hedingham’ but ‘69 and 71 East Street.’
Cressing	CRE15 / CRE13 / CRE4A / CRE4B/ CRE5 / CRE6 – do not appear in plan	The SA/SEA site appraisals for CRE 15, CRE 13, CRE 4A, CRE 4B, CRE 5 and CRE 6 should be disregarded as allocations or alternatives.
Earls Colne	EAR10 - Conservation Area impact	EAR10 should have a negative (-) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	EAR14 - Flood Zone impact	EAR14 will have an uncertain (/) impact on the Flood Zone criterion in Objective 13 as per

		site proforma (numerous zones)
	EAR1(N) - Conservation Area impact	EAR1(N) should have a negative (-) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	EAR1(S) and EAR1(N) - Accessible Natural Greenspace impacts	EAR1(S) and EAR1(N) should both have negative impacts (-) on the Accessible Natural Greenspace criterion in Sustainability Objective 3.
	EAR20 - Designations / Conservation Area impact.	EAR20 should have No Impact (0) on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	EAR4 - Conservation Area impact	EAR4 should have a negative (-) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	EAR5E/13E - Designations / Conservation Area impact.	EAR5E/13E should have No Impact (0) on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	EAR9A/BE - Designations / Conservation Area impact.	EAR9A/BE should have No Impact (0) on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
Fuller Street	Paragraph 2.15.1 - FAI2 should be FAI1	The SA/SEA site appraisal of 'FAI2', should be read as 'FAI1' as referenced in the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan
Feering	FEE10 - residential scheme (40 dwellings) and not mixed use.	FEE10 (appraised for 40 dwellings) will have the same impacts as appraised previously, however should have a Significantly Positive (++) impact on the Affordable Housing criterion in Sustainability Objective 2, a Negative (-) impact on the Primary School Capacity criterion in Sustainability Objective 9, and a Positive (+) impact on the Secondary School Capacity criterion in Sustainability Objective 9.
	FEE3 - Flood Zone impact	FEE3 will have an uncertain (/)



		impact on the Flood Zone criterion in Sustainability Objective 13 as per the site proforma (numerous zones)
	FEE5 - Flood Zone impact	FEE5 will have an uncertain (/) impact on the Flood Zone criterion in Sustainability Objective 13 as per site proforma (numerous zones)
	FEE7 - does not appear in plan	The SA/SEA site appraisal for FEE7 should be disregarded as an allocation or alternative.
Great Yeldham	GRY3 - Conservation Area impact	GRY3 should have a Negative (-) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
Hatfield Peverel	HAT8 - does not appear in plan	The SA/SEA site appraisal for HAT8 should be disregarded as an allocation or alternative.
Lamarsh	LAM1 - Flood Zone impact	LAM1 will have an uncertain (/) impact on the Flood Zone criterion in Sustainability Objective 13 as per site proforma (numerous zones)
Rayne	RAY2 and RAY7 - do not appear in the plan	The SA/SEA site appraisals for RAY2 and RAY7 should be disregarded as allocations or alternatives.
Rivenhall	RIV2 and RIV6 - do not appear in the plan	The SA/SEA site appraisals for RIV2 and RIV6 should be disregarded as allocations or alternatives.
Shalford	SHA3 - does not appear in the plan	The SA/SEA site appraisal for SHA3 should be disregarded as an allocation or alternative.
Sible Hedingham	SIB2H - Flood Zone impact	SIB2H should have an uncertain (/) impact on the Flood Zone criterion in Sustainability Objective 13 as per site proforma (numerous zones)
	SIB2E - Flood Zone impact	SIB2E should have an uncertain (/) impact on the Flood Zone criterion in Sustainability Objective 13 as

		per site proforma (numerous zones)
Silver End	SIL8 - does not appear in the plan	The SA/SEA site appraisal for SIL8 should be disregarded as an allocation or alternative.
Witham	WCH8 - does not appear in the plan	The SA/SEA site appraisal for WCH8 should be disregarded as an allocation or alternative.
	WCH16 - Conservation Area impact.	WCH16 should have a Negative (-) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	WIN9 - Designation impact.	WIN9 should have a Negative (-) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	WIS2 - Open Space impact	WIS2 should have a Positive (+) impact on the Open Space criterion in Sustainability Objective 3
	WIS9 - Open Space impact	WIS9 should have a Positive (+) impact on the Open Space criterion in Sustainability Objective 3
	WIW1 - Affordable Housing impact	WIW1 should have been appraised to reflect a yield of 40 dwellings. There should be a Significantly Positive (++) impact on the Affordable Housing criterion in Sustainability Objective 2
Braintree	BON8 - Conservation Area impact	BON8 should have No Impact (0) on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	BRC80 - Designation / Conservation Area impact	BRC80 should have No Impact (0) on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
	BRE2 - Visually Important Space impact	BRE2 should have No Impact (0) on the Visually Important Space criterion in Sustainability Objective 15 where VIS is included as part of the proposal
	BRS26 - Conservation Area impact	BRS26 should have No Impact (0) on the Conservation Area

		<p>criterion in Sustainability Objective 10</p>
	<p>BON13 - assessed in Core Strategy</p>	<p>The SA/SEA site appraisal for BON13 should be disregarded.</p>
	<p>BON15 - Proposed for recreation uses and not housing</p>	<p>BON15 should be for recreational uses and not housing. Impacts remain as stated except the Recreation criterion in Sustainability Objective 3 should see a positive (+) impact; the Primary School Capacity criterion in Sustainability Objective 9 should see No Impact (0); and the Secondary School Capacity criterion in Sustainability Objective 9 should also see No Impact (0).</p>
	<p>BOS4 - has been assessed twice</p>	<p>The BOS4 site appraisal in Annex D should be discounted in favour of the appraisal of BOS4 in the Addendum to Annex D.</p>
	<p>BOS6 - assessed in Core Strategy</p>	<p>The SA/SEA site appraisal for BON6 should be disregarded</p>
	<p>GRN1 - assessed in Core Strategy</p>	<p>The SA/SEA site appraisal for GRN1 should be disregarded.</p>
Halstead	<p>HAS13 - Flood Zone impact.</p>	<p>HAS13 should have a Negative (-) impact on the Flood Zone criterion in Sustainability Objective 13</p>
	<p>HAS26 - Retail impact / Open Space impact / Conservation Area impact.</p>	<p>HAS26 should have a Positive (+) impact on the Retail criterion in Sustainability Objective 4. There should be a Positive (+) impact on the Open Space criterion in Sustainability Objective 3. There should also be a Significantly Negative (--) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10</p>
	<p>HAS9 - Flood Zone impact.</p>	<p>HAS9 should have a negative (-) impact on the Flood Zone criterion in Sustainability Objective 13</p>
	<p>HAS1 - appears in plan as a</p>	<p>The SA/SEA site appraisal for</p>

	cycleway allocation	HAS1 should be disregarded as an allocation or alternative
	HAS11 – Recreation impact	HAS11 should have a Positive (+) impact on the Recreation criterion in Sustainability Objective 3
	HTR4 - Conservation Area impact.	HTR4 should have No Impact (0) on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
Ridgewell	RID1 - Conservation Area impact	RID1 should have a Significantly Negative (--) impact on the Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10
Gosfield	GOG3 – Designations / Conservation Area impact	GOG3 should have No Impact (0) on the Designations / Conservation Area criterion in Sustainability Objective 10



This information is issued by  
**Place Services Team at Essex County Council**  
You can contact us in the following ways:

Visit our website:  
**essex.gov.uk**

By telephone:  
**08456 430 430**

By post:  
**Place Services, Essex County Council**  
**PO Box 11, County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH**

Read our online magazine at **essex.gov.uk/ew**

Follow us on  **Essex\_CC**

Find us on  **facebook.com/essexcountycouncil**

The information in this document can be translated, and/  
or made available in alternative formats, on request.

Published February 2013