

Kelvedon Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of representations

213 representations were received from 48 contributors during the consultation for the Regulation 16 the Kelvedon Neighbourhood Plan during its Regulation 16 consultation, which took place between 4th June 2021 and 16th July 2021.

Below is a brief summary of those comments. Full comments are available to view on the link below.

https://braintree.objective.co.uk/portal/neighbourhood_plans/kelvnp/knpreg16/

Summary of comments

- Increasing bio-diversity through the use of swift bricks
- Concerns about increased, cumulative impact of and existing local traffic, as well as access issues on neighbouring settlements and the strategic road network. Road infrastructure should be improved
- Advice provided on sport and recreation provisions
- Support for the production and contents of the Neighbourhood Plan
- Brownfield sites do have natural biodiversity habitats which should be assessed and development less biased to these sites
- Support for redevelopment of Deals in Kelvedon
- Make provision for starter homes
- Support, more growth should be in bigger towns
- Housing figures likely to change over time
- GP services over stretched and should be for local residents
- Separate health care provision should be for Feering
- Support for green burial options
- Flood and water management needs consideration
- Environmentally sustainable flood mitigation management should be considered
- Include provision for electronic vehicle charging
- S106 should be binding and developments should not get out of them
- General formatting and typos issues as well as clarity
- Plan needs an overall policy map and define a plan period
- Not clear how housing need will be met
- Policies can only apply in the plan area
- Define what is meant by shared or living streets
- Reference to footpaths and bridle ways needed
- New development should be limited or no new housing developments
- Bigger gardens should be provided
- Concerns regarding air and water quality and what is a dangerous level of air quality
- Impact of recreational use on the river Blackwater
- Area has limited green space
- Objection to speculative development in the area
- Attractive street scenes should not detract from historic character
- Homes are too small
- Impact of climate change and how to mitigate it
- Support for the provision of long distance footpaths, but concern how it could be provided

- The plan should refer to equestrian access
- Wildlife habitats should be protected
- Delete policy on development briefs
- Amended development boundary to match Local Plan
- Policies should reflect wider range of housing needs and should avoid over provision of bungalows
- Footpaths need to have regard to local context.
- Plan may need up dating following adoption of Local Plan
- Highways standards need to be updated
- References to view which are not publicly accessible should be removed
- Dark Sky areas not appropriately defined.
- Crime prevention and safety should be considered
- Police services will require developer contributions
- The plan is too restrictive on restricting housing development
- Amendment suggestions for transport policies to update them
- Plan should be updated to reflect planning permissions
- Clarity on type of infrastructure development should be providing
- Reference to minerals and waste should be added
- References to A12 and A120 proposals should be provided
- Traffic calming measures can be provided through Local Highways Panel
- Constraints may prevent footpath and cycleways
- Parking standards are a material consideration rather than a policy requirement
- Support the protection of existing footpaths and creation of new ones
- Plan needs updating re educational standards, ECCs 10 year plan and early years and childcare
- Contributions required and sought for education provision
- Environmental gains should be sought from all developments
- Support new businesses
- Support the positive plan and its ambitions
- Absolute requirements for s106 and infrastructure could prevent development
- Plan should flexible to meet different housing types
- Housing trajectory for small sites is excessive
- Development briefs should not be subject to current applications
- Difficulty applying some of the policies as not all details will be available at outline application stage
- Views difficult to protect under the current planning system
- Policies need to be internally consistent and align with the NPPF
- Balcony's are not always appropriate in every constraint
- No need for site specific HRA as financial contributions sought from development

Date 13/12/21 – Braintree District Council, Planning Policy.