BRADWELL WITH PATTISWICK PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION FEBRUARY/MARCH 2025

INTRODUCTION

For the review of the Neighbourhood Plan, a questionnaire was delivered to every resident over the age of 3. There was one questionnaire for those aged up to 18 (Annex 1) and one for those aged 18 or over (Annex 2). 500 adult questionnaires and 120 questionnaires for those aged up to 18 were printed. Each household was provided with a stamped addressed envelope in which to return the completed form - 232 envelopes.

99 (43%) households returned questionnaires.

155 people responded to the questionnaires.

The response to the questionnaires was analysed, compared to the response to the questionnaires from 2016 and relevant statistical information was published in a Final Report, which was made available to Councillors and the general public through the Parish Council web-site before the November 2024 Parish Council meeting, where the Neighbourhood Plan was on the agenda.

The Final Report (attached) was published on the Parish Council web-site and highlighted potential action for the Parish Council and partners. National Highways, Essex Highways, Neighbourhood Watch and the police were invited to the December Parish Council meeting to help formulate the Parish Council (and partners) Action Plan. (Feedback at Annex 3)

The Regulation 14 version of the NP was approved at the February 2025 Parish Council meeting, The document had been made available on the Parish Council web-site.

AIM OF THE CONSULTATION

The aim of the consultation was to confirm that we, the NP Steering Group/Parsh Council, had correctly reflected the views of the residents in the revised Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION

Consultation lasted six weeks concluding on Wednesday March 26 2025. The consultation was advertised on the Parish Council notice-boards and Bradwell Facebook. All statutory bodies were contacted at the beginning of the consultation period

The response to the consultation was favourable and is summarised on the spreadsheet. Detailed responses are to be found at Annex 4.

There was one request for changes – following discussion, it was agreed the existing wording was adequate, although minor changes were made – see Annex 5.

Annex 1 – Questionnaire for those aged 3 -18

BRADWELL WITH PATTISWICK PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW

Questionnaire for those under 18 years of age

It is important to share your individual opinion about the village in order to help shape its future

Education (circle one)

Are you… attending school home educated excluded working

Other please give details ……..

Out of School (circle no more than two)

Out of school hours where do you mostly go to spend time with your friends

Stay at home Friend's house Playing Field Outside Village

Other please give details ……

What do you like to do in your spare time (circle all that apply)

Visit friends Have friends round Meet friends locally Watch TV

Play computer games Go to the cinema Bike riding

Cubs/Scouts/Guides/Brownies/Rainbows Football

Sports/Sports training Skateboarding BMX/Dirt jumping

Walk along public footpaths Walk with the family

Attend Church Horse riding Dancing Reading

Listen to music Play a musical instrument

Other (please give details) ……

Playing Fields

I go to the Playing Fields (please circle one answer)

Daily WeeklyOnce a month Never

When I go to the Playing Fields I: (circle all that apply)

Play Football walk the dog play on the swings play on the Springer

Play on the Slide etc have a picnic Play Netball/Basketball

Something else, please say what…..

……..

To visit my friends I: (circle all that apply)

walk cycle catch the bus get a lift take a taxi go by train

Do you belong to any Clubs in: (circle all that apply)

Bradwell Braintree Coggeshall Chelmsford Elsewhere

If "Elsewhere" please state where …….

Village Life

Are you happy with the facilities in Bradwell with Pattiswick? Yes No

Safety

Do any of the following cause you a problem or worry in Bradwell with Pattiswick?

Poor street lighting Litter Dogs and dog mess

Crime Speeding cars None- I feel safe

Improvements

What additional recreational and/or leisure facilities would you like to see?

……..

……..

……..

What changes would you like to see in Bradwell?

……..

……..

……..

Personal

How old are you? …… years

Are you… male female

Where do you live

Bradwell Village Pattiswick Elsewhere in the Parish

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Please return your completed questionnaire in the stamped addressed envelope to:

Tony Dunn
Ballaglass Cottage
Coggeshall Road
Stisted
Braintree
Essex CM77 8AB

Annex 2 – Questionnaire for those aged 18 and over

BRADWELL WITH PATTISWICK PARISH COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Your Parish Council prepared a Neighbourhood Plan, which was adopted in July 2019.

A Neighbourhood Plans empowers local people to take ownership of their own futures by becoming involved in the planning of the future of their Parish / Neighbourhood / Community.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

A Neighbourhood Plan is a document that sets out planning policies for our parish. Planning policies are used to decide whether to approve planning applications. The local community, the people who know and love the area, write this Plan, rather than Braintree District Council's Planning Authority.

A Neighbourhood Plan can be used to make sure local concerns and characteristics are taken into account before any planning decisions are made.

Our Neighbourhood Plan must integrate with and not conflict with local or national planning policy. It must be a blueprint for sustainable development in our parish. It is not a wish list of projects but a planning policy document for future development. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot change the past but it can help to ensure that we learn from it and do not repeat past mistakes.

Why this review?

Braintree District Council have finally published their Local Plan. The District Planners use the latest guidance available, so we need to ensure our Neighbourhood Plan is up-to date.

Why should I complete this questionnaire?

Neighbourhood Plans can only be effective if they have been subject to widespread and effective community involvement – that is, your involvement. Please do complete this questionnaire and return it to us.

If you have an e-mail address and would like the Parish Council to keep you up-to date with developments, please send your e-mail address to clerktobppc@outlook.com

Questionnaire

Housing

Over the past five years the Braintree Planners have increasingly sought the views of the Parish Council. One proposal for nine houses has been reduced to seven including two affordable homes in order to align with the Neighbourhood Plan (2019). Braintree Planners rejected an application for three houses to the South of Coggeshall Road, however, this application was approved by a Planning Inspector. The developer then applied for a further six houses, which Braintree Planners approved. The developer does not have road access to his site. While the Parish Council cannot prevent road access, it has facilitated residents' opposition to the road access.

During the past five years, three houses have been built in Pattiswick and three houses near Bradwell Church through the National Planning Policy Framework (which over-rules the Neighbourhood Plan). Two houses in the Street, one in Forge Crescent and one on Church Road were built in line with the Neighbourhood Plan.

In total, ten houses, which represents a 4.5% increase in the housing stock, have been built. Seven more houses have been approved which will be included in the count for the coming five years

– please circle your answer

There is a broad mix of housing

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Some new housing development is required in Bradwell with Pattiswick

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

If you agree, then how many new properties should be built in the next 5 years:

1 -5 per year 6-10 per year 11-15 per year 16-20 per year >20 per year

There are sufficient properties available in the village for local young people to rent or buy

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

The Parish is protected from unsuitable development

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

According to the government, Braintree District requires more housing, if Bradwell and Pattiswick have to accept additional housing, what type of housing should it be (circle two out of three):

Owner occupier Private rented Registered Social Landlord rented

(Circle up to five)

Shared ownership Starter Homes Family homes Executive properties

Flats Apartments Terraced Semi-detached Detached

Retirement homes restricted to over 55s Care Home for the Elderly

Healthcare – please circle your answer

My GP surgery is located in Braintree Coggeshall Elsewhere
Please state where

…….

Getting to the nearest GP surgery is easy

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Getting an appointment with a GP is easy

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

GP services are adequate

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

How could GP services be improved

……

……

I use outpatient services in Braintree Colchester Chelmsford Do not use

Getting to the hospital is easy

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Getting an appointment at the hospital is easy

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Outpatient services are adequate

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

When emergency medical assistance is required, it is available

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

What, if any, additional Healthcare facilities are required

……..

Education – please circle your answer or leave blank if you have no experience

There is sufficient access to quality primary education for young people

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

The education provided by Honywood School is of a high standard

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

The education provided by Alec Hunter Humanities College is of a high standard

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

There is adequate provision for nursery children

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

There is adequate provision for adult education

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

How could access to education be improved?

……

Transport – please circle your answer

I am satisfied with public transport services to and from our village

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Transport to schools is satisfactory

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

I use public bus transport from Bradwell / Pattiswick

Daily WeeklyOccasionally Never

I use rail transport from

Kelvedon Witham Braintree Braintree Freeport Colchester Chelmsford

Daily WeeklyOccasionally Never

Public transport could be improved by…

Pavements and Lighting

Pavements on the A120 are adequate

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Pavements in Bradwell Village are adequate

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Street lighting on the A120 is adequate

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Street lighting in Bradwell Village is adequate

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Please indicate areas where pavements or lighting should be improved

……..

Community – *please circle your answer*

Bradwell with Pattiswick has a good sense of community

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Bradwell with Pattiswick has adequate recycling facilities

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

The Parish Magazine should be issued free to all households

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

I would be willing to help with the production of the Parish Magazine

Yes No

Would you be prepared to help in an emergency Yes No

If you answered Yes to either of the above questions, please provide your contact details (name, address, e-mail, telephone number) to clerktobppc@outlook.com

What additional Community facilities would you like to see?

Recreation and Leisure – *please circle your answer*

Bradwell with Pattiswick is well supplied with leisure facilities

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Bradwell with Pattiswick has sufficient open spaces

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

There are adequate well-signed public footpaths

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Peoples recreational needs are adequately met

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Young peoples recreational needs are adequately met

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

What additional recreational and/or leisure facilities would you like to see?

……..

Village Hall

I attend events at the Village Hall (circle one)

Fortnightly Monthly Occasionally Never

My favourite events at the Village Hall are:

……..

What events could the Management Team provide to engage you and your family

……..

I would be willing to help with Village Hall activities Yes No

If you answered Yes to the above question, please provide your contact details (name, address, e-mail, telephone number) to clerktobppc@outlook.com

Church

How important is to you to keep Holy Trinity Bradwell open?

Very Somewhat Neutral Not at all

QAre you interested to find out more about the Christian Faith?

Very Somewhat Neutral Not at all

How often are you likely to attend a services at Holy Trinity Bradwell, if weekly services were available?

1-2 per year Monthly Weekly

Are you personally interested in supporting Holy Trinity Bradwell? (tick as many as apply)

by attendance by giving by volunteering

Law and Order

Police presence is sufficient

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Police respond in a timely way to needs in Bradwell with Pattiswick

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Bradwell with Pattiswick is a safe place to raise a family

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

There should be a Neighbourhood Watch in the Village

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Communications

My Internet speed averages ……Mb/s down

Internet speeds are adequate (circle one)

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

If you were able to get a faster internet connection would you apply for it

Yes No

I access the Parish Council web-site (circle one)

Daily Weekly Monthly Rarely Never

I use (circle all that apply)

Internet Facebook Twitter Streetlife Bradwell Facebook

Employment

There are plenty of employment opportunities within easy reach of Bradwell

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

More employment opportunities are required in Bradwell with Pattiswick parish

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

If you agree, what sort of employment opportunities are required

……..……

.....
.....

Environment

The footpaths are kept clean

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

The roads are kept clean

Agree strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree strongly

Vision

Please describe THREE changes you would welcome in Bradwell with Pattiswick

……..

……..

……..

Please describe THREE changes you would resist in Bradwell with Pattiswick and explain why you would resist these changes

……..

……..

……..

……..

……..

Demographics – please circle your answer

How old are you? 11-20 21-30 31-40 41-50 51-60 61-70 71-80 over 80

Are you male or female? M F

Are you a student, employed, self-employed, retired other
Please specify

……..

Do you live in:

Bradwell Village Pattiswick Elsewhere in the Parish

If you are employed or self-employed, where do you work:

Bradwell, Braintree London Witham Chelmsford Elsewhere

Do you have an e-mail address Yes No

Thank you for completing this Questionnaire
Please return the completed questionnaire in the stamped addressed envelope
to: Tony Dunn, Ballaglass Cottage, Coggeshall Road, Stisted, Braintree, Essex CM77 8AB

Annex 3 - Feedback on the Final Report and penultimate draft

MSE public consultation <NHSConsultation+noreply@wearestand.co.uk>
Thank you for your email. Our involvement with this consultation has ended. Please direct your correspondence to NHS Mid and South Essex ICB at mseics.getinvolved@nhs.net

GETINVOLVED, Mseics (NHS MID AND SOUTH ESSEX ICB - 99E)
Hi Tony
Thank you very for sharing the feedback report with us.
I have forwarded this to our Mid Essex Alliance leads (who cover the Bradwell and Pattiswick Parish Council area). I am sure they will find this feedback very useful.
We appreciate you taking the time to share this with us.
Many thanks
The Mid and South Essex ICB Engagement Team

Alan Massow MRTPI
Principal Planning Policy Officer
Braintree District Council | Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree, CM7 9HB

Hello Tony,
I have had a read through the document and am relatively content as most changes seem to be factual updates.
Presumably, DAC are happy to update the policy numbers at various sections of the plan if necessary as well as the Local Plan background? If not happy to do both for you.

I would offer the following comments;

- 2.8 – Missing full stop at end of sentence.
- General point on maps the license would need to be updated. These look like our maps so I can ask Carolyn to look at it.
- Policy 7 a)I – I would question the assertion about space as you can have development involving demolition of existing buildings.
- Policy 10 – Desing – Criteria 7 – The additions to this criterion could be covered in the pre-amble rather than the policy as examples of what could be provided. This may be worth doing as if you have minimal changes to the document we may not have to go through a referendum on the document again (Up to you but it's worth flagging up). David Coleman should be familiar with the differences between minor (non material changes) and material modifications which do and do not change the nature of the plan so should be able to advise).
- Policy 10 – Design – Criteria 9 - would be difficult to require from a planning application. Perhaps another one for pre-amble text which could be a suggestion of what open space could be provided as part of a development.

Hope that helps.

Alan

Annex 4 – Detailed responses to the consultation

The Coal Authority

Heads of Planning Policy
Non Coalfield Local Planning Authorities in England
FAO – Lead on Neighbourhood Planning

20 March 2015 Dear Sir/Madam

Consultation with The Coal Authority in the non-coalfield areas of England on Neighbourhood Development Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders & Community Right to Build Orders

Neighbourhood Development Plans

As you will be aware The Coal Authority is a prescribed consultation body in Schedule 1 1(c) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 in relation to Neighbourhood Development Plans (under Regulations 14 and 16).

You will obviously understand that the interest of The Coal Authority lies within the defined UK coalfield, which covers a substantial part of England, but does not include your LPA area.

We are mindful of the consultation requirements on designated Neighbourhood Forums or Town and Parish Councils who produce Neighbourhood Development Plans. There is also a further consultation requirement on LPAs. In the non-coalfield areas of England, our response to consultations received under Regulations 14 and 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 is one of 'No Comment'.

We would like to make the consultation process easier for all parties involved in Neighbourhood Planning. As such I attach a declaration of a deemed consultation response to be used by your LPA and any relevant Neighbourhood Forums or Town and Parish Councils who produce Neighbourhood Development Plans.

Protecting the public and the environment in coal mining areas

I therefore confirm that there is no obligation for you or any relevant Neighbourhood Forums or Town and Parish Councils to consult us on any stages of the production of Neighbourhood Development Plans within your LPA area.

The attached declaration of a deemed consultation response is to be used in demonstrating to both the LPA and the Independent Examiner that the Neighbourhood Development Plan has been consulted on as required by the 2012 Regulations.

From 1 April 2015 we will no longer provide a bespoke response to consultations on Neighbourhood Development Plans in the non-coalfield parts of England.

Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders

As you will be aware The Coal Authority is a prescribed consultation body in Schedule 1 2(d) (b) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 in relation to Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders made pursuant to Regulations 21 and 23 of the Regulations.

As highlighted above the interest of The Coal Authority lies within the defined UK coalfield, which covers a substantial part of England, but does not include your LPA area.

The Coal Authority is again very mindful of the consultation burden on designated Neighbourhood Forums or Town and Parish Councils who produce Neighbourhood Development Orders or Community Right to Build Orders. In the non-coalfield areas of

England, our response to consultations received under Regulations 21 and 23 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 is one of 'No Comment'.
We would like to make the consultation process easier for all parties involved in Neighbourhood Planning. As such I attach a declaration of a deemed consultation response to be used by your LPA and any relevant Neighbourhood Forums or Town and Parish Councils who produce Neighbourhood Development Orders or Community Right to Build Orders.
I therefore confirm that there is no obligation for you or any relevant Neighbourhood Forums or Town and Parish Councils to consult us on any stages of the production of Neighbourhood Development Orders or Community Right to Build Orders within your LPA area.
The attached declaration of a deemed consultation response is to be used in demonstrating to both the LPA and the Independent Examiner that the Neighbourhood Development Order or Community Right to Build Order has been consulted on as required by the 2012 Regulations.
From 1 April 2015 The Coal Authority will no longer provide a bespoke response to consultations on Neighbourhood Development Orders or Community Right to Build Orders in the non-coalfield parts of England.
2
Protecting the public and the environment in coal mining areas
Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact the Planning and Local Authority Liaison department via the contact details above.
Yours faithfully
R. A. Bust
Miss Rachael A. Bust *B.Sc.(Hons), MA, M.Sc., LL.M., AMIEnvSci., MInstLM, MCMI, MRTPI*
Chief Planner / Principal Manager

Natural England (extract)

Dear Mr Dunn
Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan Review - Pre-submission Regulation 14 Consultation
Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 12 February 2025.
Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.
Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.
Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.
However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.
Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further

information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species .
Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice.
We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.
Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.
For any further consultations on your plan, please contact:
consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.
Yours sincerely Sally Wintle Consultations Team

Braintree District Council – Planning Policy

Thank you for your email to Planning Policy
Your email will be forwarded to the appropriate officer
Regards
The Planning Policy Team

Uttlesford District Council

Thank you for contacting Uttlesford District Council Planning Policy Team. Please accept this as acknowledgement of your email. We seek to respond to enquiries within 10 working days, should that be necessary.

Kind regards,

The Local Plan's Team

Homes England

Thank you for contacting the Homes England Enquiries team. We aim to reply to online enquiries within 10 working days. If your enquiry is complex, it may take longer to answer and we will let you know when to expect a reply.

Chelmsford City Council

Dear Sir/Madam,
Thank you for consulting Chelmsford City Council on the Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Neighbourhood Plan – Review and Update 2025 (Regulation 14).
I would like to confirm that we have no comments to make.
Kind regards,
Jenny.
Jenny Robinson
Senior Planning Officer
Spatial Planning Services, Directorate for Sustainable Communities
Chelmsford City Council

Environment Agency

21 March 2025
BRADWELL WITH PATTISWICK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION PATTISWICK AND BRADWELL
Thank you for the consultation dated 10 February 2025. We have reviewed this Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan and have the following comments to make.
We have had to prioritise our limited resources and must focus on influencing plans where the environmental risks and opportunities are highest.
For the purposes of neighbourhood planning, we have assessed those authorities who have "up to date" local plans (plans adopted within the previous 5 years) as being of lower risk, and those authorities who have older plans (adopted more than 5 years ago) as being at greater risk. We aim to reduce flood risk and protect and enhance the water environment, and with consideration to the key environmental constraints within our remit, we have then tailored our approach to reviewing each neighbourhood plan accordingly.
We note the Braintree Local Plan was recently adopted in 2022, however, we have identified important environmental constraints, within our matrix for currently screening neighbourhood plans, that affect this Neighbourhood Plan Area. We are, therefore, providing you with the following advice which identifies opportunities for you to strengthen the Plan and enhance the scope of environmental Objectives considered.
Water Quality
We have identified that the Plan area boundary includes the Water Recycling Centre Stisted which is currently operating close to or exceeding its/their permitted capacity. However, Providing the Plan does not allocate sites for growth development across the Plan period, we do not have any significant concerns. We would still expect to see consideration for any windfall developments captured in a relevant policy for Water Quality in the catchment of the Plan Area and serving WRC.
Water Resources
Although the Neighbourhood Plan does not currently allocate sites for development, we recommend the Plan includes a Policy that captures the important emerging issue of Water Resources in the event of any in-fill development coming forward during the plan period, not yet allocated. The following text should assist you.
Being in one of the driest areas of the country, our environment has come under significant pressure from potable water demand. New developments should make a significant

contribution towards reducing water demand and mitigate against the risk of deterioration to our rivers, groundwater and habitats from groundwater abstraction. The Local Planning Authorities Water Cycle Study and Local Plan may indicate constraints in water supply and provide recommendations for phasing of development to tie in with new alternative strategic supplies.

New development should as a minimum meet the highest levels of water efficiency standards, as per the policies in the adopted Local Plan. In most cases development will be expected to achieve 110 litres per person per day as set out in the Building Regulations &c. (Amendment) Regulations 2015. However, a higher standard of water efficiency (e.g. 85 l/p/d) should be considered, looking at all options including rainwater harvesting and greywater systems. Using the water efficiency calculator in Part G of the Building Regulations enables you to calculate the devices and fittings required to ensure a home is built to the right specifications to meet the 110 l/p/d requirement. We recommend all new non-residential development of 1000sqm gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption.

Developments that require their own abstraction where it will exceed 20 cubic metres per day from a surface water source (river, stream) or from underground strata (via borehole or well) will require an abstraction licence under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991. There is no guarantee that a licence will be granted as this is dependent on available water resources and existing protected rights. The relevant abstraction licencing strategy for your area provides information on water availability and licencing policy at Abstraction licensing strategies (CAMS process) - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk).

Flood Risk and Statutory Main Rivers

There is a Statutory Main River Blackwater running through the parish. Any new development should bear this in mind, and the Fluvial Flood risk associated with it.

There are also Environment Agency flood risk defences that should be considered if any planned development is proposed in close proximity to these defences.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

On 12 February 2024, Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) became mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). This means that unless exempt, Developers must deliver a net gain in biodiversity of at least 10%. Consequently, a development will result in more or better-quality natural habitat than there was before development.

When a development seeks planning permission from the Local Authority, it needs to confirm whether the development is exempt from BNG.

If it is not exempt, the developer will need to provide information about how it is intended to meet the BNG target, including details of proposed significant on-site enhancements.

There are 3 ways a developer can achieve BNG.

1. They can create biodiversity on-site (within the red line boundary of a development site).
2. If developers cannot achieve all of their BNG on-site, they can deliver through a mixture of on-site and off-site. Developers can either make off-site biodiversity gains on their own land outside the development site, or buy off- site biodiversity units on the market.

3. If developers cannot achieve on-site or off-site BNG, they must buy statutory biodiversity credits from the government. This should be a last resort. The government will use the revenue to invest in habitat creation in England.

Where development falls within 10m of a watercourse, a watercourse metric should be applied to the assessment.

We note that this Neighbourhood Plan does not have any allocated sites for development, however the above advice should still be considered for any planning applications submitted.

For further information on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), such as when developments are exempt, there are details available on Understanding biodiversity net gain - GOV.UK.

Further information

We encourage you to seek ways in which your neighbourhood plan can improve the local environment. For your information, together with Natural England, Historic England and Forestry Commission, we have published joint guidance on neighbourhood planning, which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: How to consider the environment in Neighbourhood Plans - Locality Neighbourhood Planning

Please note that the view expressed in this letter is a response to the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan only and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning or permit applications that may come forward. We reserve the right to change our position in relation to any such application

We trust this advice is useful.

Yours sincerely

Mr Jack Saunders

Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor

Marine Management Organisation

Thank you for including the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in your recent consultation submission. The MMO will review your document and respond to you directly should a bespoke response be required. If you do not receive a bespoke response from us within your deadline, please consider the following information as the MMO's formal response.

Kind regards,

The Marine Management Organisation

Marine Management Organisation Functions

The MMO is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are: marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing grants.

Marine Planning and Local Plan development

Under delegation from the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (the marine planning authority), the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine

plan boundaries extend up to the level of MHWS, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans, which generally extend to the Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) mark. To work together in this overlap, the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) created the Coastal Concordat. This is a framework enabling decision-makers to co-ordinate processes for coastal development consents. It is designed to streamline the process where multiple consents are required from numerous decision-makers, thereby saving time and resources. Defra encourage coastal authorities to sign up as it provides a road map to simplify the process of consenting a development, which may require both a terrestrial planning consent and a marine licence. Furthermore, marine plans inform and guide decision-makers on development in marine and coastal areas.
Under Section 58(3) of Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009 all public authorities making decisions capable of affecting the UK marine area (but which are not for authorisation or enforcement) must have regard to the relevant marine plan and the UK Marine Policy Statement. This includes local authorities developing planning documents for areas with a coastal influence. We advise that all marine plan objectives and policies are taken into consideration by local planning authorities when plan-making. It is important to note that individual marine plan policies do not work in isolation, and decision-makers should consider a whole-plan approach. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service: soundness self-assessment checklist. We have also produced a guidance note aimed at local authorities who wish to consider how local plans could have regard to marine plans. For any other information please contact your local marine planning officer. You can find their details on our gov.uk page.

See this map on our website to locate the marine plan areas in England. For further information on how to apply the marine plans and the subsequent policies, please visit our Explore Marine Plans online digital service.

The adoption of the North East, North West, South East, and South West Marine Plans in 2021 follows the adoption of the East Marine Plans in 2014 and the South Marine Plans in 2018. All marine plans for English waters are a material consideration for public authorities with decision-making functions and provide a framework for integrated plan-led management.

Marine Licensing and consultation requests below MHWS

Activities taking place below MHWS (which includes the tidal influence/limit of any river or estuary) may require a marine licence in accordance with the MCAA. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object. Activities between MHWS and MLWS may also require a local authority planning permission. Such permissions would need to be in accordance with the relevant marine plan under section 58(1) of the MCAA. Local authorities may wish to refer to our marine licensing guide for local planning authorities for more detailed information. We have produced a guidance note (worked example) on the decision-making process under S58(1) of MCAA, which decision-makers may find useful. The licensing team can be contacted at: marine.consents@marinemanagement.org.uk.

MBNL

Thank you for contacting MBNL. Your email will be forwarded to the relevant team.

If you have a press enquiry, please contact our press offices as set out below:
EE - ee@nelsonbostock.com
Three - three@headlandconsultancy.com
MBNL - philippa.chan@mbnl.co.uk

Northumbrian Water Limited

This email and its attachments are intended for the addressee only and may be confidential or privileged. If this email has come to you in error, you should take no action based on it. Please return it to the sender immediately and then permanently delete it from all your folders.

Unless expressly stated, opinions in this message falling outside the scope of ordinary business are the private views of the sender and not of Northumbrian Water Limited.

You should be aware that this email, and any reply to it, may need to be made public under right to know legislation, or in connection with litigation. Emails may also be monitored to ensure compliance with our legal responsibilities, our policies and for audit purposes.

While Northumbrian Water Limited has scanned this email and its attachments for security threats, including computer viruses, we have no liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of any such viruses. You are advised to carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Northumbrian Water Limited, registered in England and Wales number 2366703.
Registered office: Northumbria House, Abbey Road, Pity Me, Durham DH1 5FJ.

ESSEX POLICE

To Whom it May Concern 26th March 2025

Re: Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan (2024 – 2041) Consultation
The 'Essex Police – Designing out Crime Office' (DOCO), welcomes the opportunity to comment on 'The Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan' and would wish to raise the below observations for consideration.
The DOCO acknowledges the SWOT analysis (page 14) undertaken as part of the process and throughout our response will reference mitigating measures which could alleviate some of the potential threats and concerns whilst enhancing further opportunities.
When designing new homes and community amenities, it is imperative to consider crime as a material consideration. The perception of crime and the fear of crime can be an influential factor in determining the synergy and ongoing sustainability of the wider community. Essex Police would recommend developers consider the foreseeability of crime and maximise on

the opportunity to design such issues out, as to prevent the need for bespoke situational crime prevention measures in the future.
Furthermore, reflecting upon current Home Office Agendas, such as the Violence against Women and Girls initiative, collaborative working will ensure that the proposed development and the public realm spaces attributed to the community are fully inclusive, created for the benefit for all, with safety and security considered at its core.

Headline	Essex Police Observations
Objective 3 Vision Statement	Essex Police acknowledge the Vision Statement for Bradwell and Pattiswick (Page 16) and recommend the inclusion that the community is also developed to be '*Safe, secure, inclusive and sustainable'*. It is essential that crime and safety is deemed a material consideration and recommended to be implemented into the neighbourhood plan, this will influence future development and support a sustainable and healthy future.
Environment	The DOCO acknowledge the requirement to protect and enhance the natural environment. It is essential when creating wildlife corridors and access to the countryside that any new or existing public rights of way and paths are designed to be safe and secure and do not promote the fear of crime. We would advocate engagement with the DOCO to ensure that the opportunities to design out crime have been considered.
Community Facilities and Public Open Space	Creating safe and secure communities and public open spaces will help in advocating community cohesion within the Parish. It is advised that if there are enhancements or new facilities provided that they are developed with safety and security taken into consideration at the earliest stages. Furthermore, in relation to "*provide(ing) leisure facilities to meet the needs of all residents',* it is advised that all new and current facilities are inclusive for all

	and do not promote the fear of crime. Liaison with the DOCO will help support in developing safe facilities for all future users. The DOCO would like to bring to your attention, the Home Office strategy of reducing 'Violence Against Women and Girls' (VAWG). The strategy aims to improve wellbeing and perception of crime for women and girls, thus ensuring their safety within their community. Therefore, it is recommended when designing new and adapting public realm and green spaces (inclusive of walking, cycling and play areas,) that consideration should be given to environmental design so that women and girls feel included and comfortable using the spaces. *"Women and girls often do not feel safe in parks and so use them less. This is not just because they fear crime, whether that's rape, assault, or harassment. They also feel uncomfortable, unwelcome, and judged. Women are three times more likely than men to feel unsafe in parks during the day, and that gets worse after dark*". **Safer Parks Improving access for women and girls: Safer Parks Executive Summary (greenflagaward.org)**

Heritage	The DOCO recognises the requirement to conserve and promote the heritage of the Parish and the importance of heritage assets. We acknowledge that the heritage sites may be impacted (i.e. need '*altering and improving'*) during their lifetime. It is recommended that if heritage assets are enhanced then there is consultation with the local DOCO, to ensure any improvements do not impact upon the heritage significance but also promote the feeling of safety. Essex Police acknowledges the importance placed upon protecting Bradwell and Pattiswick's heritage and design characteristics, however it is essential that such areas i.e. public rights of way and walking and cycling routes are safe to use while not promoting the fear of crime.
Housing	The DOCO acknowledges within this objective that *'housing is designed to high standards'* and *'New developments should be very energy efficient (Passivhaus) and respect the design and character of existing development in the Parish.'* Embedding 'Designing out Crime' principles can evidence Sustainability Objectives and Health Impact Assessment requirements, as developments that have mitigated against potential crime can mitigate against the social determinants of crime. As the preferred enabler to mitigate crime and ensure quality design standards, Essex Police advocate future developments seeking the most current iteration of the Secured by Design (SBD) Homes Accreditation. Additionally, the DOCO recommends the use of SBD Policed Preferred Security Products, as academic research suggests that such products support sustainability agendas as they are proven to last longer (due to the robustness of the product and minimal maintenance requirements), and therefore reduce the developments long term carbon footprint.
Local Economy	The Essex Police DOCO would welcome the opportunity to work in partnership regarding future infrastructure design at the earliest stages to ensure principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and designing out crime are incorporated.

Transport	The DOCO notes the objective '*To improve road safety by creating a safe road network, which is fit for purpose'*. Essex Police would advocate the implementation of a "Safe system approach" when designing local road infrastructure, as this will take into consideration the various user groups (such as pedestrian, cyclist and equestrians,) who wish to access these roads. Essex Police would request that thought is given for the provision of Emergency Service Access. It is essential that emergency vehicles can gain rapid access to any incident and would therefore welcome early engagement regarding new proposals and road infrastructure. The DOCO recognises the objective "*To maintain an excellent network of public footpaths and public rights of way (including byways and bridleways*)". It is advised that all new and current public rights of ways are designed to be safe and secure for all users while not increasing the fear of crime.

	We note that within the documentation that the Parish are considering introducing 20mph limit to help support and encourage active travel and improve air quality. Essex Police would recommend liaison with our Roads Policing colleagues regarding this matter as it is vital that any enforcement strategies (such as parking enforcement and low speed limits) are self- policing and enforceable. Emergency Services should not be overburdened to overcome inadequacies in safety management, access control or enforcement.
Design	It is advised that all new developments should not only be of a high quality but should also be safe, secure and support in the prevention of crime. This would support the strategic vision within the National Planning Policy Framework. The DOCO would welcome the opportunity to work in partnership regarding any future development at the earliest stages to ensure principles of 'Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design' and designing out crime are incorporated.
Neighbourhood Action Plan	The DOCO notes the Neighbourhood action plan and the tasks required to support the Parish. It is advised that under *reference 19* that if there are new paths and cycle routes designed then there is consultation with the DOCO to ensure they are safe for all users and do not allow crime or Anti-Social Behaviour to occur. *Reference 20* stipulates the implementation of a new 'Neighboured Watch' group; for further advice and support please do not hesitate to contact the Essex Police – Essex Watch Liaison Team.

If there are any further queries around embedding designing out crime, please do not hesitate to contact designingoutcrime@essex.police.uk.
Yours Sincerely
Heather Gurden
Heather Gurden AD Cert ED&CP, LCGI, MSyl, CAS
Strategic Designing Out Crime Officer *(SDOCO)* HQ Local Policing Support Unit

The recommended change was incorporated and the Parish Council does work with the local Police on a regular basis.

Braintree District Council – Planning

Dear Mr Dunn,
Thank you for including me on the e-mail below. As your correspondence relates to a Neighbourhood Plan, colleagues from our Planning Policy team will respond to you in relation to this matter.

Kind Regards,
Chris

Christopher Paggi
Planning Development Manager
Braintree District Council | Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree, CM7 9HB

Feering Parish Council

Dear Sirs
Thank you for your email from Cllr Tony Dunn dated 12 February 2024.
Feering Parish Council have reviewed the matter and determined that, as the plan does not relate to an adjacent village to Feering that they are not in a position to provide comments.
We wish you the best of luck with your review.
Kind regards
Lisa Collins
Clerk to Feering Parish Council

Greenstead Green and Halstead Parish Council

Dear Sir or Madam,
Thank you for allowing us to comment on your updated plan. The Councillors were most impressed with it. They have no comments to make and wish you well in your endeavours.
Kind regards,
Amanda Degnan (Mrs)
Parish Clerk
Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council

Historic England
Dear Mr Dunn,
Thank you for notifying us about the update to this neighbourhood plan. Based on the updates identified in para 1.11, it isn't necessary for Historic England to provide any detailed comments at this point.
I wish you well with the update to your neighbourhood plan.
Kind regards,
Edward
Edward James
Historic Places Adviser – East of England

National Highways

Dear Tony Dunn,
National Highways Operations (East) Woodlands
Manton Lane Bedford MK41 7LW
26 March 2025
Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 consultation
National Highways welcomes the opportunity to comment on the consultation of the Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Neighbourhood Plan (BPNP) – Regulation 14 which covers the plan period from 2024 to 2041.
National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth.

In relation to the Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the A120, part of the SRN.
We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national, regional, and local planning policies. Accordingly, this Neighbourhood Development Plan is required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan which complement those in the Braintree District Council Local Plan. This Neighbourhood Plan covers the proposed period to 2041 to coincide with the proposed end date of the Braintree District Council's Local Plan.
For this Neighbourhood plan National Highways have the following comments:
We note the councils previous consultations has requested a speed reduction from 40mph to 30mph on the A120. In previous discussions with National Highways, we explained the speed reduction is unlikely to happen before the new A120 is complete. We request you keep engaging with us on this matter when the A120 works are complete.

In relation to any improvement scheme for the non-motorised road users at junctions between A120 and Hollies Rd and Bridge Hall Rd, a WCHAR GG142 (Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review) assessment should be completed and issued to National Highways for review.
Similarly, for any road safety improvement scheme between A120/Coggeshall Road and The Street, GG104 should be completed, then (if required) GG119 safety assessments would need to be prepared and issued to us for review.
National Highways would advise any applicant to contact National Highways to discuss installing Speed Cameras, traffic management schemes or 'White Gates' at entrances to Bradwell Village along the A120 Road.
We have no further comments to provide and trust the above is useful in the progression of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely,
S. H.
Dr Shamsul Hoque
Assistant Spatial Planner
PlanningEE@nationalhighways.co.uk

Annex 5 – Discussion relating to potential change to the wording of the Neighbourhood Plan

Hi Tony and Rosie,

Thanks for your email and comments. I can see in paragraph 4.35 4th bullet that 'one to two houses' is indicated there as small scale development in relation to consultation responses. If we removed reference to this from the policy text, that would have been because it is not appropriate to specify a blanket 1-2 dwellings limit within a policy, as each application should be considered on its own merits and through an individual assessment of a site. For example, in some cases 3 dwellings could be absolutely fine for a site and this could still be small scale development. I think it would therefore be best to leave that to interpretation, however there is a clear steer of how this should be interpreted through the 'one to two houses' clarification in paragraph 4.35 of the supporting text.

Apart from the clarification provided regarding linear development, the text remains the same as the made Neighbourhood Plan. I am not aware that this policy created any issues regarding development in the area, so I would therefore recommend continuing to leave it predominantly unchanged. However reference to affordable housing needs seems a sensible addition, I have added that into the housing policy criteria within the attached version.

Kind regards
Tim

Tim Parton
BA (Hons) MPLAN MRTPI
Associate Director

DAC Planning
Phone 01206 688103 Mobile 07990 038778
Hop House, Colchester Road, West Bergholt, Colchester, CO6 3TJ
www.dacplanning.com

DAC Planning Limited is registered in England and Wales. Company number 10094911.
Registered address: 1st Floor, 11 Freeport Office Village, Century Drive, Braintree, Essex, CM77 8YG.
VAT registration number: 237856373

From: Rosie Pearson <compasshouse@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 18 February 2025 12:46
To: Tony Dunn <tdconsulting@btinternet.com>; Jeffrey Collins <jeff@collinspartnership.com>
Cc: Glenn Lockey <blackwateralps@aol.com>; Michael Turner <mtconstruction@btinternet.com>; lesley kinder <lesley_kinder@hotmail.com>; Antony Harding <aharding.pc@gmail.com>; Nicki Watkins <clerktobppc@outlook.com>; Adam Deighton <atdeighton@aol.com>; Craig Evans <cevans958@btinternet.com>; Tim Parton <tim@dacplanning.com>
Subject: Re: Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan Refresh

Thanks for responding so quickly on this, Tony and I look forward to hearing the response. If we're allowed to define policy further, it would be easier to defend when speculative development pops up.

Best wishes
Rosie

From: Tony Dunn <tdconsulting@btinternet.com>
Sent: 18 February 2025 12:17
To: Rosie Pearson <compasshouse@hotmail.co.uk>; Jeffrey Collins <jeff@collinspartnership.com>
Cc: Glenn Lockey <blackwateralps@aol.com>; Michael Turner <mtconstruction@btinternet.com>; lesley kinder <lesley_kinder@hotmail.com>; Antony Harding <aharding.pc@gmail.com>; Nicki Watkins <clerktobppc@outlook.com>; Adam Deighton <atdeighton@aol.com>; Craig Evans <cevans958@btinternet.com>; Tim Parton <tim@dacplanning.com>
Subject: Re: Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan Refresh

Rosie,

Thank you for your comments. Agreed.

The wording reflects the made Neighbourhood Plan, to which the Independent Inspector added the resistance to linear extensions along Rectory Meadow, Hollies Road, Coggeshall Road etc. Plus we asked our planning consultant to strengthen the wording here as BDC consider the current wording of “linear extension” “a little vague”

In the re-draft I indicated small-scale should be 1-2 dwellings, but our planning consultant appears to have taken out this caveat – I will ask why.

From correspondence with BDC regarding Land South of Coggeshall Road, BDC’s interpretation of “small-scale” indicates that 9 houses is too big to be “small-scale”.

Yes, it can be amended that is the whole point of the Regulation 14 consultation.

We can add in the exception criterion of “meet a proven affordable need”

By copy of this e-mail to Tim Parton, I would ask Tim to comment on how best to reflect your concerns in the NP as we move forward.

Kind regards,

Tony

From: Rosie Pearson <compasshouse@hotmail.co.uk>
Date: Tuesday, 18 February 2025 at 10:31
To: Tony Dunn <tdconsulting@btinternet.com>, Jeffrey Collins <jeff@collinspartnership.com>
Subject: Re: Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan Refresh

Tony
Sorry to hear you're leaving - you've been absolutely brilliant all these years and the PC could not have done without you. Huge thank you for all of your hours and hours spent on planning issues.

The only question I have about the NP changes relates to this:
"Development proposals for small scale residential development and extensions and conversions for residential use outside the Bradwell village settlement boundary shall be supported as an exception to planning policies where they;
· Can demonstrate a significant contribution towards maintaining the future viability and sustainability of the adjacent settlement;
· Are adjacent to an existing settlement or hamlet;"
I'm wondering what prompted it and whether it can be amended?
Firstly, I think that 'small scale residential development' will conflict with BDC's policies on rural development and the NPPF (though I haven't checked either).
Secondly, I'd prefer to see any small scale resi development outside the village boundary as rural exception sites that meet a proven affordable need.
Thirdly, we risk huge battles about the definition of small scale & viability/sustainability. In this wording there is a risk that a developer could argue that 50 dwellings in Pattiswick constitutes small scale development. Then they'll offer us a playground, a bus stop and other pointless amenities and claim they are making a contribution to the viability and sustainability of Pattiswick.
My personal view is that this is a very dangerous little section!!
Your thoughts?
Rosie

Maybe it needs a footnote or a glossary definition?

See NPPF Glossary for major development :
Major development: For housing, development where 10 or more homes will be provided, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more. For non-residential development it means additional floorspace of 1,000m2 or more, or a site of 1 hectare or more, or as otherwise provided in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Or maybe it's therefore self-explanatory in the NP that a small development is below the major development NPPF threshold.

Best wishes
Rosie

Hi Rosie,
Thanks for your email. I'm afraid we can't usually include maximum numbers in planning documents for the reasons I set out previously, where each application should be considered on its own merits and through an individual assessment of a site. For the context of the Parish, and with the text already set out in the supporting text of the Plan, I am comfortable it is clear what is meant by 'small scale'. However if this is still a concern for you, please do feel free to add any additional text into the supporting text. This can always be amended following the consultation if any issues are raised.
Kind regards
Tim

Tim Parton
BA (Hons) MPLAN MRTPI
Associate Director

DAC Planning
Phone 01206 688103 Mobile 07990 038778
Hop House, Colchester Road, West Bergholt, Colchester, CO6 3TJ
www.dacplanning.com

DAC Planning Limited is registered in England and Wales. Company number 10094911.
Registered address: 1st Floor, 11 Freeport Office Village, Century Drive, Braintree, Essex, CM77 8YG.
VAT registration number: 237856373

From: Rosie Pearson <compasshouse@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 19 February 2025 14:43
To: Tim Parton <tim@dacplanning.com>; Tony Dunn <tdconsulting@btinternet.com>; Jeffrey Collins <jeff@collinspartnership.com>
Cc: Glenn Lockey <blackwateralps@aol.com>; Michael Turner <mtconstruction@btinternet.com>; lesley kinder <lesley_kinder@hotmail.com>; Antony Harding <aharding.pc@gmail.com>; Nicki Watkins <clerktobppc@outlook.com>; Adam Deighton <atdeighton@aol.com>; Craig Evans <cevans958@btinternet.com>
Subject: Re: Bradwell with Pattiswick Neighbourhood Plan Refresh

Thank you, Tim
Just had a chat with Jeff, my neighbour. We wondered if it would be wise/possible to add 'up to a maximum of (say) 10'?
The reason for our concern is that with a new town proposal for up to 15,000 homes submitted into the call for sites it might well be very arguable for the promoter to say that 50 is a low number.

Best wishes
Rosie

FINAL

BRADWELL WITH PATTISWICK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REFRESH 2024 - REPORT

CONTENTS

	Page
Background	2
Demographics	2
Vision – welcome changes	3
Vision – changes to resist	3
Access to Health Assets	4
Healthcare – GP surgeries	4
Healthcare – Hospitals	5
Education	5
Housing	6
Law and Order	8
Communications	8
Employment	9
Environment	10
Pavements and Lighting	10
Community	11
Recreation and Leisure	11
Village Hall	11
Transport	12
Church	12
Young people	13

Nb Vision and Young people are dominated by **Highways** issues

The Neighbourhood Plan includes an Action Plan – suggested items to be included in the Action Plan are indicated by the word ACTION

Background

This paper summarises the feedback from residents to the questionnaires which were provided to every household in the Parish. The Questionnaires were distributed between 9 September and 29 September to 232 households. The closing date for return was 1 November 2024. 99 households (42.7% compared to 44% in 2016) returned questionnaires. 13 households returned blank questionnaires, so 86 households (37.1%) returned valid questionnaires, which have been analysed.

Demographics

Bradwell with Pattiswick Questionnaire response - demographics - at 1 November 2024									
	under 18	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	over 80	TOTAL
Bradwell F	6	4	2	11	12	18	13	2	62
Bradwell M	1	3	3	3	9	14	11	5	48
Bradwell ?									0
Pattiswick F	2			1	2	1	1		5
Pattiswick M					1	1	1		3
Pattiswick ?							1		1
Rural F	2		1		3	4	2		10
Rural M	1	2		1	2	4	4	1	14
TOTAL	12	9	6	16	29	42	33	8	143
									155
TOTAL M	2	5	3	4	12	19	16	6	65
TOTAL F	10	4	3	12	17	23	16	2	77
Response	8%	6%	4%	10%	19%	27%	21%	5%	100%
Population			Response						
All females	268	48.29%	87	56.49%					
All males	287	51.71%	67	43.51%					
Total	555		154	27.75%					
	Under 16	16-64	65+		Under 16	16-64	65+		
Population	90	334	133		16.22%	60.18%	23.96%		
	Under 18	18-70	71+		Under 18	18-70	71+%		
Response	12	102	41		7.79%	66.23%	26.62%		

Population data from 2021 Census

The response is broadly representative of the population, although fewer under-18s responded than in 2016 and more 71-80 year olds responded.

The age profile of the residents has aged from 2016

[In Bradwell (Braintree) the proportion of the population who are aged 65+ has increased since 2001, changing from 11.1% to 25.05%.][1]

More males are retired and fewer are self-employed and more females are retired and fewer are employed

[1] Local Insight Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion Ltd.

The age profile of the residents of the Parish suggests the parish is becoming a retirement village – 25% of residents are over 65 years old and 49% of respondents are retired. The number of under 18s has declined.

[The population aged 65+ in England represents 18.41% and in Essex 20.62%.][1]

Vision – welcome changes

The 155 respondents were given free range to indicate changes they would welcome
[Numbers indicate individuals who volunteered this as one of their top three priorities]

Speed limit on the A120 reduced to 30mph	25
A120 to be re-routed	18
Easier / safer access / roundabout / traffic control A120 The Street junction	8
Speed restriction through village to 20mph	11
Stop all HGV traffic through village	10
40mph speed limit on Church Road from Bradwell to the Church	5
Better kept public footpaths	9
Improved parking (around The Street / Forge Crescent)	8
Extend double yellow-lines to full length of Wadud's boundary	6
More events at the Village Hall	6

Vision – changes to resist

The 155 respondents were given free range to indicate changes they would resist
[Numbers indicate individuals who volunteered this as one of their top three priorities]

More housing development	83
Expansion of the quarry / new quarries	21
Building on green belt / farmland	5
Development of land behind Rectory Meadow	5

Rationale for resisting change

Infrastructure is inadequate to support growth – roads, healthcare, education	31
A village should stay a village	18
Too much traffic already on A120	11
Too much traffic already through village	10

Access to Health Assets

The distance from Bradwell to Leisure Centres, the nearest dentist, the nearest GP surgery, the nearest A&E Hospital and the nearest pharmacy is twice the average for Essex and also twice the average for England.[2]

The distance from Bradwell to unhealthy assets – fast food outlets, gambling outlets, pubs and tobacconists - is also more than twice the average for Essex or England. [2]

49.28% of people in Bradwell (Braintree) have very good health. This is similar to the proportion in England (48.49%) and similar to the proportion in Essex (48.57%).
A further 36.46% of people in Bradwell (Braintree) have good health. This is similar to the proportion in England (33.71%) and similar to the proportion in Essex (34.32%).(Self-reported general health) [3]

Healthcare – GP surgery

The number of people attending the Braintree surgery has declined (was 51.45% in 2016, is 33.82% now), while the number of people attending the Coggeshall surgery has increased (was 39.13% in 2016, is 55.15% now). Small numbers attend Silver End, Kelvedon, Halstead and Benfleet – they would like to be able to register at Coggeshall..

Braintree GP Surgery	Agree strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree strongly
Getting to the surgey is easy		18	13	10	5
Getting an appointment is easy		6	8	13	19
GP services are adequate		5	15	13	13

The responses to the Questionnaire for the Braintree surgery are shown above.
In percentage terms there is little difference between the 2016 responses and today's.

Coggeshall GP Surgery	Agree strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree strongly
Getting to the surgey is easy	10	39	14	11	1
Getting an appointment is easy	10	21	20	16	7
GP services are adequate	7	27	19	13	6

The responses to the Questionnaire for the Coggeshall surgery are shown above.

The sample size for the Kelvedon and Silver End surgeries was less than 5%.

There remains dissatisfaction with the Braintree surgery, while there continue to be many complimentary comments about the Coggeshall surgery.

There is still a perceived need at all surgeries for more GPs, more appointments, better arrangements for getting appointments, availability of GPs at nights and at weekends and more home visits (7.93% of households have no access to a car or van).
No one mentioned the 111 service.

[2] Local Insight Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion Ltd.
[3] Census 2021

Healthcare – Hospitals

Braintree Hospital	Agree strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree strongly
Getting to the hospital is easy		21	14	9	5
Getting an appointment at the hospital is easy		8	16	19	6
Outpatient services are adequate		11	19	16	2
Colchester Hospital					
Getting to the hospital is easy		10	5	6	4
Getting an appointment at the hospital is easy		4	9	9	3
Outpatient services are adequate	1	6	8	6	3
Chelmsford (Broomfield) Hospital					
Getting to the hospital is easy		23	11	16	6
Getting an appointment at the hospital is easy		8	18	21	9
Outpatient services are adequate		14	21	17	4
Do not use	53				
When emergency medical assistance is required, it is a	3	46	46	16	6

The responses to the Questionnaire for the three hospitals are shown above.

There is clearly a need for more NHS dentists (11 respondents), much more so than in 2016 (2).

Similar numbers of people are using Braintree Hospital, opinion of outpatient services and the ability to get an appointment at Braintree Hospital have declined.

More people are attending Colchester and Chelmsford (Broomfield) hospitals. Opinion of getting an appointment has got worse. Outpatient services at Colchester and Chelmsford hospitals are perceived as worse – more respondents are dissatisfied.

Additional Healthcare facilities suggested by respondents included making greater use of Braintree Hospital – A&E, walk-in Centre, non-urgent / minor injury unit.

There was general concern that the mandated requirement to build more houses in the District should be matched with expansion of, and improvement to, healthcare services.

Education

Bradwell with Pattiswick - Questionnaire - Education					
	Agree strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree strongly
There is sufficient access to quality primary education for young peopl	1	24	7	16	3
The education provided by Honywood School is of a high standard	3	21	14	5	4
The education provided by Alec Hunter Humanities College is of a high standard		7	25	1	1
There is adequate provision for nursery children		13	17	17	1
					1
There is adequate provision for adult education		14	18	10	

The perception is that access to quality primary education has declined slightly.

The perception of the quality of education provided by Honywood School and Alec Hunter has not changed.

Respondents suggested access to education could be improved by better and cheaper bus routes and times (School buses do not serve Bradwell and Pattiswick). Students have to use scheduled bus services, which are often over-crowded.

Housing

The following tables provide data on the type of housing and tenure in Bradwell with Pattiswick

Type of housing[4]

	Bradwell No	Bradwell %	Essex %	England %
Detached	121	52.84	30.54	22.91
Semi-detached	80	34.93	31.45	31.48
Terraced	20	8.73	19.89	22.96
Flats	1	0.44	14.95	17.07

Housing tenure[4]

	Bradwell No	Bradwell %	Essex %	England %
Owned outright	91	40.27	36.33	32.53
Mortgaged	72	31.86	32.69	28.78
Shared ownership	0	0.00	0.84	1.01
Council House	8	3.54	7.24	8.30
Housing Association	13	5.75	6.89	8.79
Private rented	44	19,46	15.92	20.46

In Bradwell (Braintree) the proportion of owner occupied housing at 72.12% is higher than the proportion in England (62.32%) and higher than the proportion in Essex (69.86%).

The proportion of social rented housing in Bradwell (Braintree) is 9.29%. This is lower than the proportion in England (17.09%) and lower than the proportion in Essex (14.13%).

In comparison, the proportion of privately rented housing in Bradwell (Braintree) is 15.04%. This is lower than the proportion in England (18.24%) and higher than the proportion in Essex (13.98%).

The proportion of dwellings built in Bradwell (Braintree) between 2020 and 2024 was 7.59%. This is higher than the proportion in England (3.50%) and higher than the proportion in Essex (3.82%).

[4] Census 2021

The proportion of dwellings built in Bradwell (Braintree) between 2010 and 2019 was 10.13%. This is higher than the proportion in England (7.10%) and higher than the proportion in Essex (7.01%).

The proportion of dwellings built in Bradwell (Braintree) between 2000 and 2009 was 10.13%. This is higher than the proportion in England (7.10%) and higher than the proportion in Essex (7.32%).

For comparison, the proportion of dwellings in Bradwell (Braintree) built prior to 1900 was 11.39%. This is lower than the proportion in England (15.06%) and higher than the proportion in Essex (7.28%).

Over the past 25 years, the rate of build in Bradwell has been significantly higher than in Essex or England

Understandably, therefore, 73% of respondents volunteered “no housing development” as their top priority for the future of the Parish

For those who accepted that some development may be required, the majority would only accept a couple of houses a year. There was more sympathy for one or two isolated houses way outside the village envelope, ideally starter homes to encourage young families.

[An infill estate of seven houses in Hollies Road has already been granted planning permission but has yet to be developed, which could satisfy demand for the next five years.]

House turnover in Bradwell is lower (at 5%) than the national average (10-12%)[5] suggesting a stable community

Bradwell with Pattiswick Questionnaire - Housing					
Patiswick and rural properties	Agree strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree strongly
There is a broad mix of housing	2	15	10	8	1
Some new housing development is required in Bradwell with Pa	2	16	7	7	4
	1-5 per year	6-10 per yea	11-15 per yea	16-20 per yea	>20 per year
Number of new properties in the next 5 years	4	7	3	1	3
Sufficient properties for young people to rent or buy		1	15	10	10
Parish is protected from unsuitable development	3	4	10	10	8

Bradwell Village	Agree strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree strongly
There is a broad mix of housing	9	64	20	7	3
Some new housing development is required in Bradwell with Pa	1	11	21	37	34
	1-5 per year	6-10 per yea	11-15 per yea	16-20 per yea	>20 per year
Number of new properties in the next 5 years	18	1			
Sufficient properties for young people to rent or buy	4	17	38	35	8
Parish is protected from unsuitable development	7	10	20	39	24

[5] 2011 and 2021 census

There is a significant difference between the response from Bradwell Village and Pattiswick and the outlying hamlets. The residents of Pattiswick and the outlying hamlets appear more relaxed about a few additional houses. These would be owner-occupied, starter homes or family homes. There is universal objection to any more significant housing developments anywhere.

Law and Order

There were 31 total crime offences in Bradwell (Braintree) between Jun-2023 to May-2024, with the overall crime rate being 52.9 per 1,000 population. This is lower than the average across England (118.1) and lower than the average across Essex (107.9). [6]

The overall crime rate in Bradwell (Braintree) has decreased from 56.2 per 1,000 people between Sep-2018 to Aug-2019 to 52.9 per 1,000 people between Jun-2023 to May-2024.[4]

The rate of reported anti-social behaviour crime in Bradwell (Braintree) has decreased from 13.5 per 1,000 people between Sep-2018 to Aug-2019 to 4.3 per 1,000 people between Jun-2023 to May-2024. Nevertheless, dogging around the Church, Bluebell Wood and Sheepcoats Lane remains an issue. **ACTION**

Bradwell is perceived as a safe place to raise a family (less than 1% disagree.)

53% (same as in 2016) of respondents consider the police presence to be inadequate; only 15% (10% in 2016) consider it to be adequate.

Opinion was equally divided on the adequacy of police response to needs (17% agreed; 21% disagreed)[same as 2016].

All respondents said there should be a Neighbourhood Watch scheme (1% disagreed). **ACTION**

Communications

Internet speeds have improved significantly since 2016, nevertheless, there remains disappointment at the speeds on offer 30% are unhappy with their broadband speeds and 62% of respondents would apply for faster speeds if they were available.

The (Universal Service Obligation) USO is set to improve broadband availability by giving homes and businesses the legal right to request a decent and affordable broadband connection defined as a download speed of at least 10Mbit/s and an upload speed of at least 1Mbit/s. People who do not have access to a decent service are able to request one under the USO as set out by the Government in legislation.

[6] Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion Ltd.

In Bradwell (Braintree), the average broadband download speed of 142.36Mb/sMbit/s is slower than England (153.25Mb/sMbit/s) and similar to Essex (140.95Mb/sMbit/s).
Note: 8 Megabits(Mb) is roughly equivalent to 1 Megabyte(MB) [7]

Over half of the respondents never access the Parish Council web-site – no change.

Less than 10% would not welcome a free Parish Magazine, however, the number of people offering to help with its production has fallen from 17 to 8 and only one left their contact details.

Half of the respondents access Bradwell Facebook, which appears to be the favoured medium for communication within the Parish..

More people have e-mail addresses now, even so 9% still do not.

Employment

For the adult population who responded

	Student	Employed	Self-employed	Retired	Disabled
Male	1	21	12	32	
Female	2	26	11	33	1
Total	3	47	23	65	1
%age	2	34	17	47	1
Census 2021					
	12	217	69	115	10
%age	3	51	16	27	2

All 12 young people who responded were at school – one at nursery school.

In Bradwell (Braintree), the proportion of those retired and economically inactive is 24.63%, which is higher than in England (21.48%) and similar to Essex (24.15%).[8]

47% of respondents said they were retired.

In Bradwell (Braintree), the proportion of those in the managers, directors and senior officials occupational group is 18.71%, which is higher than England (12.89%) and higher than Essex (14.54%). [9]

The perception of employment opportunities has worsened (34% agree there are plenty of employment opportunities – was 52%) yet the need for more employment opportunities has declined (from 23% to 18%).
Suggested employment opportunities were apprenticeships, rural-related employment to reflect Village Life and “seed bed” type start-up units.

[7] Ofcom
[8] Census 2021
[9] Census 2021

Environment

This is a new category.

23% of respondents agreed that footpaths were kept clean, however, 46% disagreed.

Footpaths are generally well-signed, but footpath maintenance leaves room for improvement. **ACTION**

40% agreed that roads are kept clean, while 31% disagreed

Pavements and Lighting

The perception of the adequacy of the pavements on the A120 is worse with 55% still thinking the pavements are inadequate.

Similarly, the perception of the adequacy of the pavements in Bradwell Village has worsened, 47% still think the pavements are inadequate. 25% think the pavements are adequate

Specific points include Forge Crescent (crumbling footway), A120 footpaths are too narrow and require repair (outside "New House") and are made worse by overgrown hedges and the footpath down to the Playing Field requires attention. **ACTION**

The lack of adequate footpaths / cycleways to Coggeshall / Braintree forces pedestrians / cyclists to use their cars, which does not help with Climate Change.

The absence of footpaths on The Street / Tippets Wade / Church Road and on Hollies Road is considered dangerous.

The perceived adequacy of street lighting on the A120 has declined - 30% (was 16% in 2016) consider the lighting inadequate in part due to faulty lights at the junction with The Street. **ACTION**

38% think the lighting is adequate – was 62% in 2016.

Residents on the A120 complain of the lighting being too harsh and intrusive into their homes.

Perception of the adequacy of the street lighting in Bradwell Village has declined from 49% to 39%; while 27% still think it is inadequate.

Consideration should be given to extending street lighting along Church Road. **ACTION**

Community

The proportion of people taking part in any civic engagement in Bradwell (Braintree) is 51.15%. This is higher than the proportion in England (45.19%) and higher than the proportion in Essex (45.20%).[10]

Only 12% of respondents think Bradwell does not have a good sense of Community

80% are content with the recycling facilities and only 8% (mostly in Pattiswick) are not.

Previously, 63 people were prepared to help with an emergency, now only 52 would volunteer.

9 people asked for a Village Shop, while others would like a traditional Public House.

Recreation and Leisure

Bradwell with Pattiswick - Questionnaire - Recreation and Leisure					
	Agree strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree strongl
Bradwell with Pattiswick is well supplied with leisure facilities		46	52	35	7
Bradwell with Pattiswick has sufficient open spaces	15	88	29	5	1
There are adequate well-signed public footpaths	3	66	33	30	6
Peoples recreational needs are adequately met		47	70	18	3
Young peoples recreational needs are adequately met		26	52	43	8

Satisfaction with the leisure facilities has improved (33% satisfied, was 10%; 30% dissatisfied, was 53%)

Satisfaction with Open Spaces (75% satisfied) and well-signed public footpaths (50% satisfied; 26% dissatisfied) remain unchanged.

Few people (15%) believe recreational needs are not adequately met.

17 adults (up from 5) think a Youth Club is required, however, none of the young people asked for one.

Many ideas to improve recreational facilities were suggested, however, none were supported by more than 3 respondents.

Village Hall

Village Hall				
I attend events at the Village Hall	Fortnightly	Monthly	Occasional	Never
	8	15	77	40
I would be willing to help with Village Hall activities	Yes	No		
	26	78		

[10] Local Insight Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion Ltd.

Attendance at Village Hall events appears to have remained unchanged. 26 people said they would be willing to help with Village Hall activities, some left their contact details – thank you.

Most popular activities are: Social Nights /evenings (18), Bingo (17), Christmas activities (16), Quiz (16), Easter Egg Hunt (13), Music nights (9), National Celebrations (7), Wine and Cheese / Wine tasting (6), Murder mystery (5), Dog Show (4)

Suggestions for additional activities included: Race nights (4), Major sports events (3), Exercise/fitness class for adults (3) **ACTION**

Transport

In Bradwell (Braintree), 7.93% of households have no access to a car or van. This is less than the proportion without access to a car or van in England (23.54%) and less than the proportion without access to a car or van in Essex (15.88%). [11]

In 2021, there were 7 lone pensioner households with no car or van (Census 2021)

27.31% of Bradwell households have 3+ cars or vans (Essex 12.7%; England 9.12%) and 36.56% have two cars/vans (Essex 30.64%; England 26.06%) while 28.19% have one car or van.

67% of respondents never use the bus service and 32% never use the rail service (unchanged from 2016).

Only three people use the rail service daily, two of these commute to London (via Kelvedon).

Residents are heavily dependent on cars for transport – to doctors, hospitals, schools, shopping, employment and further afield – **and the A120 is the main route to Braintree / Chelmsford and Colchester.**

Satisfaction with public transport has declined markedly since 2016, only 27% consider public transport to be adequate (was 40%). The main issues remain the same - the high cost of rail travel and the reliability of the bus service and in the recent survey, the (lack of) frequency of the bus service (was every 20-30 minutes, is now every 40 minutes).

Church

This is a new category.

30% think it is very important and 32% think it somewhat important to keep Bradwell Holy Trinity open.

Only 12% of respondents are interested in learning more about the Christian faith

[11] Census 2021

51 people are likely to attend services once or twice a year, 21 monthly and 5 weekly. The rest (57) are likely never to attend church. Three attend church elsewhere.

39 people are interested in supporting the church through attendance, 14 through giving and 14 by volunteering.

[In Bradwell (Braintree), there are 45.50% of the population with no religious belief. This is greater than the proportion in England with 36.67% with no religious belief and greater than the proportion in Essex with 42.05% with no religious belief. 48.56% claim Christianity as their belief in line with England and Essex – other religious beliefs are negligible.][12]

Young people

Our young people attend school, out of school they tend to stay at home, except when visiting friends. To visit their friends they walk, cycle, catch a bus or get a lift. They enjoy reading, sports/sports training, walking along public footpaths, watching TV, listening to music and walking with their family. Only half use the playing fields (there are no playing fields in Pattiswick) – the swings and slide are popular. They are members of Clubs in Braintree, Earls Colne, Coggeshall and Chelmsford. In general, they are content with the facilities offered in Bradwell. Half enjoy cycling. They are concerned about poor street lighting, and litter. **90% are concerned about speeding cars both on the A120 and through the village.** They would like a swimming pool, **a mirror by Brunswins Cottages to improve the visibility of on-coming cars** and better internet speeds at the top of the village. **They would like improvements to road safety – access from Bridge Hall Road to the eastbound bus stop on the A120/Hollies Road junction.**

This last request has greater urgency now a small development of family homes in Hollies Road has been granted planning permission.

Our young people attend schools in Braintree, Coggeshall and Colchester – they catch the bus on the A120 which requires they cross this very busy road – is this safe?

Our young people enjoy cycling and cycle to visit friends – how safe are our roads for cyclists?

Other ideas for improvement from our young people: Public toilets; tennis courts; shop, café, bike track.

END

Tony Dunn
Chair
Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council / Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

[12] 2021 Census