397 Support

Document Element: MM35 (Main)

Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM35, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. Latimer agrees that delivering a sustainable community will require a balance between employment and residential uses. However, the proposed modification introduces welcome flexibility in anticipation that it may not be feasible for each employment area to come forward in line with housing growth. This change would also allow evidence and master planning work at the planning application stage to appropriately account for employment land and other employment generating uses, including in the neighbourhood centres.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM35, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. Latimer agrees that delivering a sustainable community will require a balance between employment and residential uses. However, the proposed modification introduces welcome flexibility in anticipation that it may not be feasible for each employment area to come forward in line with housing growth. This change would also allow evidence and master planning work at the planning application stage to appropriately account for employment land and other employment generating uses, including in the neighbourhood centres.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

448 Object

Document Element: MM35 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM 35 – we are concerned this drastic change in flexibility could lead to long periods of imbalance between housing and employment opportunities, with the overall long term
correlation seemingly guaranteed upon completion of the garden community, after potentially decades of imbalance.

Full text:

While we support a number of modifications suggested by statutory bodies such as natural England and sport England, we have listed numerous concerns where policy wording is being unnecessarily weakened to the extent it is no longer effective.

As noted there a small number of modifications we believe contradict one another with regards to effective transport planning, and require significant changes, or the omission of illustrative mapping with no planning purpose that obfuscate the policies they're intended to support.

We remain concerned that an evidence based approach has not been taken with regards to effective transport and movement, especially given the reasoning for main matter 63 which itself concludes the existing traffic modelling is fundamentally flawed. This, and other modifications require substantial changes that need additional evidence, and further consultation to constitute a proper plan making process.

We can only reiterate representations made at the examination in public that we believe too much detail has been pushed to later stages of the planning process, which is supported by the numerous reasonings suggesting policy must be loosened to allow for a wider flexibility.

Change suggested by respondent:

Strengthened policy wording to ensure policies are effective and not merely suggestive.

Updated traffic modelling and re-examination of transport and movement policies to form an effective, evidence based approach.

Completion of the full link road, to be operational before domestic development commences. (as promised in previous rounds of consultation, and removed without adequate opportunity for additional input)

Integrated phasing plan overview enshrined in policy. Updated viability study to confirm potential proposal is above viability threshold as currently queried in evidence base: financial viability study confirms a 15% profit on cost was approved during section 1, appropriate range reduced to 10-14% but the same document establishes liability at 9.65% - below acceptable thresholds and which we believe will only have fallen further due to changing economic circumstance. By the DPDs own evidence base's assertion – it does not meet the threshold to be viable.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/3w

303 Object

Document Element: MM36 (Minor)

Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:

The modification provides no clarity or definition on what fast or rapid means.

Full text:

The modification provides no clarity or definition on what fast or rapid means.

Change suggested by respondent:

A definition of what is fast or rapid is needed. I.e. is it quicker than commuting by car to the listed destinations.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

359 Support

Document Element: MM36 (Minor)

Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM36, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The amendment provides consistency with DPD policy wording GC Policy 1. MM36 also corrects an error with the wording, given the Colchester Business Park is not on the RTS route, as it terminates at Colchester Park and Ride.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM36, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The amendment provides consistency with DPD policy wording GC Policy 1. MM36 also corrects an error with the wording, given the Colchester Business Park is not on the RTS route, as it terminates at Colchester Park and Ride.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

400 Object

Document Element: MM36 (Minor)
Respondent: TCBGC Community Liaison Group [104]
Agent: Mrs Manda O'Connell [105]

Summary:

The example locations that the RTS will serve should include Colchester North Station, which is currently omitted. Please amend wording to include as this will be a key destination for those commuting from the TCBGC.

Full text:

The example locations that the RTS will serve should include Colchester North Station, which is currently omitted. Please amend wording to include as this will be a key destination for those commuting from the TCBGC.

Change suggested by respondent:

To include and refer to Colchester North Station as one of the RTS stops.

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Attachments: None

449 Object

Document Element: MM36 (Minor)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM 36 - The movement and connections illustrative framework plan (page 93) clearly shows a rapid transport route/stop within the area of the business park. While it seems absurd that there would not be a direct connection to the business park – if this is to be the case set out in policy then the map plan needs amending to avoid direct contradiction with the policy and ensuing confusion for decision makers.

Full text:

While we support a number of modifications suggested by statutory bodies such as natural England and sport England, we have listed numerous concerns where policy wording is being unnecessarily weakened to the extent it is no longer effective.

As noted there a small number of modifications we believe contradict one another with regards to effective transport planning, and require significant changes, or the omission of illustrative mapping with no planning purpose that obfuscate the policies they're intended to support.

We remain concerned that an evidence based approach has not been taken with regards to effective transport and movement, especially given the reasoning for main matter 63 which itself concludes the existing traffic modelling is fundamentally flawed. This, and other modifications require substantial changes that need additional evidence, and further consultation to constitute a proper plan making process.

We can only reiterate representations made at the examination in public that we believe too much detail has been pushed to later stages of the planning process, which is supported by the numerous reasonings suggesting policy must be loosened to allow for a wider flexibility.

Change suggested by respondent:

Strengthened policy wording to ensure policies are effective and not merely suggestive.

Updated traffic modelling and re-examination of transport and movement policies to form an effective, evidence based approach.

Completion of the full link road, to be operational before domestic development commences. (as promised in previous rounds of consultation, and removed without adequate opportunity for additional input)

Integrated phasing plan overview enshrined in policy. Updated viability study to confirm potential proposal is above viability threshold as currently queried in evidence base: financial viability study confirms a 15% profit on cost was approved during section 1, appropriate range reduced to 10-14% but the same document establishes liability at 9.65% - below acceptable thresholds and which we believe will only have fallen further due to changing economic circumstance. By the DPDs own evidence base's assertion – it does not meet the threshold to be viable.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/3w

302 Object

Document Element: MM37 (Minor)

Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:

It is clear from all the evidence produced that the most viable employment will be brought forward via the employment area to the northeast of the site.

Full text:

It is clear from all the evidence produced that the most viable employment will be brought forward via the employment area to the northeast of the site.

Change suggested by respondent:

As employment is a requirement of section one of the plan it should be conditioned in policy that that area is brought forward within the plan period i.e. before 2033.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

360 Support

Document Element: MM37 (Minor)

Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM37, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The modification would allow evidence and masterplanning at the planning application stage to appropriately account for employment land and other employment generating uses in the neighbourhood centres.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM37, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The modification would allow evidence and masterplanning at the planning application stage to appropriately account for employment land and other employment generating uses in the neighbourhood centres.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

361 Support

Document Element: MM38 (Main)

Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM38, as set out in its Matter 5 Hearing Statement, and as discussed at the hearings. It would not be a realistic requirement for retired or student households to count towards the one job per household ambition.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM38, as set out in its Matter 5 Hearing Statement, and as discussed at the hearings. It would not be a realistic requirement for retired or student households to count towards the one job per household ambition.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

450 Object

Document Element: MM38 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM 38 – With the majority of students (55% in 2023) now being in paid employment, we find this to be a significant modification that drastically alters the employment landscape of the proposed development. The evidence base for this change is uncertain, with further consultation needed for adequate examination.

Full text:

While we support a number of modifications suggested by statutory bodies such as natural England and sport England, we have listed numerous concerns where policy wording is being unnecessarily weakened to the extent it is no longer effective.

As noted there a small number of modifications we believe contradict one another with regards to effective transport planning, and require significant changes, or the omission of illustrative mapping with no planning purpose that obfuscate the policies they're intended to support.

We remain concerned that an evidence based approach has not been taken with regards to effective transport and movement, especially given the reasoning for main matter 63 which itself concludes the existing traffic modelling is fundamentally flawed. This, and other modifications require substantial changes that need additional evidence, and further consultation to constitute a proper plan making process.

We can only reiterate representations made at the examination in public that we believe too much detail has been pushed to later stages of the planning process, which is supported by the numerous reasonings suggesting policy must be loosened to allow for a wider flexibility.

Change suggested by respondent:

Strengthened policy wording to ensure policies are effective and not merely suggestive.

Updated traffic modelling and re-examination of transport and movement policies to form an effective, evidence based approach.

Completion of the full link road, to be operational before domestic development commences. (as promised in previous rounds of consultation, and removed without adequate opportunity for additional input)

Integrated phasing plan overview enshrined in policy. Updated viability study to confirm potential proposal is above viability threshold as currently queried in evidence base: financial viability study confirms a 15% profit on cost was approved during section 1, appropriate range reduced to 10-14% but the same document establishes liability at 9.65% - below acceptable thresholds and which we believe will only have fallen further due to changing economic circumstance. By the DPDs own evidence base's assertion – it does not meet the threshold to be viable.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/3w