

**FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: FC4 - Waltham**

Representor Name	Focused Change /Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Andrew Gore (obo Barwoods Homes)	WAL3	Objection that the site 'WAL 3' is superior in a number of ways that the selected sites in Waltham and should therefore be elevated for reserves site to an allocation, in substitute for WAL 1 and WAL 2. The representation is supported by a very detailed analysis of the site assessment carried out within which the conclusion (scores) reached are questioned in order to present the case that WAL 3 is a superior choice. Also accompanied by plans and concept layout diagrams to demonstrate suitability and deliverability	The Council has accepted that the site is suitable, available and deliverable however does not agree that it is superior to the other sites that make up the allocation for Waltham, 'WAL 1' and 'WAL2'. These were assessed as equal in better in the assessment of sites <a href="https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/d246bd_8d1291b5af19459cae55d968d3f4882c.pdf">https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/d246bd_8d1291b5af19459cae55d968d3f4882c.pdf</a> And benefit from planning permission – full planning permission in the case of WAL1 (14/00777/FUL) and outline planning permission for part of WAL 2 (15/01011/OUT), which is also at reserved matters stage. The site is at an equal position in terms of applications as the remainder of WAL2 (outline application submitted, but not yet determined).
George Machin (obo Davidsons)	Waltham	Objection that the site is superior in a number of ways than the selected sites in Waltham and should substitute WAL 1 or WAL 2. The representation is supported by a very detailed analysis of the site assessment carried out within which the conclusion (scores) reached are questioned in order to present the case that the site is a superior choice. Also accompanied by plans and concept layout diagrams to demonstrate suitability and deliverability. Also contests that the assessment carried out should have related to the part the suite comprised in the planning application (approx. 1/3) rather than the whole site as presented through SHLAA.	The housing site assessments underpinning Focused Change 4 were based on the most up to date information and data that was available on a comparable basis across the whole of the Borough at the time, for a relevant range of sustainability, suitability and achievability factors. The Council consider this to be adequate and proportionate evidence, as per NPPF para. 158. Whilst the planning application relates to only part of the site, the entire holding has been submitted for consideration as a local plan allocation The Council has accepted that part of the site is suitable, available and deliverable, however it does not agree that it is superior to the other sites that make up the allocation for Waltham, 'WAL 1' and 'WAL2'. These were assessed as equal in better in the assessment of sites <a href="https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/d246bd_8d1291b5af19459cae55d968d3f4882c.pdf">https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/d246bd_8d1291b5af19459cae55d968d3f4882c.pdf</a> And benefit from planning permission – full planning permission in the case of WAL1 (14/00777/FUL) and outline planning permission for part of WAL 2 (15/01011/OUT), which is also at reserved matters stage. The site is at an equal position in terms of applications as the remainder of WAL2 (outline application submitted, but not yet determined).
Michelle Galloway (obo K and A Watchorn & Sons)	WAL2	Support registered for the allocation of 'WAL2' . Explanation that part of the site is the subject of a planning permission 15/01011/OUT and reserved matters currently undetermined, and that the remainder is also the subject of an application which demonstrates its deliverability, and has received a favourable recommendation.	Support Noted
Martin Lusty, WOTWTA Neighbourhood Planning Group	FC4 / WOTW	Remove WAL3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not needed as PPs bring village to within 5 dwellings of the minimum requirement through to 2036. not environmentally or socially sustainable</li> <li>• not supported by the local community as proven at public consultation events for WOWATA Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• landscape – a large site in an area of medium to high sensitivity. Would protrude into surrounding countryside and impact on the setting of the village.</li> </ul>	WAL3 is a reserve site and the applicable policy sets out it will be considered only if one (or both) of the allocated site cannot proceed. The granting of permission on 1 1/2 of the allocated sites is not considered a guarantee of their delivery and as such the role of a 'reserve site' remains valid

<p>Historic England (Emilie Carr)</p>	<p>WAL1</p>	<p>All proposed sites are adjacent to the Conservation Area (CA), as noted within the village assessment. The size of WAL1-3 would potentially impact upon the character of the CA and great care would be required to manage this impact through design, layout and detailing. Surviving ridge and furrow contributes to historic landscape character and the setting of designated assets and losses should be minimised. Impact upon the Grade I listed Church of St Mary Magdalene and The Old Mill (Grade II) to the north of WAL3 requires careful assessment. WAL3 development should avoid compromising views of the Church of St Mary which contribute to its and the CA's significance. it is not clear if WAL1 planning permission is outline only; if so, reserved matters will allow for the design to take into account nearby heritage assets. An additional bullet point in policy for each site would ensure that heritage assets are taken into account, and address Historic England's concerns in relation to soundness, such as:-                  "Development of sites WAL1, 2 and 3 will only be supported where it is illustrated through the layout, design and detailing that the heritage assets will be conserved and enhanced."</p>	<p>All 3 applications are the subject of planning applications that are either 'full' in detail or 'outline' with masterplans showing the form in which they can be developed. The Council is satisfied, in the case fo the 'full' that the are acceptatable in terms of heritage impacts and in terms of 'outlines' adequately demonstrate how development can proceed without resulting in undue harm. There is no objection to the sentence as suggested, but as this is a requirement of both the LB and CA Act 1990 and the NPPF, so it is not considered it needs replication in an LP policy.</p>
---------------------------------------	-------------	---	--