Andrew Martin Planning



BRAINTREE DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN SECTION 2 EXAMINATION

HEARING STATEMENT

by

Andrew Martin MAUD DipTP(Distinction) FRICS FRTPI

On behalf of

The Great Notley East Consortium

Main Matter 6
A Prosperous District – Homes – Strategic Growth Locations 1
Policy LPP 18 – Land East of Great Notley

June 2021 | AM-P Ref: 17023



CONTENTS

		PAGE
1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Policy LPP 18 Strategic Growth Location – Land East of Great Notley, south of Braintree.	2

Appendix: Illustrative Concept Layout Plan



Hearing Statement – Main Matter 6 A Prosperous District – Homes Strategic Growth Locations 1 on behalf of The Great Notley East Consortium

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Background

- 1.1 The Land East of Great Notley, south of Braintree Strategic Growth Location (SGL) is identified for residential-led development in Policy LPP 18 of the emerging Braintree Local Plan (2013-2033) Section 2.
- 1.2 The Great Notley East Consortium (The Consortium) controls 84ha of the 114ha Strategic Growth Location and is currently preparing an outline planning application for residential-led development.
- 1.3 Members of The Consortium have actively participated in the preparation of the Braintree Local Plan for a number of years. Representations were submitted in July 2017 to the Publication Draft Local Plan Section 2 relating to several policies that related to the site.
- 1.4 The Consortium has agreed a Statement of Common Ground with Braintree District Council. The Introduction to that Statement provides further detail of the various representations summitted to the Council at the Regulation 19 Publication Draft Local Plan stage by both Bellway Homes and the Braintree South Alliance prior to the establishment of the current Consortium.
- 1.5 The Consortium has reached agreement with the Council on all matters of objection except in relation to: Policy LPP 2 Location of Employment Land; Policy LPP 18 Strategic Location, Land East of Great Notley; and Policy LPP 77 Renewable Energy Within New Developments. These outstanding Areas of Disagreement are the subject of responses to the Inspector's Questions in respect of a separate Hearing Statement for Main Matter 3, Main Matter 6 and Main Matter 14. A Hearing Statement in relation to the latter has been prepared by White Peak Planning.





2.0 POLICY LPP 18 STRATEGIC GROWTH LOCATION – LAND EAST OF GREAT NOTLEY, SOUTH OF BRAINTREE

Question 1 – Are the above policies and site allocations justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, including the meeting the requirements of the BLP SECTION 1?

- 2.1 The Consortium considers that Policy LPP 18 site allocation for Land East of Great Notley, south of Braintree to be generally justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context, including meeting the requirements of BLP. This is reinforced by The Consortium working in close collaboration with the Council, having agreed a Planning Performance Agreement and a Statement of Common Ground. The points of agreement within the latter will necessitate some changes to Policy LPP 18 or preamble, as explained in the Statement.
- 2.2 However, as also referred to in the Statement of Common Ground under the heading 'Areas of Disagreement', there are two outstanding points within the policy which the Consortium do not consider to be justified. These relate to the:
 - 1) The provision of employment uses, and
 - 2) The wording relating to access to the site from Bakers Lane being restricted to 'additional minor vehicle access from Bakers Lane only if it is an essential requirement of the development.'
- 2.3 With regard to the first point, The Consortium has no objection to the actual wording in the third bullet of the Policy that states 'Appropriate employment user to support a major new community' but they object to the stated provision being 'up to 3ha employment policy area' as set out in Policy LPP 2(e). This is subject to a detailed response to the Inspectors' MIQs in a separate Hearing Statement for Main Matter 3.
- 2.4 The second point relating to the requirement for minor access from Bakers Lane only if it is an essential requirement is considered to be unjustified until the outcome of detailed traffic modelling and transport studies is known and proves that it is essential. The masterplanning process and transport studies carried out to date demonstrate the need to plan the highway network to serve the development on a phased basis, reflecting the first major phase in the Plan period of 1,750 homes being to the north of Bakers Lane, with the second phase of 250 homes post 2033 to the south.



Hearing Statement – Main Matter 6 A Prosperous District – Homes Strategic Growth Locations 1 on behalf of The Great Notley East Consortium

- 2.5 This also reflects the need to carry out the development in a logical sequence, generally from north to south in order to provide early access from Notley Road and the northern part of London Road. The latter is proposed by closing the A120 west-bound slip road, which has been agreed in principle with Highways England. Furthermore, the landowner to the south of Bakers Lane does not currently propose to deliver this part of the comprehensive development in the short term. Consequently it is not possible to deliver the entire spine road from north to south until this latter phase comes forward. This necessitates an interim solution to connect the first phase of the northern section of the spine road to the south of London Road via appropriate improvements to the western section of Bakers Lane. The policy, as currently drafted, would act as an unjustified constraint to delivery of the first phases of the new community. This would seriously affect delivery of the housing trajectory agreed with the Council.
- 2.6 The Consortium and Council have been working very closely through the PPA process to compile an extensive and robust evidence base to support the preparation of a masterplan framework, design code and parameter plans. This work will inform the preparation of an outline planning application with all matters reserved except access. The Consortium are proposing to submit the application in the Autumn following more detailed work and consultation. A vital part of the evidence base is the comprehensive traffic modelling that is currently being undertaken, which involves inputs from The Consortium's Transportation Consultants WSP, Essex County Highways and Ringway Jacobs. As referred to above, all indications from the modelling work thus far demonstrate that an interim access solution that involves improvements to the western section of Bakers Lane to link with the southern section of London Road, can provide a satisfactory and acceptable highway solution, to serve the proposed development north of Bakers Lane.
- 2.7 The agreed Statement of Common Ground appends a copy of the current 'working' Illustrative Concept Layout Plan for the overall proposed allocation. For ease of reference this is also appended to this Statement to indicate to the Inspectors that masterplanning is at an advanced stage. This will be refined and worked up in greater detail, together with a design code following further Workshops, consultation with and feedback from major stakeholders and the Design South East Panel.
- 2.8 The Consortium are confident that the requirements of Policy LPP 18 can be delivered, but it is also necessary to clarify and resolve the two issues above through the masterplanning process, rather than through a rigid policy requirement that has not been tested or justified through appropriate and robust evidence.



Hearing Statement – Main Matter 6 A Prosperous District – Homes Strategic Growth Locations 1 on behalf of The Great Notley East Consortium

Question 2 – Do the housing land site allocations identified above show how they will contribute to the achievement of the overall housing requirement of the BLP Section 1 (14320 new homes) and its timescale for delivery?

2.9 The Consortium are satisfied that in respect of Great Notley East it will make a major contribution to housing supply and the overall Section 1 housing requirement. A housing trajectory has been agreed with the Council.

Question 3 – Does policy LPP 18 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal in relation to these allocations?

2.10 Yes, other than in respect of the points raised above.

© Andrew Martin - Planning, 2021. Ref: AM/17023/JG



