



Great Bromley Parish Council

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 26 AUGUST 2026 AT 7.00PM AT GREAT BROMLEY VILLAGE HALL

In attendance: Cllr Fairley (Chairman), Cllr Blowers, Cllr Mander, Cllr Pirie and Cllr Smith.

Also in attendance: Lizzie Ridout (Parish Clerk)

Members of the Public: -

1. **Welcome and apologies for absence**

The Chairman welcomed those present to the meeting. No apologies for absence had been submitted.

2. **Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 12 August 2026, previously circulated, were approved and signed as a correct record.

Proposed: Cllr Mander **Seconded:** Cllr Blowers **All agreed.**

3. **Declarations of Interest**

Members were requested to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or other relevant interests, and the nature thereof, in respect of items listed on this agenda.

Cllr Mander declared a personal interest insofar as she was a close neighbour of the application.

Cllr Blowers declared a personal interest insofar as he was a close neighbour of the application.

4. **Supplementary Planning Response**

Members considered and approved a supplementary response to planning applications 26/00910/OUT - Land at Bromley Cross Carringtons Road Great Bromley Essex CO7 7UZ and 26/00912/OUT - Land to North and South Carringtons Road Great Bromley Essex CO7 7UZ, following receipt of additional information from the developer.

Supplementary Response to Planning Applications 26/00910/OUT and 26/00912/OUT

Great Bromley Parish Council submits this supplementary response following receipt of the applicant's letter dated 29 July 2026.

The Parish Council maintains its strong objection to both applications and does not consider that the applicant's latest response resolves the significant planning concerns previously raised.

1. The Applications Cannot Safely Be Treated as Independent Alternatives

The applicant seeks to present the 90-dwelling and 200-dwelling applications as alternative scenarios. However, the submitted material demonstrates considerable overlap between the two proposals.

The Transport Assessment, Travel Plan and Habitat Regulations Assessment assess the 200-dwelling proposal as the maximum development scenario. The same broad site area, access strategy, movement network and supporting evidence underpin both applications.

If the applicant's position is that these are alternatives, the Council should require a legal mechanism preventing implementation of both schemes. In the absence of such safeguards, the Council must assess worst-case cumulative impacts.

The Parish Council therefore requests that the Council requires the applicant to clarify:

- whether the applications are alternatives or capable of separate implementation;
- which plans and parameter documents are operative for each application;
- whether any permission would prevent both schemes being implemented;
- how the technical assessments relate to each application; and
- whether the 90-dwelling scheme can properly rely on documents which assess the 200-dwelling scenario.

Great Bromley Parish Council

Unless these matters are resolved, the applications do not provide a sufficiently clear basis for determination.

2. Conflict with the Settlement Strategy Remains Unresolved

The applications remain substantial residential proposals outside the defined settlement boundary.

The Parish Council does not accept that either development represents proportionate growth for Great Bromley or Bromley Cross. The scale of development proposed remains fundamentally at odds with the role and character of the settlement.

The applicant's reliance on housing land supply arguments and future Garden Community infrastructure does not overcome the fundamental conflict with the settlement strategy.

3. The Scale of Development Remains Unacceptable and Disproportionate

The applicant has not demonstrated that either scheme would represent proportionate growth.

The Parish Council considers the scale of development to be fundamentally out of keeping with Bromley Cross and its rural setting. A development of up to 90 dwellings would represent a major expansion of the settlement. A development of up to 200 dwellings would be transformational in scale and character.

The applicant's response does not overcome the Parish Council's objection that the proposals would materially change the form, identity and rural character of Bromley Cross.

This is not organic village growth. It represents the introduction of a substantial residential estate into open countryside.

4. Landscape and Visual Harm Remains Permanent and Significant

The applicant's own Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment identifies permanent adverse effects.

The assessment acknowledges:

- permanent loss of agricultural landscape;
- harm to the dispersed rural settlement pattern; and
- adverse effects which remain after 15 years.

Planting and mitigation may soften certain views, but they do not alter the fact that open countryside would be permanently replaced with large-scale residential development.

The Parish Council therefore maintains that substantial residual landscape and visual harm remains and should attract significant weight in the planning balance.

5. The Site Remains an Unsustainable Location for Major Residential Development

The applicant's further response does not demonstrate that the site is a sustainable location.

The submitted transport evidence confirms:

- limited public transport provision;
- no dedicated cycle infrastructure in the immediate vicinity;
- limited pedestrian provision along key routes;
- long distances to key services and facilities; and
- continued reliance on private car travel.

The Parish Council's concern is not limited to highway capacity. The central issue is whether future residents would have realistic, safe and convenient alternatives to private car use.

The submitted material demonstrates that the location remains heavily car-dependent and therefore unsuited to development of the scale proposed.

6. Reliance on Future Garden Community Infrastructure Is Speculative

The applicant places considerable reliance on future infrastructure associated with the Tendring

Great Bromley Parish Council

Colchester Borders Garden Community.

The Parish Council does not consider that infrastructure which is not yet delivered or secured should be relied upon to justify major residential development now.

The applications should be assessed against existing and secured infrastructure rather than anticipated future improvements.

7. Drainage Concerns Remain Unresolved

The applicant states that sustainable drainage measures will address drainage issues. However, the submitted Flood Risk Assessment records:

- failed soakaway testing;
- ongoing groundwater investigations;
- non-viable infiltration;
- surface water risks at proposed access points; and
- further survey work requirements.

The Parish Council does not consider that these matters should be deferred wholly to post-permission detail.

A fully resolved drainage and foul water strategy should be provided before determination.

The Council should be satisfied that both surface water and foul drainage arrangements are deliverable before any decision is made.

CERES states in their response to consultations that in relation to drainage, the submitted Flood Risk Assessment confirms that the Site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is suitable for residential development. Flood Zone 1 criteria states that Flood Zone 1 is at minimal risk of flooding from rivers or the sea, but does not account for surface water, groundwater, or sewer flooding. This is backed up by evidence from June 11, 2016, where properties at Bromley Cross were flooded from surface water during a prolonged deluge of rain. The fact that Essex County Council installed a berm on the side of the road along a section of the B1029 at Bromley Cross shows the elevated risk to properties from excessive, prolonged periods of rain through runoff.

Replacing permeable ground with impermeable surfaces e.g. block paving, tarmacked roads and roofs of houses increases risk of localized flooding through surface runoff. Drains and sewers can overflow as unable to cope with excessive water and watercourses cannot take away the surface water quickly enough, especially if not maintained.

8. Ecology and HRA Matters Require Further Scrutiny

The applicant's response does not remove the need for careful ecological review.

The Parish Council requests that the Council's ecological advisers fully assess the adequacy of the surveys, assumptions and mitigation strategy, particularly in relation to retained habitats, biodiversity enhancement, lighting impacts and long-term management obligations.

Any consent should only be considered where all ecological mitigation and Habitat Regulations Assessment requirements are fully secured and enforceable.

9. The Enabling Development Case Remains Unproven

The applicant continues to rely heavily upon the assertion that the proposals are necessary to support conservation works at St Osyth Priory.

The Parish Council does not object in principle to genuinely justified enabling development. However, enabling development is an exceptional planning mechanism and should only be supported where it is clearly demonstrated to be necessary, proportionate, the minimum required and subject to robust legal controls.

The applicant has not adequately demonstrated:

- the precise heritage works that would be delivered;
- the timetable for delivery;

Great Bromley Parish Council

- how funding would be ring-fenced and protected;
- how delivery would be legally secured;
- whether occupation of the development would be linked to the heritage works;
- whether the proposed scale of development represents the minimum necessary intervention; and
- whether reasonable alternatives have been fully explored.

The Council should therefore give limited weight to the claimed heritage benefits unless and until they have been independently verified and secured through enforceable obligations.

10. The Absence of Affordable Housing Is a Significant Planning Harm

The Parish Council is concerned that both applications seek to justify the absence of policy-compliant affordable housing through the claimed enabling development benefits.

The loss of affordable housing is a significant planning disbenefit and should be expressly weighed against any claimed public benefits arising from the proposals.

Given the scale of residential development proposed, the Parish Council considers it essential that the Council independently reviews the applicant's viability position and clearly identifies:

- the level of affordable housing that would ordinarily be expected;
- the affordable housing provision being foregone;
- the justification for that departure from policy; and
- the weight to be attributed to that harm in the overall planning balance.

The applicant has not demonstrated that the claimed heritage benefits are sufficient to outweigh the loss of affordable housing together with the wider planning harms arising from the proposals.

11. Minerals Safeguarding Concerns Remain Unresolved

The applicant's assertion that mineral extraction would be impractical does not remove the requirement to demonstrate compliance with the Essex Minerals Local Plan where applicable.

The Council should ensure that all minerals safeguarding requirements are properly addressed before determination.

12. Crime Prevention and Public Safety Issues Remain Outstanding

The Parish Council notes the comments from Essex Police regarding Designing Out Crime and Secured by Design principles.

These matters are particularly relevant given the proposed public open spaces, pedestrian routes and community facilities.

Should the Council be minded to approve either application, appropriate crime prevention and design safeguards should be secured through planning conditions and reserved matters requirements.

13. Community Concerns Remain Unresolved

The applicant's latest response does not adequately address concerns relating to:

- settlement strategy conflict;
- scale of development;
- landscape harm;
- sustainability;
- drainage;
- infrastructure pressure;
- health and education accessibility;
- transport impacts; and
- document inconsistencies.

These remain material planning considerations and have not been satisfactorily resolved.

Great Bromley Parish Council

Conclusion

Great Bromley Parish Council maintains its strong objection to Applications 26/00910/OUT and 26/00912/OUT.

The applicant's further submission does not overcome the fundamental planning concerns previously identified. The proposals remain contrary to the spatial strategy, disproportionate in scale, harmful to landscape character, reliant on an inherently unsustainable location, dependent upon unresolved drainage and infrastructure matters, and supported by an enabling development case which remains inadequately evidenced and insufficiently secured.

Furthermore, the absence of policy-compliant affordable housing represents a significant planning disbenefit which has not been adequately justified and should be afforded substantial weight in the planning balance.

Great Bromley Parish Council therefore respectfully requests that planning permission is refused for both applications.

If the Council is not minded to refuse the applications at this stage, determination should be deferred until the matters set out above have been fully addressed to the Council's satisfaction.

Proposed: Cllr Smith **Seconded:** Cllr Pirie **All agreed.**

5. Amendment to Standing Orders – Delegated Authority for Planning Responses

Members considered and approved an amendment to the Council's Standing Orders to introduce delegated authority, under Section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972, for the Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman (or Vice Chairman in their absence), to submit planning comments and supplementary planning responses on behalf of the Council where deadlines fell between meetings. All such responses would be reported to the next available meeting.

Proposed: Cllr Pirie **Seconded:** Cllr Mander **All agreed.**

6. To approve the following payments:

The Messenger - sponsorship	£ 135.00
PKF – External Audit	£ 252.00

Proposed: Cllr Blowers **Seconded:** Cllr Mander **All agreed.**

7. Date of next meeting – Wednesday 9 September 2026

Members were reminded that items of business for inclusion on the agenda should be submitted to the Clerk by Monday 31 August.

The meeting closed at 7.06pm.