8 Object

Document Element: FIG. 2 POLICIES MAP

Respondent: Mr Gary Plummer [23]

Summary:

Why are we continuing to build houses that are clearly not for residents of the local area? All these house are for are the continuous London overspill, that move here and make the area worse. With them comes all of the issue from the capital, like crime and drugs etc.

Full text:

Why are we continuing to build houses that are clearly not for residents of the local area? All these house are for are the continuous London overspill, that move here and make the area worse. With them comes all of the issue from the capital, like crime and drugs etc.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan should be thrown in the bin, as all CCC continue to do is concrete over our beautiful countryside . Killing trees and wildlife alike.
There is a time to stop and preserve what we have and that time is now.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

44 Object

Document Element: FIG. 2 POLICIES MAP

Respondent: Mr Hiran Perera [65]

Summary:

this will only compound the current problems around road use. map shows new link road connect A133 at point where there is huge amount of traffic already. this will increase traffic queues and rate of accidents

Full text:

this will only compound the current problems around road use. map shows new link road connect A133 at point where there is huge amount of traffic already. this will increase traffic queues and rate of accidents

Change suggested by respondent:

link roads should connect after current bottlenecks. namely after greenstead roundabout towards colchester town

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

194 Object

Document Element: FIG. 2 POLICIES MAP

Respondent: Mr Mark Cory [147]

Summary:

At each stage of consultation, hundreds of residents have sumitted consultations responses clearly stating "no development South of A133". This is seen to break the principle of coolescence with the Wivenhoe envelope; futhermore, the land allocation is not concordent with Garden Community principles, providing infrastructure outside of the "self-contained community", favoruing a site across a major 'A-road' (the A133). The A133 is seen as a clear boundary to the Garden Community development, yet this allocation was ade last minute upon request my the University.
Public consultation responses should not be ignored.

Full text:

At each stage of consultation, hundreds of residents have sumitted consultations responses clearly stating "no development South of A133". This is seen to break the principle of coolescence with the Wivenhoe envelope; futhermore, the land allocation is not concordent with Garden Community principles, providing infrastructure outside of the "self-contained community", favoruing a site across a major 'A-road' (the A133). The A133 is seen as a clear boundary to the Garden Community development, yet this allocation was ade last minute upon request my the University.
Public consultation responses should not be ignored.

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove development South of the A133, accepting the A133 as a clear border of the Garden Community settlement.

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: As County Councillor and City Councillor for the site.
Attachments: None

219 Object

Document Element: FIG. 2 POLICIES MAP

Respondent: Collins & Coward Planning and Development Consultancy (Mr Tony Collins) [58]

Summary:

The line of the proposed Green Corridor tracks through the back gardens of the properties fronting Chapel Lane. The use of residential gardens is at variance with the ecological objectives of seeking to create a Green Corridor.

The Crockleford Heath & Environs Character Area Assessment refers to Green Corridors but not in the context of Crockleford Health itself. There are no proposals for Green Corridors within Crockleford Heath. Therefore the evidence base does not support the creation of a Green Corridor as shown on the Policies Map.

Full text:

see attached letter

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments:

Collins & Coward - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sc

226 Object

Document Element: FIG. 2 POLICIES MAP

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

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

Summary:

Concern that the University of Essex growth cannot be fully met within the neighbourhoods and that greater flexibility be provided for university expansion south of the A133.

Full text:

See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:

The key of the Policies Map should be amended to ensure consistency in approach and refer more generally to 'University of Essex expansion' (see Appendix 2 of these representations). This flexibility is needed to ensure the DPD is effective and deliverable.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Developer

Attachments:

Latimer Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sp

251 Support

Document Element: FIG. 2 POLICIES MAP
Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:
Suggested changes to Key Diagram

Full text:
Policy GC1 – Land Use
I have three comments:

Clinghoe Hill
I'm worried that the knowledge-based employment land is too close to Clinghoe Hill. Part G needs to require that the buildings are set back, limited in height and landscaped to ensure that the area has a rural or "garden" feel. The objective should be to make the buildings scarcely visible from the road once the surrounding trees reach maturity. My suggestion is consistent with policy SP6 which requires appropriate buffers along strategic roads.

Growing Food
Garden Communities are meant to have opportunities for growing food. Land needs to be set aside for allotments or bigger gardens and the viability numbers adjusted accordingly.

Severance of employment land
The new Business Park is to be located to the East of the site, separated by the link road. I worry that the severance will force people unnecessarily into their cars. While this is necessary for heavy B8 type uses, many jobs are now in offices and workshops which do not need to be severed from housing. The proposed segregation of the Business Park is not justified.

Change suggested by respondent:
I suggest that the key diagram in the DPD be changed to
• integrate some of the B1 employment land better with residential to the West of the link road
• relocate the A120 service station into the employment land on the link road, a solution that would work better providing access to the existing service station along a service road
• indicate how the Knowledge Based Employment site alongside the A133 will be accessed by road

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments:
Screenshot 2023-06-25 at 08.34.37.png - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/w
W Sunnucks - Consultation Response - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sx
W Sunnucks - New Towns - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sj

252 Object

Document Element: FIG. 2 POLICIES MAP
Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:
• Need for 7,500 new homes not established.
• Bromley Road development has been curtailed because the developer's expectation of potential sales has been reduced.
•1,000-1,500 new homes on Crockleford Heath will adversely impact the special character of the area.
• Need for Knowledge Based Employment Land is not established, existing units at University remain vacant.
• Need for Gypsies/Travellers not supported by evidence.
• Term Green Links is not clearly defined.
• Wivenhoe and Elmstead have SGGs, but no Green Gap for Crockleford Heath. A GG of at least 100m may be appropriate or no housing in this area.

Full text:
Compliance:
I consider that the Development Plan Document is Legally compliant.
It is not sound for the reasons stated below.
I consider that the document complies with the statutory duty to co-operate, but the consultation process using the engagement website is overly complex and biased. It seems likely that many people will have been deterred from participation in the consultation by these arrangements.

I would be pleased to participate in the oral part of the examination if this would be of assistance.

GC Policy 1: Land Use and Spatial Approach.

• The Garden Community Principles unproven. The GC vision overly aspirational and adopts a naive perception of the way in which communities are established and of human behaviour. The latter is not simply determined by environment.
• The GC is unlikely to address a local housing need, unless a greater proportion of rented housing is included. The present proposed approach will encourage further migration from the London suburbs, by the property wealthy whose pattern of work has changed post Covid-19.
• Many prospective residents of the GC will not be seeking local jobs, they will be occasionally commuting to London and working from home.
• Unrealistic assumptions are made in relation to the extent to which private car usage will be reduced by the RTS and other more sustainable transport initiatives.
• The practicalities of community ownership are unclear.
• Shared ownership and rented housing should be included in the DPD as separate categories and the possibility of transferring from rent to shared ownership should be included.
• I was told at a consultation event that environmental requirements for new homes cannot exceed current building regulations, this is not clear from the DPD, which suggests the environmental requirements will be much higher.
• The neighbourhood map does not clearly distinguish between the North and Crockleford neighbourhoods.
• The development of the TCBGC does not justify the concreting over of a large part of rural northeast Essex.
• It does not seem logical that two proposed garden communities in north Essex were not considered to be viable, while the TCBGC is considered viable.

Policies Map:

• The need for 7,500 new homes in north Essex is not clearly established.
• A development on the Bromley Road has recently been curtailed because the developer's expectation of potential sales has been reduced. Properties have also been sold to a London Borough to house homeless families.
• 1,000 to 1,500 new homes on Crockleford Heath will adversely impact on the special character of the area.
• The need for Knowledge Based Employment Land is not established, many the existing units at the University for Knowledge Based Employment remain vacant.
• The need for provision for Gypsies and Travellers is not supported by evidence.
• The term Green Links is not clearly defined. Are these for wildlife or walkers and cyclists? How wide are these corridors? A minimum of 100m may be appropriate.
• While Wivenhoe and Elmstead are provided with Strategic Green Gaps, why is no Green Gap provided for Crockleford Heath to preserve the special character of the area?
• The present proposals suggest that housing development to the south of the Bromley Road will encroach on Crockleford Heath. A Green Gap of at least 100m may be appropriate. Alternatively, given the high volume of traffic it may be appropriate not to develop any housing to the immediate south of the Bromley Road.

Policy 2: Nature.

• Nature and biodiversity are likely to be enhanced if housing development does not proceed.
• It is not clear how the safety of public spaces will be assured, and anti-social behaviour managed.
• Churn Wood is shown on the Framework Plan, but it is not made clear this is privately owned and does not have public access.
• What is an edible walkway – a licence to steal apples?
• How will community gardens be managed and maintained? If this is not clear these areas could become a focus for anti-social behaviour.
• This chapter of the DPD demonstrates an idealised and unrealistic approach to the relationship between people and nature. Many of the prospective residents of the GC may have little experience and knowledge of nature and little desire to develop such knowledge.

Policy 3: Place Shaping Principles.

• This chapter is commendable, but highly aspirational. It is not clear how quality of life, livability, equitable prosperity, and social cohesion are to be achieved in practice.
• Communities are not created by distinctive buildings. It is difficult to envisage that the TCBGC will not simply be another large housing development.
• There is a limit to which environment can have a positive impact on societal behaviour and crime can be designed out. Crime is a variable feature of human behaviour. It also reflects the quality and level of policing and other factors.

Policy 4: Meeting Housing Needs.

• There has been significant housing development around Colchester in recent years. Predominantly this has not met a local housing need, but has fuelled movement of people from other areas, particularly London It is difficult to imagine that if it proceeds the TCBGC will not have a similar pattern of home ownership.
• Residents on low income are likely to seek rented housing, from a provider of social housing and in this respect the chosen developer may be well placed to meet this need.

• To conflate shared ownership and rented housing in 30% figure for affordable housing is misleading. A greater proportion of rented housing may be necessary to meet local need.

Policy 5: Economic Activity and Employment.

• The objective of achieving one job per household in or near the garden community may be ambitious and will be dependent on factors such as the overall economic picture.
• It seems likely that a significant proportion of prospective residents will be employed in London and working remotely from home some of the time.

Policy 6: Community and Social Infrastructure.

• This section of the DPD is highly aspirational. Dependent upon the level of stewardship and management, what may emerge in practice could be very different.
• It is not clear whether multifunctional community buildings include the provision of healthcare services. This may be difficult to achieve in practice, given specialist medical needs.
• Management and longer-term stewardship of community provision of this nature could be clearer in DPD.

Policy 7: Movement and Connections.

• This policy section assumes that residents of the GC will adopt significantly reduced use of personal private cars. This may not be a realistic assumption.
• Similarly, neighbourhood delivery hubs will not be viable if residents choose to do their shopping outside of the neighbourhood centres by car in local supermarkets.
• The RTS will be operating on roads into Colchester City and will be subject to the same traffic delays as exist currently.

Policy 8: Sustainable Infrastructure.

• This policy is commendable but does not seem to be reflected in in the design requirements for buildings in the GC.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: I would be pleased to participate in the oral part of the examination if this would be of assistance.
Attachments: None