



Shalford Parish Council

Parish Clerk:

Cathryn Carlisle

Herkstead Green Bungalow, Cornish Hall End, Braintree, CM7 4HH

Tel: 01440 731964 shalford.pc@outlook.com www.essexinfo.net/shalford

Reply to Uttlesford District Council about West of Braintree

Shalford Parish Council comments are as follows:-

Braintree's Local Plan was declared to be unsound by the Planning Inspector Mr. Roger Clews. Any modifications will be subject to a full Public Consultation. At this point in time it is not known if this development will actually go ahead.

Duty to Cooperate

The Localism Act 2011 states there should be Community Involvement. Uttlesford Statement of Community Involvement states. "A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged". Key stake holders include **Parish and Town Councils** including "**those within the District and those that adjoin the district**".

No consultations have been held with neighbouring villages in the Braintree area, who either boarder on to the Uttlesford area or will suffer from the extra traffic passing through their villages.

The Duty to Cooperate also includes other public bodies such as Civil Aviation.

This development will have impact on Andrewsfield/Saling Airfield which is an important community asset being one of the most important training schools for both private and commercial pilots from all over Gt Britain and the world.

Consultations have not been held with local hospitals, police and fire brigades. These services are already under a great deal of strain and would not be able to cope with a large influx of people.

U.D.C are behind B.D.C with their local plan and there appears to be a distinct lack of cooperation between the two councils. U.D.C were not present at the Planning Inspectors Public Enquiry on B.D.C local plan. The 2 local plans should have been run together as the proposed West of Braintree Town borders both districts.

Transport

Mr. R. Clews the Inspector for Braintree Local Plan has stated that the Garden Communities could not be developed in full without additional strategic road capacity. This development is relying on the A120 for eastwards road connections to Colchester

The nearest major road the A120 has problems each day with traffic congestion in both directions. Although a new A120 route from Braintree to the A12 has been consulted on and chosen there is no guarantee that this will be included in the next round of road development in 2025. No view can be taken of the feasibility of this development until it is known if it is to be included and fully funded.

The proposed A12 widening has been put on hold due to the proposed development at Marks Tey. This work was due to start 2020 but as new consultations will need to be held for the Marks Tey development link road to the A12 this seems unlikely to happen and it is possible that funding will have to be reapplied for. Highways England **“recognise that the new housing development might affect the alignment between junctions 24 and 25. If this is the case then it is important that those living and working along this section have the opportunity to see options and to be able to share their feedback. Once we know what decision has been made on the planning application for the housing scheme, and the potential impact on the A12 scheme, we would expect to hold a further public consultation on any revised options for this part of the route. This would then be followed by a preferred route decision, confirming the proposed route for the whole of the A12 scheme.”**

Both schemes are required to show this development is deliverable.

The M11 junction needs major road works at its junction with the A120 to cope with all the extra traffic from all the new developments proposed by Uttlesford, Braintree, Colchester and Tendering.

There are many rural B roads leading north towards Cambridge which are well used avoiding problems on the M11 and A14. These go through villages and over narrow bridges which already have large numbers of traffic movements each day and would not cope with the enormous increase in traffic from this and the Gt Easton development.

There is little transport or no transport from surrounding villages which could be use and in some cases none at the weekend.

It is felt the majority of people in this proposed town will not use public transport.

The local train from Braintree is not within walking/cycling distance and has a limited service of one per hour. No rail link has been proposed for this new development nor any extra parking in Braintree for the increase in passenger cars. Gt Dunmow does not have any Rail services.

Rapid Transport has been suggested to link this development to Stansted, Braintree and Colchester, no costs have been established to see if this is feasible.

Employment

There is no guarantee that employment will come to this development which is in the wrong location for many businesses. Companies would choose better locations such as Cambridge for its science parks or Chelmsford, Colchester and Harlow, all of which already have better rail and road links than Braintree. The opportunity to work from home should be rolled out to all residents not just those from the proposed new settlements. People may wish to live in smaller communities with good internet connections which some areas at present do not have.

Although U.D.C and B.D.C view Stansted Airport predicted growth as employment opportunity, it will only offer an extra 6,750 jobs. Both Gt Easton and West of Braintree are likely to have in the region of 10,000 properties in each development.

Location of Development

The Parish council feels that no concrete design has been shown, the area shown just coloured on a general plan. The Braintree area is just a red blob on a map. The outline area for this development has not been finalised and could be in one of three locations. If the option is to build from the new gravel pit at Rayne or in the middle of the proposed area then the Uttlesford site will be left isolated, requiring new standalone infrastructure. A proposed modern development of 3,500 properties in the Uttlesford district (10,000 for the whole development) is not in keeping with this rural area.

General Comments

This development would take place on prime agricultural land which currently produces food, we already import around 40% of food which has associated costs of pollution caused by miles travelled. This agricultural land should continue to contribute to Britain's food needs.

The natural beauty of North Essex will be destroyed by a large new town. This area of Essex is known for its lovely villages and beautiful countryside. Many of these historic villages will be swamped by this development giving a severe impact on local pollution and traffic congestion.

This area has much biodiversity with a huge variety of plant, animal life, having many public rights of way for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders all of which is considered to be important and desirable for local people to enjoy adding much to their health and wellbeing. This development will destroy all of the above.

No thought of the impact of Brexit has been given.

To include land in Uttlesford will increase the size of this very large development. There will be a need for substantial financial investment for infrastructure which must be in place before any development takes place

The only support for this development has been from Landowners, B.D.C and U.D.C. The majority of residents living in the area are totally opposed to this development

The Parish Council feel that neither U.D.C or B.D.C have experience to deliver and run this development. **This development is not viable, deliverable or sustainable with no guarantee of public funding to deliver infrastructure**

7th August 2018