



BRADFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Bradfield Village Hall, The Street, Bradfield, Essex, CO11 2UU. Tel: 07851 760264

Email: clerk@bradfieldparishcouncil.org.uk

**Minutes of the Full Council Meeting held in
The Church Room, St Lawrence Church, The Street, Bradfield, CO11 2US
on
Thursday 27th March 2025 at 6.00pm**

Present:	Councillors Coley (Vice Chairman), Cunningham, Gunter, Osbourne, Points, Scott, Weal, and Webb
In the Chair:	Cllr Burton (Chairman)
Clerk:	Mrs Marie Snell
Also present:	11 members of the public, 0 member of the press Cllr Guglielmi (Essex County Council) arrived at 6.02pm

202/24 Apologies for Absence

None

203/24 Members' Declaration of Interests

None

204/24 Public open Forum

A resident expressed an interest over the conversations to be had by the parish council regarding the Local Plan Review. Another resident offered concern over the integrity of the decision making and asks for the parish council to put forward the view of the electorate. Cllr Burton assured the resident though the council will comment, they are only a statutory consultee and any resident with comments is encouraged to submit them to the District Council.

205/24 Local Plan/Housing Briefing

Cllr Coley referenced the options document created by District Council containing 4 possible development options, with changes amongst government policy. A target for development has been raised and has now been doubled by the government, leaving the District Council with decisions to be made over where such required developments will go. Options concerning areas such as Horsley Cross, is likely to affect Bradfield as a village. He confirmed this is the first consultation and though up for debate to be discussed by the parish council, encouraged members of the public to complete the consultation. There will be further consultation as the review continues. Cllr Guglielmi (Essex County Council and Chairman of Local Plan Review Committee) explained the first part of this consultation is to understand public stance, but that it is not the District Council that are pushing this review, it has come from National Government. Cllr Guglielmi stated that the current plan wants to deliver 550 homes per year, the highest ever delivery has been 904 in one year due to the influx of planning applications, with the average being around 800-850 homes built. The end of the review is set to be 2033, every authority with planning function must review the plan, on the way for draft proposals. New Call for Sites has been initiated with new areas put forward, it remains ongoing and the consultation for this ends on 14th April, the same time as the Local Plan Review. Autumn is the aimed for date for the understanding of the results of the consultation, and this will see the next point of the review. Cllr Guglielmi encouraged members of the public to complete the review and to make feelings known. The two options that are being considered, are a hybrid of the previous plan, to deliver 1054 homes is deemed impossible, considering garden villages, with the job of the district

council to allocate land with developers unwilling to utilise land if the houses will unlikely sell. The potential of the garden village of Horseley Cross is nearby to Bradfield and poses problems regarding construction traffic. Over other years sites for development include Lawford, Manningtree, Mistley around Bradfield, these areas will be considered for minimal development over the next 15 years. Once responses are received officers will review what has been raised. Cllr Guglielmi expressed there is interest in garden communities by the railway stations, such as Weeley and Frating. A study has been requested regarding the traffic implications on all options of the review and though nothing will happen in the next 5 years in terms of building, the council is required to commence the work regarding where to build. There has had to be alternative locations considered, with the potential of 4 areas. Option C of the plan, is Cllr Guglielmi's preference which omits Horsely Cross and includes garden villages around the district with proportionate levels of growth at medium-sized and smaller villages across the district.

Upon request of Cllr Coley, it was **RESOLVED** that members of the public be permitted to partake in the ongoing discussion of the meeting.

- A resident asked if the parish council will be commenting of which Cllr Burton explained the parish council intends to do so.
- A resident asked where in Horsley Cross are they likely to build and Cllr Coley expressed this is a difficult question to know the answer owing to the area being a hamlet, boundaries are questionable. Cllr Guglielmi advised that there would have to be infrastructure for such an area which would have to include a school and the District Council would likely urge that the government should facilitate and fund any required infrastructure.
- A resident raised concerns regarding water and associated pressure with 700+ houses being proposed in the surrounding area and Cllr Guglielmi assured this is a matter of concern to be made to the planning department to stimulate the officers' rationale. Another resident raised concerns on the disposal of water and the aging sewer is not adequate and highlights the inadequacy of the sewerage plant in Manningtree. Any development in such an area is likely to further this issue, another issue of a housing development next to a busy road, is not appropriate and the open land required is integral and good agricultural land with no need for further urbanisation.
- A resident expressed an understanding of the District Council's role amongst the need for a plan and the need to revise with the government changes, overall the comment raised was that there are lots of rural communities and a very rural area, with a port town on this peninsular if someone looked to increase Tendring area, the A120 could be made into dual carriageway with dual port considerations and Harwich could see further development, the garden villages seem to be missing an opportunity to develop Harwich and Dovercourt and leaving the rural communities as they are. Cllr Coley suggested there are options within the plan that includes Harwich and Dovercourt of around 2000 builds. The resident suggested a 'win-win' was desirable and it only seems like a win for the developers or the government and no one else. Cllr Guglielmi offered the response of the constraints of the development in Harwich, with demand potentially at a low for development along the A120, but the resident stated there is an opportunity to explore areas people actually want to live in, and Harwich can offer that as a large town. Cllr Guglielmi offered that through all the applications received of development over the years, few developers included Harwich and the commuter area is less favourable.
- Cllr Gunter offered his stance that every village will be responding to this consultation in the hopes for the option most favourable to their relevant location within the district and therefore encouraged people to respond to the consultation.
- A resident raised concerns that there will be no jobs, and is too far from London with no local employment.
- Cllr Guglielmi offered that another issue regards minerals, Tendring/Essex is rich of minerals and there has been a consultation recently of the Mineral Plan with 4000 responses, this on

the proviso that the total number of houses in Essex to be 10,000-12,000 homes, there will be a refreshment consultation on this of whether there is enough mineral in Essex to sustain such builds with concerns over supply, any plan would be unviable, this plan is running alongside the Local Plan Review.

After much discussion, members **RESOLVED** to make a comment as a statutory consultee regarding the stance of the council, taking into account the concerns of the public expressed.

206/24 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the council is to be held on **Tuesday 1st April 2025 at 7.30pm** at **Bradfield Village Hall, The Street, Bradfield, CO11 2UU.**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 6.49pm

Signed

Dated

Appendix A

Tendring District Local Plan Review – Issues and Options

Consultation (Bradfield Parish Council (BPC) – Comments)

TDC has put forward four options for consultation. The indicative maps provided are by their nature imprecise and the areas of proposed new housing developments are indicated by nebulous circles. These circles give little or no clear indication of the extent or boundaries of the proposed developments.

Three of the four options include a significant new 'Garden Village' to be built at Horsley Cross. BPC does not find this description helpful in understanding the extent of this option. Horsley Cross is not a separate municipal area. It is a small undefined hamlet in the parish of Mistley and using the Horsley Cross description is unhelpful without clearer definitions.

However, the indicative maps show the majority of the 'Horsley Cross' development would be on the Bradfield side of the A120 trunk road.

BPC is concerned that any of the options A, B and D would result in a huge development at 'Horsley Cross', which we are told would be in excess of 1,500 - 2,500 new dwellings on both side of the B1035 Clacton Road, Mistley and would highly likely coalesce with the parish of Bradfield.

Page 16:

"Our Garden Villages will provide necessary infrastructure and services, enabling to meet their day to day needs locally, reducing reliance on car travel"

"These exemplar communities will not only provide high-quality housing but also foster a sense of community and wellbeing, with green spaces, recreational facilities and community infrastructure"

This seems a desirable wish list for any garden community, however as stated 'Horsley Cross' is a small hamlet. It is the view of BPC that 1,500 - 2,500 new homes, with the necessary infrastructure cannot be entirely encompassed into that hamlet without 'development creep' and inevitable coalescence.

Just the construction of attenuation ponds (SuDs) to accommodate that number of homes and the assorted services infrastructure would occupy many acres of 'Horsley Cross' without the minimum areas of recreational space and the biodiversity increases required (currently 10% some authorities require 20%).

Bradfield has already noticed the increase in traffic by domestic vehicles and large goods vehicles due to the ongoing housing developments just a couple of miles away in Mistley and Lawford.

These existing developments consist collectively of over 1,300 new homes with additional commercial sites. Most of these developments are still under construction, with over 60% still to be built (Below).

Development	Approved Housing Number	Still Under Construction
Lawford Green Mistley & Lawford	440	Yes (Currently Building)
Manningtree Park Mistley	485	Yes (Currently Building)
River Reach Mistley	235	Yes (Currently Building)
New Road Mistley	79	Complete
Stour View Mistley	72	Yes (Groundworks)
Thorn Quay Mistley	48	Initial demolition has begun
Brunswick Close Mistley	25	Complete

Delivery vehicles and new residents' vehicles are already using the back routes through Mistley Heath and Bradfield Heath to gain access to Clacton Road at Mistley then the A120. Or gaining access directly onto Clacton Road from Long Road in Mistley, to gain access to the A120 and A12.

Conversely, any new residents of the proposed 'Horsley Cross Garden Village', who need to access the railway station in Lawford or onward travel into Suffolk, will use Clacton Road, Mistley.

It is already difficult to safely leave Bradfield Village from Steam Mill Road, due to the increased level of traffic. The anticipated and obvious traffic increase using Clacton Road, after the construction of another 2,000+ homes at 'Horsley Cross' would make exiting Bradfield hazardous in the extreme.

The options at A, B and D will seriously and negatively impact upon the lives of Bradfield residents.

BPC Questions:

1) Are the identified options put forward by qualified planners who have considered the viability and sustainability of these development areas? Or are they included due to the 'Call for Sites' process by landowners and farmers wishing to liquidate their assets and capitalise their investments?

2) There doesn't seem to be a list of 'Brown Field Sites' or the government's 'Grey Sites' included in the options document. The areas indicated seem to be exclusively on what is currently productive agricultural farmland.

The proposed 'Horsley Cross Garden Village' would be on good quality farmland, which is currently producing food. When we increase the Tendring District population by many thousands of new residents, occupying the thousands of newly built homes, they will need to be fed. Building residential homes exclusively on productive farmland is contrary to sustainability.

Where is the list of Brown Field and Grey sites?

3) There is currently no infrastructure whatsoever at Horsley Cross. The investment required in infrastructure at Horsley Cross to accommodate a new population in its thousands would be significant in the extreme. Huge increases in power access, freshwater, sewage facilities, new roads, schools, shops etc. etc. would have to be brought to the site.

Credible public transport links would be required from a 'Horsley Cross Garden Village' just to get hundreds of children, from the thousands of houses, to a sixth form college (who knows where), each morning.

It is apparent that the District Council will not exist before any of the plans in the options document actually come to fruition. Which authority would oversee these projects?

As this infrastructure would be required before the houses are built and residents move in, are developers queueing up to facilitate this massive investment in infrastructure?

4) Where does the TARCHON Interconnector Project fit in with these proposals? BPC is aware that representatives of Copenhagen Infrastructure Partners (CIP) are currently involved in consultation to build a Direct Power Interconnector at Horsley Cross. Two farmers whose farms are adjacent to Clacton Road, (in Horsley Cross) Mistley have been requested to make 25 acres of land available for the project by (CIP).

This construction, which would eventually link with Niederlangen in Germany would be as tall as the water tower at Horsley Cross.

This Energy Project which states *"increasing the security and reliability of electrical systems in addition to facilitating the integration of renewable energy sources"* would sit in the middle of the 'Horsley Cross' option included in A, B and D in the TDC Options Document.

5) What guarantee would there be that no coalescence with established communities will result from the building of any new Garden Communities?

6) BPC is aware that planning proposals for 700 or more residential homes will trigger the requirement to build a new school. Therefore a 'Horsley Cross' Garden Village should result in a new primary school.

However, the inevitable and substantial increase in homes will consequentially increase the number of families and children. These children will also require access to further educational facilities, including sixth forms.

Manningtree High School (in Lawford) does not have a sixth form and there is no room or plans to build one. Is the District Council confident that adequate further educational facilities, supplying the full range of academic and vocational courses, will be in easy access to these potentially thousands of new local children?

7) BPC is concerned that GP and Dental Services are already in short supply locally. We are already aware that newly arrived residents are unable to secure reliable medical facilities. What guarantee will there be that access to adequate medical facilities will be guaranteed for the thousands of new residents, in any of the options?

Issues and Options Document (Questions)

01 Yes, generally	02 Additionally – to protect the nature and character of established communities
-------------------	--

03 As 02	04 Yes
05 No	06 No
07 Yes. That is where the infrastructure exists and could be enhanced.	08 Yes, although Manningtree (being the smallest town in England) has no capacity to grow unless the Waterworks and Jewson sites are redeveloped. Lawford and Mistley are currently unable to fully absorb the development under construction due to little improvement in infrastructure.
09 No	10 Yes, but not Only a small number
11 Yes	12
13	14 Yes
15	16
17 Yes. But future development according to local need.	18 U/K
19 All options show Bradfield as requiring medium housing development of between 30 – 100 homes. Some small areas of infill land could be identified but not anywhere near 100 new homes in the settlement area. This figure would represent a 20% increase in the existing housing numbers. With no increased capability to absorb those numbers. The school in Bradfield has no vacancies at present.	20
21 U/K. Ardleigh Parish Council is better placed to make this judgement.	22 It makes some sense to concentrate sustainable development near to railway stations, in order to reduce reliance on car use. However, the areas indicated in option A are far larger than sites just around railways stations, thereby defeating the object.
23	24
25	26 Option C seems the most viable (if we have to have this enormous increase in housing) As stated in the 'Advantages' the development in the Harwich/Bathside Bay area seems most suitable. There is existing infrastructure in the Harwich and Dovercourt area which could be enhanced to accommodate substantial numbers of additional housing. Additional development in the Harwich and Dovercourt area has the potential to revitalise the area which is desperately needed. Conversely, there is no infrastructure whatsoever at Horsley Cross. The investment required in infrastructure at Horsley Cross to accommodate a new population in its thousands would be significant in the extreme. Huge increases in power access, freshwater, sewage facilities, new roads, schools, shops etc. etc. would have to be brought to the site. Credible public transport links would be required from a 'Horsley Cross Garden Village' just to get the hundreds of children to a sixth form college (who knows where), each morning. Not many developers would find this project very attractive.
27 Of all the options, this chain of 'Garden Villages' seems to be the most sustainable.	28
29 The indicative map seems to show the proposed 'Horsley Cross Garden Village' as being the largest of	30 Firstly explore all previously developed sites, Brown Field Sites and the government's supposed 'Gray Sites'.

<p>the suggestions. This would be wholly disproportionate and would swallow neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>In the 'Advantages' section (Page 40) it states, "<i>New garden villages would be larger developments of between <u>2,000 and 5,000 homes</u> that provide not only for development during the extended timeframe of the Local Plan to 2041, but beyond that into subsequent plan-periods</i>"</p>	
31 Yes	<p>32 All new homes must be 'Future Proofed' All homes must be built to optimum standards to reduce reliance on fossil fuels.</p> <p>New homes should be insulated beyond current minimum levels and incorporate modern solar panels and air source heat pumps.</p> <p>Where appropriate communal heating systems should be explored.</p> <p>This should reduce the need for continuing to cover farmland in Solar Farms.</p>
33 Access to outdoor recreational space, for all residents, irrespective of physical mobility.	34 Dedicated and safe cycle and walking routes.
35	36
37	38
39 This seems to be a practical suggestion. An increased population results, inevitably, to increased community mortality. Provision must be made.	40
41 Great care must be exercised when considering higher density housing. Very often this approach leads to reduced amenity space and increasing the number of floors in units of apartments. It can also reduce the amount of communal open space.	42
43	<p>44 The number of older persons in Tendring is disproportionately higher than many other districts. This is unlikely to change.</p> <p>Good quality bespoke homes built with a 'down-sizing' older resident in mind, must be considered in all dedicated and mixed build developments. This will in turn release many family homes as a result.</p>
45 Consider a small programme of 'Gifted Homes' to ensure retention and nomination rights...?	46 Restrict the number of five-bedroom homes built to a very small number.
47	48 No
49	50 Yes.
51	52 There is a chronic shortage of good quality Care Homes in the district. Adult Social Care is in crisis and there should be some thoughts to locally ameliorating this situation.
53 Carefully consider all applications for 'change of use' in respect of commercial and retail premises in town centres. Some residential in towns is desirable, but the retention of a variety of commercial and retail (not all charity shops) must be paramount	54 See 53
55 Freeport and Bathside Bay will be the major opportunities for employment. Housing developments should compliment these opportunities by housing developments sustainably near to Harwich.	56
57 There should be some limited development in some of the larger holiday parks.	58

59 Retrofitting is extremely expensive and requires the residents of that dwelling to understand and adapt the way they use their home. I cannot see that TDC can assist retrofitting in the Local Plan.	60 See 32
61 See 32	62
63	64
65 Yes	66 Unlikely when the proposal is to build thousands of new homes on agricultural land. This is likely to result in a loss of biodiversity and a huge increase in carbon emissions.
67	68
69 No. Greater protection is required. See initial comments.	70
71 Yes. In Bradfield we have ancient buildings and ancient lanes which are not in the Conservation Area but desperately need protection. A huge 'Garden Community' on Bradfield's doorstep will totally erode these historic environments.	72
73	74
75	76
77 See Bradfield's Questions and Comments.	78