



Uttlesford Strategic Housing Land Availability Study 2008

Appendix 6

Minutes of Panel Meetings



Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Appendix 6 Minutes of Panel Meetings

Contents

| | | Page |
|-------------------|--|------|
| Inception Meeting | | 1 |
| Meeting 1 | ARK1 – CLA9 | 6 |
| Meeting 2 | DEB1 – GtDUN20 | 12 |
| Meeting 3 | GtDUN21 – HEM2 | 22 |
| Meeting 4 | GtCHE7; ELS8; HEN2 – Lt EAS3 | 30 |
| Meeting 5 | FEL5; LtHAL1 – RAD1 | 40 |
| Meeting 6 | H-ROD2; CLA3; GtDUN32; SAF1 – STE7 | 50 |
| Meeting 7 | HBO5; TAK1 – WIC4 | 60 |
| Consultation 8 | LtDUN2; STE2 DEB3; GtCHE8; GtDUN33; MAN2; QUE6; SAF21; TAK16; THA15 | 71 |



**Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Notes of the Inception Meeting
Held at the Council Offices, Saffron Walden
11 November 2008**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Present:

UDC – Sarah Nicholas [SN] (Planning Policy), Melanie Jones (Planning Policy), Phil Hunt (Engineer) Cllr J.Cheetham

Tim Bluff (Bloor Homes), Ben Yallop (Croudace Homes), Seb Vallance (Pelham Structures), Charles Nash (Prime Homes), Angus Hudson (Sworders), Andy Butcher (Bidwells), Richard Winsborough (RW Land and Planning), Brian Christian

Moira Groborz (Rural Housing Enabler – RCCE), Ulrike Maccariello (Hastoe HA)

Phillip Leader and Mel Sullivan – Uttlesford Association of Local Councils

Andrew Hunter – Environment Agency

Matthew Bradley and Mark Robinson – Essex County Council Highways

Paul Garland – Sustainable Uttlesford

2. What the SHLAA is all about

National Planning Policy Context

- Government priority that land availability is not a constraint on delivery of new homes
- Local Authorities need to
 - Identify specific deliverable sites for first 5 years of plan that are ready for development
 - Specific developable sites for years 6-10
 - Specific sites or broad areas for future growth for years 11-15.
 - No allowance for windfalls unless there are justifiable local circumstances

Purpose of the Assessment

- Identify as many sites as possible with potential for housing. As a minimum this should be for the first ten years of the Core Strategy from adoption but ideally for the whole 15 year period. If this is not possible broad locations for development can be identified.
- Assess their housing potential
- Assess when they are likely to be developed.
- Evidence to inform plan making

The Assessment does not determine whether sites should be allocated but forms a basis for later decision making. It highlights the need for action to make some sites deliverable. The assessment will be part of the Annual Monitoring Report and be subject to review and update.

Core Requirement of the Assessment

- A list of sites, each with a map showing site



- Assessment of the deliverability/developability of each site to determine when a site is realistically expected to be developed.
- Potential capacity of each site
- Constraints on the delivery of sites
- Recommendations on how constraints could be overcome

3. Methodology

Uttlesford's methodology is based on Government guidance but it is the details of each stage which were discussed and agreed.

Stage 1

- It was agreed that the study could be carried within the district and there was no need for joint working with other authorities.
- The methodology identifies a list of key stakeholders who SN agreed to write to with an update of the methodology.

Stage 2

Even with sites within the planning process it is still important to show that the sites are deliverable.

A stakeholder had suggested that sites subject to undetermined planning applications or refusal or subject to appeal should be considered in the assessment.

- The sites of undetermined applications continually changes and would be difficult to include in the assessment. SN considered that for practical reasons the Assessment should look at the situation at April each year. This was not considered to exclude significant sites. Under the adopted Local Plan the majority of applications for residential development are small and within development limits, other sites would be identified from other sources or the site survey.
- The study would look at sites from various sources. The Urban Capacity Study was listed as one of the sources for identifying sites not currently in the planning process. However the last urban capacity study was done in 2005 and this only looked at sites in Saffron Walden, Stansted Mountfitchet and Great Dunmow. It was suggested that other sites might have become available since then and sites in other settlements would not have been considered. SN confirmed that under stages 4 and 5 of the methodology sites not identified through the desk top study would be identified.
- The HBF had suggested that sites not currently in planning process should include 'additional housing opportunities adjacent residential areas' as some sites may be too small to be classed as urban extensions. SN agreed to make this change.

Stages 3, 4 & 5

The size threshold made the assessment manageable but also included medium sized sites which can make a contribution to housing supply.

A stakeholder suggested that the size threshold could give rise to a reliance on windfall sites. SN's view was that this would not be the case but if insufficient sites were found, smaller sites could be looked at.

Stage 6

The estimates of housing potential for sites was based on work done by the Council in 2002 and revised in 2005 which looked at the density of recent



housing developments of good design so similar densities could be applied to sites in similar locations.

- In relation to estimating the potential capacity of the sites the proposed assumptions about densities were questioned. The density of the new settlement of 50-67 was felt to be particularly high. In order to achieve these densities a high proportion of flats would be required which might not be appropriate in the context of the District. It would be better to treat the new settlement the same as development adjacent the any settlement. It was suggested and agreed that the Council would look at comparative examples e.g. South Woodham Ferres and Cambourne. This could also provide comparative information on the “gross to net” ratios.

Stage 7

Deliverable = Suitable site; available now/within 5 yrs

Developable = Suitable site; could be developed at a specific point in time ie achievable

Not currently developable = unknown when a site could be developed

- There was some discussion about the way information on the sites would be captured and presented. There was a need to strike a balance between simplicity and accuracy and providing the level of information required. A sound approach would be needed to assess the sites. The main problem would be deciding how to weight different issues. It was agreed that the traffic light system on a spreadsheet would give a useful overall impression. The issue of how achievability and availability would be dealt with on the form was raised because there was no information on this. SN would look at including some of the questions from the Availability of Potential Housing Sites form to give the necessary information.
- HBF objected to applying policy restrictions/filters. SN said that sites would not be omitted just because they were in the Greenbelt.
- It was agreed that the purpose of the SHLAA was not to consider 3rd party objections but to assess each site according to the criteria.
- Agricultural land quality should be included as one of the issues on the site suitability appraisal form.
- The title of the section on Sustainability on this form should be changed to accessibility. There should be a notes column to accompany this section to record details of bus frequency etc which may be relevant.
- It was agreed that the sustainability of communities could be a consideration. Sustainable Uttlesford would support an assessment which looks at sites in sustainability terms that meet the needs of prospective and existing residents. Sites should not be discounted because they are coming out “red” where there might be advantages in community terms. If such a site would have community benefits this could be reflected in the coding of red/orange/green and a note of explanation provided.
- It was suggested under section 7b Assessing the availability of the site that a sites is available for development if the landowner has expressed an intention to sell or develop



- It was asked how the panel would know what facilities are being proposed/needed and how therefore, will this be taken into account in the assessment? It was appreciated that this was a difficulty to which there was no straightforward answer and each site would probably need to be treated on its merits and any assumptions made recorded.
- The issue of how to assess the viability of sites in the current market situation was raised. It was suggested that one approach would be to highlight the fundamental constraints and separate these from the constraints which could be overcome at a cost and/or over time.

Stage 8

SN considered that the draft report would set out the methodology; tables of results and appendices of site details

Stage 9

The methodology currently suggests that identification of broad locations is potentially an issue in Utlesford where a number of new settlements are being promoted and counter-representations suggesting other locations for settlements are being suggested. However SN stated that Availability of Potential Sites Forms had been submitted for new settlement sites being promoted. This stage can be revisited if insufficient sites are identified.

Stage 10

- SN clarified that the assessment would not be looking at windfall sites because the Government advice was not to include these unless there was good reason to do so.

4. Terms of Reference

- In relation to the Terms of Reference for the panel it was agreed that there must be strong protocols on the participants to avoid the possibility of challenge from other interested parties. A possible protocol was suggested - that people on the panel who are promoting sites declare their interest and do not participate in the discussion on their site unless asked for information or to correct points of error. SN would seek advice from the Council's legal team and the procedure would be agreed and recorded.
- The Council would provide the initial assessment of the sites to be discussed beforehand. It was suggested that all the material for the sites to be discussed could be made available on a mini website so that members of the panel could look at the information and visit the sites if necessary. This would avoid photocopying and sending large e-mails. SN would investigate with the Council's IT section. It was suggested that if this was not possible that the site co-ordinates be provided so that people could look them up on Google earth etc.
- It was suggested that the next meeting should be in the beginning of December. A provisional date was agreed as Tuesday 9th December at 9.30am. **NOW CHANGED TO THE AFTERNOON STARTING AT 2.00PM**

ACTIONS

Methodology



Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Appendix 6 - Minutes of Panel Meetings
Inception Meeting

1. Amend table of sources of sites not currently in planning process to include sites adjacent to residential areas.
2. Look at comparative examples of new settlements/urban extensions for densities and gross/net ratios.
3. Write to Key Stakeholders with updated methodology.

Site Suitability Form

4. Include Agricultural land quality on Site Suitability Form
5. Change title from Sustainability to Accessibility on Site Suitability Form
6. Record bus frequency on Site Suitability Form

Excel summary table

7. Pick out key questions of Potential Sites form.
8. Ensure availability includes intention to development (not just sell).

Terms of Reference

9. Seek legal advice on protocol of participants during discussion of sites in which they have an interest.
10. Investigate possibility of setting up password protected website for panel to access members.



SHLAA Meeting 1
9th December 2008
Council Offices, Saffron Walden
Notes of Meeting

Attendance: T.Bluff (Bloor Homes), S.Vallance (SV) – Pelham Structures, B.Christian (Brian Christian Building Surveyor), C.Nash (Prime Homes Ltd) R.Windborough (RW Land and Planning) A.Butcher (Bidwells), M.Bradley (Essex CC Highways) P.Leeder (UALC), U.Maccanello (Hastoe Housing Association), P.Hunt (UDC Drainage and Safety Engineer), S.Nicholas and M.Jones (UDC Planning Policy and Housing Strategy)

Apologies: M.Groborz (RCCE) M.Sullivan (UALC)

Paul Garland from Uttlesford Futures had written to say that he did not think it was appropriate for him to be involved further.

1. Google Groups – some people were experiencing problems viewing large documents and printing the maps. It was agreed to continue using the groups. Anyone with problems to contact SN. SN would try and break down the files which had already been uploaded into smaller documents.
2. Densities and Gross/Net - SN is still looking into this. BC reminded that Cambourne might provide a useful comparison.
3. Terms of Reference – following the discussion at the last meeting a protocol had been developed. Panel members with an interest in the site can give a short statement, answer questions and then withdraw from the room during the discussion – this was agreed.
4. The panel assessed a number of sites. A summary of the discussion is attached. During the assessment it was suggested that it might be useful for members of the group to be able to see the “traffic light” assessment, google maps and the current development limits.
5. Dates for the next meetings are confirmed as:

Thursday 8 January 9.30 – 12.30 Council Chamber
Tuesday 20 January 9.30 - 12.30 Committee Room
Thursday 12 February 9.30 -12.30 Committee Room
Thursday 26 February 9.30 – 12.30 Committee Room



**Site Assessment Summary
 SHLAA Meeting 1
 9th December 2008**

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| ARK1 | House immediately to the west is very prominent. Failed appeal at Christiana – track record of not being suitable for development. Quicksie Hill, far less sensitive if development is required in Arkesden | Agreed unlikely to be appropriate - Suitability - Impact on Landscape | X | ? | X |
| ASH1 | Flooding issues in Ashdon – run off would need to be controlled. Rising land prominent within rural area. Within Conservation Area | Not acceptable – Suitability – Impact on Landscape | X | ? | X |
| AYT1 | There were two views. One that the site functions well in the environment at present and housing would be alien to this - other sites with greenhouses exist but are not all included in this study. There was a view that the redundant glasshouses are an eyesore and dangerous and an alternative use would be more appropriate. | More investigation on suitability required – no decision reached | ? | Y | Y |
| BAR1 | Barnston already has a lot of modern development. It has good access to Dunmow so the lack of facilities shouldn't be a deterrent. Could be a site to address local needs for housing but these would not normally be identified. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| BAR2 | There was some support for this site. There was some concern about impact on the landscape and the | Include, subject to note that for a village the size of Barnston, | Y | Y | Y |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | possible scale of the development. Could reduce the number of homes which could afford opportunities for open space and access to the wider countryside via the footpath network. A mixed development could help to make the village more sustainable | development of only part of the site would be more suitable. | | | |
| BAR3 | Football pitch should be protected this represents a major issue of suitability. | Investigate with agent/owner potential to replace football pitch elsewhere in the village Intend to relocate pitch and pavilion elsewhere. Options on other side of road in same ownership. The replacement pitch should be clearly identified. | ? | Y | ? |
| BER1 | Berden is relatively isolated. Current planning process is not creating infill opportunities. May be worth considering amending development limit but generally not suitable for additional new development | Not acceptable – suitability – impact on landscape and not sustainable location. | X | ? | ? |
| BIR1 | Important to preserve the gap between Bishops Stortford and Stansted. Green Belt is a major constraint. Marketability not a problem, even with employment surrounding – if it is felt to be suitable it would be achievable. Maybe suitable for employment but not residential. | Not suitable for housing – Important to maintain gap between Bishops Stortford and Birchanger/Stansted. | X | Y | Y |
| BIR2 | Planning Permission Granted – Agree assumption for delivery is reasonable. | No change to assessment | Y | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|-----------------------------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| BIR3 | Suitability in question. Highways agency state sites not considered as having potential for housing development. The site is currently in the greenbelt and this should be recognized. | Not suitable for housing – remote from settlement – green belt – noise issues | X | X | X |
| BIR4 | | | X | X | X |
| BIR5 | Physical boundary of the village is the track to the north of the site. Unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. Maybe possible to convert the existing building (subject to planning consent) but not redevelopment of the whole site The site is currently in the greenbelt and this should be recognized. | Not suitable for housing – Green Belt Amended to be in line with subsequent decision on sites in greenbelt | X | Y | Y |
| STA17 former reference BIR6 | Rochford Nurseries – proposal to increase yield on existing policy area. Suggested completion rates seem low but given economic situation and the fact that one developer is not building at the present this is probably realistic. | Accept | Y | Y | Y |
| CLA1 | Access good – location not particularly sensitive – should be considered | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| CLA2 | Picked up in employment survey as suitable for other uses. Agreed chicken sheds were an eyesore and could be redeveloped but it was also considered important to protect the existing strong rural economy in Clavering | Include subject to loss of employment land being acceptable | (Y) | ? | ? |
| CLA3 | SV declared an interest as agent for site and made a short statement - Site adjacent to development limits, screening to all directions, not suggesting whole site but may be frontage development 3-4 homes. SKN | Further investigation of potential of adjoining land SV to discuss with clients | ? | Y | Y |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | pointed out that if only part of the site was included it may fall outside the size threshold for the study. – SV then left the room. It was felt that frontage development would make some sense but in the context of the policy it would be logical to look at a wider area – this would be noted and investigated further. If the site were to be considered in isolation only frontage development would be appropriate but with adjoining land it could be acceptable. | | | | |
| CLA4 | BC expressed an indirect interest – acting for adjoining landowner. Development limits arbitrarily drawn – doesn't relate well to the form of the village. Question whether access can be achieved. Unlike the previous site does not have logical frontage development | Not suitable | X | ? | ? |
| CLA5 | Same considerations as CLA2 above. Site currently highly visible and redevelopment could improve appearance | Include subject to loss of employment land being acceptable | (Y) | Y | Y |
| CLA6 | AB declared an interest as agent for site. He confirmed there was a flooding issue which would need further investigation. PH suggested there would be a difficulty proving the sequential test in a district like Uttlesford. The road is liable to flood and there is no dry means of escape. Access and egress will be an issue. AB left the room. It was suggested that the need to deal with the flood | Include subject to meeting Sequential Test | (Y) | Y | ? |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | issue may present opportunities for the form of the development e.g open space within the flood risk zone with development to the rear. The Environment Agency was concerned that this site was being considered when there were clearly other sites available in this area. | | | | |
| CLA7 | Agreed site is suitable | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| CLA8 | Query about access. Development on this side of the road would have less impact. Suggestion that the identified site was too small and wrapping the development around the back of the frontage development would give greater potential. | Investigate access <i>Access and connection to services can be obtained from Oxleys Close. Willing to include further land if desirable.</i> | Y | Y | Y |
| CLA9 | Site reads as part of an important open space within the conservation area (although the site itself is outside the CA). Maybe potential for frontage development but 9 would be backland development - a more successful scheme could frame a "village green". More sensitive than the other sites listed above. | Include but note design layout would need to be sensitive to conservation area and adjoining open space. | Y | Y | Y |



**SHLAA Meeting 2
8th January 2009
Council Offices, Saffron Walden
Notes of Meeting**

Attendance: Mel Sullivan (UALC), Bill Bampton (Pelham Structures), Claire Hutchinson (Sworders), B.Christian (Brian Christian Building Surveyor), C.Nash (Prime Homes Ltd) R.Winsborough (RW Land and Planning) A.Butcher (Bidwells), B.Yallop (Croudace) E.Featherstone and L.Chapman (Essex County Council Highways), S.Nicholas and M.Jones (UDC Planning Policy and Housing Strategy)

Apologies: M.Groborz (RCCE) T.Bluff (Bloor Homes) S.Vallance (Pelham Structures)

Matters Arising from the Last Meeting on 9th December 2008:

S.Nicholas had followed up on the queries raised on some of the sites discussed at the last meeting. She would update the group when the information was received.

In relation to summary notes of the last meeting and the Barn at Hill Green, Clavering, Claire Hutchinson had queried the question mark under achievability. There was an issue relating to the suitability of the site due to the loss of the employment potential but there was no question that housing could be achieved on the site. It was agreed that the assessment should be changed.



Site Assessment Summary
SHLAA Meeting 2
8th January 2009

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| DEB1 | Important site as you approach the village from the East. Important group of listed buildings. Failed Planning Appeal. Fail to see how the site could accommodate 8-13 dwellings. Highways suggested there may be problems with access. | Not suitable | X | ? | Y |
| DEB2 | Question suitability of this site due to it's location in this small hamlet which has no facilities. There is no precedent of any development in depth in Debden Green so the site would have limited potential. | Not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| ELM1 | It was suggested that there could be some opportunities in Elmdon but that these were likely to be more along the Ickleton Road than in this sensitive location. | Not suitable | X | ? | Y |
| ELS1 | Some concern about proximity to the motorway – could be overcome by design within the scheme. The site is open and visible from Fuller's End but this shouldn't be an impediment to good design. In terms of environmental impact it was suggested that it could be more sensitive than some of the other Elsenham sites. | Overall suitable for inclusion. CPZ boundary would need to be amended to accommodate development. | Y | Y | Y |
| ELS2 | Can't look at this site in isolation. Need to look at it as part of a package and it does link conveniently into the adjoining land. The surrounding development is a typical "Fairview" development where the density | If the site is developed on it's own there is a loss of open space and protected trees. If the site is included within a | (Y) | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | tends to be quite high and open space quite rare, so there is a value in keeping open sites like this. | larger area there could be some trade off with the open space and trees being replaced elsewhere in the development | | | |
| ELS3 | Some access issues. Highways advice that most suitable access would be via Hailes Wood Road, but further work would be required to confirm. | Include subject to confirmation that highways issues can be resolved | Y | Y | (Y) |
| ELS4 | The only issue is access. The existing driveway is relatively narrow but the drawing shows potential for widening by using the adjacent land. The access point is opposite a junction but Highways confirmed that this could be overcome, possibly with a mini roundabout. | Include subject to confirmation that highways issues can be resolved | Y | Y | (Y) |
| ELS5 | It would be unreasonable not to include this site if the west side of Elsenham is being considered for expansion. Again there may be potential highways issues in securing a suitable access for this scale of development | Include subject to confirmation that highways issues can be resolved. | Y | Y | (Y) |
| ELS6 | C.Hutchinson of Sworders acting for clients gave a short explanation of the scheme. A transport assessment has been carried out. The clients also own Alsa Wood and see this development as offering potential to increase public access to the wood and improve the management regime. She was asked about the potential traffic impact on Silver Street and Grove Hill, particularly from any commercial element to the development. She indicated that the TA had | Include subject to confirmation that highways issues can be resolved | Y | Y | (Y) |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | shown that this was not a problem. She then left the room while the panel considered the site. It was felt that it would be unfair to single out this development for its possible impact on Stansted as this could potentially apply to any site in Elsenham. People could be encouraged to use Hall Road. A comprehensive approach was needed. | | | | |
| ELS7 | Reasonable stand alone site that can be accessed via Robin Hood Road | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| FEL1 | Would not achieve numbers proposed by agent. Estimated yield is unrelated to the site circumstances. Significant buffer planting would be required. Felsted is a series of disjointed settlements. Concern that site doesn't link well into the corner of the village | Include but lesser number would be more appropriate | Y | Y | Y |
| FEL2 | Wouldn't be looking for development in depth in this location – should be ribbon development. Therefore question the estimated yield | Include but lesser number would be more appropriate. | Y | Y | Y |
| FEL3 | Generally access for this number of homes would not be an issue for Felsted because of the junction improvements which have been carried out for the Oakwood Park development. Yields suggested by owner are unrealistic. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| FEL4 | As FEL2 development in depth would not be appropriate – should be ribbon development so question the estimated yield | Include but lesser number would be more appropriate | Y | Y | Y |
| GtCHE 1 | B.Christian acting for clients made some general comments about the need for additional development in Great Chesterford. There had been no new housing built in the village since 1995. There was a | Include subject to loss of employment land being acceptable | (Y) | Y | Y |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|-----------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | need for smaller and affordable housing in the village, which has excellent communications, a good range of facilities and employment opportunities. He then left the room while the panel discussed the site. The site is currently zoned for employment. The site is similar to those previously considered in Clavering where the loss of potential employment would be an issue but if the strategic decision were made to release the employment land this would be a suitable site. | | | | |
| GtCHE 2 | These employment units are not unsuitable and well used. There is no justification for their release. They are not under single ownership so it would be difficult to achieve a comprehensive re-development. A partial release would not be appropriate – juxtaposition with residential use can lead to problems. | Do not include. | X | ? | X |
| GtCHE 3 | A. Butcher of Bidwells, acting for clients reaffirmed the qualities of Chesterford as set out previously. The site is well contained and access is achieved via Stanley Road. No significant constraints but additional landscaping would be required around the boundaries. It was noted that there were a number of Listed Buildings along the southern boundary but this was well treed. Some recreational space would need to be provided as part of the development. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtCHE 4 | B. Christian, representing clients confirmed access would be via Station Road – a private road owned by British Rail. c/f GtCHE1. There was some concern that the access would be off a private road/outside | Include | (Y) | Y | (Y) |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | the owners control and that this would need to be resolved. BC confirmed that informal discussions had taken place with BR - they had indicated that this would not be a problem but it would need to be formalized. | | | | |
| GtCHE 5 | B.Christian, representing clients advised that the site is a worked out gravel pit. The levels would need to be worked out and there may be archaeological interest. Highways advised that access would need to be considered carefully because the site was opposite the junction to Carmen Street. The site does not have a formal wildlife designation but there may be some ecological interest. Concerned about loss of natural vegetation. | Do not include | X | Y | (Y) |
| GtCHE 6 | Rose Lane is narrow. The current path is well used and there may be conflict. Highways advised that impact would depend on the numbers of homes proposed. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 1 | If the final strategy is for larger sites then development of these smaller sites on approaches would not be appropriate. But if the strategy is for a larger number of small sites this would be ok. Approaches should be protected and highways access will be an important consideration but access issues could be overcome. | Include | (Y) | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 2 | Because the site is so large any potential problems should be capable of being overcome. It was generally considered that the western edge of Great | Include parcel between B1256 and Flitch way but not the other parcels and reduce capacity | (Y) | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|----------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | Dunmow would be less more sensitive to new development than the eastern side. There was concern about the environmental impact of the southern block particularly if this involved bridging over the Flitch Way. In addition future residents of the southern block could be subject to noise from the bypass and it was felt that there would be better sites. Concern about land north of B1256 as it starts to encroach into open countryside beyond the north western bypass. | accordingly. | | | |
| GtDUN 3 | Include small parcel of land to the west as well. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 4 | Employment survey identified this site as one where there might be potential for release of some employment land. Access to Ongar Road is tight with a pinch point but this could be overcome. Alternative access could be secured from Nursery Rise. There are a number of technical constraints which could affect the viability of the site. E.g.access, levels and contamination. | Include | Y | Y | ? |
| GtDUN 5 | This could be included in a strategy for smaller parcels. Concerns about loss of trees and noise. It was suggested that the site was isolated from the amenities in the town centre but that there could be opportunities to developed new footpath links and that these should be explored. | Include | (Y) | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 6 | With planning permission – under construction | Question phasing/build out rates | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN | With planning permission | Question timeframe | Y | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| 7 | | | | | |
| GtDUN 8 | Redevelopment of existing residential and former farmyard and stables. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 9 | Concern about accessibility of land to the rear of St Edmunds Fields. Development to the rear of existing properties would have a detrimental impact on the outlook of a significant number of existing properties while delivering only a limited amount of new housing. Both sites will start to encroach into the Chelmer Valley and for this reason are not considered suitable. | SKN to go back to agent and check access Possibilities include - single access from St Edmunds land through public open space and splitting to service north and southern sites; northern site could be accessed through redevelopment of Local Authority housing/land; or via site GtDUN8; Access to southern site via Millers Croft would mean coming to agreement with owner of ransom strip; or by new road at southern end of the gap through the public open space. | X? | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 10 | Suitability – this location is very sensitive and there are less sensitive sites available. Should only be considered after completion of the by pass. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 11 | Issue with access – only suitable with some of adjoining land (see GtDUN2) not as stand alone site. | Include | (Y) | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 12 | Constraints such as location within flood risk area and the presence of listed farmhouse within the site provide opportunities to plan for a more pleasant | Include | Y | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | development e.g. inclusion of ponds/open space etc | | | | |
| GtDUN 13 | Doesn't make any sense to include this site – good workable fields. Not happy to include this as a stand alone site. Doesn't relate well to anything. Wrong side of by pass – starts to encroach into open countryside. New access points, along side Woodlands Park access, if this and GtDUN2 developed individually – highways would prefer comprehensive development with single point of access. | Do not include. | X | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 14 | Site is currently allocated for employment use. It is important to maintain the availability of employment land if Dunmow continues to grow. Some employment land could be provided on other land in the same ownership. | Include subject to loss of employment land being acceptable | (Y) | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 15 | No definable boundaries to the east of Dunmow. Not suitable. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 16 | Site with Planning Permission | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 17 | Site with outline planning permission | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 18 | Site with Planning Permission | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN 19 | Difficult to see how any successful residential scheme could be achieved on this very long narrow site, so close to the bypass. | Do not include | X | Y | X |
| GtDUN 20 | On its own this would not be considered as a suitable site due to impact on the countryside and the fact that | Do not include | X | Y | Y |



Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Appendix 6 - Minutes of Panel Meetings
Meeting 2

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | is introduces new built form beyond the boundary formed by St Edmunds Lane. However if the strategy included GtDUN15 then this site could be included too | | | | |



**SHLAA Meeting 3
8th January 2009
Council Offices, Saffron Walden
Notes of Meeting**

Attendance: M.Sullivan and P.Leeder (UALC), C.Hutchinson (Sworders), C.Nash (Prime Homes Ltd) R.Winsborough (RW Land and Planning) A.Butcher (Bidwells), U.Maccariello (Hastoe Housing Association) S.Vallance (Pelham Structures) A.Hunter (Environment Agency) L.Chapman and C.Jenkin (Essex County Council Highways), S.Nicholas and M.Jones (UDC Planning Policy and Housing Strategy)

Apologies: B.Yallop (Croudace); B Christian

Matters Arising from the Last Meeting:

The notes of the last meeting had been uploaded onto the Google site. Any comments should be passed to Sarah.

SN had arranged two more meetings in March on Wednesday 11th and Thursday 26th both at 9.30 am.



**Site Assessment Summary
 SHLAA Meeting 3
 20th January 2009**

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|-------------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| GtDUN2 1 | No issues identified | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| GtDUN2 2 | Land ownership unknown, not known whether single or multiple owners. The only way this would work would be for it to be included as a package with other land and even then the group thought it would be more suitable, given the surrounding uses for commercial rather than residential use. Question achievability and suitability | Not include | X | ? | ? |
| GtDUN2 3 | Only work as a site in conjunction with other land. Issues of road noise | Include | (Y) | ? | Y |
| GtDUN2 4 | District Council surplus garage site. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN2 5 | Main issue flooding. Parts of sites fall within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. Access road within historical flood risk and Zone 2. Yield doesn't take into account flood risk. Suitable subject to design and risk assessment to overcome flood risk. | Include subject to suitable flood risk assessment being provided | (Y) | Y | Y |
| GtDUN2 6 | No issues identified | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN2 7 | No issues identified. Housing to be provided through HA. Garages to be relocated | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN2 | Currently being marketed. Access which has | Include but with amended | Y | Y | Y |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| 8 | previously proved to be an issue has been resolved. Question delivery timescale | timeframe for delivery to 2010-2015 | | | |
| GtDUN29 | With Planning Permission the only issue is when it might be built | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN30 | Site within town centre currently in use. Site availability depends on relocation site becoming available for part of the site uses. Could be phased development. | Include but concern about timescale being realistic. Amended to 2020-2025 | Y | Y | Y |
| GtDUN31 | Planning permission and under construction | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtEAS 1 | Relates well to existing development but divorced from development limit. Highways safety would be an issue. | Include | (Y) | Y | Y |
| GtEAS 2 | No issues identified | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtEAS 3 | Suitability questioned. The site is well away from the existing development and does not relate well to the rest of the village. Maybe issue of air noise from 2 nd runway | Do not include | X | ? | Y |
| GtEAS 4 | With Planning Permission/Under Construction | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| GtHAL 1 | Noise and pollution issues identified – unlikely to be suitable. Surplus Highways Agency land. Not available | Do not include | X | X | X |
| GtHAL 2 | Air noise likely to be major constraint – not suitable | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| GtHAL 3 | Site is mainly in East Herts district. Part of the site falls within Flood Risk Zone 2. The site is subject to aircraft noise and it is currently within the green belt. It is remote from any village or facilities. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| GtHAL 4 | Check out PPS on noise | If noise considerations are | (Y) | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | | paramount do not include | | | |
| GtHAL 5 | Loss of proposed employment land. Subject to aircraft noise. | Do not include | X | ? | Y |
| GtSAM1 | C.Nash introduced the site and described it as an island site which would connect the two distinct parts of Gt Sampford. He confirmed that here are local facilities in Sampford including a post office and a primary school. He advised that the site is reasonably steep but there is no issue of visibility and that the current use of the site is grazing land but it doesn't encroach into the wider agricultural land. The landowner's intention is to develop whole site but could be a smaller scheme because of the landform. C.Nash then left the room. The general consensus was that the site could be suitable for some development but that the use of the whole site would result in a scale of development which would be out of keeping with the character of the village and be highly visible on the approach from Thaxted. | Include but for smaller site more in keeping with size of village. C.Nash was asked to consult with his clients and present an option for a reduced scale of growth. Two options proposed Option 1 [GtSAM1(1)] 0.6ha with a capacity of 16-27 units and Option 2 [GtSAM1(2)] 0.8ha with a capacity of 22-36 units | (Y) | Y | Y |
| GtSAM2 | Issue of access – not clear where the adopted highway ends along the lane to the north of the site. It was suggested that the assessment sheet should be amended because development here would extend development into the countryside rather than consolidate sporadic development. For these reasons the site was not suitable. | Do not include | X | ? | Y |
| HBO1 | Although the site is within the development limits in the adopted local plan it is identified as a protected | Include but identify constraints of important open space and | (Y) | Y | Y |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | open space of environmental value and on balance the group felt that this designation should be taken into account in assessing the site's suitability. | TPO | | | |
| HBO2 | The group felt that this scale of development in Hatfield Broad Oak was not sustainable. New facilities would need to be provided. It was not clear where the access would be and this could be an issue. The fact that the land was in multiple ownerships could make land assembly more difficult and could impact on deliverability. There was also some potential risk of flooding on the west and southern edges. | SKN to clarify with agent land ownership and access issues and investigate options for smaller development areas. <i>Access is available at Cage End, adjacent the village hall. Owners of land to south would consider smaller development.</i> | (Y) | (Y) | (Y) |
| HBO3 | Highways were concerned about the narrow access. It was suggested that development on this site could set precedent for land on the other side of the lane. Development in depth would be inappropriate and frontage development would be inappropriate because it would simply extend ribbon development | Not suitable – do not include | X | ? | Y |
| HB04 | <i>This is a smaller alternative site to HBO2. The main issue is flooding. The major part of the site falls within flood risk zone 3. Only the area outside this flood risk zone could be considered suitable subject to design and risk assessment to overcome flood risk.</i> | <i>Include part of site subject to suitable flood risk assessment being provided</i> | (Y) | Y | (Y) |
| HH1 | Potential highways issues – land ownership and possibly visibility but maybe capable of resolution. Clear caveat should be included because the site is currently within the Green Belt and this policy | Check accessibility to Secondary School. Traffic light shows red but would be within 30 mins travel time of schools | (Y) | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | constraint should be recognized. The potential size of the development might be of concern to local people. On balance the group felt it should be included. | in Bishops Stortford. | | | |
| HH2 | The eastern access would need to be across the village green. C.H. explained that the western access could be achieved directly onto the highway. Highways identified a possible safety issue with the visibility splays being achieved within highway land. The pond would add to the difficulties of achieving suitable access. CH confirmed that no transport assessment had been done. CH then left the room. The group considered that the site was not as well related to the village as some of the other sites in Hatfield Heath and that development would be visually intrusive. The site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized | Do not include | X | Y | (Y) |
| HH3 | CH questioned the Traffic Light assessment in relation to agricultural land as more information was now available which indicated it was not high quality agricultural land. It was also subject to trespass and fly tipping. The traffic study had looked at a combination to two access points one from The Shaw and one from Broomfields. Two options were being presented (see HH4). Highways had safety concerns about the use of Cox Ley and the Broomfield Road junction onto Chelmsford Road as this is a substandard junction at the moment. The group felt that the potential yield based on the | Include Correct Yield based on SHLAA methodology to 70-116 | (Y) | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | SHLAA methodology was probably more realistic than the agents estimate and CH confirmed that it would be possible to reduce this. The site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. (A view was put forward that in Hatfield Heath, allocating sites would reduce opportunities for the village to provide housing to meet local needs through exception sites.) | | | | |
| HH4 | This is an alternative option to HH3 above. The scale is related to the requirement for affordable housing within the village. The site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized | Include Amend site area to 1.1ha and yield based on SHLAA methodology to 30-50 | (Y) | Y | Y |
| HH5 | This approach to the village is currently characterised by low density development with detached houses in large gardens. The potential yield was therefore questioned on this edge to the village. Only very low density should be considered – so low that it could fall below the scope of the study. Uncertain whether all of site is available. The site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized | Include | (Y) | ? | Y |
| HH6 | This site was not considered suitable – ribbon development on the approach to the village. The site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized | Do not include | X | ? | Y |
| HH7 | Consolidation of relatively sporadic development. The site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized | Do not include | X | ? | Y |
| HH8 | Ribbon development unrelated to the core of the | Do not include | X | ? | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | village | | | | |
| HH9 | With planning permission. Under construction – due to complete 2009 | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| HEM1 | Quite a large site (45) for the scale of the village but members of the group felt it might be worth looking at a smaller development. Hempstead was considered to be a highly regarded village with good marketability despite the relative lack of facilities, but that there were concerns in relation to sustainability in terms of PPS13 and the need to reduce travel by car. Out of the two sites in Hempstead this one was considered to have the greatest potential. | Include but reconsider scale | (Y) | Y | Y |
| HEM2 | Development in this location would be backland development. The point of access is not clear. Out of keeping with form and character of the village | Do not include | X | Y | (Y) |



**SHLAA Meeting 4
12 February 2009
Council Offices, Saffron Walden
Notes of Meeting**

Attendance: M.Sullivan (UALC), S.Vallance (Pelham Structures), B.Christian (Surveyor), C.Hutchinson (Sworders), C.Jenkins and L. Chapman (ECC Highways) A.Hunter (Environment Agency), A.Butcher (Bidwells), B.Yallop (Croudace), S.Nicholas and M.Jones (UDC)

Apologies: P.Leeder (UALC), C.Nash (Robert Crawford Associates) R. Winsborough (RWLP), P.Hunt (UDC)

Matters Arising from the Last Meeting:

SN had done some further work on a number of outstanding issues from previous meetings. A list of the amended comments and actions would be loaded onto the Google Groups site. The comments and actions were agreed with the following additions:

Site BAR3 – it was suggested that the note should make clear the location where the replacement playing pitch would be provided.

Site HB04 – It was agreed that the site should be considered as a whole but that further analysis may show that smaller a development is possible/achievable. Flooding issues should be highlighted as a major constraint.

The general comment was made that the analysis should not be limited by the intentions of the landowners.

Large Strategic Sites



The first of the large strategic sites were discussed at this meeting. It was acknowledged that these sites were different to the smaller sites being discussed through the SHLAA but it agreed that the sites should be considered as part of the SHLAA. It was suggested that they should be included in a separate section and that they should be considered against the same criteria so that they can be compared with each other.



Site Assessment Summary
SHLAA Meeting 4
12 February 2009

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| GtCHES 7 | <p>AB introduced the site. He explained that the intention was to promote through the RSS review. The potential yield shown was wide ranging but the actual yield would depend on a full investigation of constraints. He then left the room for the discussion. There was some suggestion that the site was too large and that it should not extend onto the productive arable land to the east of the B184 but should be confined between the B184 and the B1383, possibly extending further south towards Little Chesterford. Going east of the B184, it was felt would also take development towards the border with South Cambridgeshire where there was the potential for coalescence with Abington. Uttlesford needs a buffer in this northern zone and $\frac{3}{4}$ of this site should be included in this buffer. There were constraints, particularly in relation to the landscape impacts as mentioned above. There was concern that development on this scale would totally overwhelm the existing community and there should be a buffer around the existing village to maintain its character. Despite the potential difficulties with this site and the scale of the development it was acknowledged that the location</p> | <p>Include but further study work would be required on the precise boundaries, infrastructure requirements and the eventual appropriate size of the settlement.</p> | Y | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|------------------------------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | was very good, being close to Cambridge with good access to the M11 and the railway station. A village of 3,000-6,000 homes could work well and there were examples of such villages in Cambridge which also supported village colleges. | | | | |
| ELS8 (former reference HEN1) | This site forms part of the Council's preferred option as a site for 3,000 homes in the Core Strategy. It is also on the shortlist as a potential Eco Town location. The main concern of the panel was the access issue. It was felt that the assumptions made by the developers about the overall level of trip generation by car, the likelihood of people using rail as an alternative and the developers ability to sufficiently influence traffic flows e.g. to prevent traffic using Grove Hill were unrealistic. The other issue identified as a constraint was flooding. | Include but recognize the major constraint of existing access roads. | Y | Y | (Y) |
| HEN2 | This was considered to be a reasonable site | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| HEN3 | If it wasn't for the possibility of the Fairfield development then this would be an isolated and unsustainable location. | Not suitable sites on their own - do not include | X | Y | Y |
| HEN4 | The general view was that development in this location would affect on the character of the Conservation Area where existing development is sporadic frontage development with detached cottages in large gardens. However, the site was large enough to design a scheme with substantial landscaping etc to reduce the impact but this would reduce the yield. The other key issue raised was the access. The southern access would be a more | Include subject to access. Cricket pitch would need to be replaced. | Y | Y | (Y) |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|------------------------------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | suitable than an access to the north or east but it could be a bridleway which would need to be upgraded to achieve access. The potential loss of the cricket pitch was also noted. | | | | |
| HEN5 | As HEN4 above in terms of possible impact on the Conservation Area but the group thought that this site was better related to the form of the centre of the village. Access was also identified as an issue with this site. There is a lane to the east which could potentially give access to the site but the initial view from ECC Highways was that they probably wouldn't adopt it. | Include subject to confirmation that highways issues can be resolved. | Y | Y | (Y) |
| HEN6 | The location is remote from the village and unsustainable | Do not include – not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| HEN1 (former reference HEN7) | This site was felt to be a very good location for housing | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| H-EAS1 | This site is prominent and would have an impact on the entrance to the village. There are very few services in High Easter | Do not include – not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| H-EAS2 | Access would need to be achieved through an archway in the existing frontage development. Ecological constraints including a management plan for the orchard site. Very few services in High Easter. | Do not include – not suitable | X | ? | ? |
| H-ROD1 | Site being promoted solely for affordable housing. Loss of open space within the conservation area, previously used as allotments but not statutory. | Include | Y | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| H-ROD2 | ECC highways are currently looking at an application for 26 homes on the part of the site within the current development limits and have not identified any constraints. The panel felt it would be useful to look at the current application to see how this extension would relate to it | Consider when more details of the application are known. | | | |
| H-ROD3 | This is a council owned site identified as being surplus by the housing department. The panel felt it would be difficult to achieve a successful development without overlooking/design constraints which may result in a less than 6 units and therefore this was not really a site to be considered through the SHLAA | Remove from assessment – falls below threshold. | | | |
| LAN1 | The panel generally felt that Langley, as a village was remote and detached and was not an appropriate location for new development. There was a redundant barn on LAN1 and this was the only site where the panel felt there might be a possibility of some development. | Do not include – not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| LAN2 | | | X | Y | Y |
| LAN3 | | | X | Y | Y |
| L-ROD1 | Site detached from village and contributes to the rural approach to the village The site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized | Do not include – not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| L-ROD2 | It was generally felt that the scale proposed was too large for this rural village. In Leaden Roding the only direction in which the village could be extended was to the north because of the green belt constraint. The potential for development could be | Include but at a smaller scale | (Y) | Y | Y |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | limited to a ribbon development which wouldn't really work so careful consideration would need to be given to layout and landscaping to achieve a successful form of development. | | | | |
| L-ROD3 | Site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized but the panel felt that some development of the parcel of land along the northern road frontage might be possible. | Include but at a smaller scale | (Y) | Y | Y |
| L-ROD4 | Site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. The panel felt that the site was too large - the potential for some frontage development along the northern boundary was limited by the presence of a TPO and there were concerns about it's suitability for these reasons. | Do not include – not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| L-ROD5 | This site has been identified for redevelopment by the Council's housing department. The Council is working in partnership with a Housing Association to provide affordable housing on the site | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| LIT1 | The potential yield (14-23) was questioned because of the shape of the site. The panel felt that the access was poor. | Check number of units in permission. Outline permission granted for 15 dwellings and construction of access to the highway in 1997 | Y | ? | Y |
| LtCAN1 | A recent planning application for 15 private and 10 affordable homes along with a new village hall, allotments and open space was recently refused on this site. The local community was supportive of the | Include but the scale of the development should be directly related to the need to provide the community | (Y) | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|-----------------------------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | scheme because of the community benefits. The panel thought there were issues identifying sites in Canfield which has no identifiable village centre and is strung out along the B1256 close to the much larger new development of Prior's Green. ECC highways raised the issue of the possible intensification of use of a substandard access. | facilities. | | | |
| LtCAN2 | The panel felt that on it's own this site would not be suitable and would only make sense if developed in combination with an extension to Priors Green | Include | (Y) | Y | Y |
| LtCAN3 | All these sites are currently outside development limits but they form gaps within an area of built development to the south of the Priors Green site. The panel felt it would be sensible to look at this area as a whole. The need to protect the Flich Way would determine the site layout and therefore the extent of the developable area and the yield from each of the sites | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| LtCAN4 | | | Y | Y | Y |
| TAK15 Formerly LtCAN5 | | | Y | ? | Y |
| LtDUN1 | The Panel thought this was a poor location for a strategic site. Little Dunmow is totally reliant on vehicular access whereas Elsenham does at least have some potential for alternative transport modes. In terms of impact on existing settlements the panel felt that Little Dunmow should be protected and when it was compared with the Council's preferred option that Elsenham was a better starting place. | Do not include - not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| LtDUN2 | | This site was not considered because the panel needed | | | |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | | more information on the relationship of the proposal to the existing and proposed development | | | |
| LtDUN3 | The panel felt that this site would breach the natural boundary formed by the Fritch Way | Don't include – not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| LtDUN4 | Little Dunmow is a village with very few facilities and the panel considered that in sustainability terms it was a poor location for residential development because residents would have to travel to Dunmow and/or Braintree for services and facilities. ECC Highways pointed out that the status of Grange Lane could be an access issue for sites LtDun6 and LtDun7. This would not necessarily prevent development but it should be taken into account. The scale of any development should be appropriate to the scale of the village and the availability of facilities. | Although all four sites were felt to be generally suitable, available and achievable, the combined scale of the developments would not be appropriate in this small village with few facilities and a decision would have to be made about the most appropriate sites and scale at a future stage. | Y | ? | Y |
| LtDUN5 | | | Y | ? | Y |
| LtDUN6 | | | Y | ? | Y |
| LtDUN7 | | | Y | ? | Y |
| LtEAS1 | This is another of the strategic sites known as Easton Park. The panel felt that this was a unique area with very poor transport links which should not be considered. The panel was also concerned about the proximity of the site to the airport and the possible impact of the second runway, if this were to be granted planning permission | Do not include – not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| LtEAS2 | The panel considered this site could be included | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| LtEAS3 | This area was considered to be too large a scale for a village like Little Easton with very few facilities, although it was acknowledged that it's proximity to | Do not include – not suitable due to scale | X | ? | Y |



Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Appendix 6 - Minutes of Panel Meetings
Meeting 4

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | Dunmow makes it less remote than some of the other villages | | | | |



**SHLAA Meeting 5
 26 February 2009
 Council Offices, Saffron Walden
 Notes of Meeting**

Attendance: M.Sullivan (UALC), P.Leeder (UALC), S.Vallance (Pelham Structures), C.Nash (Prime Crest Ltd), B.Christian (Surveyor), C.Hutchinson (Sworders), U. Maccanello (Hastoe), R.Winsborough (RW Land and Planning), C.Jenkins and E.Featherstone (ECC Highways) A.Butcher (Bidwells), B.Yallop (Croudace), S.Nicholas and M.Jones (UDC)

Apologies: A.Hunter (Environment Agency), P.Hunt (UDC)

**Site Assessment Summary
 SHLAA Meeting 5
 12 February 2009**

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| FEL5 | Development in depth could result in backland development but this would be a reasonable site if Felsted were to take more homes. Possible problems achieving an adequate access with good visibility over third party land. Development would not intrude into the countryside but it would introduce a different pattern of development in this location. | Include, subject to access. | Y | Y | (Y) |
| LtHAL1 | Aircraft noise is a significant issue. The site falls between the 60 and 63 leq for the 2015 base case | Not suitable – noise | X | Y | Y |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | and between the 63 and 66 leq for the 2 nd runway. This falls within category B in PPG24 – “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise”. Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available. The site is also within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. | | | | |
| LtHAL2 | Aircraft noise is a significant issue. The site falls between the 57 and 60 leq for the 2015 base case and between the 57 and 63 leq for the 2 nd runway. This falls within category B in PPG24 – “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise”. Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available. The site is also within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. | Not suitable –noise | X | Y | Y |
| LtHAL3 | In addition to aircraft noise (the site falls between the 57 and 60 leq for the 2015 base case and between the 57 and 60 leq for the 2 nd runway) this site will be subject to noise from the M11 and is within the poor air quality zone which runs along the | Do not include – not suitable – noise and air quality | X | ? | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|----------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | M11. The site is also within the Green Belt and this should be recognized.. | | | | |
| LtHAL4 | Aircraft noise is a significant issue. The site falls between the 57 and 60 leq for the 2015 base case and between the 60 and 63 leq for the 2 nd runway. This falls within category B in PPG24 – “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise”. Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available. The site is also within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. | Not suitable – noise | X | ? | Y |
| LtHAL5 | Aircraft noise is an issue. The site falls outside the 57 leq for the 2015 base case where noise need not be considered as determining factor in granting planning but the site is between the 57 and 60 leq for the 2 nd runway. This falls within category B in PPG24 – “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise”. Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available. The site is also within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. | Not suitable – noise | X | ? | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|----------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| LtHAL6 | Aircraft noise is a significant issue. The site falls between the 60 and 63 leq for the 2015 base case and between the 63 and 66 leq for the 2 nd runway. This falls within category B in PPG24 – “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise”. Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available. The site is also within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. | Not suitable – noise | X | ? | Y |
| LtHAL7 | Aircraft noise is a significant issue. The site falls between the 60 and 63 leq for the 2015 base case and between the 63 and 66 leq for the 2 nd runway. This falls within category B in PPG24 – “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise”. Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available. The site is also within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. | Not suitable – noise | X | ? | Y |
| LtWAL1 | A number of the buildings within the farm complex are listed. It was suggested that this would constrain the number of units which could be | Not include | X | X | ? |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | achieved on the site so much that it would fall below the threshold of sites to be included in the SHLAA. It was also felt that the buildings provide useful local employment opportunities and there would be a sustainability issue for the village if this were to be lost. | | | | |
| MAN1 | Seb Vallance acting for the parish council explained that this is an enabling development of 14 homes (4 affordable) to support the development of community facilities, playing pitches, cricket pitch, new village hall and multi games area. The parish council is preparing to submit a planning application and is pursuing the site through the SHLAA to reserve its position should an application be unsuccessful. The existing pitches are used for multiple games and not good quality. The existing village hall is to be converted to a dwelling. The suggested location of the housing is the preferred location of the parish. Some of the land is leased to ECC and is currently planted with conifers. There is no value in the existing woodland, a tree survey will be submitted with the planning application. SV then left the room while the site was discussed. There was some concern about the scale of the playing fields which was felt to be more than was required just to meet the needs of the village. The tree cover provided by the conifer plantation was the only tree planting in the area and this would be lost. The access which would serve the playing fields as well | Only suitable if part of enabling development and subject to planting scheme to replace and enhance the tree cover by planting native species elsewhere within the site. | (Y) | Y | (Y) |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | as the housing was remote from the housing and if the housing site were to be considered on it's own, achieving a safe and workable access would be an issue since the site was right on the bend | | | | |
| NEW1 | The site has a tortuous access, it is remote from the village and highly visible | Do not include – not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| NEW2 | Andy Butcher introduced the site saying that the Council's historic towns assessment had highlighted this area as having potentially less impact on the historic core. Access could be achieved from London Road or from Frambury lane on the western side of the site. Bidwells have had some discussion with the school about safety. AB reported that the Parish Council was reasonably comfortable with the site. Densities could vary over the site. AB didn't see the site as a low density site because Newport is a higher order centre with facilities and public transport access. AB then left the room. The panel thought the site was generally an appropriate one for development although there was some concern about access from London Road. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| NEW3 | The site was not considered to be suitable because of the flood risk. | Do not include – not suitable | X | ? | Y |
| NEW4 | S Vallance introduced this site and NEW5 saying that the historic character assessment identified this area as potentially more suitable for development without damage to the historic core. He said that traffic congestion was an issue in School Lane and Burywater Lane. The highways consultant had | Include but note concerns re. access | Y | Y | (Y) |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | advised that there was some potential for improvement. SV then left the room. The panel were concerned about the access issue – a traffic impact assessment would be needed (It was noted that the David Wilson homes site to the south had been granted planning permission because there were significant traffic movements associated with the previous use). There were concerns that the highway improvements required and increase in traffic movements could have a detrimental impact on the character of the conservation area. There was some concern that a high density form of development would not be suitable on this site. | | | | |
| NEW5 | The existing cucumber greenhouses are redundant and are an eyesore and a potential safety hazard. The same issues arise with potential traffic issues on Bury Water Lane would arise with this site as NEW4 above. Newport has few employment sites even though it does have some facilities and has been identified by the Council as a key service centre and an employment use providing start up accommodation might be more suitable on this site. Any strategic level of housing growth in Newport should be accompanied by employment uses. | Include but note concerns re access | Y | Y | (Y) |
| NEW6 | Two options in the same general location - see also | Include but note concerns re access | Y | Y | (Y) |
| NEW7 | NEW7 below. C Hutchinson confirmed if it was just the NEW6 area that access would be from the nursery site to the south (ref.NEW5). It was felt including the larger site to the west (NEW7) as well | | Y | Y | (Y) |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | would mean an additional point of access and it would be better planning to consider the three sites as a comprehensive development. Again access was identified as a possible constraint | | | | |
| NEW8 | The site has planning permission. It is included in the SHLAA for the panel to consider the timetable for delivery – this was agreed | Timetable agreed | Y | Y | Y |
| NEW9 | There was concern about the scale of this proposal which could potentially have a massive impact. There may be potential in some parts but constraints in others. Any areas of land within the floodplain should not be included. Land subject to noise from the M11 should be excluded. Potential accesses could give rise to additional traffic on the Wicken Road and the B1383. The site is very narrow at two points which could restrict access through the site. Achievability must be in questions because as submitted there are too many issues which can't be resolved. | Further work required to look in more detail at likely areas and the capacity of these. | ? | Y | ? |
| NEW10 | Two options submitted for one location. Traffic issues were identified as previous sites. The western part of the large site is highly visible and development here would have a significant impact. | Include both sites but adjust the capacity to reflect the fact that development should not take place in the most visually sensitive part of the site/s | (Y) | Y | Y |
| NEW11 | | | (Y) | Y | Y |
| NEW12 | There was some concern about owner/agents estimate of yield. No highways issue with visibility. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| NEW13 | These employments units have been fully occupied over a long period of time suggesting that they provide useful accommodation for employment | Include but note potential loss of valuable employment site | (Y) | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | uses in Newport. There are no alternative sites. The site is more suitable for employment but would also be suitable for housing | | | | |
| QUE1 | Existing playing pitch is well used and would need to be replaced and the site is visible from the B1383 but generally felt to be suitable | Include – subject to replacement of playing pitch | (Y) | Y | Y |
| QUE2 | Important gap in street scene making important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. No sustainability reason to include additional housing sites because most of the existing facilities are within Rickling Green and it would make more sense to concentrate any development here. | Do not include. | X | Y | Y |
| QUE3 | Although the site has good access and is within the village it was generally considered that the development of this site on the edge of the village green would introduce a more built up form of development to the detriment of the character of the conservation area. | Not suitable | X | Y | Y |
| QUE4 | The site is currently in use as allotments. SKN reported that she had gone back to the agent to find out what the period of notice was likely to be and whether there was any intention to replace the allotments and was still waiting for a response. Highways advised that the access was very narrow and it may not be possible to bring it up to an adoptable standard. | Include – subject to access issue being resolved and replacement of allotments. | (Y) | Y | (Y) |



Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
 Appendix 6 - Minutes of Panel Meetings
 Meeting 5

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| QUE5 | Mixed development. Access would be from the B1383. It was generally considered this was a suitable site but it was noted that the owner's estimate of yield was completely unrealistic. | Include at SHLAA estimate of capacity. | Y | Y | Y |
| RAD1 | A. Butcher declared an interest because Bidwells are assisting the Parish Council. The site has been identified through the Parish Plan work. The area being promoted for open space is within the flood zone. A roundabout on the B1054 is being investigated. No detailed studies have been carried out for ecology. AB then left the meeting. There was some discussion about such a large site being sustainable in Radwinter, a village with relatively few facilities while nearby Wimbish has more facilities and better accessibility to Saffron Walden. | Include. | Y | Y | Y |



SHLAA Meeting 6
11 March 2009
Council Offices, Saffron Walden
Notes of Meeting

Attendance: M.Sullivan (UALC), S.Vallance (Pelham Structures), C.Nash (Prime Crest Ltd), B.Christian (Surveyor), C.Hutchinson (Sworders), U. Maccanello (Hastoe), C.Jenkins, L.Chapman and M.Bradley (ECC Highways) A.Butcher (Bidwells), B.Yallop (Croudace), S.Nicholas and M.Jones (UDC)

Apologies: P.Leeder (UALC), R.Winsborough (RW Land and Planning), A.Hunter (Environment Agency), P.Hunt (UDC)

Matters Arising from Previous Meetings:

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| H-ROD2 | ECC highways are currently looking at an application for 26 homes on the part of the site within the current development limits and have not identified any constraints. The panel felt that it would be useful to look at the current application to see how this extension would relate to it. | Consider when more details of the application are known. The agent has now submitted a SHLAA assessment form identifying all the area to be considered which includes the existing house and garden and the redundant mushroom sheds. Using the whole site could give a better form of development than the application for 26 homes submitted for area of land currently within the | Y | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | | development limits. Numbers at the higher end of the assessment would not be appropriate in High Roding which has few facilities but a mid range development at a lower density which reflects the surrounding development would be appropriate. | | | |
| CLA3 | SV declared an interest as agent for site and made a short statement – site adjacent to development limits, screening to all directions, not suggesting whole site but may be frontage development of 3-4 homes. SKN pointed out that if only part of the site was included it may fall outside the size threshold for the study. SV then left the room. It was felt that frontage development would make some sense but in the context of the policy it would be logical to look at a wider area – this would be noted and investigated further. If the site were to be considered in isolation only frontage development would be appropriate but with adjoining land it could be acceptable | Further investigation of potential of adjoining land. SV had spoken to adjacent landowners who had agreed that the land could be included. The panel felt this enlarged area was suitable and should be included. | Y | Y | Y |

An additional site had been submitted in Great Dunmow

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| GtDUN3 | SV outlined the proposal. Helena Romanes School | Do not include – not suitable | X | Y | (Y) |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--------|----------|-----------|------------|
| 2 | suffers with traffic congestion during peak times. This would be an enabling development with a legal agreement between the school and the landowner. SV then left the room. Highways expressed some doubt that the proposed new road was actually needed. The location proposed for the housing is remote from the existing development limit. A development of this scale in depth would be out of keeping with the existing form of development in the adjacent conservation area which is low density and forms the transition between the town and the countryside beyond along this northern approach. It was generally felt that this should not be pursued through the SHLAA. | | | | |

**Site Assessment Summary
 SHLAA Meeting 6
 11 March 2009**

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|----------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| SAF1 | Site already proposed for development. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| SAF2 | SKN had had recent discussions with the landowner who had confirmed that the site was likely to be needed for hospital related development. | Do not include | X | X | (Y) |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | Poor access through hospital grounds and would need relocation of ambulance station. | | | | |
| SAF3 | The site is within development limits. AB confirmed that the site is currently vacant and has been previously marketed for employment use. He left the room while the panel considered the site. It was agreed that the site should be included if loss of the employment land is acceptable. | Include – subject to resolution of highways/air quality issues and school capacity. | Y | Y | (Y) |
| SAF4 | <p>Strategic site contained within the natural bowl of Saffron Walden. Minimal impact on the historic core of the town.</p> <p>Highways were concerned that a site of this size should have more than one point of access. This site would therefore work better with the addition of the site on Thaxted Road (SAF6) since this would continue the road link and give a second access onto Thaxted Road. (SAF5 below shows sites SAF4 and SAF6 combined).</p> <p>Highways capacity and air quality are highlighted as important issues for all the large Saffron Walden sites. A transport assessment would be required at an early stage to provide more information on trip generation etc. Highways were concerned that the proposed relief road would not help with the traffic issues since it could not provide a route out of Saffron Walden northwards to Cambridge etc. The signals at the Thaxted Road/Radwinter Road are already at capacity. The route westwards via the</p> | Include – subject to resolution of highways/air quality issues and school capacity. | (Y) | Y | (Y) |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|---|----------|-----------|------------|
| | Debden Road/Borough Lane junction is also constrained and there are physical land constraints to improving junction capacity in both these locations. Secondary School capacity was also highlighted as an issue. CH advised that County High was likely to reach capacity in 2012 and discussions were ongoing with the school and other parties about possible solutions. | | | | |
| SAF5 | See above | Include – subject to resolution of highways/air quality issues and school capacity. | (Y) | Y | (Y) |
| SAF6 | Site is contained with the natural bowl of Saffron Walden but the land rises steeply away from the Thaxted Road and there were concerns about possible landscape impacts. Minimal impact on the historic core of the town. Could be developed on its own or in conjunction with SAF4 (as in SAF5 above) to provide the link road. | Include – subject to resolution of highways/air quality issues and school capacity. | (Y) | Y | (Y) |
| SAF7 | Due to site's location adjacent to employment uses, this site is more suitable for similar employment development. Access would be required through adjoining sites. | Do not include | X | Y | X |
| SAF8 | This was felt to be a suitable site for inclusion | Include – subject to resolution of highways/air quality issues and school capacity. | (Y) | Y | (Y) |
| SAF9 | Site partially built | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| SAF10 | Sites form part of employment area for Saffron | Do not include | X | Y | X |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | Walden and it would therefore be unsuitable to redevelop or introduce residential development | | | | |
| SAF11 | This site has no relationship with the built up area of the town or the road and development would be prominent in the agricultural landscape. Access improvements would be required. | Do not include | X | Y | (Y) |
| SAF12 | Site identified in the current local plan for community centre, playing fields and affordable housing. The site is along the attractive valley. Access improvements would be required. The landscape is currently open. There is an identified lack of playing fields in Saffron Walden some of the site is subject to floodrisk. | Do not include – not suitable due to impact on landscape, floodrisk | X | Y | X |
| SAF13 | Existing employment site within development limits. Existing buildings are underutilized and coming to the end of their life. Suitable for a mixed use development providing better quality provision for employment | Include – subject to resolution of highways/air quality issues and school capacity. Yield to take into account mixed use | (Y) | Y | (Y) |
| SAF14 | Planning permission recently refused on appeal but principle of development acceptable. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| SAF15 | Preliminary discussion taking place, developer undertaken public consultation. Application expected shortly | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| SAF16 | Following refusal of planning permission preliminary discussions have taken place on a revised scheme. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| SAF17 | Planning permission recently granted | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| SAF18 | Previously developed site within town and allocated in local plan | Include | Y | Y | Y |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| SAF19 | Previously developed site within town – development of this site could provide an opportunity to improve junction arrangements. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| SAF20 | Planning permission recently granted | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| STA1 | Could lead to environmental improvement within residential area. Include subject to loss of employment site being acceptable | Include | (Y) | Y | Y |
| STA2 | Beyond eastern boundary of village defined by High Lane. Loss of natural habitat. Not suitable. | Do not include – not suitable | X | ? | Y |
| STA3 | Site with recent planning permission - include | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| STA4 | Site with recent planning permission – include | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| STA5 | Site with recent planning permission – include | Include – subject to check on floodrisk | (Y) | Y | Y |
| STA6 | The panel felt that the site was in a good position to provide village services but there was also a view that the pedestrian access to the site was poor. Site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. | Include | (Y) | Y | Y |
| STA7 | The panel felt that this site was prominent within an important area of landscape and for this reason was not considered to be suitable. The site is also currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized | Not suitable because of landscape impact | X | Y | Y |
| STA8 | Pines Hill is well treed. Development of this site could provide a better access onto Pines Hill. Currently the Old Bell junction is substandard and dangerous. The only alternative route is around Old | Include | (Y) | Y | (Y) |



| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | Bell Close. There are multiple owners and it was suggested that this might affect achieveability. Site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized | | | | |
| STA9 | This site is made up of two separate parcels of land. Access would be from Bentfield Causeway to the north of the northern parcel of land. This was not considered to be ideal. The northern parcel of land forms the landscape setting to the Conservation and development here would have a detrimental impact. The southerly parcel of land is disconnected from the main built up area of the village. In making strategic choices for development in Stansted Mountfitchet this area would not be the most logical area for extension. Site is currently within the Green Belt and this should be recognized. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| STA10 | Suitable location within the village centre. Potential for mixed uses. | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| STA11 | Suitable location within the village centre. Potential for mixed uses | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| STA12 | Suitable location within village centre. Potential to remove industrial use from within the residential area. Include subject to loss of employment site being acceptable. | Include | (Y) | ? | Y |
| STA13 | AB explained that the boundary follows the hedge lines and natural breaks in the landscape making it less prominent. Some capacity modeling had been done. The existing estate road network could accommodate the development apart from | Do not include – unsuitable due to landscape impact and access via Pennington Lane | X | Y | Y |

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| | Pennington Lane which is narrow and protected along some of its length. AB then left the room. This is a sensitive area where there would be some environmental impact. | | | | |
| STA14 | Prominent sweeping views on the edge of the town. Not suitable | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| STA15 | There was some difference of opinion. While some panel members felt this site was prominent others felt it formed a logical infill site and should be included. | Include | (Y) | ? | Y |
| STA16 | Highways agency state site not considered as having potential for housing development. Not suitable for housing due to proximity to M11 Motorway. | Do not include | X | X | X |
| STE1 | AB suggested that in the reporting for the SHLAA there should be consistency in the way that these large strategic sites were dealt with. There would be an impact on Stebbing Green. In relation to accessibility Braintree was the nearest centre but the service was not so good so may result in trips to Chelmsford. It was felt that this was a poor location for a new settlement in this open area remote from existing settlements and the services they could offer. There would be an impact on the countryside. Environment Agency advised that foul water capacity could be a significant issue. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| STE2 | This was another strategic site but the panel felt that this submission did not respond properly to the requirements of the SHLAA. There were too many | SKN to go back to the consortium promoting the site to offer them the opportunity to | | | |



Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
 Appendix 6 - Minutes of Panel Meetings
 Meeting 6

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | uncertainties for the panel to consider properly e.g the submission showed the majority of the housing being provided within Braintree District, | submit further information. | | | |
| STE3 | This site is not well related to the village and is very prominent. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| STE4 | Site with planning permission and under construction. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| STE5 | The panel was concerned about the potential impact on character of the conservation area, access and loss of the cricket pitch. | Do not include | X | ? | (Y) |
| STE6 | Include subject to being able to achieve suitable access | Include | Y | ? | (Y) |
| STE7 | Development here would result in consolidation of development down this rural lane. The site would only be suitable for less than 6 houses and would therefore fall outside the scope of the SHLAA | Do not include | X | ? | Y |



SHLAA Meeting 7
26 March 2009
Council Offices, Saffron Walden
Notes of Meeting

Attendance: P.Leeder (UALC), A.Butcher (Bidwells), R.Winsborough (RW Land and Planning) S.Vallance (Pelham Structures), B.Christian (Surveyor), A.Hunter (Environment Agency),C.Jenkin, and M.Bradley (ECC Highways), , S.Nicholas and M.Jones (UDC)

Apologies: B.Yallop (Croudace), M.Sullivan (UALC), C.Hutchinson (Sworders), Liz Chapman (ECC Highways), P.Hunt (UDC), C.Nash (Prime Crest Ltd),

Matters Arising from Previous Meetings:

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| HB05 | Access inadequate to serve development of this size in rural village. Smaller scale development might be more appropriate having less impact visually and on highways network. | SN to look into capacity of smaller area of land reflecting adjoining development. Land in north east corner measuring 0.35ha could provide 9-16 units. The assessment is made on this basis. | (Y) | Y | Y |
| | | | | | |

**Site Assessment Summary
 SHLAA Meeting 7
 26 March 2009**

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| TAK1 | With planning permission and under construction. Timing to take into account current economic climate. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| TAK2 | Logical extension to current local plan allocation (see TAK1 above). No obvious highways problems. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| TAK3 | Planning permission refused in 2008 on policy grounds, appeal lodged. Highways would currently object but on standard grounds that the site was outside the development limit. No other highways objections. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| TAK4 | Not well related to the existing settlement. Access would be onto narrow roads and highways expressed concern that development here would be divorced from everything else in Takeley. The Fritchway is an important break in landscape terms. Although land to the south of the Fritchway is not covered by any formal designation it does have a different character which should be protected. | Do not include | X | ? | ? |
| TAK5 | Loss of cricket ground - the panel had generally resisted other development sites where there would be loss of existing sports provision unless it could | SN to check whether Takeley is under provided at the moment and if adequate provision is | (Y) | Y | Y |



| | | | | | |
|------|---|---|-----|---|-----|
| | be shown that this would be replaced or sufficient facilities were available elsewhere in the settlement. | available elsewhere within walking distance e.g. provision on Priors Green. If not then this site should not be included. Takeley also has outdoor sports provision south of the village with a football ground and sports field. No pitch provision is being provided as part of the Priors Green Development. | | | |
| TAK6 | Any development should be as far to the east of the site as possible to avoid the risk zones from the second runway with the runway operating in single mode. If the runway were to operate in dual mode this might be different. | Not immediately deliverable because of uncertainty with the airport. | ? | Y | ? |
| TAK7 | Development of this site poses no significant environmental harm. Access would preferably need to be via Harvest Fields and not from the B1256 | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| TAK8 | For the parcel of Land to the south of the Flitch Way, this would be the same as TAK4 - the Flitchway is an important break in landscape terms. Although land to the south of the Flitchway is not covered by any formal designation it does have a different character which should be protected. Development of the northern parcel would result in coalescence but need to maintain safety zones may effectively provide a buffer zone. Capacity should take into account any impact from the second runway. | SN to check whether the landowners still intend to pursue the golf course application on the same site. Agents confirmed that the decision on the golf course will depend on the outcome of their pursuit of residential development. | (Y) | Y | (Y) |
| TAK9 | Suitable location within the village which could lead | Include | Y | ? | (Y) |



| | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------------|---|---|---|
| | to environmental gains. Loss of employment site. Commercial use could be more appropriate especially with the likelihood of contamination of the site. Finding another suitable site could be problem if the intention is to relocate the existing scrap business on the site. | | | | |
| TAK10 | Not suitable due to flooding and impact of second runway | Do not include | X | Y | X |
| TAK11 | Development would result in loss of open land and obscure views of Hatfield Forest. However site does not impact on wider countryside. In relation to the access onto the B1256 there would be policy objection at the moment because the site is outside the development limit. It would be more achievable if the owners were to act together to deliver comprehensive scheme. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| TAK12 | Partly falls between 54-57 leq – category A in PPG24 – where noise need not be considered as a determining factor in granting planning permission, although the noise level at the high end of the category should not be regarded as a desirable level; and partly falls between 57-60leq for 2015 base case – category B in PPG24 where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise” Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy | Do not include | X | Y | Y |



| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|---|---|---|
| | sites are not available | | | | |
| TAK13 | Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case – category B IN PPG where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise” Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available. Existing employment use is suitable to continue. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| TAK14 | Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case – category B IN PPG where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise” Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available. Existing employment use is suitable to continue. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| Thaxted General | A number of sites have been suggested in Thaxted. A general observation was made that if Thaxted is included in the District Strategy as a village where some additional development is desirable then the traffic issues needed to be considered comprehensively and that because of Thaxted’s special circumstances that the sites identified for the SHLAA might not be the most appropriate. It was also suggested that a Historic Character | | | | |



| | | | | | |
|------|--|--|-----|---|---|
| | <p>Assessment should be carried out for Thaxted.</p> <p>It was noted that sewage from Thaxted is piped to the Great Easton works to be treated and there may be capacity issues which would need to be considered in order to accommodate additional development.</p> | | | | |
| THA1 | <p>Mr Leeder declared an interest and retired from the meeting while the panel discussed the site. If the Council considered that ribbon development was an acceptable form of development then frontage development on part of the site may be appropriate but only if THA2 were to go ahead.</p> | Include if THA1 included | (Y) | Y | Y |
| THA2 | <p>Extension of ribbon development but not significantly intrusive into countryside. If the Council considered that ribbon development was an acceptable form of development then this site would be suitable</p> | Include | (Y) | Y | Y |
| THA3 | <p>Very narrow site with narrow access (also a public footpath) leading to inappropriate backland development.</p> | Do not include not suitable due to poor access | X | Y | X |
| THA4 | <p>The site is well related to the core of the village but access could be an issue. A previous application for a community use had to negotiate an access through the Fire Station yard.</p> | Include | Y | Y | ? |
| THA5 | <p>BC declared a personal interest.</p> <p>Brownfield site within the village. Opportunity to enhance conservation area. Some of the buildings are listed which makes them difficult to use</p> | Include – capacity to reflect mixed use. | Y | Y | Y |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | <p>economically for employment uses and the current use is outgrowing the site with no opportunity to expand.</p> <p>It was also agreed that the site does make an important contribution to local employment and it would be a shame to lose all the site to housing and that there might be some potential for mixed use.</p> <p>Falls between 54-57 leq – category A in PPG24 – where noise need not be considered as a determining factor in granting planning permission, although the noise level at the high end of the category should not be regarded as a desirable level.</p> | | | | |
| THA6 | <p>Isolated backland development unrelated to the form and character of development in this part of the village.</p> <p>Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case – category B in PPG24 where “noise should be taken be taken into account when determining planning applications, an where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise”.</p> <p>Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available.</p> | Do not include. | X | ? | Y |
| THA7 | <p>Isolated backland development unrelated to the form and character of development in this part of</p> | Do not include | X | Y | X |



| | | | | | |
|------|--|----------------|---|---|---|
| | <p>the village. Access along narrow streets with substandard junction with Newbiggen Street. Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case-category B in PPG24 where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise.</p> | | | | |
| THA8 | <p>Significant intrusion of ribbon development into the countryside. Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case-category B in PPG24 where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise” Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available</p> | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| THA9 | <p>Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case-category B in PPG24 where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise” Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available</p> | Do not include | X | Y | Y |



| | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------------|---|---|---|
| THA10 | Site under construction – but consider phasing. | Include | Y | Y | Y |
| THA11 | <p>A number of constraints are identified in relation to this site and it should not be included unless they can provide evidence that the constraints can be overcome.</p> <p>Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case-category B in PPG24 where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise” Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available</p> | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| THA12 | <p>Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case-category B in PPG24 where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise” Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available</p> | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| THA13 | There was concern about the traffic which would feed onto the main road via the Tanyard with no footpath and environmental constraints. A transport assessment, however may not necessarily show up capacity issues. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |



| | | | | | |
|-------|--|----------------|---|---|---|
| | <p>Falls between 57-60 leq for 2015 base case-category B in PPG24 where “noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications, and where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure adequate level of protection against noise”</p> <p>Even if suitable conditions are imposed the enjoyment of any property will be reduced and this site should only be developed if other, less noisy sites are not available</p> | | | | |
| THA14 | <p>Land suggested for playing fields may not be suitable because of sloping landform.</p> <p>Limited development may be appropriate in terms of the access but the suggested yield may be too high.</p> <p>Lane to the north should be protected.</p> <p>Falls between 54-57 leq – Category A in PPG24 – where noise need not be considered as a determining factor in granting planning permission, although the noise level at the high end of the category should not be regarded as a desirable level.</p> | Do not include | X | Y | Y |
| WEN1 | <p>Current application for 150 space extension to car park.</p> <p>Inappropriate access for residential development</p> | Do not include | X | X | X |
| WEN2 | <p>The current use is a viable estate. The units are not</p> | Do not include | X | ? | X |



| | | | | | |
|------|--|----------------|---|---|-----|
| | unsuitable for employment use and are well used. There is no justification for their release. | | | | |
| WIC1 | If the most efficient use of land is made then it would result in an inappropriate scale of development in a village with limited access to facilities. Site represents important open space within village. | Do not include | X | Y | (Y) |
| WIC2 | Not sustainable location with very few facilities in the village. There is a visibility issue in relation to the access. | Do not include | X | Y | (Y) |
| WIC3 | If site is considered suitable the most appropriate development would be frontage development which would fall below the SHLAA threshold. | Do not include | X | Y | (Y) |
| WIC4 | If development was considered appropriate in the village then this site would appear to have the least impact on the wider environment. Access could be off Wicken Road, where sightlines could be improved. | Include | Y | Y | Y |



SHLAA consultation with Panel Group
 Electronic Consultation
 8 May 2009

The following sites were sites outstanding from the panel meetings and comments were sought from the Panel via the SHLAA website.

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|--|--|----------|-----------|------------|
| LtDUN2 | This submission reflects the most recent planning application. UTT/0355/09/OP. Much of the proposal lies within the Development Boundary. The proposed housing which lies beyond would have development on 3 sides. The development cannot occur until the STW has been relocated or upgraded. The developers give no indication that this is a constraint to achievability. This proposal relocates the sports pitches and NEAP (neighborhood Equipped Area for Play) south of Stebbing Brook and further from the housing. | Include – subject to relocation of uses being acceptable. The minimum potential yield based on SHLAA methodology provides flexibility for additional uses on the site should this be seen as important. | (Y) | Y | Y |
| STE2 | In relation to accessibility Braintree was the nearest centre but the service was not so good so may result in trips to Chelmsford. It was felt that this was a poor location for a new settlement in this open area remote from existing settlements and the services they could offer. There would be an impact on the countryside. Environment Agency advised that foul water capacity could be a significant issue. | Do not include | X | Y | Y |

The following sites were identified through site visits and comments were sought from the Panel via the SHLAA website.

| Site Ref | Comments | Action | Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|---|---------|----------|-----------|------------|
| DEB3 | Development of this site would complement the development on the opposite side of the road | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| GtCHE8 | This factory unit is currently in use. Should the nursery site be released for housing then inclusion of this site would be a logical extension, should loss of employment land be acceptable | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| GtDUN33 | Only work as a site in conjunction with other land. See GtDUN23. Issues of road noise | Include | (Y) | ? | Y |
| MAN2 | This site affords views across the valley but is well located within the village, near the school and a well designed development would not have a significant detrimental impact on the wider countryside. | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| QUE6 | Development of this site would complement the development on the opposite side of the road | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| SAF21 | This is an existing employment use within a residential area of the town. The 1995 local plan identified the site as residential development opportunity | Include | (Y) | ? | Y |



| | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------|---|---|---------------|
| | <p>site. It was omitted from the 2005 local plan as its availability was uncertain. Should the site become available and loss of employment land is acceptable, residential development would lead to environmental enhancement of the area.</p> | | | | |
| TAK16 | <p>All these sites (LtCAN3 – 4 & TAK15-16) are currently outside development limits but they form gaps within an area of built development to the south of the Priors Green site. The panel felt it would be sensible to look at this area as a whole. The need to protect the Flich Way would determine the site layout and therefore the extent of the developable area and the yield from each of the sites</p> | Include | Y | ? | Y |
| THA15 | <p>This site is located in the valley base and a well designed development would not have a significant detrimental impact on the wider countryside.</p> <p>Park lane is narrow and additional traffic may cause congestion. May be an issue of visibility with site access being close to corner in road.</p> <p>Falls between 54-57 leq – category A in PPG24 – where noise need not be</p> | | Y | ? | (Y) access |



| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>considered as a determining factor in granting planning permission, although the noise level at the high end of the category should not be regarded as a desirable level.</p> <p>A former gas works site, new developed, adjoins the site, although unlikely contamination may have migrated to this site.</p> | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|