



Notes of the Feering Parish Council Planning Working Group
held virtually on Monday 24 February 2025 at 10.00 am
via Teams

In Attendance: Cllr Katherine Evans Cllr Pam Carlaw
Cllr Bob Palmer Cllr Ed Mitchell
Cllr Jo Spencer Cllr Nathaniel Warwick
Lisa Collins – Clerk

Member of Public 0

1 **DISCUSSION OF THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS**

a) **BDC Local Plan**

Comments by Councillors: It has been explained that BDC have extra housing targets. The consultation asks you to comment on each aspect of the LP but there is very little opportunity to respond in depth with comments to each part.

Specifically says that communities should keep their characteristics and we are in danger of losing this in Feering and Kelvedon. It also says about making sure that villages do not coalesce.

It is very difficult to put in a response.

What about green buffers, particularly between Feering and Marks Tey, Feering and Coggeshall and Feering and Tiptree. The response was there is enough green land that they do not need to specify in the plan retaining a buffer. We do not want to get to this situation where there is only a field between us and Marks Tey etc. We are very concerned about this. We acknowledge that we have to have our share in the village, and we have the 850 homes coming so we do not need any more and we do not want to lose the village character and end up coalescing. Call for sites could mean that Kelvedon and Feering end up linking into Coggeshall with one development instead of 3 villages. Calls for sites in Colchester include Inworth and Messing so could expand the village as well.

Housing trajectory is prepared. They are meeting the 5 year trajectory but they are yet to accept the section 2 trajectory. 850 Crown homes are featured but will be spread over the period of 16 years. Will be difficult to argue against more development but we should try as we do not want it to be at the expense of the environment the type of village that people want to move into. We want to keep the characteristics of our village and do not want to coalesce. We also need to make comment on the traffic. We would like something to connect all the facilities in Kelvedon with Feering eg a hoppla bus. This could go under the heading of supporting active travel and we have in the NP safe cycle and walking routes. We should also mentioned encouraging employment and the type of employment.

Delegated response: Feering Parish Council have the following comments in response to the Draft Local Plan:

Section 1. We were interested to see that this part of the Local Plan has been produced in conjunction with Tendring and Colchester City and acknowledge that this is on the basis of these 3 councils forming a viable economic area. We broadly agree that section 1 remains relevant and appropriate, but have the following comments:

Policy 3, spacial context. We are particularly keen that efforts are made to meet the 'countryside will be protected and enhanced' aspect of this policy, and the intention that settlements will 'retain their character' and 'avoid coalescence'.

Section 2. We acknowledge that Kelvedon and Feering functionally act as a whole and that they have status as Key Service Villages but will nevertheless 'keep their individual identity and character'. We further acknowledge that because of their location on the A12/mainline corridor, the villages are a Strategic Growth Location.

The Natural Environment - in view of the aim of avoiding coalescence, Feering Parish Council would urge the provision of Green Buffers between Feering and Coggeshall, Feering and Marks Tey and Feering and Tiptree. Although there would appear to be sufficient undeveloped land in each of these locations, 'call for sites' and planning applications recently, with both BDC and Colchester City, have shown that separation that seems adequate can easily become diminished. This would be in contradiction to Section 1 policy 3 mentioned above and with the intention that individual villages should keep their own character.

Creating better places - there seems to be a lag between the local ICB plans for improved health facilities for Feering/Kelvedon and the expansion of the two villages by over 1000 homes (and possibly more) in the next 10 years. This needs to be addressed.

Active travel - there needs to be a specific requirement for developers to provide suitable and safe cycling and walking routes between groups of houses and where people actually need to get to eg school, public transport, shops, medical facilities, employment, avoiding main roads wherever possible.

We would also urge that as part of Health and Wellbeing impact assessments, air quality assessment in the light of increased road traffic consequent on new housing development should be expected in all planning applications. This should also take account of construction impacts on air quality.

Housing - we acknowledge the need for new homes, but in light of comments above that villages should keep their own character, avoid coalescence, and that the countryside will be 'protected and enhanced' we are concerned that excessively large scale developments in Kelvedon/Feering will overwhelm the capacity of both communities to continue to function effectively (see also below).

Transport and infrastructure - we welcome the intention that BDC will continue to 'refuse development on road congestion grounds'. Without breaching the village envelopes, with the completion of the BDW development north of London Road, Kelvedon and the 'Land at Feering' development, Kelvedon and Feering will have used all the access to the main road. Further developments would need to use sinuous and narrow B roads that are totally unsuitable for the increased amount of road

traffic - inevitable unless public transport and active transport routes are adequately provided early in the development of new estates. Developments relying on egress to narrow country roads should be refused.

Economy and retail - we welcome the intention to provide SME space on the 'Land at Feering' development and acknowledge the likelihood that storage and logistics might play a role in providing sustainable employment in the village.

b) **21/03579/OUT** – Land South West of Coggeshall Road, Kelvedon

Comments by Councillors: National Highways withdrew their objection, have not seen any recent comment from Essex County Council or ECC Education. The application does not seem to have changed at all. It still has the same amount of housing and the school has moved slightly, still access onto Coggeshall Road, and still proposing a foot/cycleway and still proposing links across the railway line with is not totally in their gift as the railway line bridges belong to Network Rail and they cannot do without their approval. If they want to go across the Cala Homes they will have to have approval from Cala Estates. They do not have a connection to the station and they have mentioned that they have access to the Cala estate but the Cala estate does not have an off road connection to the station.

Development is outside of the village envelope. Kelvedon have had all their allocation of housing in the Local Plan and more with the London Road Development. There is still the issue of traffic on Coggeshall Road. The forecast of 300 more trips during the morning and evening peak is unsustainable. The junction at Station Road is not sustainable. A12 forecasts less traffic through the village, but it wasn't taking into account the 850 homes from the strategic growth location in Feering, however this has been delayed and may not happen. Updated transport plan from 2023 does not reflect the current realities of where we are with the A12.

What percentage of land was category 3a (best and most versatile agricultural land) and what is 3b – Because of the high pressure gas main going through the site which means the land is protected and cannot be built on, it is a very inefficient use of agricultural land.

No update from ECC Education of November 2023 – when looking at Kelvedon academy it appears that they excluded the southern playing field land on the site. Existing Kelvedon 2 form entry school has a considerable amount of land around it and more than is proposed in the primary school allocation in the development and there is room for expansion at Kelvedon Academy and there is no need for a new primary school and the strategic growth location in Feering also allocates capacity.

Bigger concerns are the health facilities. Calculations do not appear to have allowed for Feering's strategic growth development for the health centre so it will probably not have included these 600 houses. There will be an even bigger shortfall and more people trying to get into the one new health centre. It would also add to the car journeys through the village as it is a long way from the development to the Health centre and as there will be limited parking for the new health centre it will have a considerable impact to the parking on the development, which is not appropriate or safe for the people living there.

Sport England have repeated their objection as a site that has more than 300 homes needs to have specific outdoor sports provision, not just outside space. There has been no mention of sports facility. There is currently only 1 outdoor sports facility in Kelvedon, although there is the use of the pitches at Kelvedon Primary School. This is not enough for a village the size of Kelvedon with Feering.

We would like confirmation that the sheltered home provision is in addition to the 40% affordable homes.

The proposed high voltage pylon provision will be slightly north of the site and will be clearly visible from the development.

This is phase 1 of the bigger scheme of King's Dene which is in the call for sites and we feel this application is premature.

Delegated response: Feering Parish Council maintains its strong objection to this planning application, which remains largely unchanged since our previous submission in February 2022. The development is outside the village envelope, is not included in the adopted Local Plan, and presents significant concerns related to infrastructure, sustainability, and local amenity provision.

Highways and Transport

The proposed development is still expected to generate approximately 300 additional vehicle trips during peak hours, placing further strain on the already congested Coggeshall Road and Station Road junction. This is unsustainable given existing traffic levels.

While National Highways has withdrawn its objection, the revised transport assessments do not account for the 850 homes planned for the Feering strategic growth location. Given the delays to A12 widening, the current projections for A12 traffic reduction may no longer be accurate.

The applicant proposes links across the railway line, but these are dependent on approval from Network Rail and Cala Estates, neither of which has been secured. Furthermore, the development does not provide a direct, off-road connection to Kelvedon Station, making claims of improved accessibility misleading.

Land use and Environmental concerns

Clarification is needed on the proportion of the site designated as Grade 3a (best and most versatile agricultural land) versus Grade 3b. Given the presence of a high-pressure gas main, a significant portion of the land is undevelopable, leading to inefficient land use.

The proposed National Grid Norwich to Tilbury upgrade will see high-voltage pylon infrastructure located just north of the site. This will have a visual impact on the development and surrounding landscape.

Education Provision

The application continues to propose a new primary school, despite the fact that Kelvedon Academy has sufficient land for expansion. The existing school has a larger footprint than the site allocated for the new school, making its necessity questionable.

Furthermore, the Feering strategic growth location already accounts for additional school capacity.

The latest available update from ECC Education (November 2023) does not provide any justification for the new school proposal.

Health and Community Facilities

The application does not adequately consider the healthcare needs of the growing population. The proposed new health centre in Kelvedon is already expected to serve additional growth from the Feering strategic growth location, and these 600 homes would further exacerbate demand.

Parking & Accessibility: The distance between the proposed development and the new health centre, coupled with limited parking, would lead to increased car journeys through the village, impacting local traffic and parking availability.

Sport & Recreation

Lack of Outdoor Sports Provision: Sport England has reiterated its objection, noting that developments over 300 homes must provide dedicated outdoor sports facilities. At present, the only outdoor sports provision in Kelvedon one sports pitch with use of the school's pitches, which are insufficient for a community of this size. The proposal fails to meet this requirement.

Affordable & Sheltered Housing

We request confirmation that the proposed 75 units of sheltered housing are in addition to the 40% affordable housing allocation.

Prematurity & Wider Context

This application represents Phase 1 of the broader King's Dene proposal, which is under consideration in the "Call for Sites" process. Given this context, the application appears premature and should not be considered in isolation.

Conclusion

Given the above concerns, Feering Parish Council continues to strongly object to this application. The development remains inconsistent with the Local Plan, poses unacceptable infrastructure and environmental challenges, and lacks sufficient justification for key community facilities.

c) Essex Air Quality Strategy

Comments by Councillors: It is full of questions with no substance. They seem bad market research questions which are leading. In our area road transport is probably the most important with construction and agriculture following given that Feering is going to have a lot of construction in the Feering area. We would strongly support to work together to monitor air quality and seek to improve the air quality in Essex. There are specific questions about nitrogen oxide and the particulates. Further comments not covered by questions We are happy to see Nitrox oxide and particular matter highlighted in strategy but would like to see options for monitoring of other pollutants, especially in areas downwind of industry such as Rivenhall EfW plant. Even though the operator will be applying strict pollution control measures it would be reassuring to the local community, and important in the event of a breach. Given the

increase in population and traffic movements in the CO5 area, we would also like to see additional monitoring stations for NOx and particulates. There are no proposals to put any more monitoring stations in the strategy which is a big miss. The consultation is missing more meaningful monitoring. We regularly have standing traffic along Feering Hill and London Road which increases the pollution above the allowed limits. Consultation states that encouraging vehicles to switch off when stationary which makes a difference. It is not just road transport, it is also on home heating. There is supposed to be a ban on boilers which may or may not happen.

Delegated response: I am writing on behalf of Feering Parish Council in response to the Essex Air Quality Strategy consultation. While we welcome the initiative to improve air quality across the county, we have several concerns regarding the consultation and the proposed strategy.

Firstly, the consultation itself lacks substantive detail and is structured around leading questions that resemble market research rather than a meaningful exploration of air quality challenges and solutions. In our area, road transport is the predominant contributor to air pollution, followed by construction and agriculture—particularly relevant given the significant development planned in Feering.

We strongly support collaboration to monitor and improve air quality in Essex. However, we feel that the strategy does not go far enough in addressing key pollutants, particularly nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (PM). While we are pleased to see these pollutants highlighted, we would like to see an expansion of monitoring efforts to cover additional pollutants, especially in areas downwind of industrial sites such as the Rivenhall EfW plant. Even with strict pollution controls in place, additional monitoring would reassure local communities and provide critical data in the event of any breaches.

A major omission in the strategy is the absence of proposals for new monitoring stations. Given the increasing population and traffic movements in the CO5 area, we believe additional monitoring stations for NOx and PM are essential. Standing traffic along Feering Hill and London Road, we believe, results in pollution levels potentially exceeding legal limits. While the strategy mentions encouraging drivers to switch off engines when stationary, this alone is insufficient to tackle the issue effectively.

Furthermore, the strategy should acknowledge the role of home heating in air pollution. While there is an expectation of a shift away from traditional boilers, it remains uncertain whether proposed bans or restrictions will be implemented. A clearer stance on how residential heating contributes to air quality and what measures will be taken to mitigate its impact would be beneficial.

d) **Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Neighbourhood Plan Review and Update**

This application was raised as we have been asked to comment on the review. It was felt that as this was not an adjacent parish, that the Parish Council could not provide comments on the review and an email should be sent to this effect.

2 **UPDATE ON APPLICATIONS APPROVED / REFUSED**

Applications Approved:

24/02676/HH – 5 Greenways, Feering

Applications Refused:

24/02518/FUL – 1-3 Police Houses, London Road, Feering

24/00006/NONDET – Deals of Kelvedon, Station Road, Kelvedon

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To be confirmed.

DRAFT