



www.landuse.co.uk

Appendix 6 to Additional Sustainability Appraisal of North Essex Section 1 Local Plan

Identification of spatial strategy alternatives

Prepared by North Essex Authorities
July 2019

Project Title: North Essex Local Plan Section 1 Additional Sustainability Appraisal

Client: North Essex Authorities

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
3.0	17/7/2019	Final	North Essex Authorities	North Essex Authorities and LUC	North Essex Authorities



www.landuse.co.uk

Appendix 6 to Additional Sustainability Appraisal of North Essex Section 1 Local Plan

Identification of spatial strategy alternatives

Prepared by North Essex Authorities
July 2019

Planning & EIA
Design
Landscape Planning
Landscape Management
Ecology
GIS & Visualisation

LUC LONDON
43 Chalton Street
London
NW1 1JD
T +44 (0)20 7383 5784
london@landuse.co.uk

Offices also in:
Bristol
Edinburgh
Glasgow
Lancaster
Manchester



Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number: 2549296
Registered Office:
43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD
LUC uses 100% recycled paper

Identification of Spatial Strategy Alternatives

The Stage 1 assessment of individual site-based options suggests that many of the alternatives perform similarly against the various sustainability criteria and for the majority of sites, there are no alternatives that stand out as being particularly desirable or undesirable. The consequence of this outcome for Stage 2 of the assessment is that there are theoretically a significant and unwieldy number of permutations in which different sites could be combined to form an overall spatial strategy for North Essex. For every site option to be combined with every other potential alternative site and then tested as a spatial strategy in its own right would be an unmanageable task and therefore it is important to apply some common sense judgement to determine what a reasonable number of alternative options would be, based on some reasonable planning principles. Indeed the Local Plan Inspector states in his 8th June 2018 letter, in paragraph 118: *“It is not feasible to test every possible option through SA. Reasonable planning judgements have to be made on what to include. That is recognised in the legal requirement for reasons to be given for the selection of alternatives for assessment.”*

From the round table discussions involving different stakeholders held as part of the ‘check and challenge workshop held on 29th March 2019, a number of key principles, ideas, arguments and factors arose from the discussions. As taken from the record of the check and challenge workshop prepared by LUC, these included:

- Considering demographics, housing need and travel to work patterns to provide the right homes in the right places and to enable choice.
- Ideally each authority should seek to meet its own individual housing needs with their own area rather than crossing boundaries.
- Maximising the opportunities for sustainable travel and alternative means of travel including public transport, electric vehicles and cycles – focussing development on rail links where possible.
- Aspiring to achieve self-containment/self-sufficiency within new settlements but with strong connectivity to other settlements.
- Considering local attributes and settlements’ strengths and weaknesses in terms of infrastructure and environmental capacity.
- Treating viability, deliverability and cost benefit analysis as key determining factors.
- Utilising existing infrastructure capacity where it exists and only considering new settlements when the opportunities for proportionate growth around existing settlements have been exhausted.
- Avoiding scales of development that place additional burden on existing infrastructure without the means to increase infrastructure capacity.
- Empowering communities to plan the growth in their area (e.g. through Neighbourhood Planning) and ensuring communities are well informed.
- Promoting development that supports health provision and the prevention of ill health through health facilities and quality recreational space.
- Considering the impact on various environmental assets including heritage, landscape and biodiversity.
- Considering impact on the vitality and viability of existing town centres, especially if new centres are proposed as part of new developments.
- Considering the potential for new technologies to alter the way people work and commute in the future, including superfast broadband, 5G and driverless vehicles.

- Providing for a mixture of smaller and larger developments to ensure that both short term needs and longer-term strategic needs are met.
- Exploring opportunities for developments in locations with poor services and facilities where they could help to improve those assets for the benefit of all residents.
- Promoting long-term strategic developments that can deliver new infrastructure through economies of scale and a planned approach.
- Considering targeted (as opposed to proportionate) growth in certain areas where it would meet key objectives.
- Planning for strategic-scale growth, but not at the scale currently proposed as part of the Garden Communities.
- Developing a plan that only includes proposals to deal with housing need up to 2033 only.
- Ensuring there are sufficient guarantees over the timing and funding of infrastructure as part of any strategy.
- Expanding existing settlements in a sequential order until they meet their optimum size in terms of maximising self-containment and self-sufficiency.
- Directing development to locations that will support and deliver key transport links and key transport improvements to help tackle congestion problems. Maximising the use of previously developed brownfield land. Avoiding the coalescence of villages through the safeguarding of landscape buffers.
- Locating development close to employment opportunities and locations where new employment sites are likely to be viable.
- Directing more development towards the east and the more deprived areas of Tendring to help stimulate their regeneration.
- Considering large urban extensions where they can deliver rapid transit services to existing jobs, shops, services and facilities.
- Making sure the cumulative impacts of the development are taken into account.
- Assessing the West of Braintree Garden Community in combination with proposals for growth in Uttlesford.

These ideas have all been taken into account along with the Local Plan Inspector's specific comments both by LUC in developing the methodology for the additional Sustainability work and by the NEAs in developing an overarching set of principles to guide the planning judgement that has been applied in the selection of a reasonable set of spatial strategy alternatives for assessing. These seven principles are set out below.

Principle 1: Meet the residual housing need within the plan period

As a basic principle, any spatial strategy alternative should, as a minimum, meet the objectively assessed housing need for housing in North Essex for the remainder of the plan period to 2033 plus a reasonable level of flexibility (as is currently the case) to guard against the prospect of certain sites not coming forward for development when expected – whether that is through a strategy that identifies sites for the plan period only, or a strategy that identifies larger strategic sites that will deliver homes both within the plan period and beyond.

As set out in Policy SP3 in the Section 1 plan, the total minimum housing requirement for the period 2013 to 2033 is 43,720 – a figure that has already been found to be based on sound evidence by the Local Plan Inspector and of which approximately 11,000 have already been built in the period 2013-2019. Between 2019 and 2033, approximately 31,000 homes are expected to be delivered across North Essex on existing

sites with planning permission and on sites allocated in Section 2 Local Plans. For the purposes of the further Sustainability Appraisal Work, it is assumed that the Section 2 allocations will be found to be sound through the examination process; and that together with existing planning permissions, they will deliver the above-mentioned 31,000 homes within the plan period and there is no intention to deallocate any of these sites. Site allocations in the three Section 2 Local Plans have been the subject of separate Sustainability Appraisals which will be examined, in due course, through the future Section 2 examinations.

Taking into account the above planning permissions and Section 2 allocations, the residual requirement for housing in the plan period to 2033 (for which additional sites are required) currently sits at around 2,000 homes. Whilst, in the context of the overall housing need this is relatively modest requirement, it is common planning practice to 'over-allocate' land for development to keep to a minimum the risk of the housing need not being met within the plan period because of certain sites failing to come forward for development when expected - for a range of unpredictable reasons. In the current Section 1 Local Plan, the strategy includes proposals for three Garden Communities that, together, are expected to deliver 7,500 in the period to 2033 – meeting and residual requirement for the plan period and incorporating a healthy level of over-allocation whilst also providing locations for longer-term growth beyond the plan period and into subsequent plan periods.

Therefore in testing alternative options to the current strategy, those alternatives must also aim to deliver an equivalent 7,500 homes (approximately) up to 2033 for them to be comparable.

Principle 2: Test the alternatives suggested by the Local Plan Inspector

In his letter of 8th June 2018, the Local Plan Inspector Mr. Clews provided some clear advice as to the alternative options that should be tested through the Sustainability Appraisal. In paragraph 125 of his letter, the Inspector suggested that the alternatives should include, as a minimum:

- Proportionate growth at and around existing settlements
- CAUSE's Metro Town proposal
- One, two or more GCs (depending on the outcomes of the first-stage assessment)

It is therefore important that these alternatives form part of the assessment.

Proportionate growth at and around existing settlements has been tested as part of the further Sustainability Appraisal work in two forms: a) a 'percentage-based' distribution of growth that sees each defined settlement (irrespective of their position in the settlement hierarchy) accommodating the same percentage increase in new housing relative to their existing size and dwelling stock; and b) and 'hierarchy-based' distribution which actively prioritises growth around the larger settlements further up the settlement hierarchy which are generally best served by shops, jobs, services and facilities. These proportionate growth options seek only to deliver housing required to the end of the plan period to 2033 and can incorporate development sites of any scale necessary to meet that requirement. The purpose of testing proportionate growth scenarios is to determine whether or not there is any need for the North Essex Authorities to bring forward proposals for stand-alone settlements, Garden Communities or any other more strategic development proposals within this plan period.

CAUSE's Metro Town (now 'Metro Plan') concept is also part of the further Sustainability Appraisal work and, as a strategy, aims to focus growth on land around existing railway stations on the Colchester to

Clacton branch line, namely at the villages of Alresford, Great Bentley, Weeley and Thorpe le Soken – all within the Tendring District. It is important that this concept is tested in combination with other options.

Different numbers and combinations of Garden Communities are also now tested in the further Sustainability Appraisal work including, notably, the Monks Wood proposal by Lightwood Strategic at a scale of development which reflects the site promoter's aspirations.

Principle 3: Reflect relative housing need and commuting patterns in any alternative strategy

The North Essex area contains three local authorities for which housing need has been assessed as part of the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs Study. Through the current proposals in both the Section 1 and Section 2 Local Plans, the distribution of housing growth reflects, broadly, the relative housing needs of the three authorities i.e. that housing need is greater towards the west. These relative housing needs in turn also reflect commuting patterns and how they vary across the North Essex – for example a strong relationship of commuting from Tendring to Colchester for work and, to the west, the relationships between Braintree and Colchester with one-another and more widely with Chelmsford, London and Stansted.

Any alternative spatial strategy should also take the relative housing need and commuting patterns into account for them to be based upon reasonable evidence and logic. For example, there would be little sense in pursuing a spatial option that places all of the 7,500 homes currently proposed through Garden Communities in just one of the three districts because it would ignore the respective housing needs and the commuting patterns of the other two. There would also little sense in promoting a strategy that does not acknowledge or reflect important transport corridors in North Essex such as the A12, the A120 and/or rail connections.

To ensure all alternatives respect relative housing needs and commuting patterns, and to help distil the options down to a manageable number for testing, it is proposed that the North Essex area be divided into two notional sub-areas – namely 1) the area west of Colchester including Braintree and the western part of Colchester borough and urban area; and 2) the area east of Colchester including Tendring district and the eastern part of Colchester borough and urban area. In accordance with the housing need and commuting patterns it would be reasonable to discount concentrating development at one end of the North Essex area and to expect any spatial strategies to broadly deliver around 5,000 dwellings west of Colchester and 2,500 east of Colchester.

Looking more closely at the residual housing requirements of the three individual authorities, Braintree, Colchester and Tendring are required to deliver an objectively assessed need derived requirement of 14,320, 18,400 and 11,000 homes between 2013 and 2033 respectively – a rough percentage split of 33%, 42% and 25%.

Between 2013 and 2019, actual dwelling completions in each authority were approximately 2,500, 5,500 and 3,000 respectively (11,000 in total) and the amount of development already expected to be delivered within the remainder of the plan period to 2033 through existing planning permissions, Section 2 Allocations and windfall sites in each authority amounts to approximately 11,000 12,000 and 8,000 respectively (31,000 in total). That leaves a 'residual' or remaining housing need within each authority (for which additional site allocations would be required) of approximately 2,000 i.e. 1,000 in Braintree (14,320 –

2,500 – 11,000); 1,000 in Colchester (18,400 - 5,500 – 12,000); and 0 in Tendring (11,000 – 3,000 – 8,000). In percentage terms, the split of this residual requirement is approximately: 50% Braintree, 50% Colchester and 0% Tendring as summarised, in very broad terms, in the table below.

Table 1

District	Objectively assessed housing requirement 2013-2033	Actual dwelling stock increase 2013-2018	Dwellings expected 2018-2033 from existing planning permissions, Section 2 allocations and windfall sites	Residual requirement 2013-2018 for which additional allocations are required	% split of the residual requirement by district
Braintree	14,320	2,500	11,000	1,000	50%
Colchester	18,400	5,500	12,000	1,000	50%
Tendring	11,000	3,000	8,000	0	0%

However, the current allocation in the Local Plan across the three authorities incorporates a healthy level of flexibility to provide a buffer for under delivery and to guard against the possibility that, for one reason or another, certain sites might not deliver as planned. This flexibility amounts to some 5,500 homes on top of the residual need of 2,000 which accounts for the 7,500 currently planned for through the three Garden Communities). If that 5,500 homes is allocated to the three authorities in proportion to their overall housing need (i.e. applying the 33:42:25 split), it would give 1,800 extra to Braintree, 2,300 to Colchester and 1,400 to Tendring (roughly 13% flexibility for each district over and above their respective OAN requirements).

For the Section 1 allocation of 7,500 homes to genuinely reflect the objectively assessed housing needs of each of the three authorities, it would need to be distributed as follows:

- Braintree: 2,800 (1,000 + 1,800)
- Colchester: 3,300 (1,000 + 2,300)
- Tendring: 1,400 (0 + 1,400)

If these figures are applied to the notional division of North Essex in west of Colchester and east of Colchester by simply dividing the Colchester figure in half, it would allocate the housing as follows:

- West of Colchester: 4,450 (made up of 2,800 at Braintree and 1,650 derived from half of Colchester’s number)
- East of Colchester 3,050 (made up of 1,400 for Tendring and 1,650 derived from the other half of Colchester’s number).

This would suggest that the current allocation of 5,000 homes to the two Garden Communities west of Colchester and 2,500 homes to the single Garden Community east of Colchester is broadly reflective of objectively assessed housing needs and it would therefore follow that any strategy that deviates significantly from this 2:1 ratio does not reflect the evidence of housing need. This general principle of testing options that reflect relative levels of need is also reflected, indirectly, in the Inspector’s comments

within paragraph 114 of his 8th June 2018 letter where he says *“it is difficult to see the logic of assessing Monks Wood as an alternative to [the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community] CBBGC and to [the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community] TCBGC , but not to [West of Braintree Garden Community] WoBGC, when appraising combinations of three GCs.”* The logic behind assessing comparable options to the west of Colchester separately from comparable options to the east therefore appears to be in line with the Inspector’s thinking.

Principle 4: Ensure alternative strategies are coherent and logical

For a strategy to be genuinely strategic, it should follow a coherent logic rather than being cobbled together from a ‘mix and match’ of different concepts and approaches. For example, a strategy for North Essex that incorporated entirely different approaches to growth in each of the three constituent authorities would not reasonably constitute a coherent strategy and would bring into question the benefit of having a joint strategic plan for North Essex. Neither would it be logical to have a strategy that, on the whole, follows the A120 corridor or other key transport corridors but in one location takes an entirely different path that does not reflect such corridors. As a general principle therefore, there ought to be some sensible logic behind any alternative strategy put forward for testing through the Sustainability Appraisal rather than an unnecessary assessment of every conceivable permutation of sites.

Principle 5: Ensure alternative strategies are reasonable

If there is limited evidence to suggest that an option is likely to be delivered, it begs the question whether that option is reasonable. For example, if a site or sites have been put forward as an alternative concept but there is no evidence of any developer or land-promoter involvement or there are significant unresolved questions about the form of development, its infrastructure requirements or the willingness of landowners to bring a scheme forward, there is little sense in treating it as a reasonable alternative to what is currently proposed in the Local Plan. If an assumingly unreasonable site option had emerged from the Stage 1 assessment as performing notably stronger against the sustainability criteria than other alternatives, there may have been a case for investing more time and effort into working with the promoters to work the proposal up into a feasible scheme – however, the conclusion of the Stage 1 assessment has shown that this is not the case and that no one option performs significantly better or significantly worse than another. On this basis, it would not be unreasonable to discount options from the next stage of the process on the basis that the current evidence shows them to be unreasonable. The responses (or lack of response) from site promoters to the method scoping statement consultation, check and challenge workshop and deliverability and viability consultation has helped inform any decisions as to whether certain options are reasonable.

Principle 6: Strategic sites will deliver a minimum of 2,000 homes within the plan period to 2033

With the exception of the proportionate growth scenarios where sites of any size could be combined in order to deliver the residual housing requirement, all the strategy options involving specific strategic sites assume that those sites will deliver a minimum of 2,000 homes within the remainder of the plan period up to 2033.

Principle 7: All strategy options will deliver social infrastructure

All spatial strategy options will deliver the following infrastructure: early years, primary & secondary schools, youth centre provision, open space, bus services, local centre facilities, healthcare facilities and community meeting spaces.

Sites to be discounted from the Stage 2 Assessment

The following list of sites tested as part of the Stage 1 assessment are proposed not to be carried forward into the Stage 2 assessment where different combinations of sites are tested as alternative spatial strategies. The main reasons for sites being discounted at this stage relate to either a lack of evidence to suggest there are reasonably deliverable proposals being advanced through the plan-making process at this time, or a lack of evidence to demonstrate that they are reasonable options in practical planning terms. Some sites have been discounted because they overlap or form part of a larger site that is being carried forward into Stage 2 or, following responses to the engagement with site promoters, it has been decided to merge certain sites together.

Table 2

Site	Reason for discounting
ALTGC1 Land West of Braintree	This is a smaller part of the West of Braintree Garden Community but is not being actively promoted by any landowners or developers at the size of 2,000 dwellings. This option was therefore merged with NEAGC1.
ALTGC2 Land East of Silver End	This site is an eastern extension to Silver End village which is a larger village with a selection of civic and retail services, as such it is not expected that the proposal would be stand-alone. The site is promoted for 1,800 dwellings but large enough to be able to accommodate 2,500 dwellings, these proposals incorporated the route of the A120 (Options D/E) along with a grade-separated junction as the primary access as it is not likely that existing junctions on the A12 and A120 could accommodate anticipated traffic growth without severe highway impact. Due to the proposal's limited scale, interdependence on Silver End, reliance on the delivery of the new A120 route and lack of clarity on new junctions, this site has been discounted.
ALTGC4 Land at Marks Tey Option One	Forms part of the Colchester Braintree Borders Garden Community and also independently promoted by L&Q, Cirrus Land and Gateway 120. AECOM Report on Infrastructure, Planning, Phasing and Delivery suggests that the land around ALTGC 4 and ALTGC 6 could form part of the earlier phases of development and could therefore be the areas of land likely to be preferred if a 'smaller' version Marks Tey development was to progress. Proposed that ALTGC 4 and ALTGC 6 be tested as a smaller-capacity version of NEAG2 (alongside Monks Wood and West of Braintree – see 'West 4' below) rather than site proposals in their own right.
ALTGC5 Land at Marks Tey Option Two	This site refers to land west of Marks Tey and is a subsection of the alternative Garden Community being independently promoted by L&Q, Cirrus Land and Gateway 120. The landowner has no desire to subdivide their scheme therefore this site was combined with ALTGC4 to form the full alternative Garden Community proposal. This was assessed through stage 1 as ALTGC4 thus ALTGC5 does no need to be carried forward to the Stage 2 assessment in its own right.
ALTGC6 Land at Marks Tey Option Three	Forms part of the Colchester Braintree Borders Garden Community and also independently promoted by L&Q, Cirrus Land and Gateway 120. AECOM Report on Infrastructure, Planning, Phasing and Delivery suggests that the

Site	Reason for discounting
	land around ALTGC 4 and ALTGC 6 could form part of the earlier phases of development and could therefore be the areas of land likely to be preferred if a 'smaller' version Marks Tey development was to progress. Proposed that ALTGC 4 and ALTGC 6 be tested as a smaller-capacity version of NEAG2 (alongside Monks Wood and West of Braintree – see 'West 4' below) rather than site proposals in their own right.
ALTGC8 Land at East of Colchester Option Two	Site not being actively promoted by any landowning party unlike the adjoining ALTGC7 which is being promoted by Catesby Estates and is more likely to be a deliverable option. There are also concerns about achieving suitable road access and achieving a development of significant dwelling capacity that is also sensitive to the undulating landscape around the valley of Salary Brook.
ALTGC9 Land at East of Colchester Option Three	Forms the northern part of the current Garden Community proposal at NEAGC3 but is unlikely to be a desirable development on its own as it would fail to achieve desired links to the University of Essex and would not facilitate or incorporate the full A133/A120 link road which is a key component of the Garden Community scheme. The AECOM Report on Infrastructure, Planning, Phasing and Delivery suggests that the northern part of the Garden Community would most likely be developed in later phases most likely beyond the current plan period.
ALTGC10 Land at East of Colchester Option Four	Forms the southern part of the current Garden Community proposal but is unlikely to be a desirable development on its own as it would not facilitate or incorporate the full A133/A120 link road thereby lacking direct access to the strategic road network. It is likely that development would cause severe traffic problems for areas East of Colchester Town Centre which already operate at capacity. This option has been discounted in favour of the full development proposed on the scale of NEAGC3 which would deliver the full link road.
ALTGC11 Langham Garden Village	Site no longer being actively promoted by its original proponent and considered to be an illogical northward extension to Colchester that breaches the strong defensible boundary formed by the A12 Colchester Bypass and threatens the sensitive landscape of the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty crossing the Essex/Suffolk border.
SUE3 Land South East of Braintree	Site overlaps with site SUE2 to the north therefore development on SUE2 could result in some development on SUE3. SUE 2 is considered to be the most logical of the two sites east of Braintree to form a strategic urban extension to the town and has been carried forward into the assessment of spatial options both under a proportionate (hierarchy-based) growth option) or as a strategic urban extension option in its own right (see West 7 below) given its proximity to the Tier 1 settlement of Braintree. Site SUE3 is therefore discounted at this stage.
SUE4 Land South of Haverhill	Haverhill located outside of the Braintree district and the land in question at extreme north west corner of the Braintree thus there is poor compliance with the principle of developing along the A120 or A12 growth corridors. Any strategic development would have to take place in co-operation with West Suffolk Council. However West Suffolk Council is only just embarking on the preparation of a new Local Plan and is exploring issues and options – so plan making timetables for the two authorities are not currently aligned.
VE2 Land at Coggeshall	Envisioned by the LPA as a group of village extensions capable of achieving 2,000 dwellings in total. One of the larger sites (Cogg182) was granted outline permission in 2018 meaning that there is no longer capacity for a strategic scale development at this location.
	Multiple ownership, no interest from landowners to work together to deliver a

Site	Reason for discounting
VE4 Weeley Garden Village	comprehensive scheme. Major development at Weeley considered as an option by Tendring District Council as part of its Section 2 Local Plan. Strategic growth at Weeley best tested as part of the CAUSE Metro Plan concept which involves different landowners and forms part of a more cohesive strategy involving other villages along the Colchester to Clacton branch line.

Sites to be included in Stage 2 Assessment

The following list of sites tested as part of the Stage 1 assessment are proposed to be carried forward into Stage 2 where they will be assessed in different combinations, with explanations given.

Table 3

Site	Explanation
ALTGC3 Monks Wood	Scheme being actively promoted by Lightwood Strategic. While the Local Plan Inspector has specifically suggested this scheme be tested at an alternative at 5,000 and 7,000 homes (IED011, para123), Lightwood have confirmed through consultation responses that their evolved scheme stands at 5,500 dwellings.
ALTGC7 Land at East of Colchester Option One	Site being actively promoted by Catesby Estates and is effectively an urban extension to north east Colchester. Should be tested as a reasonable alternative to the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community and other alternatives proposed for the area east of Colchester.
C1, C2, C3, C4 CAUSE Metro Plan	Local Plan Inspector specifically requires the Metro Plan concept to be tested as a spatial strategy alternative. It is a logical concept which aims to focus growth on land around existing railway stations on the Colchester to Clacton branch line, namely at the villages of Alresford, Great Bentley, Weeley and Thorpe le Soken – all within the Tendring District. In taking housing need and commuting patterns into account, the option would be tested as an alternative to the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community and other alternatives proposed for the area east of Colchester.
NEAGC1 West of Braintree	This is one of the three current Garden Community proposals in the submitted Section 1 Local Plan – against which alternative proposals are to be tested.
NEAGC2 Colchester Braintree Borders Garden Community (Marks Tey)	This is one of the three current Garden Community proposals in the submitted Section 1 Local Plan – against which alternative proposals are to be tested.
NEAGC3 Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community	This is one of the three current Garden Community proposals in the submitted Section 1 Local Plan – against which alternative proposals are to be tested.
SUE 1 Land at Halstead	Some of this land could form part of an urban extension to Halstead under a proportionate (percentage-based) or proportionate (hierarchy-based) growth option despite poor compliance with the principle of developing along the A120 growth corridor. The site would be capable of delivering dwellings beyond the plan period in reasonable proximity to the Tier 2 settlement of Halstead.
SUE2 Land East of Braintree (including Temple Border)	Could be considered both under a proportionate (hierarchy-based) growth option (with SUE 3) or as a strategic urban extension option in its own right given its proximity to the Tier 1 settlement of Braintree.

Site	Explanation
VE1 Land at Kelvedon	Some of this land could form part of an urban extension to Kelvedon to be tested alongside urban extensions to Braintree as a 'strategic urban extension' option, particularly as it aligns well with the A120 and A12 growth corridor.
VE5 Tendring Central Garden Village	Scheme being actively promoted by Edward Gittins Associates. Development in this location has been considered by Tendring District Council and discounted in the past, but the latest version is a larger development and should be tested as a reasonable alternative to the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community and other alternatives proposed for the area east of Colchester (such as Metro Plan).

Proposed Spatial Strategy Options (Table 4)

WEST OF COLCHESTER (Whole of Braintree and most of Colchester) Target of approximately 5,000 additional homes up to 2033	EAST OF COLCHESTER (Tendring and eastern part of Colchester) Target to deliver approximately 2,500 additional homes up to 2033
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proportionate (percentage-based) growth <i>[Resulting in a thin distribution of growth across both urban and rural settlements]</i> 2. Proportionate (hierarchy-based) growth <i>[Resulting a strong focus for growth on Braintree, Halstead and Hatfield Peverel]</i> 3. West of Braintree GC [NEAGC1] + Colchester/Braintree GC [NEAGC2] <i>[As currently proposed in the submitted Section 1 Local Plan]</i> 4. West of Braintree GC [NEAGC1] + Monks Wood GC [ALTGC3] + Colchester/Braintree GC [NEAGC2] and West 4a: smaller scale of West of Braintree [NEAGC1] + Monks Wood GC [ALTGC3] + smaller scale of Colchester/Braintree GC [NEAGC2] <i>[Options involving three Garden Communities including Monks Wood]</i> 5. Monks Wood GC [ALTGC3] + Colchester/Braintree Borders GC [NEAGC2] <i>[An alternative combination of two Garden Communities]</i> 6. West of Braintree GC [NEAGC1] + Monks Wood GC [ALTGC3] <i>[Another alternative combination of two Garden Communities]</i> 7. East of Braintree [SUE2] + Kelvedon [VE1] <i>[A non-Garden Community option proposing focussed growth at Braintree and Kelvedon]</i> 8. Land at Halstead [SUE1] + proportionate growth. <i>[One alternative Garden Community alongside proportionate growth at existing settlements]</i> 9. West of Braintree GC [NEAGC1] + proportionate growth <i>[One alternative Garden Community alongside proportionate growth at existing settlements]</i> 10. Colchester/Braintree GC [NEAGC2] + proportionate growth <i>[One alternative Garden Community alongside</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proportionate (percentage-based) growth <i>[Resulting in large increases in development at coastal towns]</i> 2. Proportionate (hierarchy-based) growth <i>[Resulting in major development around Brightlingsea]</i> 3. Tendring Colchester Borders GC [NEAGC3] <i>[As currently proposed in the submitted Section 1 Local Plan]</i> 4. Colchester North-East Urban Extension [ALTGC7] <i>[Strategic urban extension across the Colchester/Tendring border]</i> 5. Tendring Central Garden Village [VE5] <i>[New settlement at Frating at the A133/A120 interchange]</i> 6. CAUSE Metro Plan [C1, C2, C3 & C4] <i>[Development focussed on railway stations along the Colchester to Clacton branch line at Alresford, Great Bentley, Weeley and Thorpe le Soken]</i>

WEST OF COLCHESTER (Whole of Braintree and most of Colchester) Target of approximately 5,000 additional homes up to 2033	EAST OF COLCHESTER (Tendring and eastern part of Colchester) Target to deliver approximately 2,500 additional homes up to 2033
<p style="text-align: center;">proportionate growth at existing settlements]</p> <p>11. Monks Wood GC [ALTGC3] + proportionate growth [One alternative Garden Community alongside proportionate growth at existing settlements]</p>	

Descriptions of the Options

West 1: Proportionate (percentage-based) growth

The rationale behind each of the proportionate growth scenarios (West 1 & 2 and East 1 & 2) is to test the potential for accommodating the development currently expected to be delivered through Garden Communities within the current plan period on land in and around existing settlements – thus avoiding the need to establish any new ‘stand-alone’ settlements or other strategic-scale developments, at least until 2033. The Inspector has specifically requested that this option is assessed as part of the further SA work to help demonstrate whether or not a strategy involving the creation of new settlements is justified in the current plan period.

Under this particular option, it is envisaged that all defined settlements in North Essex across all three authorities, regardless of their position within the Local Plan settlement hierarchies would accommodate a pro-rata share of the remainder of the North Essex housing requirement for the period 2019 to 2033 including an element of flexibility – a level of approximately 40,000 homes. This represents an approximate 18% increase in dwelling stock above 2019 levels and under this percentage-based approach, each defined settlement would accommodate an 18% increase in housing over 14 years (2019-2033).

Taking into account homes already expected on sites with planning permission or otherwise allocated in Section 2 plans, many of the existing settlements would not need to accommodate any additional housing as they are already expected to achieve or exceed their 18% dwelling stock quota through existing proposals. There are however some settlements that would be expected to accommodate additional housing allocations under this percentage-based proportionate approach to achieve the remainder of the requirement. For the settlements in the area west of Colchester, these are summarised, in broad terms, in the table below.

Table 5.1

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Halstead	200-300	N/a	Existing employment allocations in Section 2 Local Plans to be retained and possibly expanded. Some of the additional developments might be accompanied by a range of new small employment areas or expansion of existing areas.	Halstead bypass desirable but not likely to be deliverable off the back of the relatively modest level of additional development that proportionate growth would bring. Infrastructure proposed as a result of proposals in the Section 2 Local Plans to be retained and, where necessary, expanded.
Colchester	100-199 (each)	N/a		
Coggeshall				
Black Notley				
Rayne				
Sible Hedingham				
Earls Colne	50-99 (each)	N/a		
Finchingfield				
Castle Hedingham				
Gosfield				
Panfield				
Wethersfield				
Aldham				
Birch				

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Easthorpe	1-49 (each)	N/a		The very thin spread of additional growth, particularly across smaller villages, would result in numerous developments of insufficient scale to accommodate new facilities such as schools or health centres. Such infrastructure might need to be delivered through pooled financial contributions towards expanding existing facilities or delivering new shared facilities for which land would need to be identified and acquired.
Great Wigborough				
Layer Breton				
Little Horkesley				
Messing-Cum-Inworth				
Mount Bures				
Peldon				
Salcott				
Wormingford				
Bures Hamlet				
Great Bardfield				
Great Yeldham				
Steeple Bumpstead				
Ashden				
Audley End				
Belchamp Otten				
Belchamp St Paul				
Belchamp Walter				
Blackmore End				
Bradwell				
Bulmer				
Bulmer Tey				
Colne Engaine				
Cornish Hall End				
Cressing				
Foxearth				
Gestingthorpe				
Great Maplestead				
Great Sailing				
Greenstead Green				
High Garret				
Helions Bumpstead				
Lamarsh				
Little Maplestead				
Little Yeldham				
Nounsley				
Pebmarsh				
Ridgewell				
Rivenhall				

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Rivenhall End				
Shalford				
Shalford Church End				
Stambourne Chapelend Way				
Stambourne Dyers End				
Stinstead				
Sturmer				
Surrex (Coggeshall)				
Terling				
Tilbury Juxta Clare				
Topplesfield				
White Colne				
White Notley				
Wickham St. Paul				

For the area west of Colchester, a percentage based growth strategy would result in a very thin spread of development through the various settlements with only Halstead having to accommodate additional allocations of 200+ dwellings and six other settlements accommodating 100+. The total amount of development generated through this percentage-based approach would deliver approximately 3,000 homes which is around 2,000 short of what might be expected from the area west of Colchester when applying principle 3 above. This indicates that the proportionate percentage-based approach would shift the majority of the additional development to Tendring and East Colchester, as can be seen under the East 1 option, albeit not to the extent by which such a strategy might be seen as altogether unreasonable.

West 2: Proportionate (hierarchy-based) growth

Under this option, it is envisaged that development would be allocated to settlements in North Essex across all three authorities according to their position within the settlement hierarchy with the aim of directing growth towards the most sustainable locations.

Policy SP2 in the Section 1 Local, which sets out the spatial strategy for North Essex, states that existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across North Essex within the Local Plan period with development being accommodated within or adjoining settlements according to their scale, sustainability and existing role both within each individual district and, where relevant, across the wider strategic area. Under this hierarchy-based growth strategy, this principle is extended to deliver the full housing requirement for North Essex instead of part of the proposed growth being delivered through Garden Communities.

The hierarchy-based strategy involves 50% of the 40,000 homes between 2019 and 2033 going to the larger 'Tier 1' settlements of Colchester and Braintree; 20% to 'Tier 2' settlements such as Clacton, Harwich, Witham and Halstead; and 10% to 'Tier 3' settlements such as Frinton, Walton & Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford & Mistley, Brightlingsea, Kelvedon and Hatfield Peverel. The remaining 15% would be delivered around smaller 'Tier 4' and 'Tier 5' settlements but with growth already accounted for through existing planning permissions and Section 2 housing allocations.

The Inspector has specifically requested that proportionate growth is assessed as part of the further SA work to help demonstrate whether or not a strategy involving the creation of new settlements is justified in the current plan period. Hierarchy based proportionate growth is a different interpretation to the proportionate growth option outlined under West 1. Appraising two different approaches ensures that proportionate growth has been properly and fully explored. For the settlements in the area west of Colchester, the hierarchy-based distribution of growth is summarised, in broad terms, in the table below.

Table 5.2

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment Assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Land east of Braintree [SUE2]	4,500-5,000	N/a	The proposals for the Braintree site includes the provision of a range of leisure, employment and retail uses to complement the relocation of Braintree Football Club to the site. Approximately 10 hectares of B-use employment land in total is suggested as being deliverable as part of the Braintree scheme alongside 5,000 dwellings. Smaller employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport, and Colchester • Millennium slipways at Galleys Corner Roundabout are required to provide additional capacity for initial phases (funded and expected to be constructed June 2020). • New route of A120 to provide a free-flow link in place of the Galley's Corner roundabout. • RIS funded A12 upgrading 2022 to 2025 • Bypass for Halstead
Hatfield Peverel	800 (each)	N/a		
Halstead				

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment Assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
			sites of around 2ha could be delivered alongside each of the developments at Hatfield Peverel and Halstead.	

Like the percentage-based proportionate growth scenario, the hierarchy-based model results in many of the existing settlements not needing to accommodate any additional housing as they are already expected to achieve their share of the new homes increase through existing proposals. Unlike the percentage-based approach, however, the settlements that would be expected to accommodate additional housing allocations are fewer in number – meaning less of a ‘thin spread’ of development, but the scale of required growth in the affected settlements much greater, particularly for Braintree and, to a lesser extent, Hatfield Peverel and Halstead.

This approach would deliver around 6,000-6,500 additional homes in the area the west of Colchester which is substantially greater than the 5,000 that would be expected under a strict application of Principle 3 above. This demonstrates that a hierarchy-based approach shifts the focus of development to the west – mainly because Braintree is categorised as a Tier 1 settlement even though its existing dwelling stock and current proposals for development are significantly smaller than that of Colchester.

West 3: West of Braintree GC [NEAGC1] + Colchester/Braintree GC [NEAGC2]

This option reflects what is already included in the submitted Section 1 Local Plan with development at two new Garden Communities, one west of Braintree and one on the Colchester/Braintree border around Marks Tey. In the submitted plan, each of these Garden Communities is expected to deliver 2,500 new homes within the remainder of the plan period to 2033. In terms of their long-term dwelling capacity, the Colchester Braintree borders proposal will potentially be more than double the size of that west of Braintree.

Under this option, the two garden communities are of a sufficient mass and distance from each other, and other town centres, to be capable of developing as standalone communities. The connection of the proposed garden communities, along the A120 corridor, means that RTS is an option. The Concept Feasibility Study (EB/008) provides evidence that 2,500 dwellings can be delivered in each garden community within the plan period. The two garden communities proposed will deliver a total of 5,000 dwellings to the west of Colchester within the plan period, as justified under principles 1 and 3. The total dwellings figure, which is within the range in the Submission Local Plan, is taken from evidence in the North Essex Local Plan (Strategic) Section 1 Viability Assessment Update report by Hyas Associates and thus reflects the most up to date position in respect of viability assumptions.

Table 5.3

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
West of Braintree GC NEAGC1	2,500	10,000	Evidence base document entitled 'Reconciliation of Cebr and Cambridge Econometrics Employment Scenarios and Floorspace Requirements for the North Essex Garden Communities – Cebr note for the North Essex Authorities recommends employment land figures for the Garden Community proposals. For West of Braintree, it suggests approximately 9ha by 2033, 26ha by 2050 and 43ha by 2071. For the Colchester/Braintree Borders, it suggests 4ha by 2033, 19ha by 2050 and 37ha by 2071. Totally built out, it is suggested that West of Braintree will likely deliver 43ha of employment land and Colchester/Braintree borders 37ha.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport and Stansted • RTS links to Colchester and Braintree, with potential to link to London Stansted Airport. • Strategic improvements to Marks Tey Railway Station. • New junctions. Widening, and rerouting of A12. • Bypass for A120.
Colchester/Braintree GC NEAGC2	2,500	21,000		

West 4: West of Braintree [NEAGC1] + Monks Wood GC [ALTGC3] + Colchester/Braintree GC [NEAGC2] and West 4a: smaller scale of West of Braintree [NEAGC1] + Monks Wood GC [ALTGC 3] + smaller scale of Colchester/Braintree GC [NEAGC2]

Under these options, there would be three new garden communities to the west of Colchester each of a smaller size overall than those proposed in the Section 1 Local Plan, but each expected to deliver around 2,000 homes in the remainder of the plan period to 2033. The three smaller garden communities would be west of Braintree, the Monks Wood site being promoted by Lightwood Strategic and at Marks Tey. The Inspector specifically requested that a range of options, including garden communities, are tested as he felt that these would be reasonable scenarios that the previous SA had failed to cover.

Under these scenarios, it is anticipated that each of the three locations – all well related to the existing A120, could reasonably deliver 2,000 dwellings (in line with Principal 6 explained above) i.e. around 6,000 in total for the area west of Colchester – slightly higher than the 5,000 expected from the two Garden Communities currently proposed in the Section 1 Local Plan. This reflects the likely delivery within the plan period of 2,500 dwellings for each site as evidenced in the Concept Feasibility Study for West of Braintree and Braintree Colchester borders GCs and the viability and deliverability site information form for Monks Wood, but adding in an element of flexibility as three garden communities are proposed.

The size of each proposed garden community under this option is less than options involving 1 or 2 garden communities because, whilst planning for longer term development through the delivery of garden communities this option, if taken forward, will be combined with development to the east of Colchester. An option involving a lower scale of development enables the SA to draw out the different effects, both positive and negative, from smaller and larger garden communities.

The total dwellings figures for West 4 for West of Braintree is within the range in the Submission Local Plan and is taken from evidence in the North Essex Local Plan (Strategic) Section 1 Viability Assessment Update report by Hyas Associates Ltd. The total dwellings figure for Marks Tey is within the range in the Submission Local Plan and includes land that is being independently promoted by L&Q, Cirrus Land and Gateway 120. The AECOM Report on Infrastructure, Planning, Phasing and Delivery suggests that this land could form part of the earlier phases of development and could therefore be the areas of land likely to be preferred if a smaller version Marks Tey development was to progress. The total dwellings figure for Monks Wood reflects the scale of development being promoted as set out in the viability and deliverability site information form.

The total dwelling figures for West 4a for each of the three sites is 5,500. This allows the NEAs to consider the likely sustainability effects of smaller scale development and facilitates a direct comparison of these three sites.

Table 5.4

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
West of Braintree GC NEAGC1	2,000	10,000	Evidence base document entitled 'Reconciliation of Cebr and Cambridge Econometrics Employment Scenarios and Floorspace Requirements for the North Essex Garden Communities – Cebr note for the North Essex Authorities recommends employment land figures for the Garden Community proposals. For West of Braintree, it suggests approximately 9ha by 2033, 26ha by 2050 and 43ha by 2071. For the Colchester/Braintree Borders, it suggests 4ha by 2033, 19ha by 2050 and 37ha by 2071. Totally built out, it is suggested that West of Braintree will likely deliver 43ha of employment land and Colchester/Braintree borders 37ha.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport and Stansted • RTS links to Colchester and Braintree, with potential to link to London Stansted Airport. • Strategic improvements to Marks Tey Railway Station. • New junctions. Widening, and rerouting of A12. • Bypass for A120. • Sustainable transport link to Kelvedon Station • District centres
Colchester/Braintree GC NEAGC2	2,000	17,000		
Monks Wood ALTGC3	2,000	5,500	<p>25h.2a for B 'uses' has been identified in the master plan /land use budget plan that underpins the Alder King Viability Report for Monks Wood (March 2019) at 5,500 homes. Estimated that 11ha would be delivered in the plan period up to 2033.</p> <p>16.2ha has been identified for Retail /District/Local Centre 'A' uses. Upper floors can provide alternative or additional B1 space to that within the 25.2ha</p>	

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
			referred to above	

Table 5.4a

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
West of Braintree GC NEAGC1	2,000	5,500	Evidence base document entitled 'Reconciliation of Cebr and Cambridge Econometrics Employment Scenarios and Floorspace Requirements for the North Essex Garden Communities – Cebr note for the North Essex Authorities recommends employment land figures for the Garden Community proposals. For West of Braintree, it suggests approximately 9ha by 2033. For the Colchester/Braintree Borders, it suggests 4ha by 2033. It is suggested that these figures are doubled to 18 and 8ha respectively to correspond with the fully built out scenario of 5,500 homes at each development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport and Stansted • RTS links to Colchester and Braintree, with potential to link to London Stansted Airport. • Strategic improvements to Marks Tey Railway Station. • New junctions. Widening, and rerouting of A12. • Bypass for A120. • Sustainable transport link to Kelvedon Station • District centres
Colchester/Braintree GC NEAGC2	2,000	5,500		
Monks Wood ALTGC3	2,000	5,500	<p>25h.2a for B 'uses' has been identified in the master plan /land use budget plan that underpins the Alder King Viability Report for Monks Wood (March 2019) at 5,500 homes.</p> <p>16.2ha has been identified for Retail /District/Local Centre 'A' uses. Upper floors can provide alternative or additional B1 space to that within the 25.2ha referred to above</p>	

West 5: Monks Wood GC [ALTGC3] + Colchester/Braintree Borders GC [NEAGC2]

Under this option, there would be two Garden Communities to the west of Colchester but the Garden Community West of Braintree would be substituted with the Monks Wood proposal from Lightwood Strategic so the strategy would include Monks Wood and the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community at Marks Tey. The focus of growth would therefore shift eastwards along the A120 corridor towards Colchester but further away from Braintree and Stansted.

This option would assume 2,500 homes being built at each of the two Garden Communities within the plan period to 2033 – delivering an equivalent number of homes to that already proposed through the Garden Communities in the Section 1 Local Plan. Longer-term however, a total of 26,500 homes are proposed.

Table 5.5

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Monks Wood GC ALTGC3	2,500	5,500	25h.2a for B ‘uses’ has been identified in the master plan /land use budget plan that underpins the Alder King Viability Report for Monks Wood (March 2019) at 5,500 homes. Estimated that 11ha would be delivered in the plan period up to 2033. Likewise, 16.2ha has been identified for Retail /District/Local Centre ‘A’ uses. Upper floors can provide alternative or additional B1 space to that within the 25.2ha referred to above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport and Stansted • RTS links to Colchester and Braintree, with potential to link to London Stansted Airport. • Strategic improvements to Marks Tey Railway Station. • New junctions. Widening, and rerouting of A12. • Bypass for A120. • Sustainable transport link to Kelvedon Station • District centres
Colchester/Braintree GC NEAGC2	2,500	21,000	Evidence base document entitled ‘Reconciliation of Cebr and Cambridge Econometrics Employment Scenarios and Floorspace Requirements for the North Essex Garden Communities – Cebr note for the North Essex Authorities recommends employment land figures for the Garden Community proposals. For the	

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
			Colchester/Braintree Borders, it suggests 4ha by 2033, 19ha by 2050 and 37ha by 2071. Totally built out, it is suggested that Colchester/ Braintree borders scheme will likely deliver 37ha.	

West 6: West of Braintree GC [NEAGC1] + Monks Wood GC [ALTGC3]

Under this option, there are two garden communities: the Colchester Braintree Borders Garden Community at Marks Tey would be substituted with Monks Wood and would be delivered alongside the Garden Community West of Braintree. The focus of growth would therefore shift westwards along the A120 corridor away from Colchester and more towards Braintree with the majority of development being within the Braintree district.

This option would assume 2,500 homes being built at each of the two Garden Communities within the plan period to 2033 – delivering an equivalent number of homes to that already proposed through the Garden Communities in the Section 1 Local Plan. Longer-term however, 15,000 homes are proposed.

Table 5.6

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Monks Wood GC ALTGC3	2,500	5,500	25h.2a for B 'uses' has been identified in the master plan /land use budget plan that underpins the Alder King Viability Report for Monks Wood (March 2019) at 5,500 homes. Estimated that 11ha would be delivered in the plan period up to 2033. Likewise, 16.2ha has been identified for Retail /District/Local Centre 'A' uses. Upper floors can provide alternative or additional B1 space to that within the 25.2ha referred to above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport and Stansted • RTS links to Colchester and Braintree, with potential to link to London Stansted Airport. • Strategic improvements to Marks Tey Railway Station. • New junctions. Widening, and rerouting of A12. • Bypass for A120. • Sustainable transport link to Kelvedon Station • District centres
West of Braintree NEAGC1	2,500	10,000	Evidence base document entitled 'Reconciliation of Cebr and Cambridge Econometrics Employment Scenarios and Floorspace Requirements for the North Essex Garden Communities – Cebr note for the North Essex Authorities recommends employment land figures for the Garden Community proposals.	

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
			<p>For West of Braintree, it suggests approximately 9ha by 2033, 26ha by 2050 and 43ha by 2071. Totally built out, it is suggested that West of Braintree will likely deliver 43ha of employment land.</p>	

West 7: East of Braintree [SUE2] + Kelvedon [VE1]

Under this option, there would be no stand-alone Garden Communities to the west of Colchester at all. This non-Garden Community option would be different to the proportionate growth scenarios in that it would involve targeted growth in the form of two strategic urban extensions – one to the east of Braintree and one to Kelvedon – both within Braintree district. The focus of growth would therefore move away from Colchester.

Traditionally, growth has been delivered across the NEAs through planned urban extensions to existing settlements, this option is a continuation of the historic approach. Both options are proposed to deliver 2,500 dwellings each within the plan period and a further 2,500 dwellings each beyond the plan period. Whilst the Inspector did not specifically request that non-garden community options are appraised as part of the Additional SA, the NEAs consider that the appraisal and consideration of urban extensions as a spatial strategy option will provide a useful comparison to the options involving garden communities. Land east of Braintree and land at Kelvedon have been selected as these sites meet the principles outlined above.

Table 5.7

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Land east of Braintree SUE2	2,500	5,000	The proposals for the site includes the provision of a range of leisure, employment and retail uses to complement the relocation of Braintree Football Club to the site. Approximately 10 hectares of B-use employment land in total is suggested as being deliverable as part of the Braintree scheme alongside 5,000 dwellings of which 5ha would be achieved in the plan period to 2033 alongside 2,500 dwellings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport, and Colchester • Millennium slipways at Galleys Corner Roundabout are required to provide additional capacity for initial phases (funded and expected to be constructed June 2020). • New route of A120 to provide a free-flow link in place of the Galley's Corner roundabout. • The delivery of the Kings Dene scheme (Kelvedon) is not contingent upon the prior (or eventual) construction of the dualled A120 or the 'Option D' alignment, nor does it prejudice the delivery of this alignment. • RIS funded A12 upgrading 2022 to
Land at Kelvedon VE1	2,500	5,000	The proposals for Kings Dene include the provision of up to 36ha of employment land for B use class employment use (B1, B2 and B8). This land is to be provided in a highly accessible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RIS funded A12 upgrading 2022 to

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
			<p>location to the south west of the site between the A12 and railway line. To complement the proposed employment land provision, opportunities also exist to provide B1 and non B class employment generating uses around the rail station as part of mixed used district centre and within local centres.</p>	<p>2025</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative route from Coggeshall Road through the site to the A12 south west of Kelvedon. This provides the opportunity to remove through traffic from the restricted centre of Kelvedon and connect the Coggeshall traffic directly to the new A12 junction.

West 8: Halstead (SUE1) and proportionate growth

This option and the following three options, all involve development of one garden community alongside further proportionate growth. Each of the proposed garden communities to the west of Colchester that are included in the 'Sites to be included in Stage 2 Assessment' table are options (West 8, 9, 10 & 11).

The Inspector asked for a range of garden community options to be appraised, including 1, 2 or more garden communities. As the housing requirement to the west of Colchester under Principle 3 is for approximately 5,000 dwellings in the plan period and one strategic site [i.e. at Halstead] is only realistically capable of delivering 2,500 dwellings in the plan period, the remaining development would be delivered through proportionate growth around existing settlements. The total dwellings for site SUE1 at Halstead reflects what the site promoter believes is achievable on the site, as set out in the viability and deliverability site information form.

The proportionate growth for other settlements west of Colchester follows the 'hierarchy-based' approach as explained under the West 2 option which, when compared to the 'percentage-based' approach (which spreads development very thinly across rural settlements) is considered to be the more sustainable approach. Where a strategic site is being proposed alongside proportionate hierarchy-based growth, the amount of development proposed under proportionate growth is set at half of what is proposed under option West 2. Essentially, this option would direct development to Halstead, Braintree and, to a lesser extent, Hatfield Peverel and would deliver approximately 5,500 homes which reflects, broadly the scale of growth required west of Colchester to meet housing needs in line with Principle 3.

Table 5.8

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Land at Halstead [SUE1]	2,500	8,000	Yes, please refer to accompanying note to site information form. The site provides an opportunity to enhance accessibility to (and/or expand) the Bluebridge Industrial Estate. 2ha of employment land suggested. The proposals for the Braintree site includes the provision of a range of leisure, employment and retail uses to complement the relocation of Braintree Football Club to the site. 5ha of employment land suggested alongside 2,500 homes. Smaller employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full Halstead Bypass • Restore and restore dismantled railway Colchester Road to Tidings Hill as a new cycle and pedestrian route. • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport, and Colchester • Millennium slipways at Galleys Corner Roundabout are required to provide additional capacity for initial phases (funded and expected to be constructed June 2020). • New route of A120 to provide a free-flow link in place of the Galley's Corner roundabout. • RIS funded A12
Land east of Braintree [SUE2]	2,500	N/a		
Hatfield Peverel	400	N/a		

			sites of around 1ha could be delivered alongside development at Hatfield Peverel.	upgrading 2022 to 2025
--	--	--	---	------------------------

West 9: West of Braintree GC [NEAGC1] and proportionate growth

This option involves development of one garden community and proportionate growth. Each of the proposed garden communities to the west of Colchester that are included in the 'Sites to be included in Stage 2 Assessment' table are options (West 8, 9, 10 & 11).

The Inspector asked for a range of garden community options to be appraised, including 1, 2 or more garden communities. As the housing requirement to the west of Colchester is for approximately 5,000 dwellings in the plan period and the West of Braintree Garden Community is only capable of delivering 2,500 dwellings in the plan period, proportionate growth is also required under this option to make up the remainder. That remainder under this option is formed by applying half the development expected under the hierarchy based approach to proportionate growth as set out per West 2. The total dwellings figure, which is within the range in the Submission Local Plan, is taken from evidence in the North Essex Local Plan (Strategic) Section 1 Viability Assessment Update Report by Hyas Associates (June 2019).

The proportionate –hierarchy-based growth that would be delivered alongside the Garden Community would result in a strong focus of development around Braintree with major developments to the east and the west. This option could deliver around 6,000 homes which reflects, broadly the scale of growth required west of Colchester to meet housing needs in line with Principle 3.

Table 5.9

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
West of Braintree GC NEAGC1	2,500	10,000	Evidence base document entitled 'Reconciliation of Cebr and Cambridge Econometrics Employment Scenarios and Floorspace Requirements for the North Essex Garden Communities – Cebr note for the North Essex Authorities recommends employment land figures for the Garden Community proposals. For West of Braintree, it suggests approximately 9ha by 2033, 26ha by 2050 and 43ha by 2071. Totally built out, it is suggested that West of Braintree will likely deliver 43ha. Smaller employment sites of around 1ha could be delivered alongside development at Hatfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport and Stansted. • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport, and Colchester • Millennium slipways at Galleys Corner Roundabout are required to provide additional capacity for initial phases (funded and expected to be constructed June 2020). • New route of A120 to provide a free-flow link in place of the Galley's Corner roundabout. • RIS funded A12 upgrading 2022 to 2025 • Bypass for Halstead
Land east of Braintree [SUE2]	2,500	N/a		
Hatfield Peverel	400 (each)	N/a		
Halstead				

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
			Peverel and Halstead.	

West 10: Colchester/ Braintree Borders garden community [NEAGC2] and proportionate growth

This option involves development of one garden community and proportionate growth. Each of the proposed garden communities to the west of Colchester that are included in the ‘Sites to be included in Stage 2 Assessment’ table are options (West 8, 9, 10 & 11).

The Inspector asked for a range of garden community options to be appraised, including 1, 2 or more garden communities. As the housing requirement to the west of Colchester is for approximately 5,000 dwellings in the plan period and the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community is only capable of delivering 2,500 dwellings in the plan period, proportionate growth is also required under this option to make up the remainder. That remainder under this option is formed by applying half the development expected under the hierarchy based approach to proportionate growth as set out per West 2. The total dwellings figure, which is within the range in the Submission Local Plan, is taken from evidence in the North Essex Local Plan (Strategic) Section 1 Viability Assessment Update Report by Hyas Associates (June 2019).

Table 5.10

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Colchester/ Braintree Borders garden community NEAGC2	2,500	21,000	Evidence base document entitled ‘Reconciliation of Cebr and Cambridge Econometrics Employment Scenarios and Floorspace Requirements for the North Essex Garden Communities – Cebr note for the North Essex Authorities recommends employment land figures for the Garden Community proposals. For the Colchester/Braintree Borders, it suggests 4ha by 2033, 19ha by 2050 and 37ha by 2071. Totally built out, it is suggested that the scheme will likely deliver 37ha. The proposals for the Braintree site includes the provision of a range of leisure, employment and retail uses to complement the relocation of Braintree Football Club to the site. 5ha of employment land suggested alongside 2,500 homes. Smaller employment sites of around 1ha could be delivered alongside development at Hatfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport and Stansted • RTS links to Colchester and Braintree, with potential to link to London Stansted Airport. • Strategic improvements to Marks Tey Railway Station. • New junctions. Widening, and rerouting of A12. • Millennium slipways at Galleys Corner Roundabout are required to provide additional capacity for initial phases (funded and expected to be constructed June 2020). • New route of A120 to provide a free-flow link in place of the Galley’s Corner roundabout. • RIS funded A12 upgrading 2022 to
Land east of Braintree [SUE2]	2,500	N/a		
Hatfield Peverel	400 (each)	N/a		
Halstead				

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
			Peveler and Halstead.	2025 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bypass for Halstead

West 11: Monks Wood [ALTGC3] and proportionate growth

This option involves development of one garden community and proportionate growth. Each of the proposed garden communities to the west of Colchester that are included in the 'Sites to be included in Stage 2 Assessment' table are options (West 8, 9, 10 & 11).

The Inspector asked for a range of garden community options to be appraised, including 1, 2 or more garden communities. As the housing requirement to the west of Colchester is for approximately 5,000 dwellings in the plan period and the Monks Wood development is considered capable of delivering 2,500 dwellings in the plan period, proportionate growth is also required under this option to make up the remainder. That remainder under this option is formed by applying half the development expected under the hierarchy based approach to proportionate growth as set out per West 2. The total dwellings reflect what the site promoter believes is achievable on the site, as set out in the viability and deliverability site information form.

Table 5.11

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Monks Wood ALTGC3	2,000	5,500	<p>25h.2a for B 'uses' has been identified in the master plan /land use budget plan that underpins the Alder King Viability Report for Monks Wood (March 2019) at 5,500 homes. Estimated that 11ha would be delivered in the plan period up to 2033. Likewise, 16.2ha has been identified for Retail /District/Local Centre 'A' uses. Upper floors can provide alternative or additional B1 space to that within the 25.2ha referred to above.</p> <p>The proposals for the Braintree site includes the provision of a range of leisure, employment and retail uses to complement the relocation of Braintree Football Club to the site. 5ha of employment land suggested alongside 2,500 homes.</p> <p>Smaller employment sites of around 1ha could be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Braintree Town, Braintree Freeport and Colchester • Sustainable transport link to Kelvedon Station • Realignment and upgrading of A120 route and junctions to accommodate traffic generated. • Millennium slipways at Galleys Corner Roundabout are required to provide additional capacity for initial phases (funded and expected to be constructed June 2020). • New route of A120 to provide a free-flow link in place of the Galley's Corner roundabout. • RIS funded A12 upgrading 2022 to 2025 • Bypass for Halstead
Land east of Braintree [SUE2]	2,500	N/a		
Hatfield Peverel	400 (each)	N/a		
Halstead				

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
			delivered alongside development at Hatfield Peverel and Halstead.	

East 1: Proportionate (percentage-based) growth

For the area east of Colchester, the percentage-based proportionate approach to growth (explained in more detail under West 1 above) would generate the need for additional housing allocations in the following locations:

Table 5.12

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Clacton	1,000-2,000	N/a	<p>Existing employment allocations in Section 2 Local Plans to be retained and possibly expanded. The Section 2 Local Plan for Tendring already includes a significant over-allocation of employment land to bring choice to the market. Employment land proposals for Clacton and Harwich in particular would have to be brought forward at an accelerated rate to support additional housing growth proposed under this scenario.</p> <p>Some of the other additional developments might be accompanied by a range of new small employment areas or expansion of existing areas.</p>	<p>The link road currently proposed for north Clacton as part of the Hartley Gardens Strategic Development in Tendring's Section 2 Local Plan would need to be funded and brought forward early to enable the rate of development to be accelerated and to enable the additional 1,000-2,000 homes to be delivered before 2033.</p> <p>Increased development around Tendring's coastal towns would also require the £1million upgrade to the A133/A120 roundabout at Frating to be undertaken early within the current plan period.</p> <p>Generally, infrastructure proposed as a result of proposals in the Section 2 Local Plans to be retained and, where necessary, expanded or accelerated.</p> <p>The thinner spread of additional growth across the smaller villages, would result in numerous developments of insufficient scale to accommodate new facilities such as schools or health centres. Such infrastructure might need</p>
Harwich	500-999	N/a		
Frinton/Walton	(each)			
Brightlingsea	300-499	N/a		
West Mersea	200-299	N/a		
Wivenhoe	(each)			
St. Osyth	100-199	N/a		
Thorrington	(each)			
Little Clacton	50-99 (each)	N/a		
Dedham				
Ardleigh				
Bradfield				
Kirby-le-Soken				
Little Oakley				
Dedham Heath				
Abberton and Langenhoe	10-49 (each)	N/a		
Boxted				
Beaumont-Cum-Moze				
Great Bromley				
Great Holland				
Little Bentley				
Little Bromley				
Ramsey Village				
Tendring				
Wix				
Wrabness				
East Mersea				
Fingringhoe				

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
				to be delivered through pooled financial contributions towards expanding existing facilities or delivering new shared facilities for which land would need to be identified and acquired.

Under this percentage-based approach to proportionate growth, settlements to the east of Colchester would be delivering approximately 5,000 additional dwellings which is significantly above the 2,500 level proposed in the current Colchester/Tendring Garden Community and the proportion of growth that might be expected in applying principle 3. That said, the level of additional development is not wholly unreasonable in the context of the overall housing need – although a shift to the east does bring about questions over the ability for lower-value areas such as Clacton and Harwich to generate sufficient market demand to deliver the additional growth and also the environmental impacts of directing growth towards more sensitive locations on the coast. Because many of the rural settlements to the east of Colchester are already expected to deliver their fair share of growth through existing proposals, the focus for additional development under this option would indeed be on settlements around the coast, both in Tendring and in Colchester.

In the Section 2 Local Plan for Tendring, a significant amount of land around Clacton is already earmarked for new development and would be capable, in physical terms, of accommodating 1,000 to 2,000 additional homes – however the Section 2 plan makes conservative assumptions about how much development is realistically achievable on those sites within the plan period to 2033 and thus much of the strategic growth that is currently expected to take place beyond 2033 would somehow need to be accelerated under this scenario to achieve higher built-out rates in the period up to 2033. Key road infrastructure projects in north Clacton and on the A133 at Frating would need to be delivered early to enable an accelerated rate of development.

The other coastal towns that would be affected by this growth scenario would be Harwich, Frinton/Walton, Brightlingsea West Mersea and Wivenhoe – all of which are environmentally sensitive in landscape and ecological terms (with close proximity to the European Designated sites) and physically constrained by the coast and peripheral locations. Brightlingsea and West Mersea are both served only by one road in and out with no rail services and an infrequent bus service. Wivenhoe is the subject of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan which limits the contribution of additional development it could make within the plan period to 2033.

East 2: Proportionate (hierarchy-based) growth

For the area east of Colchester, the hierarchy-based growth scenario would only deliver around 1,500 homes against the 2,500 proposed at the Tendring/Colchester Garden Community.

Table 5.13

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Brightlingsea	900-1,000	N/a	Existing Section 2 Local Plan allocations for the Harwich area would need to deliver faster than currently anticipated. Additional employment land circa 3-4ha would be required at Brightlingsea to achieve a level of self-containment – particularly given the town’s transport limitations.	Major transport infrastructure improvement for Brightlingsea would be required to enable it to accommodate such a high level of additional development and this might involve re-opening the historic railway line to Wivenhoe or constructing a second access road to the town.
Harwich	300-400	N/a		
Frinton/Walton	100-299	N/a		

This approach would only deliver around 1,500 additional homes in the area east of Colchester which is lower than the 2,500 that would be expected when applying Principle 3 and what is proposed at the proposed Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community.

Brightlingsea is the settlement that would be most greatly affected because it is town in the settlement hierarchy but one where growth has been limited due to its significant physical and environmental constraints and because of its limited transport network. A development of some 900-1,000 homes in this location would require the development of greenfield sites that are sensitive in landscape terms and within close proximity to the Colne Estuary which is an internationally designated wildlife site. It would also bring into question the adequacy of the current transport provision which is limited to a single road (the B1029) in and out of the town, a limited bus service and no rail provision. The re-opening of the historic branch line between Brightlingsea and Wivenhoe would be a popular choice, but would be extremely expensive in relation to the scale of development being proposed and the necessary engineering works would no doubt bring great disturbance to the Colne Estuary wildlife. Similarly the construction of a new road into Brightlingsea would be cost prohibitive and environmentally damaging – when weighed up against the amount of housing that would realistically be achieved.

East 3: Tendring Colchester Borders GC [NEAGC 3]

This option reflects what is already included in the submitted Section 1 Local Plan with development at a Garden Community, east of Colchester. In the submitted plan, this Garden Community is expected to deliver 2,500 new homes within the remainder of the plan period to 2033. In terms of overall dwelling capacity, the Tendring Colchester borders garden community proposal will deliver 7,500 dwellings which is within the range in the Submission Local Plan and taken from evidence in the North Essex Local Plan (Strategic) Section 1 Viability Assessment Update (DRAFT) (Hyas Associates Ltd, May 2019) report and thus reflects the most up to date position.

Table 5.14

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Tendring/ Colchester Borders GC NEAGC3	2,500	7,500	Evidence base document entitled 'Reconciliation of Cebr and Cambridge Econometrics Employment Scenarios and Floorspace Requirements for the North Essex Garden Communities – Cebr note for the North Essex Authorities recommends employment land figures for the Garden Community proposals. For the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community, it suggests approximately 7ha by 2033, 21ha by 2050 and 25ha by 2071. Totally built out, it is suggested that the scheme will likely deliver 21ha.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTS links to Colchester Town with potential to link to Braintree and London Stansted Airport. • A120 to A133 link road with new junctions.

East 4: Colchester North-East Urban Extension [ALTGC 7]

Under this option, there would be no stand-alone Garden Community to the east of Colchester at all. This non-Garden Community option would be different to the proportionate growth scenarios in that it would involve targeted growth in the form of a strategic urban extension to the north-east of Colchester. This site could deliver 2,500 dwellings within the plan period and an additional 1,500 dwellings beyond the plan period.

Traditionally growth has been delivered across the NEAs through planned urban extensions to larger settlements, this option is a continuation of this approach. Whilst the Inspector did not specifically request that non-garden community options are appraised as part of the Additional SA, the NEAs consider that the appraisal and consideration of urban extensions as a spatial strategy option will provide a useful comparison to the options involving garden communities. This site has been selected as an option as it is being actively promoted and is effectively an urban extension to north-east Colchester.

Table 3.16

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Colchester North-East ALTGC7	2,500	4,000	None as the site is within walking distance to existing employment provision, including but not limited to, Severalls Business Park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullock Wood, which borders part of the site's western boundary, is a SSSI and ancient woodland. The site promoter recognises that this would require a minimum 15m stand off from built development which can be sensitively designed to incorporate this stand-off. • Link road between Ipswich Road and Harwich Road. • RTS links to Colchester

East 5: Tendring Central Garden Village [VE 5]

This option involves the delivery of a Garden Community in Tendring district, adjacent to the A120 but detached from Colchester and Clacton. The site information form confirms that 2,500 dwellings can be delivered within the plan period, with a further 2,500 dwellings beyond the plan period. This is an alternative garden community to the proposed garden community in the Submission Local Plan and is the only alternative garden community proposed east of Colchester.

Table 5.15

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Tendring Central Garden Village VE5	2,500	5,000	In addition to the existing employment areas (Penguin Books, Manheim Auctions etc.): B1, B2 & B8 : 29.85 ha. Village Centre: 4.59 ha.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project includes delivery of omni-directional access between the A120 and A133 at the Oasis (Trunk Road) Junction. • Community Woodland <p>The site information form states that improvements to the B1029 to a new Metro Plan Station at Thorrington will be delivered. This assumption can, however, only be made under options involving both Tendring Central and the Metro Plan but should not be considered under this option, which involves Tendring Central only.</p>

East 6: CAUSE Metro Plan [C1, C2, C3 & C4]

The Inspector has indicated that CAUSE’s Metro Plan should be appraised as a spatial strategy option. This option represents both a short term and long term alternative to the garden communities proposed by the NEAs and the alternative garden community proposed under option East 5. Within the plan period, 2,800 dwellings are suggested, based on an average of 700 new homes being delivered at each of the four settlements and which will provide the East Colchester requirement with added flexibility. The longer term option, proposes 8,000 dwellings, which is comparable in scale to the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community.

Table 5.16

Proposal/site	Dwellings to 2033	Total dwellings	Employment assumptions	Strategy-specific infrastructure assumptions
Alresford CAUSE	700	2,000	CAUSE’s 1000 home appraisal allows for 6.5% employment land, the same proportion as for West Tey. In addition there will be agglomeration benefits arising from the excellent connectivity between Colchester, Clacton and the Metro villages which will create local jobs better than standalone settlements connected mainly to London. The Metro settlements will also provide support for existing businesses in adjacent villages. Based on above assumptions, employment land expectations are approximately 8ha each at Alresford and Great Bentley, 9ha at Weeley and 12ha at Thorpe le Soken.	Increased frequency of trains utilising the Colchester to Clacton/Walton branch line – as advised by CAUSE’s transport advisor. Early years, schools and health provision would be delivered in a way that be accessed via the branch line services. It would expected that each settlement would deliver a new primary school and early years facility, but only one new health facility and one new secondary school would be delivered and these would be located at one or two of the villages concerned – potentially the two central villages of Great Bentley and Weeley.
Great Bentley CAUSE	700	2,000		
Weeley CAUSE	700	2,000		
Thorpe le Soken CAUSE	700	2,000		

Given the multitude of ownerships within the 800m circle around the four railway stations, the amalgamation and acquisition of the necessary land to deliver schools and health facilities would one of the main infrastructure challenges facing this strategy.