

1 Introduction

- 1.1** This representation has been produced on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council (SPC) in response to the consultation on 'A Plan for the West of Braintree Garden Community – Issues and Options Consultation'. This being a Development Plan Document (DPD).
- 1.2** We note that it is stated at the beginning of the document that the principle of development for this new Garden Community is contained in both Braintree and Uttlesford District Councils' emerging Local Plans, which set out the approximate location, scale and approach of the West of Braintree Garden Community (WBG). In the case of Uttlesford District Council, a decision has not yet been made if the Garden Community should extend into their district and that decision will be made by the Council before the Uttlesford Local Plan is submitted for independent Examination, after the Council has considered all of the representations which have been made in relation to its Draft Local Plan (Regulation 18).
- 1.3** Stebbing Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community; a development that could potentially deliver 10,000 new homes, employment land, and supporting social infrastructure on land that straddles the administrative boundary with Braintree District Council. Of these 10,000 new homes, it is anticipated that 970 could be delivered in Uttlesford towards the end of the Local Plan period but ultimately 3,500 could be constructed beyond 2033.
- 1.4** SPC has previously submitted representations in respect of both the Braintree and Uttlesford Draft Local Plans in which it has clearly stated its opposition to the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community. It hopes that Uttlesford District Council takes on board the criticisms voiced by it and other respondents, and ultimately decide not to include the West of Braintree Garden Community within the Submission Draft version of the Local Plan. It does not consider the proposals would promote the principles of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and would erode the unique character to the village and its setting within the wider landscape.

General Comments

- 1.5** We wish to begin by observing that we consider it both inappropriate and unhelpful for the two District Councils to have produced a consultation document with such a

small font size that it is almost unreadable when printed off. Particularly given the importance of the document's content in relation to the future lives of their residents. This results in the document being inaccessible for members of the public. We consider this to be a failure on behalf of both District Councils to ensure compliance with the content of their own Statements of Community Involvement.

- 1.6** SPC is concerned that the questions contained within this consultation have been phrased in such a way as to steer respondents to agree with them. The questions should have been worded in such a way as to encourage open discussion and debate, rather than seek endorsement of the two Councils' overall approach.
- 1.7** Although there are references to the important role of a Local Delivery Vehicle (LDV), there is no detailed explanation of how such a vehicle would actually work, or how it would oversee the acquisition of the land necessary to deliver the new Garden Community.
- 1.8** It is also unhelpful in making responses to the document's content, to have no paragraph numbering in the document upon which to reference individual comments.

Detailed Comments

- 1.9** Below we set out our detailed comments regarding particular sections of the consultation document.

Introduction (p.5)

- 1.10** It is stated that the West of Braintree Garden Community Plan will take the principle of development further than the Councils' Local Plans and include specific proposals, strategies and detailed policies to inform the delivery of the Garden Community, and that the final Plan will provide certainty for stakeholders on the type, scale and location of specific land uses including the infrastructure required to accommodate them.
- 1.11** SPC agrees that a DPD is required to guide the development of the Garden Community rather than a Supplementary Planning document (SPD), which is not subject to the same degree of consultation and independent examination, because of the scale of the development proposed; its cross-boundary nature; the associated land assembly required to accommodate the proposal; and the potential use of a

Local Delivery Vehicle (LDV) which will put proposals into practice. It also agrees that it should be subjected to a greater degree of scrutiny and consultation.

- 1.12** SPC would very much like to see the West of Braintree Garden Community Plan prepared in a comprehensive and transparent manner that would provide all stakeholders with an opportunity to not only inform the planning of the Garden Community but also to scrutinise its preparation. It awaits to see if this will actually happen as the Plan is progressed forward. However, we note that whilst the Braintree Local Development Scheme (LDS) adopted in January 2017 includes provision for the production of Strategic Growth Development Plan Documents (DPD's), the Uttlesford LDS (July 2017) contains no such provision or commitment.

National Planning Policy (p.8)

- 1.13** Reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) "...advocating the use of large-scale developments which incorporate the Town and Country Planning Association's (TCPA's) Garden City Principles as one way of achieving development at scale (paragraph 52)...". Whilst this may be the case, the NPPF also emphasises the importance of addressing housing pressures by boosting the supply of housing in a prompt manner. There is a danger, particularly with proposals for three large new settlements across the North Essex Authorities that too much emphasis is being placed on the promotion of new garden Communities, and that housing delivery will either not happen, or happen considerably later than was originally envisaged. Much to the detriment of those that require housing now or in the near future. We are aware that Braintree District Council has already accrued about one year's backlog of housing supply against its Joint Strategic Local Plan target figure, since the start of the new Plan period in 2013.
- 1.14** We welcome the reference to the fact that the development of new large-scale communities must be established by working with existing local communities. However, any such engagement must be meaningful and take on board valid points made.
- 1.15** Mention is made of the NPPF seeking to ensure an integrated approach to the planning of housing, and provision of commercial and employment uses alongside the delivery of community services and facilities, to include education and open space uses as part of the creation of healthy and inclusive communities (paragraph 69). SPC has already raised concerns that any Garden Community development

within Uttlesford, will be located at the western extremities of the new settlement, and lacking appropriate employment and community facilities.

- 1.16** In terms of the NPPF recognising the significance of financial viability in both planning and decision making, SPC is concerned that the very high cost of infrastructure associated with the WBGC, given both its scale and the relative remoteness of its location to major urban populations, will make delivery of the aspirational features referred to throughout the consultation document, difficult or impossible to achieve.

A National Agenda for Garden Communities (p.8)

- 1.17** With regard to the Government's intention to legislate to allow locally accountable New Town Development Corporations to be set up which could further support public sector delivery of new communities it is stated that the Councils will continue to explore such innovative mechanisms to deliver the Garden Community. It is then specified that the Councils are working jointly to explore the most effective way to deliver the Garden Community that would maximise benefits of the development for all. One delivery option being through NEGC Ltd (working closely with Uttlesford District Council) and Local Delivery Vehicles for each Garden Community; another may involve emerging Government proposals for locally-led New Town Development Corporations which may offer an alternative means of delivery that is devolved and locally accountable. It is, therefore, fully apparent that at present there is still great uncertainty and lack of clarity regarding how exactly the new Garden Community is going to actually be delivered.
- 1.18** It is then stated that regardless of which delivery model is applied, capturing the uplift in development land value will be critical to ensuring that the long-term aspirations of community stewardship of public assets and infrastructure are delivered. This is a very important point. However, if the intention is to acquire the development land cheaply at prices not significantly above agricultural land value, in order to maximise money for investing in necessary infrastructure, it appears far from certain that landowners will be willing to sell their land for development. Any requirement to go down the compulsory purchase route could be both expensive and time-consuming.

Landscape: Constraints & Opportunities (p.12)

- 1.19** Mention is made of the fact that the land within the site forms an open farmland plateau with a gently sloping topography to the south. It is acknowledged that the topography means that there are long distance views into the site from the surrounding rural areas, and a number of sensitive receptors associated with the surrounding settlement, and that large scale development has the potential to impact on the rural character of the small settlements surrounding the site.
- 1.20** Accordingly, SPC believes that in order to address such landscape constraints, it will be necessary to reduce the overall amount of housing being proposed for the Garden Settlement.
- 1.21** The proximity of existing villages to the Garden Community is said to open up opportunities to improve areas between these existing settlements and new development. Existing private farmland, for example, could be opened up as publicly accessible parkland with new green links formed to improve walking and cycling connectivity in the area for both existing and future residents.
- 1.22** SPC would wish to ensure that an appropriate buffer is provided between it and the new settlement. The Chris Blandford – Land West of Braintree Landscape & Visual Appraisal (June 2017) acknowledged in paragraph 4.3.4 the importance of views into the site from Stebbing Green:

“The visual appraisal demonstrates that views into the Site are typically limited due to a combination of topography and vegetation structure. Exceptions to this include open views into western part of the Site from Stebbing Green to the west, and cross valley-views of the eastern part of the Site are obtained from the east in the vicinity of Panfield.

Heritage (p.13)

- 1.23** SPC welcomes acknowledgement of the fact that Stebbing has a designated Conservation Area and several listed buildings that would be sensitive to development. In addition, there are acknowledged to be a number of isolated farmhouses and farm buildings both within the site and in the surrounding area that are listed which would be sensitive, and a Roman Villa in the area of Boxted Wood

and potential earthworks within the Ancient Woodland. Any development must have suitable regard to the aforementioned constraints.

- 1.24** Stebbing Parish Council has significant concerns regarding the potential heritage and landscape impacts that could accrue should the West of Braintree Garden Settlement go ahead.

Connectivity – public transport (p.14)

- 1.25** It is specified that the development of the Garden Community presents an opportunity to heavily invest in public transport infrastructure in the area, providing high quality and high frequency services within the site and to and from existing destinations, including transport hubs within Braintree, Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and through the proposed Easton Park Garden Community to London Stansted Airport. It is said that improvements in public transport will provide benefits to existing residents in surrounding settlements, which may help to make services more viable at an earlier stage in the development.

- 1.26** SPC is highly sceptical of the above claims. It considers that the lack of any single significantly sized urban area in the locality will mean that residents of the new community will be heavily reliant upon motor vehicles for travel.

Connectivity – road network (p.15)

- 1.27** In terms of constraints, it is acknowledged that it is forecast that numerous junctions in and around Braintree will be overcapacity by 2032 if no improvements to the A120 between Braintree and Marks Tey take place. This is recognised as being particularly important due to the lack of existing road infrastructure to the north of the site resulting in dependency on access from the south, putting pressure on A120, its junctions and the town centre route via the B1256. There are also known to be potential capacity issues to the west of the site along the B1256 towards Great Dunmow and its connection to the A120 as well as the A120 westwards and further afield to Junction 8 of the M11. Without intervention there may also be issues with traffic impacts on Felsted to the south of the site, possibly as a result of a lack of an all movements junction with the A120 in the vicinity of the site.

- 1.28** It is stated that opportunities have been (and will continue to be) sought to addressing the lack of connectivity with the A120 in the vicinity of the site. In order to

resolve this issue early in the development process a bid for the funding of a new all-movements junction with the A120 was submitted to Government in September 2017.

- 1.29** SPC considers that the document's admission of major access and capacity constraints upon the surrounding road network to be a major concern. It believes that this supports its position that the West of Braintree Garden Community to be inappropriate development, which will cause significant congestion for both new and existing residents. The result of this could also well be an unacceptable rise in air pollution and reduction in air quality.

Water cycle (p.15)

- 1.30** The fact that both the Pods Brook and River Ter are already failing to meet the Water Framework Directive target of good ecological status and are considered to be at risk of further deterioration in water quality is a significant concern to SPC. Particularly given the statement that diffuse urban pollution from surface run off associated with future development could exacerbate this risk.

Economy – retail (p.16)

- 1.31** Mention is made of the site being located approximately 5km to the west of Braintree Town Centre, 6km to the west of the regional shopping and leisure attraction of Braintree Freeport and 13km from Great Dunmow Town Centre. The risk of the Garden Community itself becoming a dormitory residential suburb is acknowledged.
- 1.32** SPC is firmly of the opinion that the risk of WBGC becoming a dormitory residential suburb is extremely high, given the lack of any regional or sub-regional sized town centre within reasonable proximity to the proposed new settlement.

Economy – Employment (p.16)

- 1.33** SPC has already raised concerns that any Garden Community development within Uttlesford, will be located at the western extremities of the new settlement, and lacking appropriate employment and community facilities.

Utilities (p.17)

- 1.34** It is acknowledged that Anglian Water has stated that the site is forecast to be in a deficit state by 2040, and that one of the main measures to mitigate the forecasted deficit will be to increase the transfer from neighbouring areas that benefit from a water supply surplus. Unfortunately however, there is little spare capacity at either the Rayne or the Braintree waste water treatment plants, and waste water will need to be pumped to Bocking waste water treatment plant. It is recognised that this would only provide a short term solution, and in the medium term a new waste water treatment plant would have to be provided within the new settlement area. It is also recognised that this could be challenging because existing water courses are too small and ecologically sensitive to accept the final discharge of treated sewage effluent, so any effluent which cannot be discharged locally would still have to be pumped to Bocking.
- 1.35** SPC considers the difficulties associated with water supply to be a serious impediment to the delivery of a Garden Community, and to raise significant doubts about the suitability of the site for such a development.

Minerals extraction (p.18)

- 1.36** The Broadfield Farm site to the west of Rayne is allocated for mineral extraction in the Essex Minerals Plan and is subject to a planning application by Tarmac for the extraction of 3.66 million tonnes of sand and gravel. It is stated that any mineral extraction operations would require a noise and environmental buffer zone between the potential Garden Community and neighbouring villages, ensuring any disruption is kept to a minimum for both new and existing residents whilst the site is active.
- 1.37** However, SPC would question the likely impact of such major mineral extraction on the delivery timescale for WBGC. There is likely to be many years of disruption as lorries travel to and from the site through the surrounding area. Such movements are not likely to assist developers sell their new homes whilst disruption is ongoing. There is also then the issue of the future restoration of the site and its realistic timescale.

Q.1 Vision and principles (p.19)

- 1.38** SPC welcomes the reference to good value, frequent, high-quality and reliable public transport will connect the new Community to existing settlements in Braintree and Uttlesford Districts including Braintree, Rayne and Stebbing, and further afield to other transport hubs including London Stansted Airport.
- 1.39** It is the belief of SPC that the Vision should also refer to the WBGC protecting the setting, character and attributes of surrounding local communities.
- 1.40** It is clear that the Vision is very aspirational. The question is will it realistically be achievable.

Q.2 Charter Principles (p.21)

Principle 3: Employment Opportunity (p.21)

- 1.41** It is stated that the employment function will be a key component of creating character and identity and sustainable communities. Seeking to provide access to one job per household within the new community or within a short distance by public transport is laudable. However, it may be very many years into the development before this becomes at all realistic. In the meantime, it is likely that residents of WBGC will need to travel further afield (probably by car) to their place of work.

Principle 6: Good Design (p.21)

- 1.42** It is specified that through all stages of the planning, design and development of the Garden Communities the highest quality of design and management of the built and public realm will be promoted. Existing local assets will be capitalised to help create distinctive places. Again, these principles are to be welcomed. However, SPC is concerned that, in reality, the extremely high cost of providing key infrastructure to allow WBGC to work, will compromise the ability to achieve high quality design and deliver other specified community infrastructure components identified within other principles.

Q.3 Emerging approach to integrated and sustainable transport

Public Transport – Strategic Connectivity (p.27)

- 1.43** It is stated that to ensure the highest level of strategic connectivity the Garden Community will have to be integrated into the wider regional transport system. Whilst the site is in close proximity to the A120, it does not currently feed into the wider public transport system. The Transport Strategy will therefore have to deliver new strategic public transport systems that are capable of connecting the Garden Community to surrounding areas, including areas with employment growth opportunities. Such a form of public transport is referred to as Rapid Transit System, reflecting the scale and speed of its service.
- 1.44** It is specified that a future Rapid Transit System serving the Garden Community could take the form of strategic light rail, tram-train, or a guided or priority bus service which could link the site up to London Stansted Airport to the west and Harwich (via Colchester) to the east. It is stated that the availability of frequent public transport access to a potential future multimodal transportation hub at the airport would also vastly improve the connectivity of the new Garden Community, making destinations further afield (including to London and Cambridge) accessible via convenient and sustainable modes. It is acknowledged that in addition to the future Rapid Transit System, the transport network will have to be supplemented by local, frequent-stopping and high quality bus services. The strategic public transport network could include the following potential interventions:
- 1.45** SPC does not dispute the above statements. However, it does have serious doubts regarding the deliverability of these major aspirations. It believes that the cost and timescale for implementing such changes would be very problematic in a location such as WBGC, which is sited a significant distance away from major urban areas.
- 1.46** It is noted that the Garden Community is seeking to be an exemplar in terms of the way that people can travel, with 40% of movements by active modes (walking or cycling). SPC seriously doubts such a high percentage of movements by these transport modes to be realistic, for the reason already identified in the paragraph immediately above.
- 1.47** With regard to a reduced amount of land being set aside for car based infrastructure and instead more land for green space, development and useful amenities, SPC

would be very concerned if this approach results in a significant amount of vehicle parking occurring on the outer edges of the WBGC. There are many examples from developments elsewhere in Essex where insufficient car parking provision in new developments has resulted in unsightly, heavily cluttered and obstructed neighbouring roads. Whilst encouraging non-vehicle movements is fine, heavy restrictions on car provision in a locality like WBGC is likely to be unrealistic given its relative remoteness.

Q.4 – The emerging approach to integrated and sustainable transport

Road Network (p.28)

- 1.48** Reference is made to the site, by its nature, lending itself to only a small number of access possibilities, all of which connect with the B1256 and A120 to the south. It is stated as being essential that the Garden Community's connection with the A120 is carefully considered given its strategic nature; its anticipated improvements to its eastern section between Galley's Corner and Colchester; and the capacity implications brought about by additional largescale growth along the route. It is acknowledged that a functioning road access will always be required to access the site, but it is stated that this access should not at the detriment of encouraging residents and employees from using others forms of transport. Therefore the access arrangements between the site, the B1256 and the A120 will have to be planned in such a way that when new infrastructure is provided it considers ease of travel in relation to other transport modes with provision built into the design for bus priority lanes
- 1.49** SPC would be very concerned if inadequate direct road access to WBGC is provided, and that motorists are instead forced to use the surrounding villages and their roads as back running to utilise alternative access routes. Consequently, it concurs that it will be essential that further highway modelling and testing of the solutions presented in the Movement and Access Study are fully explored, and fully based upon realistic assumptions.

Q. 6 – The emerging approach to the living environment

Centres Strategy And Settlement Hierarchy (p.32)

- 1.50** There is an open acknowledgement that the current rural context of the site and surrounding area means the population is relatively sparsely distributed. The urban area of Braintree is referred to as having the highest concentration of population and activity, and being approximately 5km to the east. While the market town of Great Dunmow is approximately 6km to the west with a modest population and local key service provision. The village of Rayne sits in close proximity to the east, but provides relatively limited economic activity. It is specified that there is little close connection to any major urban settlements to the north or south.
- 1.51** As a result, it is said that the Garden Community will need to establish a major new centre at its heart to focus the predominant interaction and exchange of social and economic capital within the Garden Community. Mention is made that the new centre will likely comprise of large groups of shops containing at least one supermarket and a range of non-retail services such as banks, cafés and restaurants.
- 1.52** The above sections of the document highlight and reinforce SPC's own concerns regarding the isolated nature of the proposed new Garden Community and its lack of proximity to any single substantive urban area. Even assuming that WBGC is fully developed over time, it would appear very unlikely that even then its centre will be capable of providing a sufficient scale of facilities and services that would alleviate a significant amount of journeys by its future residents to more substantive locations elsewhere (e.g. Chelmsford, Colchester, Cambridge etc).

Q.12 Emerging approach to innovative delivery structure

Charter Principle 10: Innovative Delivery Structure (p.41)

- 1.53** SPC would concur that the delivery of new Garden Communities would require delivery arrangements that are more complex and wide-reaching than those that would apply to conventional development. However, SPC is concerned by references to an expressed desire by the two local Councils, to play a full and active role in the development of the Garden Community, and to participate in both the risks and the rewards of development, securing benefits for the wider communities. In particular, SPC has strong concerns regarding a potential conflict of interest between the

Authorities seeking to maximise revenue, and their roles as being responsible for meeting the wider needs of their populations.

- 1.54** By taking a more involved role in the Garden Community the Councils state that they will have a stronger say in the delivery of the settlement, ensuring that infrastructure is delivered at the right time to support the new Garden Communities and to minimise the impacts and increase the benefits to existing communities. They will be looking to capturing land values to pay for infrastructure and community assets, and have stated their desire to share the development risks and rewards.
- 1.55** SPC consider that the formation of any LDV and Development Corporations with powers to acquire and to hold land, to prepare master plans and other guidance, and to determine planning applications in the Garden Community area, must not be to the detriment of the existing local community. The main concern would be that the Councils could be drawn to taking decisions without suitable community engagement and public scrutiny.
- 1.56** Furthermore, SPC has strong doubts regarding the assumptions underpinning realistic land capture values, particularly regarding the likely willingness of landowners to sell their agricultural landholdings at the very low values necessary to fund the major infrastructure that will be required.

Q.13 Comments on the potential boundary of the Garden Community

Q14 - Any other considerations relevant to the West of Braintree Garden Community that have not been identified or discussed in this document

Spatial Boundaries (p.42)

- 1.57** Reference is made to the fact that both the Braintree and Uttlesford emerging Local Plans show the West of Braintree Garden Community as a broad location. This means that further detailed work is required to determine the full extent of land required. Once the developable area is determined the quantity of land required for each land use or infrastructure type needs to be calculated based on the evidence base as well as the principles contained in the Garden Communities Charter. SPC considers that this to be an open acknowledgement that the proposals for a new Garden Community are not yet at an advanced enough stage in order to make detailed comments.

- 1.58** Stebbing Parish Council considers that there is a lack of clarity regarding the intended scale of the proposed West Braintree Garden Community. The draft Local Plan refers to potentially 3,500 dwellings in Uttlesford out of approximately 10,000 dwellings with the remainder being in Braintree. Policy SP7 ‘Development and Delivery of New Garden Communities in North Essex’ in the Braintree Publication Draft Local Plan (2017) however refers to an overall total of between 7,000 – 10,000 dwellings. If the West of Braintree Garden Settlement might only be 7,000 dwellings in size, it would not seem necessary for it to stretch across into Uttlesford.
- 1.59** SPC is opposed in principle to the creation of the West of Braintree Garden Community as it considers that it will be sited in an inappropriate and unsustainable location. However, should the decision be taken that the new settlement should go ahead, it believes that Option 2 to be preferable to Option 1.
- 1.60** The Uttlesford Ecological Sites on or adjacent to new settlements / neighbouring proposals (May 2017) noted that:

“Ufd 281 Boxted wood lies within the development site. There is a grassland site and Cannon Wood adjoining the development site which may be of ecological importance. Up to date information on these sites is required as part of an overall ecological survey accompanying any eventual planning submission”.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 1.61** The West of Braintree Garden Community Plan (Reg.18) – Sustainability Appraisal produced by Essex Place Services (November 2017). Below, we draw upon its key findings of relevance.
- 1.62** Paragraph 3.3.4 refers to better quality farmland existing around Stebbing Green:
- “...With the majority of the land in productive agricultural use; intensively farmed for arable crops, field size typically medium to large, and the majority of the water courses classified by the Environment Agency as ecologically poor, overall the site is unlikely to have high levels of existing biodiversity. There is however an area of good quality semi-improved grassland and priority mixed habitat around Stebbing Green...”.**

1.63 Paragraph 3.3.13 highlights Stebbing’s conservation value

“....Stebbing also has a designated Conservation Area and several listed buildings that would be sensitive to development. In addition, there are a number of isolated farmhouses and farm buildings both within the site and in the surrounding area that are listed which would be sensitive. There is also known to be a Roman Villa in the area of Boxted Wood and potential earthworks within the Ancient Woodland....”.

1.64 Whilst it is acknowledged that the provision of a new buffer might result in an opportunity to create a permanent green gap to avoid future coalescence, SPC does not regard the creation of a very large new Garden Community stretching from Braintree across into Uttlesford, as providing a positive impact. It is acknowledged that an appropriate new green buffer might be possible to achieve if WBGC is shrunk down in size, and confined to Braintree District only.

“...There will be significant positive impacts on Sustainability Objective 6 regarding coalescence in response to the new community, through Theme 1, addressing the relationship with existing communities close to its boundaries and maintain a separation between them including the villages of Great Saling, Stebbing Green and Rayne. Further detail is likely to be provided at later consultation stages. Similarly, under Theme 1 - Principle 6 it is stated that, ‘it is considered desirable to retain a ‘green gap’ between the new Garden Community and the surrounding villages and towns, to avoid coalescence and maintain settlement identity....’.

1.65 We note that p.71 recognises that Option 1 specifically, development in the area could also contribute to the coalescence of Stebbing Green in the south west.

1.66 Paragraph 5.3.3 states that

“...The smaller Option 2 is considered to have fewer potential negative impacts at this stage. Option 1 is assessed as having comparably more negative implications due to an increased likelihood of negative impacts associated with nature conservation and heritage assets (and associated landscape features) to the western boundary of the option,

largely singularly representing the inclusion of Boxted Wood. Both options will need to address the presence of heritage assets throughout the area, and also off-site to the north associated with the Conservation Area of Great Saling which contains a range of listed buildings as well as the Registered Park and Garden of Saling Grove. It is recommended that enhancements are sought at the design and masterplanning stage with assets factored into the Garden Community. It is also recommended that a buffer separation be ensured through masterplanning to minimise certain impacts on existing communities, specifically in relation to residents in Great Saling, Stebbing Green and Blake End...”.

Appendix 1 - The North Essex Garden Communities Charter

- 1.67** Whilst SPC recognises the aspirational nature of many of the charter principles, it would again question their deliverability in the context of the West of Braintree Garden Community site location.

Conclusions

- 1.68** SPC has consistently stated its opposition to the WBGC proposal as proposed in the emerging Braintree and Uttlesford District Local Plans based upon sound sustainability and environmental reasons. The above comments explain many of the key reasons why this is the case.
- 1.69** Notwithstanding SPC’s opposition to WBGC, it strongly believes that should the new Garden Community proceed, Option 2 (Braintree only) should be preferred over Option 1 (Braintree and Uttlesford). It considers that Option 2 will result in a significantly reduced environmental impact.
- 1.70** Notwithstanding SPC’s objection in principle to the WBGC proposals, it wishes to be properly consulted and engaged in the Plan making process, as and when the West of Braintree Garden Community DPD progresses. It recognises that this is essential if it is to ensure that the interests of its residents and the wider community are properly considered.



West of Braintree Garden Community Issues & Options Consultation – November 2017 Representations on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council

Background Documents & Images

1.71 In terms of useful background documents and images, SPC would refer the two local authorities to the following material:

- Grover Lewis Associates Heritage Impact Assessment relating to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/e1a742_54960e04cfaa4ec89fc207bd2a463414.pdf

- The Landscape Partnership's Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal including Maps and Photos

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/e1a742_1266d5913383492ba0f4f8ef74f9ebbc.pdf

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/e1a742_9ede298975ff46afbbdec3b1a45b0ab3.pdf

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/e1a742_fe6b4759fdf44f72af0d6feeeeae3150f.pdf

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/e1a742_de62bd290fd144609d75ab37819dc450.pdf

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/e1a742_bcba51f7810a48b6a09b178509fc3e76.pdf

PC/1472/NW
22 January 2018