GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

CD7

1 Support

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:

I support the general spatial approach, but would note that in reality, this development will be a suburb of Colchester, and the residents will be more likely to use services provided in Colchester than in the more distant town centres of the Tendring district. As such either a redrawing of the local authority boundaries, or an ongoing financial agreement between the two authorities, should be agreed, since the residents of this development will be paying council taxes to Tendring DC but using many services provided by Colchester CC.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

94 Object

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:

Officers Summary
•The GC Principles unproven. Vision overly aspirational and adopts naive perception of way in which communities are established and of human behaviour- is not simply determined by environment.
•The GC unlikely to address local housing need, unless a greater proportion of rented housing is included. Present proposed approach will encourage further migration from London suburbs, by the property wealthy whose pattern of work has changed post Covid-19.
•Many prospective residents occasionally commuting to London and WFH.
•Unrealistic assumptions made to extent to how private car usage will be reduced by the RTS.
•The practicalities of community ownership are unclear.
•Shared ownership(SO) and rented housing included in the DPD as separate categories and transferring from rent to SO 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.
•Not justifiable to concrete over large part of rural Essex.
•Why is this GC viable, while others in Essex were not.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

39 Object

Respondent: Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

Summary:

There is insufficient discussion of the justification of the location of various activities/facilities.
The neighbourhood structure for the Community is not designed to exploit the potential synergies of a development on the scale proposed.

Change suggested by respondent:

There should be better connectivity of the neighbourhoods whilst still encouraging active and public transport movement between them. It should be clear where University expansion is to be located.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

188 Support

Respondent: TCBGC Community Liaison Group [104]

Agent: Mrs Manda O'Connell

Summary:

The CLG are in support of almost all of this policy with the exception of that referring to the RTS route and, by extension, an incomplete link road. We have worked extensively with the planners and the communities we live in and represent from east Colchester, Wivenhoe, Crockleford Heath and Elmstead Market to agree the key elements of the Land Use Parameters and Policies Map submitted in this DPD, apart from that relating to the RTS, which was not part of the Reg 18 consultation and based on a report that was only made available on 10 February 2023.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Alt_RTS_Route.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/z
CLG Rep GC Policy 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tw

97 Support

Respondent: Affinity Water (Mrs Hannah Wilson, Environmental Planner) [108]

Summary:

Part K - Planning application requirements. Affinity Water supports the requirements for Masterplans and Design Codes. We would like to be consulted as these are developed to ensure water efficiency and water re-use is considered.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

214 Object

Respondent: Historic England (Mr Andrew Marsh, Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Planning Group) [129]

Summary:

Whilst we welcome that there are specific measures for the historic environment in Part E of this policy, we request that it is amended. The amendment suggested will clarify that these are designated heritage assets, therefore providing justification for (and therefore supporting the soundness of) the identification of a Strategic Gap in this location.
We take this opportunity to remind you that what is considered 'appropriate development' should be informed by the further HIA (referred to throughout this letter) in consultation with Historic England.'

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Historic Engalnd - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/s7

121 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water Services Ltd (Ms Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [40]

Summary:

Anglian Water welcomes the strategic aims of the policy in addressing the reduction of operational and embodied carbon across the new Garden Community, including through ensuring resource efficiency and prioritisation of renewable energy, which align with our purpose and long term strategic ambitions. Support the requirement for a comprehensive masterplan and design codes to deliver a sustainable and resilient community. Anglian Water would welcome engagement on the preparation of masterplans and design codes through the Enabling Water Smart Communities project.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

18 Object

Respondent: Mr Carl Banks [46]

Summary:

The scope of the development is too large and does not sufficiently protect the integrity and identity of Elmstead. There is already a lack of basic infrastructure, traffic has already increased and there are often delays on Clingoe Hill, this plan will add significantly to these issues. I have lived in the village over 2 years and am unable to register at the local doctors surgery this plan does not provide necessary services ahead of development it just adds to the problems. The air quality and noise pollution will increase to an unacceptable level. I fully object to the plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

Improve roads and basic infrastructure before development to account for all the previous development.
Reduce scope of development by 25% and allow at least one clear mile between development and Elmstead.
Develop new junction on A120 first so that site traffic does not have to travel through Elmstead village.
Scrap industrial park to preserve integrity of church and surroundings and to reduce impact on noise and air quality

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

19 Object

Respondent: Ms L G [49]

Summary:

> Far too many houses for infrastructure. Local hospital can't cope, GP surgeries are stretched to breaking point, schools are full with competition for any spaces. Traffic is building and dangerous, no speed limit enforcement with cameras in place. Impossible to pull out of side roads onto main road safely. Air pollution building to health impacting levels. 1000+ houses with no investment in local services is a catastrophic burden on an already exhausted and depleted community and local services that cannot cope now. This development will break those services and people will be impacted negatively.

Change suggested by respondent:

> Reduce the number of houses. Invest in local services for every X number of houses built, put in a doctors, police, school, fire service etc.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

22 Object

Respondent: Mr A Rayner [51]

Summary:

> Elmstead does not need 7500 new homes as that is 15000 cars. We need new schools and doctors. I wish I was not so old as I would move are out of ELMSTEAD it was nice when I moved here 50yr ago.
> We need new Roads now not in 2 years, the hospital can not cope now, with 15000 more people how CAN THEY cope, will they try and cope or not look after us as we would like.

Change suggested by respondent:

> -

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

23 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Ewers [52]

Summary:

Too many homes so close to Elmstead which already has developments built or under construction, and which has few amenities. Existing services such as schools and nurseries are full and health services struggling. This will result in removal of the countryside.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

220 Object

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

Summary:

This allows for development within Crockleford taking into account the context of the character area. Part of the policy refers to the “existing landscape structure”. The Policies Map seeks to impose a “Green Corridor” across land where this is some development potential. This approach is not supported by any evidence.

A Green Corridor in this location without supporting evidence is unsound and should be removed. Green Corridors should incorporate existing ecological assets. An alternative route is shown on the attached plan – links existing woodland at the Heath.

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

36 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Summary:

Colchester will spread making us an urban jungle.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

40 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carolyn Mason [64]

Summary:

The Draft Plan identified an 'Area of Special Character' at and around the settlement of Crockleford Heath, aimed at safeguarding its distinctive rural character. This will be destroyed by the development of up to 1200 houses. The Parish of Ardleigh has less than1000 households. Concentrate on extending the county park aspect further, within Crockleford, to maintain its rural characteristics. Compensate the land lost to recent large housing development along the Salary Brook. Extension of a country park would mitigate this loss. Local food production for the whole community could be provided in the existing agricultural/horticultural land. Keep it rural.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drastically reduce the proposed housing development of Crockleford to bare minimum to keep its recognised rural characteristics but increase public access through larger country park and local food production in this area of the Garden Community.
The local road network will simply not accommodate any increase in housing and it is unlikely that should 1200 houses be built in Crockleford that people would access the transport provided further afield.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

43 Object

Respondent: Mr Hiran Perera [65]

Summary:

plan has given no thought about the harm this is going to do to the environment and population already living in surrounding areas.
At present it takes min 25 mins to pass Greenstead roundabout every morning and 45mins in the evening to get cowdary avenue. children take 30mins in the morning and 45 mins to home to school (Elmstead Market - Colchester)
on the assumption 50% vehicle ownership of all new households this will add min 3750 new vehicles to roads in the surrounding area adding massive amount of pressure to road users and pollution.

Change suggested by respondent:

Number of houses and the size of the area used need to be reduced at least 50% . new link roads should connect A133 and A120 after bottlenecks not through new roundabouts.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

45 Object

Respondent: Prof Anthony Vickers [68]

Summary:

The green links, indicated in this section, should have a defined width no less than 100m and should have specified tree preservation and woodland/nature conservation management specifications.

Change suggested by respondent:

The green links should have a defined width no less than 100m and should have specified tree preservation and woodland/nature conservation management specifications.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

148 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

Living in the immediate area considered for development I strongly oppose this proposal as I believe the council has not fully considered the colossal impact this massive development will create. Colchester doctors, schools, hospitals and roads are full to capacity at present. Local surgeries in the area are closing their patient lists due to the increasing numbers of new residents in the current new developments being built. The roads in this area are small country lanes that are breaking up already with the amount of traffic, they talk about a rapid transit system which is basically a bus Lane!

Change suggested by respondent:

Drastically reduced. Any additional traffic arising from new developments need to have only direct access onto the proposed new road linking the A120 and A133 to avoid further congestion through Crockleford Heath and Wivenhoe Road which links onto Bromley Road heading into Greenstead and Colchester Town. These roads are currently small country lanes, already unsafe for additional fast moving traffic, unable to cope with large lorries and public transport.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

49 Object

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Summary:

Officers Summary:Traveller site??? Why there is no reason this has to be here they are known to cause lots of rubbish and destruction to their own living environment. Attracting more crime to areas of elderly and families this seems like a really unthought about idea which needs to be reconsidered.

Myself and many new residents of Elmstead have moved here for the country peaceful life where its a community everyone is friendly its peaceful easy access into town however far enough away for families to feel safe. I am happy to let my children play outside and I live in a small close where they do feel safe this development would change Elmstead for the worst.

KEEP ELMSTEAD A VILLAGE KEEP IT SEPERATE FROM COLCHESTER.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

55 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Yexley [76]

Summary:

The plan needs to be completed and published in much more detail.
The A133 to A120 link road must be built before any housing is started.
Traffic impact on A133 through Elmstead during building phases to be analyzed and published including lorry movements etc.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan needs far more detail on it's eastern edge where the buffer zone between it and Elmstead Market is being shown. As a recent resident of Elmstead Market I have read the "local plan" before I moved here and it clearly states a significant buffer zone would be in place between the eastern boundary of the new garden community involving woodlands, other new planted areas and landscaping - none of this is clear on the current plan.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

250 Support

Respondent: Frinton & Walton Town Council (Mrs Jennifer Woodland, Town Clerk) [79]

Summary:

On behalf of all Members of Frinton & Walton Town Council who at their full council meeting of the 8th June, moved approval of their support that they consider the plan to be legally compliant, sound and complies with the duty to co-operate.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Frinton & Walton Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tg

64 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Summary:

- Opposed to the proposals for the new Garden Community on the Colchester Tendering borders
- Concern with regard to the size, provision and location of the Gypsy and Traveller site.
- The employment area could end up spilling halfway down the country park area, which is at best a meagre offering of habitat.
- Contradiction of community and public input into the engagement process principles.
- Building on the ridgeline would not be in character with a country park, the slopes and the surrounding landscape. The buildings would have a detrimental effect and be viewable from great distances.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan is too vague and has not addressed issues raised by groups and individual members of the public.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Consultation document Garden Village.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/4

66 Object

Respondent: Sport England (Mr Roy Warren, Planning Manager) [90]

Summary:

The policy is generally supported but some amendments are requested to improve the policy by
1. Providing clarity on the scope of sports facilities that may be accommodated in the sports and leisure park
2. Making it explicit that a masterplan should be prepared for the sports and leisure park

Change suggested by respondent:

- Clarity should be provided on the scope of sports facilities that may be accommodated in the sports and leisure park i.e. will indoor facilities and floodlit facilities be permitted.
- The preparation of a masterplan for the Sports and Leisure Park should be an explicit requirement of the policy

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

72 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

Summary:

The plan states: Garden Community.....to avoid housing developments that can overwhelm existing facilities and infrastructure. There is no way this can be carefully managed with thousands of additional homes! The majority of people will always take the quickest and easiest transport/route in their hectic lives ie a car will more likely be chosen over a bus or walking. Clingo Hill will become completely gridlocked and the road through Elmstead will become dangerous especially the junctions in the village, where accidents are already happening.

Change suggested by respondent:

Having lived in Colchester for 46 years, the roads cannot cope with the increased number of cars already seen, adding more will make it impossible. I'm guessing the people who designed this garden community, do not actually use the roads in this area on a daily basis. Far less housing and improvements to existing roads through Colchester is whats needed. There is no way the town can cope with this development.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

130 Support

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

Securing a new Country Park at Salary Brook is a wonderful idea. I'm a frequent visitor to the area and am keen to see the cycle path improved to take out the blind corners and segregate cyclists from walkers with room made for all. The land in the present Nature Reserve is in the Colchester City boundary but I'd like to see expansion to create a substantial buffer zone between Greenstead and the Garden Community. The policy doesn't explain which authority will have responsibility for long term maintenance or how this will be funded in perpetuity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

235 Object

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

Summary:

Do not understand what being consulted upon if it is subject to change and alternative layout are not available.
Contradictions with Section 1 policy. Reports that were criteria of the DPD that have not been produced.
Large number of Wivenhoe residents have made views clear on development south of A133. Consistently been ignored.
Wivenhoe and Elmstead Strategic Green Gaps said to be protected. Sports and Leisure Park appears in area that should be green buffer for Wivenhoe.
Part D – any options brought forward will destroy any strategic green gap. All land south of A133 must be designated as a country park.
Part F – University now being allocated more area, condition of this shared use needs greater definition and legal status.
Part G – Masterplanning does not include any sound or visual barrier.
Park and Choose Facility need to be resolved now as area requires is not defined.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

81 Support

Respondent: Ms Rose Clarke [99]

Summary:

I use Salary Brook path constantly and consider it an essential part of my everyday life. I enjoy the many mature trees and the bird life within them. Also the Brook area is a peaceful place to rest and relax. Many people use the Brook for walking and dog walking. The pandemic showed how important it is that the population have access to a quiet and peaceful area close to their homes.
I feel that this area must be kept as it is and would hope that a definite promise to keep and care for the Brook area is made.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

82 Object

Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

Summary:

This is a consultation heavily focused on those with specialist knowledge. The documentation seems to be deliberately opaque, bombarding the reader with details. The maps/images are far too small and not legible even when enlarged on a monitor screen.
The wording on the Rapid Transit System is vague, so as to only signal a broad intention rather than a firm plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

Be a lot firmer in the commitment to the RTS.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

96 Object

Respondent: Chris Went [109]

Summary:

- The roads can't cope with the excess traffic in peak hours. Clingo Hill is forever grid locked without another 7,500+ homes.
- Infrastructure needs to be in place first.
- The hospital can't cope with the current amount of patients.
- The same also applies the schools, doctors and dental surgeries.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

100 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Halsall [111]

Agent: Mr Richard Halsall

Summary:

We refer back to previous representations. We now note “green route” through Crockleford and increased housing density. We object to the area being designated as area of Special Character, there are limited buildings / features of architectural interest and other similar lanes are being developed. This will result in an awkward land-locked “island” community in the middle of the overall development. The land is too small to be economical for horticulture or agriculture and should no longer be assigned as such.

Change suggested by respondent:

Chapel Grove should be specifically included for a select development of executive housing as per previous representations to ensure the broadest diversity of housing offer - ie executive homes for this who generate wealth and jobs for the community.

The Agricultural covenant should be removed from the property as it is unviable and uneconomical. If left with this designation / restriction, the land will become an overgrown waste-ground, dumping ground and eye-sore. With the restriction removed the land can be used for private gardens or for horses and therefore maintained in an attractive state until developed sympathetically as previous representations.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

102 Support

Respondent: Mr Michael Lucking [112]

Summary:

I broadly support the land uses and spatial approach. It is great that the special interests of the Salary Brook area have been recognised and enhanced. Lockdown proved how valuable this is. This will provide a great space for many local people and prevent the joining up of the development to the rest of Colchester

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

156 Support

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

- TCBGC needs a better name
- We need three D modelling as requested by the Inspector and some illustrations (example attached) to show a meaningful vision
- Garden community principles on land value capture and community ownership of land need to be respected.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

157 Support

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

Clinghoe Hill needs to retain a "garden" feel, not urban.
Provision for growing food is needed in line with GC principles
Too much severance of employment land (B1/E uses) from residential

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

104 Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:

Essex County Council supports the preparation of a DPD for TCBGC and as a member of the Joint Committee will continue to work in close partnership with Colchester City and Tendring District councils to ensure the delivery of ECC's statutory roles and responsibilities, so that TCBGC delivers a safe, green and healthy community with long term sustainable infrastructure delivery.

The content of the Draft Plan and its evidence base reflects our active involvement throughout all stages of plan preparation and ensures that the provision of ECC's infrastructure and services for future residents and businesses are identified and can be delivered.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

118 Support

Respondent: Mrs Claudia Alsdorf [116]

Summary:

I would like to support the option C with land use south of A133 restricted to sports use e.g. University plus open to community, possibly parking and sports pavilions, set in green planting to make a clear distinction from housing development north of the A133. This is a huge improvement to the previous proposal set out in the first consultation. I am also pleased and relieved to see that now there is no plan of spilling over down the slopes of Salary Brook but instead a plan for a country park, vital to preserve the ridge skyline seen from Greenstead.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

134 Support

Respondent: Mrs Claudia Alsdorf [116]

Summary:

I am generally in favour and impressed with the improved new proposal and how views and comments of the public have been taken into account, e.g. use of the land south of the A133. However, I still have some reservations and concerns, especially around the RTS and link road, and getting infrastructure in place before starting to build houses, see submission from the CLG of which I am a member.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

119 Support

Respondent: Braintree District Council (Mr Alan Massow, Principal Planning Officer) [118]

Summary:

Braintree District Council shares a joint strategic Section 1 Local Plan with Colchester City Council and Tendring District Council. The Council is pleased to see the progress that is being made with the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community and are of the view that the proposed DPD broadly complies with the relevant policies in the Section 1 Local Plan and is considered legally complaint and sound.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Braintree District Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/8

225 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

Summary:

Latimer is generally supportive of GC Policy 1 'Land Uses and Spatial Approach' but seeks some amendments to allow for greater flexibility with respect of the land use and spatial approach, to allow the precise detail of the development to be subject to further master planning and evidence.

Change suggested by respondent:

Overall, Latimer is generally supportive of Chapter 3 and Policy 1, but seeks some critical amendments to allow for greater flexibility with respect of the land use and spatial approach to make the DPD more effective in terms of deliverability. This will allow the detail of the development to be subject to further master planning through agreement with the Councils and stakeholders, via future planning applications.
Request Changes to Part A, Part F and Part J (see attached document).

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

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

144 Object

Respondent: Mr David Ward [134]

Summary:

I cannot support this development simply because it is to be sited on Grade 1 Agricultural land. In fact one of the few areas of land in the Eastern region that is designated so.
See the following link...
https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/127056?category=5954148537204736

Why on earth chose a vast area of our precious, prime growing land to build thousands of houses on, unbelievable!

Change suggested by respondent:

Simply abandon the project!

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

136 Support

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Summary:

I think the often competing desires to protect certain areas have been listened to and considerable effort put into getting as much evidence as possible as to the best way forward. I think this plan will work well in protecting the Salary Brook area and avoiding the development spreading into Elmstead or Wivenhoe. Planting of buffer zones with woodland would certainly help there alongside, of course, being a positive move for the climate.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

208 Object

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Summary:

They are using a language to sell the project, ignoring the true damages they are doing. The maps used are not clear and seem to hide what we must not know yet. Elmstead has already suffered a great loss of its countryside and does not need to lose more. It is imperative to keep grade 1 fields, to nourish the population.

Change suggested by respondent:

THERE ARE NO NET BIODIVERSITY GAINS, as it states in the DPD! the only way that biodiversity can continue is by not destroying the area and covering it with concrete and pollutants. The farmland should be protected and encouraged as the Mondial situation is very precarious, and the future is uncertain. Unless we want to push the people to cannibalism for their survival, may it be due very high food prices or unavailability of food supply, the farmland should be protected and not turned into some pie in the sky project.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

206 Object

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Summary:

This project's an over-ambitious development, not thought -through with no solution should it encounters any trouble and becomes in danger to go burst., It's inconceivable to have such a high housing density within a mile of Elmstead Market, a rural Parish, the infrastructure is a real problem for the existing local residents. where a density of only half this figure would be considered too high for suitable development, and is highly detrimental. This directly contradicts the DPDs justification of preventing developments that alter a communities' character. It's also the loss of excellent fields, ancient hedgerows, an image and a culture.

Change suggested by respondent:

I want this plan to be honest and tell the truth and not lies. Those people should live in the real world and take into consideration: 1) the actual land space available for the housing development, The area of search established for the project (2017) for the local plan defined a broad range of housing provision between 7000 – 9000 dwellings. It should be noted this is substantially less than the combined housing requirement of 29,400 dwellings for Colchester and Tendring as established in policy 4 of the shared strategic plan, which is only for the period until 2033. A significant majority of these houses must still be placed on the edges of existing towns and villages, bringing the project's justification into question. While somewhat arbitrary the project's housing provision range of seven to nine thousand dwellings was only a starting point, intended to develop as evidence was gathered and planning commenced, but this was not told by our representatives. The area of search represents approximately 740 hectares of land. The settlement development boundary proposed in a draft DPD (2022) reduced this area as needed by the link road (A133 to A120) allocation, protection of ancient woodland and dedicated strategic green gaps, and some other smaller necessary concessions, a woodland remains within this settlement development boundary, and this is a real concern as it reduces immensely the developable area of land to place those houses. After the 2022 draft DPD was published, further concessions were made to expand areas dedicated to Salary Brook country park as well as Knowledge Gateway (university) for additional sporting facilities. This has therefore reduced the land for housing development quite considerately. Add to this the development for businesses and keeping in mind the significant number of existing residential properties within the area, which are rural homes with considerable gardens and other outdoor spaces, the land they are going to develop the project on is very small, therefore will push either to a high density development or to very high storey houses, and these facts will be in serious contrast with the character of the surrounding communities . Many of these homes in the Crockleford Heath are area of special character which is recognised (policy 1B) as requiring a substantially lower housing density than the rest of the area. These combined effects further reduce the available developable land allocation. I am not aware that there is a mention of all the real facts that make the developable land so small, or the quantity of land allocated for the development of those houses in the DPD or its evidence base. Their commitment to retain existing trees and hedgerows is wonderful, but I do not think that they will keep it. I believe that this brings further pressures on land use when we take into consideration town planning. Combining this policy, with the necessary allocation for school land of the 6 schools proposed in chapter 5 this continues to reduce the land that can be developed residentially and makes it harder to deliver satisfactorily and efficiently.
2) We need a strong distinction between the TCBGC and the communities of Elmstead Market, Alresford, Wivenhoe and Colchester. This is important in order to constrain urban sprawl, retain separate identities and prevent coalescence between towns and villages that have already experienced substantial development over the last 3 years.
The original TCBGC scope was to create a new town bordered by the A120 to the north, the A133 to the south and a new link road between both to form the Eastern boundary. Development outside these boundaries is unacceptable urban sprawl and not in keeping with the original Garden Community concept.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

146 Support

Respondent: Mr James Marchant [138]

Summary:

It is vital that the whole of the Salary Brook valley, the area around the valley, woodlands and the slopes leading away, up to a distance of 1.5km, is kept as a country park for enjoyment of the many thousands of residents of Greenstead, Longridge Park and the new community. This is also important for biodiverity and wildlife. This idea makes the plan sound.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

161 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Summary:

Whilst I support the overall plan, I am concerned regarding the impact upon Crockleford Heath. Rightly, this has been designated as an area of special character, however, there seems little definitive in terms of protecting this. Unlike Elmstead and Wivenhoe, there is little in the way of a buffer to new development encroaching on and absorbing what exists. Lanes and trees need to be protected and careful consideration needs to be given to traffic management within this existing community as, frequently, it is used as a rat run when issues occur on the A133.

Change suggested by respondent:

A clearly defined buffer zone for Crockleford Heath needs to be drawn up. Proactive traffic management needs to be implemented that recognises the limitations of existing infrastructure and its ability to cope with increasing volumes of traffic (which will only be exacerbated as the community develops, even with the drive for sustainable transport options).

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

166 Support

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:

I would have preferred no development south of the A133, to protect the space between Wivenhoe and both Colchester and the new community. However the approach set out in this consultation, with just University sports facilities south of the A133 much better than housing or commercial development south of the A133

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

173 Object

Respondent: Ardleigh Parish Council (Ms Rachel Fletcher, Parish Clerk) [143]

Summary:

We welcome the Crockleford Heath Character Appraisal Plan as it recognises the uniqueness of the area that it needs to be treated very carefully to avoid destroying it. The draft DPD begins to address this, and has included a larger than previously identified Crockleford Heath Special Character area for special treatment.
However, the problem is the density of housing being proposed. 30 dwellings per hectare (although much less than in the other hubs) is not conducive to creating a village feel to the development, which is what seems to be proposed, and is denser than all other parts of Ardleigh.

Change suggested by respondent:

reduced density for the Crockleford development. For context, the settlement area of Ardleigh (i.e. the centre of the village and the main development North South and West of the crossroads) is a similar area to that being proposed to be developed around Crockleford. Ardleigh's settlement area has approximately 350 houses which equates to under 12 dwellings per hectare. The Crockleford development hub would have at least 2.5 times more dwellings i.e. 1,000, perhaps even 1,500 with a density of 30 per hectare. This is much more than the most densely populated part of Ardleigh!

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Regulation 19 Feedback Ardleigh Parish Council for TCB Garden Community.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/x

180 Object

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

Summary:

- Policy is inward looking – doesn't address impact on nearby communities.

Part A

- Number of new homes is ambiguous
- Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap is in parish of Elmstead.

Part B

- Statements about phasing are unclear/ineffective.
- Neighbourhoods having distinctive character could lead to segregated communities
- Density too high.
- Transport links gives greater connectivity to Colchester than Tendring.
- Incompatible with GC principles
- Unclear how RTS will interact with the link road.
- Infrastructure required before neighbourhood centres are complete.
- Neighbourhoods too close to ancient woodland.
- Policy for Crockleford doesn't protect residents of the wider area.

Part C

- Salary Brook Country Park biases Colchester's benefit
- Existing new development on Bromley Road already causes coalescence with Colchester

Part D

- Wivenhoe SGG is important to Elmstead.

Part E

- Location of business park will harm Grade 1 listed building
- Elmstead SGG isn't big enough.

Part F

- Sports facilities unsuitable for SGG

Part G

- Site too small for transition to countryside
- Impact on ancient woodland

Part H

- Employment area will harm setting of listed building.
- Shouldn't be on eastern side of link road.

Part J

- Need additional park and choose facility to north of site.

Part K

- EPC want to be more involved with masterplanning.

Justification

- Concern over density.

Change suggested by respondent:

- Policy should address impact on nearby communities.

Part A

- Policy should give an absolute range of acceptable housing numbers.
- Student accommodation should be defined and included in this figure.
- Policy 1 part D should recognise that Eastern area of Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap is also important to Elmstead.

Part B

- A definitive phasing proposal is required.
- Remove requirement for neighbourhoods to be distinct.
- Transport links should give greater connection to the surrounding area, not just towards Colchester.
- Need clarification around how RTS will interact with the link road.
- Greater clarity required about infrastructure phasing, as interim solutions will be detrimental to things like education.
- Greater buffers around ancient woodland
- Lower density in Crockleford Neighbourhood is needed.
- Remove reference to self-build houses, as this will give existing community less control

Part C

- Salary Brook Country Park doesn't need to be completely delivered at the earliest phases of development.

Part D

- Importance of Wivenhoe SGG to Elmstead should be included.

Part E

- Listed buildings should be given greater protection within Strategic Green Gap, employment area should be in a different location.
- All countryside between link road and Elmstead Market should be SGG.
- Require greater detail about what development is and isn't suitable in this location.

Part F

- Extend Wivenhoe SGG to fortify green link and protect woodland.

Part G

- Change location of employment area.

Part J

- Additional park and choose facility to north of site to serve the A120.

Part K

- Lower range of houses more suitable.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

191 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Cory [147]

Summary:

CCC - Press Release: "Linking the A120 and A133 aims to enable people to more easily access the A120 and A12, reducing the need to travel directly into Colchester and helping to manage congestion on more local roads.
The Link Road will also play a direct link in helping to unlock land to provide housing, business and leisure space - including the new TCBGC."

ECC 7 July 2022ProgressUpdate "easily access the A120 and A12 and reducing the need to travel directly into Colchester, the new Link Road is an important part of the plans for growth....the creation of the newCTGC."

Change suggested by respondent:

The Policies Map makes clear the boundary created by the "A120-A133 Link Road", therefore the "Link Road" must be completed from the start, enabling housing and associated development to follow. Please insert the following: [The Eastern boundary of the site is along the completed A120-A133 Link Road. This Link Road must be completed ahead of development of the site."

Without the "Link Road" completed, it fails the GC principles and impacts with great harm on existing communities and the local road network.

In their previous Section 1 Local Plan Submission, the North East Essex Authorities outlined the following when introducing the then Policies Map: Policy SP8 - Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community The adopted policies map identifies the broad location for the development of a new garden community of which the details and final number of homes will be set out in a Strategic Growth Development Plan Document to be prepared jointly between Colchester BC and Tendring DC and which will incorporate around 2,500 dwellings within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7,000-9,000 homes) and provision for Gypsy and Travellers. The Strategic Growth DPD will set out the nature, form and boundary of the new community. The document will be produced in consultation with stakeholders and will include a concept plan showing the disposition and quantity of future land-uses, and give a three dimensional indication of the urban design and landscape parameters which will be incorporated into any future planning applications; together with a phasing and implementation strategy which sets out how the rate of development will be linked to the provision of the necessary social, physical and environmental infrastructure to ensure that the respective phases of the development do not come forward until the necessary infrastructure has been secured. The DPD will provide the framework for the subsequent development of more detailed masterplans and other design and planning guidance for the Tendring / Colchester Borders Garden Community. The DPD and any planning application will address the following principles and requirements in the design, development and delivery of the new garden community:

D. Transportation 7. A package of measures will be introduced to encourage smarter transport choices to meet the needs of the new community and maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel including the provision of a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways to enhance permeability within the site and to access and to access the adjoining areas; development of a public rapid transit system connecting the garden community to Essex University and Colchester town centre; park and ride facilities and other effective integrated measures to mitigate the transport impacts of the proposed development on the strategic and local road network. Longer term transport interventions will need to be carefully designed to minimise the impacts on the strategic and local road network and fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts arising from the development. These shall include bus (or other public transit provisions) priority measures between the site, University of Essex, Hythe station and Colchester Town Centre; 8. Foot and cycle ways shall be provided throughout the development and connecting with the surrounding urban areas and countryside, including seamlessly linking key development areas to the University of Essex, Hythe station and Colchester Town Centre; 9. Primary vehicular access to the site will be provided off the A120 and A133.

It is very clear above that vehicular access will come from the A120 and A133 and thus a Link Road must be provided. Furthermore, it say "Longer term transport interventions will need to be carefully designed to minimise the impacts on the strategic and local road network and fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts arising from the development." The current proposals for a phased Link Road contravene these policy statements.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

205 Object

Respondent: Mrs Margaret Campbell [148]

Summary:

I object to the Garden Community being situated as an expansion of Colchester City and too close to existing towns.
I object to the use of land between A133 and Wivenhoe which will cause light pollution.
I object to any reduction of vehicle lanes and green areas on the A133 for the Rapid Transport System.
I object to the 1st phase of building not including the link road between the A133 and the A120.
I object to the overstretched facilities in Wivenhoe being used by garden community residents if their new facilities have yet to be built.

Change suggested by respondent:

1. Curb the expansion of the University. Surely in the future there will be less residential and more online learning.
2. Protect the green buffers between communities.
3. Re-route the Rapid Transport System across the A133 at the Knowledge Gateway junction and on to the existing bus routes and the Hythe Railway Station.
4. Build the link road between the A133 and the A120 in the 1st phase of building the Garden Community.
5. New facilities must be built in the 1st phase of building the Garden Community.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

204 Object

Respondent: Liberal Democrats Colchester (Mrs michelle burrows, Local Cit Councillor) [151]

Summary:

Without the "Link Road" completed, it fails the GC principles and impacts with great harm on existing communities and the local road network.

Change suggested by respondent:

This 'Policies Map' includes a clear boundary being the 'A120-A133 Link Road'. In the Garden Communities principle, the development should be infrastructure-led and not cause demonstrable impact on the existing communities. However, the 'A120-A133 Link Road' is no longer a 'Link Road' if it is not to be built out before the development begins.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

253 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Policy not fully 'justified' as Part B of the policy (page 22) omits reference to key social infrastructure in the form of emergency services (incorporating ambulance, police & firefighting facilities).

Change suggested by respondent:

Include reference to all the emergency services in the text of Part B, paragraph 7 of the policy referable to the South and North Neighbourhoods;

Amended Policy Excerpt to read:
"The councils will work with the University of Essex and other partners as appropriate, to deliver the key infrastructure (health, education, ambulance, police, firefighting and other community uses)"

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

222 Object

Respondent: bill marshall [153]

Summary:

- There will be no Link Road or rail connection.
- Few homes with 'gardens' are planned, instead plans indicate high level high density units, with some 7,500 units on 143ha of land.
- The RTS is reliant upon the HIF, most of which will be spent on CCC transport improvements.
- The Link Road HIF is now inadequate to build the Link Road.
- The GC will be sited on +700ha of good quality agricultural land.
- Large scale light, noise pollution, and wildlife issues will be experienced.
- Roadworks around Clingo Hill will seriously affect local people's lives.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

217 Object

Respondent: Sir Bob Russell [162]

Summary:

- The Link Road must come forward at the outset.
- No new development should take place on Salary Brook Valley.
- No new development should be seen from existing communities of Greenstead and Longridge.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

218 Object

Respondent: Dr & Mrs Roy J Crooks [163]

Summary:

- Planned development is much too large
- Clingoe Hill is congested already
- Green space at Salary Brook has already been developed at the Bromley Road end (Crockleford Hill)
- What happens to the bluebell wood and to the central green reservation and trees on Clingoe Hill (St Andrew's Ave)?
- Colchester is already congested with traffic from major new developments in other directions
- The Hospital is already struggling to cope and has been in and out of special measures
- We understand the local schools are at capacity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

266 Object

Respondent: East Suffolk & North Essex NHS Foundation Trust (ESNEFT) [174]

Agent: Lawson Planning Partnership

Summary:

Healthcare facilities should be included in the vision.

Concerns that Policy 1 does not reflect Part 1 Policy SP6 and Colchester Core Strategy Policy SD3.

Requirement to include references to healthcare facilities when considering phasing at Crockleford Heath.

A request for additional clarification as to what is included within a Health Impact Assessment is sought.

Typo in Part 1 Part K.

Change suggested by respondent:

Amend wording of Vision to include healthcare facilities. Suggested wording:

“The Garden Community will be known for its healthy and happy community. It will have a variety of diverse community spaces, play spaces, great local schools and a network of sport, leisure and health facilities. It will establish long term and participative stewardship of infrastructure from the outset.”

Amend text at Part A (first bullet point) to include reference to include healthcare provision. Suggested wording:

“Delivery of circa 7,500 new homes with a range of shops, jobs, services and community facilities, including education and healthcare provision (see Part B below).”

Amend wording in Part B to include reference to healthcare facilities. Suggested wording:

“Accessibility to services and facilities including health care, utilities infrastructure and the Rapid Transit System will be key to determining the phasing of development in the ‘Crockleford Neighbourhood’.”

Details around the quantitative assessment of impacts on existing and proposed facilities is required. "Appendix 4" should be "Appendix 3".

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

ESNEFT Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t4

274 Object

Respondent: The University Of Essex [181]

Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP

Summary:

University has need for student accommodation on and off campus in line with growth objectives.

University accommodation located in accessible locations within the Southern Neighbourhood is entirely inappropriate, and wholly unacceptable to the University. This location may be appropriate for private sector developing student accommodation for returning students.

University recognises benefit of allocated Sports and Leisure Park. University will play its part, in liaison with the Council and other stakeholders to attract third party providers and operators.

University supportive of objective of allocating employment land, contiguous with the Knowledge Gateway. Concerned that amount of land and location will fail to achieve full potential that could be made to local economy and employment opportunities

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

University Of Essex Submission - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tm
The University of Essex- Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tn
The University of Essex- Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ty
The University of Essex- Appendix 3 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tp

275 Object

Respondent: The University Of Essex [181]

Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP

Summary:

Fails to meet requirements of Policy SP9 of the Section 1 Plan in that it fails to allocate land within the GC, to accommodate the University's expansion, which is at least equivalent in size to the allocation in the former Colchester LDF Site Allocations.

Employment land to the north of the A133 linked to the Knowledge Gateway, should be at least 12ha.

Fails to maximise benefits from continued growth of University and activities linked to the Knowledge Gateway. Inconsistent with Section 1 Policy EC1.

Wivenhoe NP expresses preference for expansion land north of A133 – unacceptable to the University.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

University Of Essex Submission - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tm
The University of Essex- Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tn
The University of Essex- Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ty
The University of Essex- Appendix 3 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tp

276 Object

Respondent: The University Of Essex [181]

Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP

Summary:

Those parts of the policy that relate to the University and Knowledge Gateway have not been positively prepared, are not justified, will not be effective and are not consistent with national policy or the Council's adopted policies.

DPD does not provide full provision for the planned expansion of the University up to the end of the plan period.

University will not develop accommodation for priority student groups, to the north of the A133.

Spatial orientation of employment allocation should be changed, to allow for creation of better links between new employment land and existing Knowledge Gateway and University.

Change suggested by respondent:

Policy and Policy Map should be amended as shown in attachment.

Part F: Sports and Leisure Park and University of Essex Expansion
An appropriate allocation of developable land is allocated on the 'Policies Map' for University Expansion and a new 'Sports and Leisure Park', of which the sports and leisure facilities would be available for use by residents and clubs in the existing community and the proposed Garden Community.

In addition to the developable area, the allocation will also include a strong landscaped edge to the south, adjacent to the 'Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap', protecting the character of the surrounding landscape and creating new habitats for a range of biodiversity. It will connect to the wider network of multifunctional green and blue infrastructure and will provide walking/cycling routes serving the Garden Community and its Neighbourhoods'.

Part G: Knowledge-Based Employment Land

Approximately 12 hectares of land north of the A133, opposite the Knowledge Gateway, is allocated on the 'Policies Map' for knowledge-based employment purposes to maximise the benefits arising from close proximity to the University of Essex and the existing Knowledge Gateway. This would be attractive to securing business investment whilst encouraging the provision of sustainable travel trips via walking and cycling routes either directly across the A133, or via the 'Salary Brook Country Park'. Development will be designed and landscaped to make an efficient use of the land available and to ensure an appropriate transition between built development and the open countryside – particularly towards the 'Salary Brook Country Park'.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

University Of Essex Submission - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tm
The University of Essex- Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tn
The University of Essex- Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ty
The University of Essex- Appendix 3 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tp

FIG. 2 POLICIES MAP

8 Object

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.

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

252 Object

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.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

219 Object

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.

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

44 Object

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

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

251 Support

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

Suggested changes to Key Diagram

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

226 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

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.

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

Attachments:

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

194 Object

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.

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

Attachments: None

GC POLICY 2: NATURE

2 Support

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:

I support the SuDS policy, in particular the policy of resisting the use of impermeable surfaces for driveways. Where possible, the councils should encourage the use of surfaces similar to Grasscrete for communal parking areas, as these offer good water permeability as well as increased green cover which benefits invertebrates.
Enhancements to the Colchester Orbital should pay particular attention to the link from the development site across Clingoe Hill to the Colne, and beyond towards the Distillery Pond. This link, and the link to the Wivenhoe Trail, could benefit from enhancements, and protection from further University development alongside the Colne.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

86 Object

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:

•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.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

9 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Plummer [23]

Summary:

How can the council say " Net Gains in biodiversity and a thriving ecological network will shape the Garden Community ensuring native species thrive". when it is concreting over acres of green belt land?
This land should be protected and allowed to thrive naturally as it is now.

Change suggested by respondent:

The development is ridiculous and will kill our countryside, and it needs to be stopped.
THERE ARE NO NET BIODIVERSITY GAINS! the only way that biodiversity can continue is by not bulldozing the area and covering it in concrete.
Stop the development now.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

29 Object

Respondent: Miss Louise terry [30]

Summary:

There needs to be space for nature to breathe and to help us breathe. Without the fields, the bees, the animals, birds we will just be a country full of concrete and a village of pollution, illness, overworked, no work, no space for appointments kind of village. So please, is there anywhere I can object to this. I am sure my family will also object due to this being a family village.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

122 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water Services Ltd (Ms Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [40]

Summary:

Anglian Water is supportive of the policy requirements for biodiversity net gain which can help provide additional habitat enhancements and climate resilience for the new Garden Community. Part G policy requirements for sustainable drainage systems and green-blue infrastructure are considered to be an essential foundation for good place-making and Anglian Water supports the reference for SuDS to be used in conjunction with water efficiency measures. The multi-functional benefits of SuDS, including rainwater/stormwater harvesting and reuse, means that SuDS have a critical role in not only reducing flood risk but also for climate resilience and sustaining water resources.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

111 Object

Respondent: Mr Shaun Raven [37]

Summary:

The GC and its additional traffic will lead to a severe Impact on air quality in the general area - and both the residents of Elmstead and the GC will suffer for It.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

98 Support

Respondent: Affinity Water (Mrs Hannah Wilson, Environmental Planner) [108]

Summary:

Affinity Water welcomes the reference in Part G to the use of SuDS in conjunction with water efficiency measures. Rainwater reuse can be used effectively for residential and non-residential development and will help reduce the potable water demand.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

120 Object

Respondent: Woodland Trust (Ms Nicole Moses, Campaigner - Woods Under Threat) [122]

Summary:

The Woodland Trust holds concerns regarding the proposed Garden Community Plan as there is potential for detrimental impact and disturbance to numerous areas of ancient woodland. Secondary woodland should also be retained to ensure that ecological networks are maintained and enhanced.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Woodland Trust - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/9

20 Object

Respondent: Kathryn and Timothy Pugh [50]

Summary:

We have been horrified at the destruction of green space that has occurred as more and more dwellings are built. Our main concern until last year was the devastating loss of wildlife habitats that we already know are under severe threat. Now, with increasingly uncertain international affairs Impacting our food prices (and longer term security), surely farmland should be afforded extra protection to bolster our means of food production here in the UK. To build these 7,000 homes on green space while proudly promoting a "new" Country Park is self-congratulatory and In our opinion hypocritical. Yes, protect Salary Brook; yes, protect Churn Wood but go further: protect the fields, hedges, trees and ditches that provide homes to Important flora and fauna.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

30 Object

Respondent: Gemma Robinson [54]

Summary:

Perhaps step away from your office and sit in your garden and see how lovely it is and then the council and developers saying "we are building a 'community ' of over 27,000 people, killing wild life and an A road that will create a lot of noise air pollution and disturbance and lots more and its only 1/2 mile away from your home!" How would that make you feel?. Please do not ruin this county any more that you already have.
Its heartbreaking to think this will happen and ruin people's lives and health that already live nearby.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

35 Object

Respondent: James Chable [55]

Summary:

from a personal point of view I am not overly concerned that the Elmstead country side is being buried in bricks and concrete by the time it is complete me like a lot of other residents would have moved away to somewhere that developers can't make their millions in profits without putting the residents before profits. is always the best policy so be more transparent on how building 7500 houses actually helps a community without including infrastructure. Not to mention additional air pollution in such a tight area

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

223 Object

Respondent: Natural England (Ms Tessa Lambert, Lead Adviser- Sustainable Development) [167]

Summary:

Pleased proposed GC Policy 2: Nature specifically requires proposals to accord with NE SANG guidance. However, no information provided in DPD (or supporting documents) on overall size of Garden Community land take, size of likely developable area or amount of land that will be identified as Green Infrastructure. Without this information, NE unable to establish whether SANG guidance can be met site wide and whether the policy requirement is deliverable in practise. Based on 7,500 dwellings, SANG provision would amount to around 145 ha of suitable natural greenspace.

Reference to need for wintering bird surveys (HRA/AA reference 4.8.7) only features in “justification” section of GC Policy 2: Natural and not in wording of this policy or any other policies in DPD. Policy 2 should be made more explicit.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

224 Object

Respondent: Natural England (Ms Tessa Lambert, Lead Adviser- Sustainable Development) [167]

Summary:

The HRA/AA is specific about the need for traffic modelling to be undertaken to assess whether any mitigation for traffic-related impacts will be necessary (4.9.12).

It would be reasonable for the AA to consider in more detail the specific circumstances at the relevant European Site to establish whether mitigation is required as a consequence of the proposed development (alone or in combination)

It is unfortunate that the air quality monitoring information and traffic modelling are not yet available. The mitigation identified does not provide mitigation per se.

NE advise that screening for air quality impacts should be revisited once there is traffic modelling information available to confirm which European Sites merit consideration when the DPD is considered alone and in combination.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

41 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carolyn Mason [64]

Summary:

Crockleford has already been identified as having special characteristics within an agricultural/historical setting. It will be destroyed by the proposed 1000/1200 houses. Extend public access to a larger country park covering the whole of Crockleford, retaining some land for local food production. This is some of the best growing land in the country. The landscape and rural nature will simply not be replaced by any amount of biodiversity net gain! It already exists! Think creatively about how food can be grown locally by local people and use the land already there. Don't cover it in dense housing development.

Change suggested by respondent:

There has already been land irreversably lost along Salary Brook to unsustainable large housing development. Land that was once part of the ancient valley of Salary Brook and access by all to enjoy the wildlife and flora. This should be compensated for by committing to extending the country park further. Extend the size of the country park into Crockleford.
The Garden Community should mazimise the amount of land provided for local food production around Crockleford. This is top quality land that is at risk of being lost forever, at a time of climate crisis, when our country should be looking at safe and sustainable food production. Innovative ways could be developed to provide sustainable food sources for local people that could also provide local employment opportunities.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

150 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

The area proposed is already an area that supports an abundance of wildlife. It is impossible to say that by building thousands of houses, roads and associated buildings that bring considerable pollution, by simply building green areas and pathways you are adding to the sustainability of wildlife, sustainability is already here the way nature intended. This area already provides walks, horse riding and cycling facilities to many. Adding thousands of homes, hundreds of cars etc is unsustainable.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drastically reduced area of development, larger buffers to existing communities with no access on the already small country lanes.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

47 Object

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Summary:

Officers Summary:Elmstead has many elderly residents who have lived here for many years, its a beautiful picturess village when entering, the drive from Colchester is lovely and green why do you feel you need to change this???

Elmstead and surrounding villages should be left alone and kept how they have been over centuries these developments cause upset and heart ache to local people who have seen the changes over the years loss of wildlife and woodland. This has been a major worry with all the new homes being built everywhere the only thought is about money and no consideration for local people and their families this is a huge concern as I believe the residents should have their say and this should be listened too. The noise and dust is not acceptable for residents to have to live with.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

67 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr Roy Warren, Planning Manager) [90]

Summary:

The policy is supported for various reasons listed in the full comments.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

132 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

I doubt that the new Country Park at Salary Brook and provision of Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) will have significant impact on reducing trips to the Essex coast. The environments are different and individuals need to have a wide range of leisure and recreational activities to maintain optimum physical and mental health. Focus should be on sustainable transport and safe cycling routes to enable visits to local places of interest, e.g. Tenpenny Hill on the B1027. Other Tendring initiatives such as the new Beach Hut Strategy are promoting visits to the coast.

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove the sentence "This will reduce the amount of day-to-day recreational trips to the sensitive Essex coast."

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

236 Object

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

Summary:

Ecology audit bases on desktop surveys and has limitations.
BNG metric fundamentlly flawed.
Restricted access to land for consulting ecologists.
BNG metric measures habit loss as messaure of what is to be replaced. Does not consider way habitat may be degrated or materially changed as a result of development.
Part B – will not prevent additional trips to the coast
Part E – no buffer to East of country park where screening and noise mtigation is more relevant
Part F – No suggestion these facilites go in ether Elmstead or Wivenhoe green buffer.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

160 Object

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

It seems unlikely that 10% Biodiversity Net Gain can be achieved on site. We need to see the DEFRA Metric prepared by a credible expert in the evidence base.

Change suggested by respondent:

The DEFRA Metric should be prepared and included in the Evidence base
The viability appraisal will need to be changed if offsite mitigation is needed

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

105 Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:

ECC supports the vision and policy. The Draft Plan has integrated multifunctional green infrastructure / natural environment / green spaces throughout, and it aligns with the Essex Green Infrastructure Principles and Standards, 2022. To strengthen the Draft Plan, applicants should have regard to the use of the Essex Green Infrastructure Standards, 2022 published in the Essex Design Guide in order to facilitate securing multifunctional green infrastructure. The standards have been supported and endorsed by Natural England, were prepared in consultation with all Essex local authorities (including Colchester City and Tendring District councils), and align with the National Green Infrastructure Framework.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

106 Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:

Part B (Page 39). Green roofs are refenced twice in this section – in the second and fourth lines i.e., “green walls and roofs” and then “green roofs”. It is recommended that the second reference to “green roofs” is deleted and replaced with “dual purpose street furniture”. The design of street furniture and bin stores can add character to the landscape, reduce clutter, and benefit biodiversity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

107 Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:

It is welcomed that the overall policy wording for GC Policy 2 has been strengthened from the Regulation 18 Draft Plan (Spring 2022), demonstrating the commitment for the protection and provision of green infrastructure throughout the Garden Community. However, a further change is recommended to strengthen the policy.

Replace "should" with "will need to" in the last sentence of GC Policy 2: Part E (page 41):

“Areas for planting or regeneration will need to be set out and agreed in the appropriate landscape and green-blue infrastructure strategies and management plans.”

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

227 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

Summary:

Latimer is supportive of the GC Policy 2 approach to 'Nature' overall and is aligned to the vision that the outdoor and natural environment of the Garden Community will be its biggest asset. To achieve this, some amendments are proposed in this section to ensure a future masterplan, informed by the DPD can deliver all the required ambitions and supporting infrastructure.

Change suggested by respondent:

Clarity in GC Policy 2 'Nature' regarding which Green Infrastructure features the Council would and would not accept as contributing to Biodiversity Net Gain ('BNG') and how 'stacking' could be demonstrated.
Amendments suggested to Part D and supporting policy justification.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

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

209 Object

Respondent: Mr David Ward [134]

Summary:

Please take the opportunity to think totally differently about residential and urban planting.

Change suggested by respondent:

Consider alternative urban planting where appropriate.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Chattowood one year from planting.jpg - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/s4

174 Object

Respondent: Ardleigh Parish Council (Ms Rachel Fletcher, Parish Clerk) [143]

Summary:

- We welcome the commitments and intent, but want to see more definition of green corridors, and recognition of the negative impact of the Bellway development on Bromley Road and adjacent to Salary Brook and compensation by extending the Country park by an equivalent space.
- Consideration should be given to local food production.

See attached document (submitted in Land uses and Spatial Approach section)

Change suggested by respondent:

We would ask that the equivalent green space, permanently lost by the recent 145 dwellings off Bromley Road (within the original development area), should be compensated for by adding to the green spaces within the Country Park. Also, that further development, along Bromley Road should be firmly resisted. (current appeal for 14 homes with Planning Inspectorate APP/P1560/W/22/3313107)

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

270 Object

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

Summary:

Introduction
- Garden community site isn't natural, it's intensely farmed. Truly natural areas are very few.
- New homes will not contribute to nature recovery.
- Policy is unrealistically optimistic and will be ineffective in practice.
- Natural preservation and effective development are in direct contrast to each other.
- Only viable form of carbon capture for the GC is vegetation, and the site already does this without development. Any meaningful carbon capture would rely on yet to be invented technology.
- Concerned about misleading discrepancies between illustrative plans and policies map.

Policy intro
- Elmstead church will be harmed by proposals.

Part A
- Using Salary Brook as a SANG will harm the native habitat here.

Part B
- Development will take away natural and historic environment, not celebrate it.

Part C
- Policy wording is not robust enough.
- Information for new residents isn't enough to protect sensitive sites.

Part D
- Delivering BNG on site too resource intensive.

Part E
- Farming landscape isn't conducive to planning a settlement.
- Language isn't precise enough.

Part F
- Policy is commendable but insufficient evidence is presented to support using so much land without compromising other land uses.
- Allotments are not acceptable within green gaps.

Part G
- Disagree with evidence base around groundwater conditions and the suitability of SuDS.

Part H
- Link road mitigation needs more certainty.

Part I
- 30-year commitment for BNG isn't long enough for such a long term scheme.

Justification
- Concerned about public being excluded from natural spaces to protect biodiversity.

Change suggested by respondent:

Part A
- Alternative approach to SANG required that won't harm Salary Brook

Part B
- Remove reference to celebrating?

Part C
- More robust language is needed to be effective in retaining habitats
- A scheme to buffer established woodland is needed (particularly Churn, Thousand Acre, and Home Woods.
- A strategy to limit access to the public to the most sensitive sites should be included.

Part D
- BNG should be secured off-site to ensure efficient use of resources.
- Turnip Lodge Lane should be offered greater protection.

Part E
- The policy should be more precise with regards to which hedgerows and trees should be retained, and those should be given additional protection and buffer zones.
- Strategic policy is needed to instate tree belt planting before development begins, and to maintain and reinforce the landscape.

Part F
-

Part G
-

Part H
- A detailed comprehensive approach to mitigation around the northern part of the Link Road is needed.

Part I
- A further commitment is needed to ensure custodianship of BNG responsibilities indefinitely.
- Further work needed to understand the extent of drainage requirements for the site, to ensure it is viable.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t9

269 Object

Respondent: Dr Chris Gibson [177]

Summary:

There is no certainty that the proposed mitigation measures will be successful in sufficiently reducing impacts on Habitats Regulations sites. The appropriate legal test is that the competent authority must be able to ASCERTAIN that the plan, with mitigation, will not have adverse effects upon the Habitats Regulations site.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t5

GC POLICY 3: PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES

3 Support

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:

I note that a minimum of 30% affordable housing is to be provided, but what proportion of social housing will be provided? A significant number of council/housing association homes must be included in this scheme, interspersed across the whole site to ensure the whole development is socially integrated.
Student accommodation should confined to the southern part of the site, with strict planning policies in place to prevent large numbers of family homes in the garden community being converted to student homes later, as has happened in Greenstead and other parts of East Colchester in recent years.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

87 Object

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:

• 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.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

237 Object

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

Summary:

Development south of the A133 adjacent to the historic park will lead to harm to park and setting of Wivenhoe.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

16 Support

Respondent: Mr Bryan Thomas [38]

Summary:

- There must be inspirational design to create a community.
- New homes must be exciting and stimulating places to live in and should incorporate peoples' own lifestyles.
- A building development is incomplete until it has a planted and thriving landscape.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

215 Object

Respondent: Historic England (Mr Andrew Marsh, Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Planning Group) [129]

Summary:

As a general comment, Historic England welcomes emerging plan and work undertaken to date. Whilst we consider many aspects of the DPD to be sound, we have identified some issues which do compromise the overall soundness of the plan. In particular we remain concerned regarding the timescales for some of the technical evidence needed to inform this Plan. Without this information the Plan is not effective in protecting and enhancing the historic environment and is therefore not sound.'

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Historic Engalnd - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/s7

168 Support

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:

Need to ensure that the planning permission has sufficient clout to ensure the intentions set out in this section are delivered.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

151 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

People will not use the transit systems or cycle to work, how do you get three children to school on a bike! How do you get to work if the transit system or bus does not follow your route, what if you work on the outskirts of town, or Ipswich, London, Cambridge etc. the transit system won't help you there. The transit system will have to follow an already congested area and by diminishing facilities on the roads for cars for a bus Lane will only add more congestion for residents, a foolish and unworkable idea.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drastically reduced and a realistic solution to the problem, building this massive development, basically a new town on the outskirts of a Roman Town, built on a hill with little infrastructure to adapt successfully is foolhardy at best

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

48 Object

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Summary:

Why do you have to join Tendering with Colchester?? Making Greenstaed part of the village?? Greenstead has a very high crime rate this will spread further and further into the suburbs. Causing run down parts of the area bringing the wrong type of people into such a well-loved area.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

68 Object

Respondent: Sport England (Mr Roy Warren, Planning Manager) [90]

Summary:

The policy is supported for various reasons listed in the full comments. However, it is requested that part I of the policy (or the policy justification) is amended to explain how achieving Active Design principles should be considered by developers in practice.

Change suggested by respondent:

It is requested that Part I of the policy (or the policy justification) is amended to explain how Active Design can be achieved by developers in practice. For example, Active Design criteria have been incorporated into the new Health Impact Assessment guidance prepared by the EPOA so therefore Active Design could be assessed as part of a HIA. Alternatively, a Design and Access Statement or a specific Active Design assessment could assess how Active Design opportunities have been considered through completing the checklist in the Active Design guidance.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

83 Object

Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

Summary:

The statements here are so general, they're meaningless. For example: "Well-designed and integrated public realm with high quality landscape design, street furniture and other distinctive features that help to create a sense of place; [...]" What exactly does this mean for THIS particular community? Does this 'public realm', for example, include designated places of worship (for different faith groups)?

Change suggested by respondent:

I would like to see a lot more concrete detail of what is being proposed, how this will be financed and built, what the time frames are and what planning contingencies are in place should the financial situation change. Not another HS2-type white elephant... I really don't want to be pessimistic and I do with the project well, but, as a continental European, I have yet to see in this country an example of community-focused rather than (commercial) developer-focused development.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

162 Object

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

Policy GC3: Buildings, Places and Character
Naming: the Garden Community urgently needs a name if it is to have its own recognisable identity. Scarcely anyone has heard about Colchester's biggest development and TCBGC is a mouthful to explain on the doorstep. I suggest that a shortlist be prepared and put out to consultation with the public.

Design requirements: there has been no proper consideration of the high costs created by the regulations in GC3. The financial appraisal adds 10% to the build cost to allow for "Part L&F" which costs the project £94m and contributes to the financial viability problem.

Change suggested by respondent:

More work is needed to identify the compromises needed to make the plan deliverable. The cost of compliance with the heavy regulatory burden needs to be considered and more detail is needed on the 10% addition to build cost.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

108 Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:

GC Policy 3, Part B (page 54). For clarity and consistency with other reference in the Draft Plan, it recommended that reference is added to the “multifunctionality” of green infrastructure.

Change the third bullet in GC Policy 3: Part B (page 54) to read as follows:

“Provide for a network of integrated multifunctional green and blue infrastructure features.”

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

228 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

Summary:

Latimer is supportive of the approach to GC Policy 3 ‘Place Shaping Principles’ overall and broadly. However, Latimer requests greater flexibility to be added to some of the wording and also provides some comments on the historic environment to ensure the approach is consistent with national planning policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

Changes to wording of Parts B, C, D, E and H. See attached document.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

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

137 Support

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Summary:

In the absence of a church building, I would ask that consideration is given to how community spaces and buildings are suitable and available for faith groups to meet. Consideration also needs to be given to burial spaces alongside spaces where ashes may be interred or scattered - quiet spaces where residents may go to mourn.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

210 Object

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Summary:

In a fairy tale, this project is a perfect world. But in the real world it will be a nightmare.. Nothing is defined at all. If built wrongly they will be 3 different neighbourhoods. Money will change what is planned, as they will be cutting corners to save money, Nothing has been refined, nothing has really been planned. It is left to the developers who do not care for the damages they cause, for the errors they make. It is left to the local people to deal with. Everything is general, so open to be abused by the developers.

Change suggested by respondent:

To create this project where it truly belongs to. It is urban, it is modern, it is supposed to have everything at hand. Therefore why pushing it in a rural community, why letting the developers free to toy with us? They haven't thought of places of worship, of hospitals, of police station, of fire station, of ambulance station, of disposal of rubbish, of pubs, of cinema... This project is a pie in the sky waiting to prove its true worth of blot on the landscape. A building development is incomplete until it has a proper /suitable infrastructure, a planted and thriving landscape.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

163 Support

Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Summary:

I broadly support this aspect of the Plan providing clear thought is given to the design of the new community and it is not allowed to 'drift' into bland structures, with limited open space, that offer little to enhance the development. If, as is stated, it adopts a 'landscape led approach' that genuinely allows for residents to have access to amenity space, and that protects the existing environment, the Plan will be positive.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

181 Object

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

Summary:

- Question the use of the word beautiful in official planning policy.
Intro
- Respecting existing character should not be secondary to creating unique/distinctive neighbourhoods.
Part B
- Concern that re-prioritising parking will be detrimental in the mid-term.
Part C
- Design quality requirements is too brief and ambiguous.
Part D
- Street lighting should be directional to avoid light pollution.
- Designing out crime in GC will push crime into Elmstead.
Part G
- High housing density in conflict with adequate private amenity space.
Part H
- Impact of employment area will harm setting of Elmstead church.
- Non-listed heritage assets need extra protection.
Part I
- Heritage assets should be within an expanded Strategic Green Gap.
- Need further explanation around GC being ‘self sufficient’
Justification
- HIA is insufficient.

Change suggested by respondent:

Intro
-
Part B
- Less emphasis on de-prioritising parking.
Part C
- Greater clarity required regarding design quality – e.g. how many trees are required for a 'tree-lined street'.
- Need an early, innovative approach to a centralised, efficient waste solution scheme.
Part D
- Additional wording to require directional street lighting.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t6

GC POLICY 4: MEETING HOUSING NEEDS

89 Object

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:

• 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.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

59 Object

Respondent: Ms Jean McNeil [82]

Summary:

No social housing. Affordable housing is at present not affordable for people on lower incomes.

Change suggested by respondent:

A percentage of social housing and housing for rent.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

239 Object

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

Summary:

No mention of affordable home provision to include split fo 80% affordable rent and 20% help to buy schemes. It needs to comply with CCC specifc planning document on this matter. No scope for conditions to change to reflect updated evidence.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

114 Object

Respondent: Mr Shaun Raven [37]

Summary:

- None of these homes will be in the reach of the average community buyers as they'll be priced too high, so most of the buyers will be either private landlords or people from outside the community where wages are higher. Guess what, the population expands, rather than relocates.

- By the way - Garden Community? Are you serious? This is going to be a high-density housing estate, poorly designed and poorly executed. Whoever the planners/designers/authorisers are, they obviously will not be living there - if they were, it would not even be considered.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

125 Support

Respondent: Miss Mary Dale [132]

Summary:

I hope that those responsible for this development will make sure it is majority affordable homes, with access to green spaces which create biodiversity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

138 Support

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Summary:

Very important that affordable housing ambitions are met and the need locally, particularly for lost cost rental properties, is met.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

26 Object

Respondent: James Chable [55]

Summary:

I am sending my comments on garden communities, though I don't believe they will be heard.

I agree that new housing helps, however 7,500 come on!! Garden community has started building these houses in Elmstead Market prices ranging from £350,000 to £500,000 anyone with any common sense knows this is out of middle class price range, oh but there are some social houses incorporated in the build, I'm guessing 3 per cent.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

33 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Summary:

This project has been badly thought up it does not help normal people with housing ,just greedy builders who are jumping on the band wagon to build houses that the majority cannot afford.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

152 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

As previously mentioned this colossal new town needs further consideration. I appreciate the need for new housing, but realistically without concrete evidence to support the sustainability of this project it should be disbanded. There is no point in building thousands of homes with the 'promise' of schools, doctors etc. we all know that recruitment in these professions are limited at best. There is no strong evidence to state that these vacancies would be filled on such a humongous scale. We would then have a community with no facilities necessary for sustainable living.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drastically reduced and a more realistic approach is needed.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

79 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Summary:

Affordable Housing Phasing: The public should have a definitive statement stipulating that the 30% affordable housing rule should apply at all stages of the development. Planning permission stage, housing starts and housing occupation. Otherwise the developers would use an "Affordable Housing Phasing Strategy" to justify the late delivery, or diminished quantity of affordable housing.
Accordingly, all 'Affordable Housing' should be first offered to locally living residents affected by the development; followed by Front line / Blue Light workers.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan is too vague and has not addressed issues raised by groups and individual members of the public.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Consultation document Garden Village.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/4

95 Object

Respondent: Mrs Wendy Lupton [103]

Summary:

7500 homes is way to many! The roads around this area are far too busy as it is. This area is beautiful and will just be spoilt. Greedy builders charging extortionate prices and way out of reach for many. This will also create a lot of disruption to the surrounding villages. Please stop spoiling our countryside!

Change suggested by respondent:

Just scrap it! There are a lot of houses in this region that are not selling so why build more!!

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

198 Object

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

The current evidence suggests that 30% social housing is unlikely to be achievable without compromises elsewhere. See my appendix 2.

A further MOU between Tendring and Colchester is needed to agree an equal split of housing numbers, nomination rights and business rates in perpetuity.

Change suggested by respondent:

A phase 1 appraisal is needed to show how the plan can be delivered over the next 10 years, and to identify any compromises needed and resultant changes to the plan.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Appendix 2 - Viability.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/f
Appendix 7.1 - The master developer business model - Urban & Civic.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/g
Appendix 7.2 - Welborne Viability Review - Edited.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/h

211 Object

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Summary:

The density is not proportionate for the area and the desire to build multi storey buildings is in disaccord with the local design of the Parish. In my opinion, either they have not told us the truth or they have under researched and therefore under estimated the project and what it means

Change suggested by respondent:

Find a true place for such a project that size. Not build it in a countryside using fields grade 1 and destroying so many assets of the community. (ancient hedgerows, woodland, trees, a hamlet that is a natural place of beauty, protected lane, a grove, fauna and flora living in this area). Replacing it by a system that will need years to prove its effectiveness when we have a fully integrated and functional ecosystem in place is pure folly in my opinion.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

182 Object

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

Summary:

Part D
- Repeats concerns around density and viability.

Part E
- Self-build should be provided elsewhere in the GC where there won't be such stringent design code requirements.

Part H
- Concerned about 2,000 units of student accommodation in addition to 7,500 homes.

Justification
- High density is not justified other than by figures carried forward from earlier stages.

Change suggested by respondent:

Please see Elmstead Parish Council official response submission document submitted to TCB Garden Community at tcbgardencommunity@colchester.gov.uk.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t7

277 Object

Respondent: The University Of Essex [181]

Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP

Summary:

Councils not in the best position to determine either number or location of additional student bedrooms required to facilitate University's growth.

Strategy set out in DPD would significantly alter University's character, ethos and culture in a manner which is unacceptable to the University.

Will not develop its own accommodation north of A133 in South Neighbourhoods. Private sector student accommodation for returning students may be acceptable in this location. Developing majority of student housing in South Neighbourhood would overwhelm communities living there. Policy should be amended as shown in attachment.

Change suggested by respondent:

Part H Student Accommodation

The University of Essex has long term plans to expand student numbers and to extend its accommodation provision. Accommodation for students in their first year of study and other priority groups will be provided on land identified for University Expansion within the Proposals Map. Other student accommodation will be encouraged in accessible locations within the 'South Neighbourhood' where it would have good sustainable links to the University of Essex and where it will contribute to a mixed and diverse community. The size and specification of any student accommodation outside of the expanded Campus will be determined through the Housing Strategy (see Part B) and will be informed by evidence held by the Councils in partnership with the University of Essex.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

University Of Essex Submission - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tm
The University of Essex- Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tn
The University of Essex- Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ty
The University of Essex- Appendix 3 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tp

POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT

4 Support

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:

The policy mentions that a hotel could be permitted on the A120 business park, but not on the southern employment site, but for various reasons I believe this should be the other way round.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

90 Object

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:

• 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.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

57 Object

Respondent: Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

Summary:

Without a link to the A120 it is unlikely there would be demand for the northern business park.
It is not clear what the merit is of stringing the employment development along the north side of the A133 rather than focussing on land opposite the current Knowledge Gateway.

Change suggested by respondent:

The Knowledge based employment area should be to the south west of the site.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

240 Object

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

Summary:

Economic and Employment Study concluded that business park with direct access to A120 was a very strong offer whereas the knowledge gateway provision was a more long term opportunity. However, deliverability of link road bring into question as to whether the project can now live up to its one job per household expectation

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

42 Support

Respondent: Mrs Carolyn Mason [64]

Summary:

When thinking about local jobs consider local food production. Crockleford, rather than becoming another housing development, instead should be considered for food production, as well as providing public access to an extended country park. The land is top quality agricultural/horticultural land and has historically been a fruit growing area. Locally, there are vegetables, top and soft fruit, salad and vineyards grown commercially. Consider local cooperatives, employing local people that could provide sustainable, local food for the Garden Community.
Crockelford has special characteristics developed over centuries around horticulture and agriculture that should be sustained and not destroyed.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

153 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

In light of the economic climate we are facing where people are struggling to pay mortgages, companies are struggling to provide employees with salaries to compensate the increased cost of living, how many firms are realistically able to set up new businesses providing people with competitive salaries to purchase homes on such an enormous scale. Where are the teachers, dentists, doctors, and the already over stretched community care going to miraculously appear from? I believe there is a very real prospect, a serious prospect that thousands of homes are going to be massively under supported in vital areas.

Change suggested by respondent:

A more realistic smaller approach

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

51 Object

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Summary:

An industrial site placed next a village church that has been there since the 18th would completely change the beauty of this church that looks out into the most beautiful countryside of all green.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

73 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

Summary:

'The aim of achieving a minimum of one job per household, either close to home or within a sustainable commuting distance'. An aim is not a requirement, it is highly unlikely that one person in every household will be employed within the development. Therefore, referring back to my first point that most people will jump in their cars to get to work rather than use public transport.

Change suggested by respondent:

Again, less housing. Colchester and the surrounding area cannot cope with increased traffic and increased demand for jobs.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

192 Object

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

Policy GC5: Economic Activity and Employment
The business park should be better integrated with the garden community. It is severed from the GC by a road, and is likely to draw in employees using the A120 rather than the GC. Some heavy uses need to be segregated but many of the B1/E uses could be sensibly integrated with the housing.

Change suggested by respondent:

Words should be added to make it clear that B1/E employment uses are permitted within residential areas.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

229 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

Summary:

Latimer is supportive of the approach to this policy in general. However, there will be a need for detailed master planning and need based evidence to inform future planning applications, and suggestions are made to ensure there is flexibility to do so.

Change suggested by respondent:

Greater clarity should be provided with regard to Part A along with amendment to wording to provide flexibility.
Clarity over quantum of employment land specified in Part B to allow greater flexibility and clarity.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

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

212 Object

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Summary:

business park is too close to the church and is a threat to this listed grade 1 building.

Change suggested by respondent:

The business park needs to be built where it is needed in any urban area, but not in a rural community.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

183 Object

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

Summary:

- Higher target of jobs per household is required.

Part A

- Concerned phasing of business accommodation is tied to occupation of housing, but education and healthcare are not.

Part C

- Employment land should be available to public services if necessary in short to mid term.

Justification

- Although employment land must be near A120 link road, it does not have to be East of it.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t8

GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

5 Support

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:

There are pros and cons to providing one large secondary school or to smaller ones. Two smaller schools is more compatible with the aspiration for small, walkable neighbourhoods, and may work better as part of the phased development approach, but one large school could benefit from better facilities and provide better value for money for taxpayers.
Whichever approach is taken, at least one of the schools should include a sixth form from the very outset, in line with the desire for the garden community to be self-sufficient (and because Colchester Sixth Form College is running out of space to expand).

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

91 Object

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:

• 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.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

28 Object

Respondent: Miss Louise terry [30]

Summary:

I have just received a leaflet through the door in regards to the garden community.

I am new to the area but have been coming here since I was a baby due to family living here for over 30 years. {REDACTED}

I am for developments in bigger areas but am angry that they are building in a peaceful area. I moved here to be away from crime, over crowding, and built up areas. I've lived in both types of areas and I prefer the village life. To know that this is happening makes me regret buying our first home in this lovely village.
The hospital is under so much pressure and crowded with patients and to build more homes will make that worse, especially when they have {REDACTED} down halstead hospital.

It's hard to get a GP appointment and dentist here. Worried about school places being available.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

116 Object

Respondent: Mrs Helen Byrne [32]

Summary:

- The new houses would place increased pressure on existing schools in Elmstead Market. New schools need to be built first.
- There is a lack of existing healthcare facilities, bringing more people in to the area without purpose built facilities will make this worse.

Change suggested by respondent:

- New primary school(s) to be built prior to homes being occupied.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

58 Object

Respondent: Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

Summary:

Greater clarity is needed about the ownership of community assets and ultimate financial responsibility for these.

Change suggested by respondent:

More detail is required on ownership and maintenance responsibilities for community assets.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

60 Object

Respondent: Ms Jean McNeil [82]

Summary:

The social infrastructure will only become operative when a certain number of dwellings has been built. How long before the garden community becomes a community?

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan needs to guarantee that this will happen as soon as possible, a time scale determined, and suitable services provided for residents in the mean time.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

69 Object

Respondent: Sport England (Mr Roy Warren, Planning Manager) [90]

Summary:

The policy is broadly supported for the reasons set out in the full comments. However, it is requested that the policy is reviewed to address these points:
- The need to consider the planning implications of shared use of sports facilities on school sites;
- To set out the minimum sports facility requirements that should be provide for
- To acknowledge the role of the University's sports facilities in meeting the needs of the development
- To ensure that the Healthy Living and Play Strategy is informed by the evidence base.
- To secure community use of the school facilities

Change suggested by respondent:

- It is requested that part C expects schools to be designed to encourage health and wellbeing, especially physical activity, by the design and layout of the schools (e.g. storage facilities to support cycling and designing the school grounds to promote informal physical activity as well as providing the conventional sport and play facilities);
- It is requested that part C or D refers to the opportunities to provide community facilities in new schools through the shared use of sports, arts etc facilities and that this should be fully explored as part of the masterplanning. There should also be a requirement for the community use of school facilities to be secured through formal community use agreements.
- It is requested that part D details the expected minimum community sports facility requirements to be provided within the Garden Community
- It is requested that Part D acknowledges the potential role of the University's existing or future sports facilities in meeting the needs of the development
- It is requested that part G clarify that the Healthy Living and Play strategy be informed by the recommendations of the 2022 Colchester and Tendring Open Space Strategy. and be co-ordinated with other relevant strategies for the development such as the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Active Travel Strategy
- It is requested that part G of the policy or the reasoned justification make it clear that the proposed community use of school facilities would be secured in practice through the completion of formal community use agreements secured as part of any planning permission

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

112 Object

Respondent: Mr Shaun Raven [37]

Summary:

If the first wave of building goes ahead at the Elmstead end, what happens to the local community services? Yes, we know that the proposal says there will be new schools, shops and a surgery, but these will not be in place straight away - if at all. Elmstead has one small general shop and a garage shop, and that is it. It has one Surgery which is already stretched, and one primary school - all of which will struggle to cope with an increase of the population, which is already occurring in other areas being developed around Elmstead.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

248 Object

Respondent: Mr TIM BATTS-NEALE [131]

Summary:

- Specific design suggestions should be addressed under this policy or in future design code and outline applications and infrastructure delivery plans.
- Stewardship - Developer contributions to include an integral part TP monitoring as part of set up and running costs.

Change suggested by respondent:

See attachment for suggested wording amendment.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

DPD Submission Version comments All Tim Batts-Neale.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/v

126 Support

Respondent: Miss Mary Dale [132]

Summary:

I hope a frequent and reliable bus service into Colchester and other places in the surrounding area is guaranteed.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

21 Object

Respondent: Kathryn and Timothy Pugh [50]

Summary:

We have read of plans for "at least one new secondary school and at least five primary schools." Well yes, we would expect nothing less for children and young people in our community. Worrying not to have read of any new medical centres which will-be vital to the whole community, especially given the increasing older population.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

24 Object

Respondent: Elizabeth Thompson [53]

Summary:

I strongly disagree with this development for the following reasons.
Elmstead is a small village with minimal Infrastructure.
Elmstead cannot cope with this level of development so close
There is 1 Doctors surgery and 1 primary school
I cannot see any positive benefits in this level of development prior to improvement in the current infrastructure of Elmstead.
My fear is that once the building of these homes are completed rising costs will result in reduced money available and the promised additional infrastructure will be greatly reduced.
I would urge that we stop this happening

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

31 Object

Respondent: James Chable [55]

Summary:

The garden community is a developers paradise for an upper class community, there are 3 estates built around me now without any infrastructure at all, so doctor surgeries none incorporated in the planning schools none incorporated in the planning roads no new roads built to take the ever increasing traffic, the tcb can gloss the website as much as they like but action speak louder than words.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

273 Object

Respondent: Suffolk & North East Essex Integrated Care Board (Mr chris crisell, Estates Strategic Planning Manager) [180]

Summary:

Stress the importance of the need for a robust HIA process. Enables ICB to be flexible to population needs for health and care infrastucure and ensure its fit for purpose and future proof

Timing of infrastructure needs to be discussed in depth – timing, type, value for money and evidence procssed through HIA process.
Need to ensure proposal considers constraints for delivery - capacity existing facilities, workforce recruitment, funding, NHS clinical and service strategies, NHS budilng design apporaches.
Agreed through ICB governance process

Change suggested by respondent:

The current health strategy for the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community is dependent on various factors including capacity in existing neighbouring primary care facilities, workforce recruitment, funding streams, NHS clinical and service strategies and NHS building design approaches. A comprehensive, evidence-based health impact assessment will be carried out engaging with all local health and care partners and local communities to ensure that a robust view of need is assessed. The strategy shall be designed to ensure that health is designed into the TCBGC and that any new infrastructure delivers an integrated service for the population. A consideration on the wider impact of the development on key health stakeholders including Public Health, secondary care, blue light services and others within the local partnership will need to be taken into account and mitigation of any impact appropriately provided.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

NHS-Suffok & North East Essex Integrated Care Board - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tj

54 Object

Respondent: Miss Deborah Jones [62]

Summary:

Where are the doctors surgeries, dentists, community health and social care providers, nurseries/childcare to be located?

Change suggested by respondent:

There does not seem to be any joined-up thinking, or consideration for how the proposed development will impact existing infrastructure and services. Schools are shown on the plan, but where are other necessary care and support services? Healthcare services in the city are already stretched beyond their limit, having thousands more residents without additional infrastructure, established in advance, is dangerous and prejudicial.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

37 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Summary:

Officers summary:The New development has been prepared without thought for infrastructure. We are struggling at the moment to live and get medical treatment as the hospitals and doctors are over whelmed with 5/6 weeks wait for appointments. No thought of how our village can cope, this cannot be allowed to go on without some sensible input and constructive thinking, councillors cannot just do as they please forgetting the people that have paid their taxes. Education will not be available to all children as there are no places for them as no extra schools are being built this again is unacceptable the impact of the population is not possible. Government have no idea what they want regarding more homes no thought about quality of life. It will cause over crowding and no infrastructure to cope with the rise in the populous.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

154 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

Having worked in the local food bank on the huge council estate near to this proposed plan, in my opinion social infrastructure is currently missing already! There is very little support for a huge community literally down the road! I believe it's a very idealistic notion to think there would be enough finances to support this long term. Promises will be made I'm sure, but unless there will be a guaranteed budget for the foreseeable future that is ringfenced, my belief is once built, these houses will be left with very little community facilities.

Change suggested by respondent:

As previously mentioned, drastically reduced plans, and realistic expectations in the current climate and the impact on already local communities.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

50 Object

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Summary:

Officers Summary: 9000 new homes not 7,500 as previously mentioned where on earth are these families going to register with a doctors, dentists??? Schools???? this is a very large number of homes for such a small area is this necessary? Elmstead is a well-loved community with residents having lived here majority of their lives. Money should be put into areas to improve them for example a zebra crossing across the A133 from Affells road to make it safer and easier to access the local school. A speed camara at the start of the village to slow down incoming vehicles that speed through the village there is lots of children in Elmstaed and is a major worry to parents. Resurfacing roads reducing the potholes this list is endless.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

77 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Summary:

Concerned that no infrastructure will be in place during the first stages of the development. There is not enough social, health or education provision initially planned. The report says these views have been taken on board but the consultation document does not address the concerns raised in any depth.

The suggestion that an initial 100+ houses may be required to begin funding the project before any infrastructure begins is alarming and directly in contradiction to the local plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan is too vague and has not addressed issues raised by groups and individual members of the public.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Consultation document Garden Village.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/4

127 Support

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

Regarding Health care provision, I fully support creation of additional services especially GP practice professionals, pharmacists, dentist and buildings. Parsons Heath Medical Practice has been closed to new patients who need to register with a GP for some time as the practice is at full capacity. Local providers will not be able to meet increased demand so it is essential that adequate measures are taken. Expansion of hospital services will also be required to cope with the demands of an increased local population.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

128 Support

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

Provision of Neighbourhood Centres, Community Buildings, Education, Sports and Health are essential from the very beginning and with a national shortage of qualified professionals to provide these services, the facilities need to be carefully designed to both meet the needs of the local population and to be attractive to professionals. 'Infrastructure first' must always apply.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

241 Object

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

Summary:

Healthcare – no mention of physical delivery of facilities and what these would be. Clarification of catchment of primary health care required. Proposals for a doctor's surgery at the university has confirmed there will be no access available for Wivenhoe residents, yet Rowhedge will have access to it.
Stewardship strategy will need to interact and work alongside existing local government arrangements including town and parish councils. Country Park is mostly boundary of Wivenhoe, but no residential units contributing to locally superseived management of it.
Local chronic shortage of allotment spaces and cemetery spaces and more importantly school and doctors spaces. Would new residents of GC have claim on any of these if they lived within a parish boundary?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

84 Object

Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

Summary:

I do wish the project well, but this chapter reads like pie-in-the-sky to me. For example: "Developer contributions will be required to fund the initial set up and running costs, including staff, premises, and equipment costs. This support will need to be provided for a minimum of 10 years, or until such time as stewardship activities are financially self-sustaining, before the occupation of the first home." What exactly does this mean? Who will finance what, and for how long? How are the "stewardship activities" going to become "financially self-sustaining"?

Change suggested by respondent:

I would like to see at least some financial planning included in the plan, esp. in terms of projected costs, who will commit to what, and in what time frame. I would also like to see some concrete scenarios and some contingency planning.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

193 Object

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

I'm concerned that GC Policy 6 is too vague.
• Parts A, B and C are strong and clear, but they need to commit to the phasing in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
• Part D could be more place specific
• Part E (health) needs to be much more specific. We need a plan including timings from the NHS

I fear that health provision will fall far behind population growth, and that surrounding communities will be adversely affected.

Change suggested by respondent:

Part E (health) needs specific targets and commitment from the NHS as well as the developer. The NHS should commit at plan stage - application stage is too late.

The Infrastructure delivery phasing and funding plan (IDPFP) needs to be legally tied in to the DPD. If the IDPFP is to be changed the developer must produce evidence that residents will not be disadvantaged.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

230 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

Summary:

Latimer is supportive overall of the approach in Chapter 7 and the overall approach in GC Policy 6 'Community and Social Infrastructure' with only a few focused amendments suggested.

Change suggested by respondent:

- More clarity is needed on deliverables and timescale expectations in regard to the DPD.
- Flexibility under Part C required to ensure that the number of schools is evidence led, based on need and demographic studies.
- Supporting text should have a recognition that an estate charge will be required and payable by future households.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

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

139 Support

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Summary:

Community infrastructure is so essential into the formation of communities rather than simply a housing development. For this timing - earlier rather than later - is essential. Surrounding communities are already under pressure for school places, GPs etc so these need to be put in place for the new community straight away.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

213 Object

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Summary:

For me it is difficult to understand why it is so important to do this project, when the infrastructure of the existing residents is inadequate and insufficient. It appears that we are second rate citizens, have been muted and do not count at all if it is not paying our taxes and our money not spent where it should be.

Change suggested by respondent:

too many to be put right.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

164 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Summary:

It is essential that there is appropriate infrastructure in place from the outset for the proposed community. Schools, health care, places of worship and community facilities must be provided so that new residents have access to these. There are significant demands upon facilities within Colchester and its surrounding areas that will only be exacerbated if infrastructure is not in place. Local schools are full; health facilities are under pressure; and, community hubs are under-resourced. If the Plan is to reflect need, these areas must be addressed.

Change suggested by respondent:

The provision of education, health and other facilities should be prioritised from the outset. If the community is to be sustainable, people need access to such facilities so that they do not go 'outside' the community in order to access them. If they do, the danger is that this becomes the norm and the new community risks having a 'hollowed out' feel.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

169 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:

Then plan has tackled infrastructure provision within the new community. However it has failed to explain how the increased demands on infrastructure outside the community will be tackled. For example Colchester General Hospital is already tight for space, with insufficient parking space for those arriving by car. Public transport links are slow and not ideal for those who may not be in the best of health.

Change suggested by respondent:

Explain how the impact on the wider infrastructure across Colchester and NE Essex will be mitigated.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

175 Object

Respondent: Ardleigh Parish Council (Ms Rachel Fletcher, Parish Clerk) [143]

Summary:

Stewardship principles, governance and democracy It seems clear that the 'jurisdiction' and boundaries of the existing Parishes will need to change once the developments come to fruition.
We have asked in meetings and consultation events for details of what might be envisioned as far as governance and management of amenities and local democracy is concerned. There is no mention of local democracy in this section of the Plan and policies.

Change suggested by respondent:

We would welcome a firm commitment to actively involving the existing Parish Councils (who after all represent the residents already living in the area) at all stages of discussion about stewardship options and to an appropriate element of democratic/public ownership and management of amenities and assets. Some Crockleford residents have told us that they want to stay in Ardleigh, so, for example, it shouldn't be assumed that an entirely separate governance arrangement for this new hub is the only option.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

184 Object

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

Summary:

Principles
- Concerns that existing communities who steward the land are being excluded from long-term stewardship considerations.
- Governance and future is too uncertain.
- Concerns over consultation process.
- A neighbourhood can only have one 'centre'.

Part C
- Concern that Elmstead Primary School has not engaged in plan making process.
- Concerns around phasing of education provision, and pressure on existing facilities in the short term.
- Additional capacity needed to ease existing pressures.
- 'up to five new primary schools' is imprecise, and a definite link to phasing is required whereas 'at least five new… early years and childcare facilities' is better.
- A single secondary school is more efficient and suitable.

Part E
- Single health hub doesn't accord with 20-minute neighbourhood principle
- Details are imprecise, need greater emphasis on healthcare provision.
- Need provision for other healthcare facilities such as dentists and pharmacies.

Part F
- More robust and conclusive approach to stewardship is required at an early stage.

Part G
- Developers should not be proposing phasing – LPAs should take the lead.
- Assessing need for healthcare provision separately for each proposal is inefficient and can lead to inequality and poor supply.

Change suggested by respondent:

Principles
- An alternative name should be found for groups of services and facilities outside of the neighbourhood 'centre'.

Part C
- More precise wording needed regarding number and phasing of primary schools e.g. "one new primary school for every 1500 new dwellings".
- More detail around phasing of secondary school required.

Part E
- More precise detail around phasing of health provision needed.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

254 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Plan text not fully 'justified' as the paragraph (para.1 page.78) omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read:
"This chapter contains the Council's expectations and policy ensuring the Garden Community is served by community services and facilities of the right type in the right location, including schools and sports facilities; as well as access to health, ambulance, police and firefighting services and how the development will incorporate measures to encourage including, healthy and happy lifestyles."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

255 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Soundness Objection: Policy not fully 'justified' or 'effective' as the policy omits reference to key social infrastructure in the form of emergency services (incorporating ambulance, police & firefighting facilities);

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Include reference to all the emergency services in the text of the policy under a new Part F following on after Part E: Health;

Amended Policy Excerpt to read:
"Part F: Emergency Services
The Garden Community will promote community safety and cohesion by providing for an appropriate level of ambulance, police and firefighting facilities to serve the needs of each neighbourhood and its residents, with the phasing of facilities to be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing & Funding Plan.
Developers should enter into early discussions with the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST), Essex Police and Essex Fire & Rescue to identify the physical and social infrastructure and facilities funding required, along with a strategy for phased implementation."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

256 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as the paragraph (para.1 page.86) omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read (from line 3)
" . . . The Garden Community is an opportunity to explore, with service providers, new ways to provide and deliver the education, health, ambulance, police, firefighting and other community and social infrastructure and facilities needed to support the new community, and the Councils have worked with service providers throughout the production of the Plan."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

257 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as the paragraph (para.2 pafe.86) omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read:
"Community and social infrastructure covers a wide range of facilities, such as health; ambulance; police; firefighting; education; sports; recreation and greenspace; places of worship; community halls; public houses and cultural infrastructure . . "

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

261 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

DPD Ref – Appendix 1. Principles & Objectives: Community & Social Infrastructure subheading 'a Place where its easy to be healthy & happy' (Page 138)
Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as it omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended bullet point 4 to read:
• "Provision of healthcare, ambulance, police, firefighting, leisure, social and community facilities accessible by all modes of transport."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

262 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

DPD Ref – Appendix 3: Planning Application/ Validation Requirements (Page 145)
Soundness Objection: Validation list not fully 'justified' as it omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

After bullet point 22 add a new bullet point 23 to read:
• "Strategy for addressing the requirement for ambulance, police, & firefighting infrastructure & facilities"

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

263 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

DPD Ref – Glossary – reference to Infrastructure (Page 149)
Soundness Objection: the Glossary list not fully 'justified' as it omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested:The subheading 'Infrastructure' to be amended to include reference to ambulance, police & firefighting facilities as follows:
"Infrastructure
Infrastructure means any structure, building, system, facility and/or provision required by an area for its social and/ or economic function and/ or well-being including (but not exclusively): footways, cycleways and highways; public transport; drainage and flood protection; waste recycling facilities; education and childcare; healthcare; ambulance, police, & firefighting facilities . . "

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

267 Object

Respondent: East Suffolk & North Essex NHS Foundation Trust (ESNEFT) [174]

Agent: Lawson Planning Partnership

Summary:

Concerns that the introductory paragraph of supporting text could place reliance on existing healthcare facilities over the plan period.

Concerns that secondary and acute healthcare is not specifically mentioned which does not highlight all healthcare needs.

Concern that the Policy does not fully consider off site facility provision.

Further flexibility is required around when the Health and Wellbeing Hub will be delivered and what it will contain.

Change suggested by respondent:

Amendments to support text to clarify. Suggested wording:

“ensuring the Garden Community is served by community services and facilities of the right type in the right location, including healthcare, schools and sports facilities;’’ Remove text after this point.

Request to include secondary and acute healthcare provision. Suggested wording:

‘’Measures for increasing capacity in, and accessibility to, primary, secondary and acute healthcare – either through new infrastructure or the improvement, reconfiguration, extension, or relocation of existing medical facilities.”

A request is made to clarify the position of offsite provision. Suggested wording:

“The Garden Community will require all developments to provide for the on and off-site infrastructure necessary to support the development and mitigate its impacts. The Garden Community will deliver local community services and facilities …”

Wording changes to allow further flexibility and timings of Hub delivery and mechanism for this. See full representation.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

ESNEFT Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t4

272 Object

Respondent: Suffolk & North East Essex Integrated Care Board (Mr chris crisell, Estates Strategic Planning Manager) [180]

Summary:

Initial high level comments – intention for Statement of Common Ground an TCBGC Working Group established.
Topic Paper provides a strong foundation for what we would want to see within the development
Strongly support inclusion of health impact assessments and stress importance of this being carried out as early as possible. Need for environmental impact assessment to intergrade this into population and health chapter or have stand alone document.
Due to duration of build, single health impact assessment will not be acceptable to address changing health impact

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

NHS-Suffok & North East Essex Integrated Care Board - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tj

GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

6 Support

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:

The design of cycling infrastructure should consider the need to reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.
Provision should be included for A120 access from Bromley Road, either via the Garden Community or via a new junction, to reduce congestion at the busy and complex A133 junctions in East Colchester.
The RTS should form a loop to provide quick access from the Garden Community to the Northern Gateway and Colchester Business Park via the A120.
Long term, Ardleigh train station should be rebuilt to give residents of the Garden Community better access to the rail network than Hythe can provide.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

7 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Plummer [23]

Summary:

The transport system is all pie in the sky, and a complete waste of money. As the new development is out of town most residents will use their own cars.
People do not and will not rely of public bus services as they are far to expensive, unreliable and also people like the comfort of their own vehicles.
Killing wild life and their habitat to build a "rapid transport system" is a disgrace, and i for one don't wish to fund a bus service that will carry about 5 people per bus.

Change suggested by respondent:

The council needs to face facts and accept that people prefer their own vehicles, and a majority WILL NOT CYCLE, or WALK, or catch a bus.
There are far better things money could be spent on rather that waste it on cycle lanes and a rapid transport system that will see more Tumbleweed than cyclists or passengers.
Build a better road system that can cope with the additional traffic, rather than continue to be anti car!

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

10 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Plummer [23]

Summary:

Whoever proposed this development is living in cloud cuckoo land. By definition a road is a place for vehicles it is not a playground. If the council continue with such ridiculous ideas i hope that they are prepared for all of the accidents which will follow.
Roads and streets are for vehicles, parks and playgrounds are for playing, you cannot mix the 2 as you are inviting problems.
You cannot dress up a rapid transport system, It is a bus.
The council can't vet all of the new residents to ensure they don't have cars!

Change suggested by respondent:

I think somebody needs to go and lie down in a dark room, as clearly they have had to much sun, and its sent them slightly insane.

Roads and street by definition are for vehicles and this notion needs to be maintained, the plan needs to change to reflect this. If you encourage people especially younger children you will be putting them at risk.

Roads = Vehicles
Parks and playgrounds = People

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

92 Object

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:

• 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.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

12 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mr Martin Crisp, Bridleways Development Officer) [25]

Summary:

There is no consideration for the equestrian user group in this Plan. The creation of a new Country Park provides opportunity to create new riding routes, but the equestrian user group has been completely ignored which is inequitable. A full response has been provided as have proposals for the incorporation new equestrian friendly routes.

Change suggested by respondent:

We note that the Plan proposes the creation of a new Country Park, (Salary Brook), including land and woodland at and around Salary Brook Local Nature Reserve that connects with a wider network of green corridors and walking/cycleways throughout the garden community. Again, seemingly no thought for equestrians. It is our strong view that consideration should be given to the creation of a new circular bridleway as part of the Country Park planning, extending into adjoining planned green spaces, and that further consideration should be given as to whether said new Bridleways could link with the Restricted Byway 162-21 situated within the radius of the proposed Garden Community.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

13 Object

Respondent: Mr James Biltcliffe [26]

Summary:

I believe that the route to the A120 should be completed before any residential construction works occur. I feel that it would not be satisfactory to allow the additional traffic form the new residential dwellings to be routed via the existing Colchester to Elmstead A133 road.

Change suggested by respondent:

Ensure A120 access is completed and mandated for use before construction of any residential dwellings occur

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

14 Object

Respondent: Mr Timothy Wood [29]

Summary:

1) the new link road to the A120 is ESSENTIAL before ANY houses are built, to avoid Clinghoe Hill becoming Colchester's biggest car park and imprisoning Wivenhoe residents in the village

2) the 'rapid transit' is a complete con and will be an ordinary bus, which no one will use.

3) the 'cycling plans' ignore that (a) the development is on the top of a big hill and so cycling into Colchester will be fine, but not coming back. It also rains a lot and no one will cycle in the rain.

Change suggested by respondent:

The whole mad idea should be scrapped! But if it can't be, the new road and a viable 'rapid transit system' (not a ramshackle ex school bus) MUST be provided BEFORE any houses are built.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

56 Object

Respondent: Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

Summary:

- Concerns raised with regard to the HIF funding and Link Road Phasing. No indication of how many dwellings etc might be built before the completion of the link road nor is there any guarantee that it will be 'practically and financially possible' for it to be funded.
- Insufficient detail with regard to the RTS route, operation and implications for Clingoe Hill.
- Demand for the proposed Park & Choose needs to be justified.
- Further detail is required for the junctions, crossing and roundabouts on the A133. With increased traffic levels the junction layout as shown on the Policies Map must be demonstrated to be workable.

Change suggested by respondent:

The phasing of the link road build out must be discussed. Details of the RTS off site need to be explained and justified. Access for this to the site should not be located at the A133/B1027 junction.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

117 Object

Respondent: Mrs Helen Byrne [32]

Summary:

At present traffic from Elmstead going into Colchester and beyond via the A133 is heavy and there can be significant delays at peak times. The additional traffic caused by the new development would be negative and result in increased wait times to travel into Colchester and beyond. This would have an impact of increasing air pollution and reduce quality of life for residents. The new link road would potentially not be built for a considerable time and the period in the lead up to it's use would be awful for those travelling and those affected by the air
pollution.

Change suggested by respondent:

- Reduction in volume of houses to impact on traffic/air pollution.
- New road must be built early on in development.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

110 Object

Respondent: Mr Shaun Raven [37]

Summary:

- Building 7,500 new homes without the A133-A120 Link Road constructed first will put additional pressure on an already busy network, in particular Clingoe Hill and the Hythe.
- New bus and rail links are unlikely to come to fruition. This will add additional load to the traffic system.
- The reduction in parking spaces in the GC will lead to cars being parked on green areas/pavements. The cars will be there and will be needed.
- Traffic from the industrial parks will also put pressure on the A133 if there is no link road.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

61 Object

Respondent: Ms Jean McNeil [82]

Summary:

Travel into Colchester will result in very much increased congestion in Clinghoe Hill, roundabouts near Tesco, East Street and level crossing.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan needs to show how rapid transit and other vehicles will enter Colchester without putting any more pressure on present entry points.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

143 Object

Respondent: TCBGC Community Liaison Group [104]

Agent: Mrs Manda O'Connell

Summary:

The completed A133-A120 link road is critical to the success of the TCB Garden Community. The TCBGC Community Liaison Group strongly recommend its completion as a matter of priority BEFORE house building commences PLUS radical re-routing of the planned RTS to utilise the link road onto the A120 in an anti-clockwise circular route around and into Colchester, thus avoiding the need for expensive road widening works, saving million of pounds on Clingoe Hill and in central Colchester, and ensuring the TCB Garden Community meets the modal shift and sustainability goals outlined in the DPD and Section 1 Local Plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

The CLG contends that
a) The £21 million ring-fenced for the RTS should be instead put towards completing the link road FIRST, so that it is in place before the first houses are built and
b) the route for the RTS should be drastically changed to a route which does not utilise the A133 Clingoe Hill, already hugely congested, or go through an equally hugely congested central Colchester necessitating millions to widen roads and introduce bus lanes. Instead it should be redrawn to use the route suggested by the CLG and shown in the attached file labelled Alt_RTS_Route. This is already in part dedicated bus routes and will all , once the link road is constructed, be fit for use for a modern RTS system. That suggested route is shown in the attached file. It avoids Clingoe Hill in favour of already dedicated bus routes through Elmstead Road, Capon Road and Boundary Road (used by First Buses, routes S1 and 87), links all the key destinations required including the Northern Gateway and Garden Community Park and Choose, the hospital and North Station, together with a stop at the top of Balkerne Hill to access central Colchester, and the University and Knowledge Gateway. It would operate in a loop in an anti-clockwise direction, utilising roads which are already fit for use for a modern RTS system, thus saving millions of pounds. It would be in place as soon as the link road is constructed in full linking the A133 and the A120, ready for the new residents to adapt to new patterns of travel behaviour without the car, achieving modal shift, because all key destinations as listed above are quick, frequent and accessible via the RTS.

The key stops that the new route would link are as follows, starting from the Park and Choose at the bottom edge of the TCB Garden Community on the A133:
- The Garden Community stops (initially the first (southernmost) developed community)
- The A120 employment park, top right of the Garden Community (providing fast transport to work for Garden Community residents who are employed there)

- Severalls Lane and Colchester Business Park, also an employment hub. Shown on the map as being accessed via the Ipswich Road and Severalls Lane, Colchester Business Park does have a route into and through the Business Park from the A120/A12 junction, which may be preferable and give a smoother curve on the route.
- The Stadium
- Colchester Sports and Leisure Park
- Northern Gateway Park and Ride
- Colchester General Hospital
- Colchester North Station
- Top of Balkerne Hill stop for the town centre (by the old Embassy Suite)
- St Botolphs train station
- Bottom of Hythe Hill (for walking access to Hythe station just over the bridge over the river Colne)
- Start of Elmstead Road (for access to Tesco The Hythe)
- End of Capon Road, on Boundary Road, for access to Essex University's Innovation Centre, Essex Business School and the Knowledge Gateway Science and Business Park
- Back to the start of the loop at the Park and Choose on the junction of the A133.

The link to this Google map is shown below. It allows the user to zoom in, move the map around and view in different ways just as you can with a regular Google map. https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=1jDmOLSmGRF5PHD61n7TSBD5HlZiP__0&usp=sharing

Benefits of this recommended revised approach
The benefits completing the link road in its entirety BEFORE commencement of homes being built together with an RTS that utilises the anti-clockwise route shown are as follows:

1) Using the route proposed, no building work for extra bus lanes etc needs to be done on Clingoe Hill, in either direction, thus avoiding the horrendous congestion that would result therefrom.
2) No expensive road alterations need to be made through central and historic Colchester. The new route would skirt the town centre, with a key stop at the top of Balkerne Hill by the Embassy Rooms to access the centre, and then again at St Botolphs train station.
3) This could potentially pave the way for central Colchester to be pedestrianised or remain as it is, being served by local bus routes.
4) The proposed alternative to Clingoe Hill (Elmstead Road, Capon Road, Boundary Road, B1028/27 back to A133) is already a dedicated bus route (First Buses Routes S1 and 87)
5) Much of the route is already in place and fit for purpose for an RTS (A120, Severalls Lane, Axial Way, Via Urbis, plus Elmstead Road avoiding Clingoe Hill above) thus presenting a huge cost saving.
6) The saved cost of works on Clingoe Hill alone would contribute a large proportion of the monies needed for the completion of the link road.
7) The completed link road would immediately begin to relieve pressure on Clingoe Hill by providing a through route for traffic going to North Station or the hospital or the A12.
8) Because of the immediate fast access via the RTS anticlockwise route to North Station or the A120 employment park in the north west corner of the Garden Community or even Colchester Business Park, or Colchester General Hospital, new Garden Community residents working in London or any of the other locations would very easily adopt this modal shift from the outset. If there is a wait of 5-16 years for the link road to be completed this opportunity will have been lost. Much of the soundness of the TCBGC derives from its having the link road and not having to be dependent upon routes into Colchester, either for employment, schools, hospital care, shopping or travel.
9) It would meet the previous inspection’s criterion for soundness as the link road would be doing as it was intended in siphoning traffic with onward destinations beyond Clingoe Hill off from the A133 and onto the A120 or beyond.
9) The Park and Choose on the Garden Community with the new RTS anti-clockwise route to access these destinations then also becomes a very real possibility from the outset.
10) Already it is painfully difficult to get a parking space in the hospital car park because it is so overloaded and people often have to drive around waiting for someone to leave before they can park. This will only be exacerbated with a larger demographic. However, with a fast RTS system adopting the proposed anti-clockwise route, residents from all

communities east of Colchester can use the Park and Choose on the Garden Community to not only avoid battling with the traffic on A133 Clingoe Hill and beyond but avoid driving to the hospital at all using the RTS with the looping anti-clockwise route proposed by the CLG.

Recommendation
Very much of the strength and soundness of the TCBGC project relies on its provision of self sustainability ie for schools, healthcare, employment and shopping without having to travel outside of the Garden Community either to put added pressure on road infrastructure, or services found in surrounding communities. The RTS route plan shown in the current DPD, based on a link road that does not link, is in direct contradiction of this. As the point of the link road is to reduce traffic going into Colchester and a central tenet of the Garden Community is to be self-contained, why are huge sums being spent to provide an RTS to increase this traffic and access services outside the Garden Community? And this is at the expense of the mitigating link road, and using the very route whose traffic the link road was intended to alleviate. This is also in direct contravention of the key principles of the Garden Community and one of the chief causes of controversy, concern and dismay, expressed from the outset, in local communities.

We would contend that the TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures report commissioned by the Councils and provided by Ringway Jacobs is far too narrow and limited in its outlook and with its RTS proposals and routing is merely providing a very expensive sticking plaster which will not meet demands even 10 years into the future, as the report itself admits: p5 ‘The RTS HIF project is introducing priority measures on the approach to Greenstead roundabout which is expected to operate satisfactorily up to 2033 for RTS vehicles’ but ‘In the potential second phase of investment post 2033, it would be expected that the garden community would be continuing to grow but a general increase in car trips could be threatening RTS reliability and worsening RTS journey times on the route west of Greenstead roundabout, which would work against achieving mode share targets and sustainable travel aims.’

Recommended movement and travel routes must therefore adopt a much broader future-proofed approach to accommodate the transport needs of an additional 17,500 people (2.3 persons living in each of 7,500 homes) on the east of Colchester. This is represented by the proposal outlined here by the CLG in putting the unnecessary sticking plaster monies described above towards completion of the link road as originally intended by the Housing Infrastructure Fund, together with the wider circular and much more economical RTS revised route, shown in the attached file, which will accommodate a thriving community 50 years into the future and beyond, without impinging on or increasing congestion of surrounding road and central Colchester infrastructure. To do anything else is to render the whole of the good work done by the planners in other areas such as Land Uses and Spatial Approach, and the aspirations embodied in both the Section 1 Local Plan and other TCBGC policies hamstrung at best by this crippling and at best wholly inadequate approach.

Note: It is also of some concern that the plan currently proposed is based on a report (TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures) by an organisation (Jacobs part of Ringway Jacobs, who describe themselves thus: 'We design, create and maintain world-class, safe, efficient and environment-friendly highway infrastructure for local authorities') which may stand directly to gain commercially and financially from these very expensive and by their own admission inadequate and time-limited plans. It is also of concern that the proposal actually in real terms detracts from the soundness of and benefit to the TCBGC, by utilising funds which should go towards the full completion of the link road, as well as actually exacerbating harm to surrounding communities.

The CLG assert therefore that it is absolutely vital NOT to delay the completion of the link road – it was deemed to be fundamental to the soundness of the TCB Garden Community by the last inspection and on it hang very many of the Garden Community’s goals and aspirations. To leave it undone is to strike at the very heart of the soundness of the project. We would therefore urge the Inspector to include our proposals – to complete the link road from the outset and to re-route the RTS – as main modifications in their inspection report to transform the DPD from what is otherwise an extremely unsound plan which may even see the vision of the TCBGC dashed entirely, to one that is sound, pragmatic and meets all of its aspirations.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Alt_RTS_Route.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/b
Alt_RTS_Route_inc_Wivenhoe+Elmstead.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/c
CLG Rep Policy 7 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tf

15 Support

Respondent: Mr Bryan Thomas [38]

Summary:

I am very much in favour of the new road linking the area to the A133 as a matter of urgency, not being pushed into the background. This could be such a boon to locals around here. The fact that it would clear jams on Clingoe Hill and divert traffic from the Colchester circuits for those going South or North suggest that Essex Highways and Colchester Borough should be funding it rather than the developers. There have been local pleas that public transport could and should benefit, too.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

189 Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Young [146]

Summary:

I support the alternative proposal submitted by the community liaison group as supplied by email as this portal is not suitable to input the arguments

Change suggested by respondent:

The route of the RTS to enable a saving to be made available to ensure the link road is completed.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Movement and Connections Response 1.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/m

27 Object

Respondent: Elizabeth Thompson [53]

Summary:

There is a lack of road repairs, with a great number of potholes unrepaired. Increase in traffic flow would be detrimental to Elmstead and further damage our roads.
We don't have a dentist, fire station, secondary school or any other health facilities.
Only one small grocery store.
Increased traffic and homes would impact on our minimal street services ie street cleaning, fly tipping road repairs refuse service and bus route
There is also the Environmental Impact on our elderly residents through increased air pollution.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

25 Object

Respondent: Gemma Robinson [54]

Summary:

Why do we need a link road?
Please don't say to reduce traffic when you are building the GC with 9000 homes averaging 27.000 people, not including the Industrial and travellers site and shops.
If this monstrosity was NOT being built we would not need this link road! A village meaning a "rural area" which this will be taken away from our village life! I moved to the countryside meaning "the land and scenery of a rural area" which is now being taken away from us and children of Elmstead. I cannot understand why an unfinished road that is costing £50 Million to build when the whole county/country is in poverty! Just because the council have a "pot" of money that you "need" to use otherwise it goes to another county, is not acceptable!
Distribute the money out to those that need it and change lives for the better! This is disgraceful behaviour from the council!

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

38 Object

Respondent: Miss Deborah Jones [62]

Summary:

Transport links must be improved for all residents in the area, not just those within the proposed development.
Expecting families or working-age residents not to own or use one or more vehicles is unrealistic.
Existing cycle routes in the city are ignored, so how is the very hilly proposed development area going to be any different?
Horse riding is mentioned more than once, where are these horses going to be kept, and who can afford to own one?

Change suggested by respondent:

Please consider how existing villages and towns outside the proposed development will be integrated. Transport links must be improved for all residents, not just those within the proposed development. There does not seem to be any joined-up thinking, or consideration for how the proposed development will impact existing infrastructure and services.

There is not enough employment locally so many people will travel outside the city. It is unrealistic to expect people to only work on their doorstep, and not to own or use a car for travelling distances. If families rely on parents/grandparents for childcare, how will these visitors access the development as they will not necessarily live locally? Expecting visitors to walk up to 20 minutes or use public transport after travelling some distance would be unpopular, impractical, and potentially impossible for some.

There are many cycle routes around the city already, the majority are ignored. The hills around the city are huge, and the proposed development is miles from anywhere. Cycling will not be popular, and is impractical as a sole transport option for many.

Why promote horse-riding as a travel option? Where are all these horses, and who could afford the stabling and upkeep? Maybe a few residents would possibly choose horse-riding as a leisure pursuit, but not as a viable sustainable transport option.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

34 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Summary:

Officers summary:No thought has gone into how our village can manage the volume of traffic when most local people have to travel to get medical treatment shopping and other important essentials to better their lives. The village has already grown to twice its size with new homes.
No thought has gone into our villages, infrastructure for roads crossings and just to maintain quality of life. The increased traffic will cause more accidents and people not being able to access medical help via ambulances the traffic which is going to cause delays. people will die.
Elmstead will become isolated with no way of getting to Colchester for the essentials to maintain a quality of life that we expect.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

155 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

What a wonderful idea that people will walk, cycle to work, school, etc. realistically this will not happen. I feel that this report glosses over the fact that most people have at least two cars, mainly because they need vehicles for work, shopping, school runs etc. to suggest that by merely installing these utopian visions of a green, traffic free, we will ignore the reality that the roads around colchester will be more congested by this development, people will not do their weekly shop by bus, or cycle, the rapid transit system will not cater to the needs of everyone.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drastically reduced and more realistic reports on the negative impacts this will have, as we know there will be many of them.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

46 Object

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Summary:

Officers summary: This would cause huge amounts of traffic in a small village, causing more congestion and pollution. The back log of traffic along the A133 is very busy during rush making the road more dangerous than it already is. I have young children who attend the local school in Elmstead and crossing the A133 can sometimes take 6-7 minutes due to no crossing that has been promised for years. The roads are busy enough without adding more oncoming and outgoing traffic. This will just overpopulate the areas surrounding.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

65 Object

Respondent: Mrs Linda Forth [88]

Summary:

Imperative to build the "through road" first with construction traffic operating from A120 NOT A133 as this is a very congested road; not safe or viable to increase traffic even more down here.

Change suggested by respondent:

Imperative to phase the building works from A120, not A133, with proper slip roads from A120 as the access via A133 is not safe and will cause long term serious congestion.
Ensure Rapid Transit System and "through road" operational before start of these construction phases. RTS would need an extra lane on A133. It caters for the new garden community residents and not people travelling into Colchester from Tendering and surrounding areas, so will not improve traffic flow in that respect and it is already dangerously congested. Wivenhoe is the nearest railway station to the garden community, with the university running a regular bus service to it. It is a conservation area with very narrow roads, a weak railway bridge to cross and very narrow pavements. The RTS will not deter the new residents from trying to drive to Wivenhoe Station to commute rather than to Colchester Station. Naive to think they will choose to work on the site itself and the current Park&Ride in Colchester is barely used as it is, so why will the RTS be any different? 7000 new homes need bespoke doctors and dentists surgeries, not just regular visits to their local community centre as is currently proposed. Employment on site, please allow sufficient parking at the business park, bearing in mind people from outside the garden community may choose to work there and the RTS is planned to start from there and not from a park & ride on the eastern side of the development? 7000 houses/flats will result in parking issues. Ensure sufficient parking per household and enough space on roads for parking. People will continue to own cars, unless they're banned!! Environment/Nature - careful timing and handling of wildlife issues imperative.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

78 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Summary:

- The route of the RTS is too vague.
- The buses will always be in traffic struggling through bottlenecks. There are no plans to address these points by building new bridges or underpasses.
- A clear definition of the route and identification of the bottlenecks and costings for resolving them is required.
- There is no indication of how the RTS will be paid for.
- The RTS will be built in stages according to the sale of properties to fund each part. This means years of increased traffic, starting with Heavy Goods Vehicles.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan is too vague and has not addressed issues raised by groups and individual members of the public.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Consultation document Garden Village.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/4

70 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr Roy Warren, Planning Manager) [90]

Summary:

The policy is supported for the reasons set out in the full comments.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

74 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

Summary:

'To ensure neighbourhoods are walkable, low traffic and livable, where residents can access most of their daily needs within a 20-minute walk or safe bike ride from their home'. I for one would not want to try and cycle or walk home with my 6-8 shopping bags after my weekly food shop!!!! Nor would I take the bus. People with always navigate towards using their cars as it is quicker and easier. Most houses tend to have 1-2 cars, add a couple of kids who drive and a family household can have 3 cars + !

Change suggested by respondent:

There is no way Colchester can cope with 9000+ households with all their cars. The only change would be to dramatically reduce the size of the development.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

140 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

If Housing Infrastructure Fund monies are insufficient for the full cost of the A133-A120 link road how can planning approval be given to the Garden Community?
What happens if only the first phase at A133 end can be completed because rising costs make financial delivery of the second phase linking to A120 untenable?
I am concerned about the likely increase in traffic on the A133 affecting travellers from Elmstead Market, Wivenhoe, Alresford, Thorrington and Brightlingsea.
What is the exact route of the RTS alongside Clingoe Hill?
The impact of the RTS on Greenstead roundabout is unclear in the plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

Explanation of the two phases of construction of the link road A133-A120.
The plan needs to include a detailed description of the RTS route outside of the Garden Community so its impact on Clingoe Hill and the Greenstead roundabout can be understood.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

129 Support

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

As a regular cyclist, I approve the plans for cycling provision if they are as described. Compromises would diminish their success. The design of the homes needs to accommodate multiple bikes in each household and hubs for cycle repairs and servicing would help sustained use. Safe and easy access to cycle routes outside the GC, e.g. the Colchester Orbital is important. Easy routes to locations such as the city centre, hospital, coast, railway and libraries are needed.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

271 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Kay [94]

Summary:

- Over reliance on car journeys.
- Too much workplace parking in Colchester.
- Insufficient public transport.
- Insufficient explanation to current modal share figures, impact on local road and origins of TCBGC.
- No costs of RTS and insufficient detail of operation.
- Existing Park and Ride failed, Park and Choose will also fail.
- No evidence of current and predicted flows on other roads in vicinity of TCBGC.
- DPD non compliance with S1.Policy.SP6 (RTS).
- Contradictory of location of Park and Choose.
- Unsustainable financial position of RTS.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Peter Kay - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tz

232 Object

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

Summary:

Extremely worrying that DPD fails to mention extreme difficulties there are with the delivery of a link road. WTC do not see how it can still be considered the most appropriate site, or sustainable at all, without the link road and rapid transport system being proven as deliverable.
No confidence link road will be completed. There is no limit specified as to how many dwellings can be built before the completion of a link road. Original HIF grant application set out road network would not be able to sustain more than 1000 new homes without the road.
No guarantee will be delivered in an infrastructure first capacity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

233 Object

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

Summary:

DPD does not detail design and delivery of RTS. No evidence that planning consent and funding have been secured.
Not credible to suggest classed as rapid, no evidence quicker or cheaper than using car.
RTS fundamentally flawed as existing roads not big enough for bus lanes and car traffic.
No detail on how traffic priority can be given to the bus.
No link to university campus or local bus routes from Brightlingsea via Wivenhoe to Colchester, new residents travelling from Garden Community would not be able to interchange to local bus network. University students would not finance the RTS.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

242 Object

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

Summary:

The traffic modelling acompanying the DPD replies on demonstrably unachievable modal shifts.
Question independence and accuracy of modelling (work completed by Ringway Jacobs who are under direct appointment to ECC)
No plan to mitigate determinetal impact to overzealous emphais on active travel will have on getting other traffic moving.
Little detail on what mitgation measures will be, it is impossibnle to comment on if they will have a postive impact.
A more direct RTS route to a junction opposite the current Knowledge Gateway would be more productive and pedestrain and cycle crossings for A133 should be provided via bridges.
Disappointed not willing to introduce intiatives.
Modal shift predictions can go badly wrong. Looking too far into the future is inadvisable. Figures in DPD (pg 95) not fully explained.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

243 Object

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

Summary:

Reduction in local adult rail communting.
Rail companies no apetite to increase number of trains per hour
Local bus services pushed into crisis
DPD policy needs to be bases on realistic and achieable propositions and robust enough it cannot be watered down at planning application
Nothing in evidence to justify RTS will be quicker than travelling by car
Park and Choose new route will not have incentive to attract enough users
Traffic modelling assumes full modal change being achieved. Creates overly optimisic figures. 2033 to 2041 figures need reworking.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

244 Object

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

Summary:

To comply with Policy SP6.1 of Local Plan, DPD needs to give details of Route 1 (RTS).
Conflicting infromation on position of RTS stops.
Uncertainty of RTS line to Employment Areas.
Clarification needed on 'Express route' to north station and location of park and choose.
No clearly defined start date for RTS
Active travel comprised if sport pitches other side of A133 and link road being a through route.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

245 Object

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

Summary:

Colchester's roads have no spare capacity, already suffer from chronic congestion and gridlock are an everyday event.
DPD is unambitious re public transport
DPD heavily dependent on Active Travel. Cyclingto and from Colchester along A133 is not attractive proposition.
Greenstead roundabout is lethal.
City Centre is not cycle friendly.
DPD active travel modal shift for longer journeys are very unambitious at 10%. Multi modal journeys overlooked.
Walking and cycling to RTS stops will be easy enough but RTS will take 25 minutes to Colchester North, unlikely to be popular option for long distance journeys.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

85 Object

Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

Summary:

This is a vital aspect of the whole project and at the same time the most ill-defined. It's not clear how the RTS will work, esp. financially. It is not clear how it ties in with the other public transport in Colchester. "Active travel" is highlighted, also linked to the RTS, but how does this tie in with wider national rail links and/or travel to and from airports or the port of Harwich, for example?

Change suggested by respondent:

I would like to see a lot more concrete information on the RTS - how it will be financed, how exactly it will work, how it ties in with other public transport infrastructure. The RTS should also be made a deal maker/breaker for the whole development.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

103 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Lucking [112]

Summary:

It has already been decided that the link road will not be open before development. A key selling point of the Project was that it would be infrastructure led. Colchester roads will suffer. The rapid transit system is a fantasy that will not solve the traffic problems

Change suggested by respondent:

The developers need to deliver the full link road before houses are built

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

195 Object

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

TCBGC risks serious traffic congestion in Colchester because:
* the modal shift assumptions are too optimistic
* there is doubt about whether the second phase of the A120/A133 link road will be delivered
* there is confusion about the traffic modelling - does it include the link road or not?
* the costs of the link road and RTS have not been disclosed, nor have the full terms of the HIF agreement

Change suggested by respondent:

Two new restrictions are needed in addition to those in the Section 1 plan:
i) No new housing can be started until both phases of the A120-A133 link road are started on site, and
ii) no dwellings can be occupied before the link road is completed and operational.

Colchester needs reassurance that it won't be forced to accept further compromises on infrastructure provision without proper discussion. The duty to co-operate was tested by the last minute phasing of the link road, and the City Council's frustration was expressed in the formal resolution passed (see my appendix 3).

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

109 Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:

ECC as the highway and transportation authority, supports Chapter 8: Movement and Connections, which seeks to create high quality sustainable connections and an environment that make walking, cycling and public transport the most attractive method of travel. ECC has worked closely with Colchester City and Tendring District Councils to develop a place-based approach to achieving net zero carbon transport by 2050 for the Garden Community. The Draft Plan is in line and consistent with the current Essex Transport Strategy: the Local Transport Plan for Essex (LTP3).

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

133 Object

Respondent: Mrs Claudia Alsdorf [116]

Summary:

Concern about sequence and order of action, regarding RTS and link road between A120 and A133

Change suggested by respondent:

Link road is vital to be completed at the beginning of phase 1 housing development. Funding seems not secured completely, therefore priority might have to be changed from RTS to link road and funds reallocated, in order to complete link road first, with access to the business park in the corner off link road junction with A120 which would then attract businesses. The existing bus routes could be changed to create a reliable, frequent, affordable (say, flat fee of 2 pounds a trip, or smart card, free for residents), joined up loop linking new development with university, Hythe, north STation, hospital, stadium, and via link road back to A133.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

231 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

Summary:

Supports the principle of Chapter 8 which includes GC Policy 7, welcome the changes in language introduced since the Regulation 18 response across a number of key areas which provide flexibility as the design process evolves. Some objections remain, principally to assist with seeking to achieve the aims and objectives for the Garden Community through the planning application process, so that it is designed and built in a way that reduces the need to travel, especially by car; promotes sustainable travel modes and can adapt and respond to future transport challenges and emerging technologies such as connected and autonomous vehicles.

Change suggested by respondent:

The DPD and accompanying evidence base is unclear on the vehicular access for the Crockleford Neighbourhood, including the approach stated in GC Policy 1 and GC Policy 7, Part A. It is unclear from reading these policies alongside the transport evidence base (para 1 and 2) whether the Crockleford Neighbourhood is expected to have vehicular access to the new A120 – A133 Link Road and/or the Bromley Road. Parts of the Crockleford Neighbourhood to the north of Bromley Road will require vehicular access from Bromley Road, however there are some references in the DPD to Bromley Road being a sustainable movement / active travel corridor only, which could restrict the use of Bromley Road and have an impact on existing homes and businesses as well as homes further north of the A120. It is important that the evidence base and policy wording across the DPD is clear and consistent on this point to identify a feasible strategy for movement to, from and within Crockleford and Bromley Road in the DPD. This will also enable the sustainable transport strategy required to support the Crockleford Community to be developed through the planning application. Recommended detailed wording changes to the draft DPD text are provided at Appendix 3 of the attached document.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

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

131 Object

Respondent: Mr TIM BATTS-NEALE [131]

Summary:

- Opportunity to strengthen policy and supporting documents – where there's potential to remove text saying "where appropriate" or "where necessary and appropriate"
- The transport evidence base documents would benefit from text or pointers to other documents to show expected RTS journey times to other destinations, given the importance afforded to this infrastructure. How long does modelling show RTS from TCBGC to eg University of Essex, Hythe station, City Centre, Colchester station, General Hospital, Severalls Business Park?

Change suggested by respondent:

Attachment comments set out requests to generally: clarify text and assumptions in transport evidence reports including modelling; and proposing updating wording in DPD policies and justification.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

DPD Submission Version comments All Tim Batts-Neale.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/v

145 Object

Respondent: Mr David Ward [134]

Summary:

Additional traffic onto A133

Change suggested by respondent:

Vehicular access only available via the A120, no access to the A133, apart from public transport, cycles, footpaths etc.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

141 Object

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Summary:

Currently the traffic down Clingoe Hill to the roundabout into Colchester is frequently heavily congested. The work to Clingoe Hill for the RTS will be horrendous as sensible alternative routes into Colchester don't exist. It is brilliant that so much work is being considered to reduce the use of cars in the garden community but realistically there will still be a considerable number. Local residents had been promised the link road to the A120 would be completed before the building commenced and this is no longer the case. Without this link road I cannot see how the plan can work.

Change suggested by respondent:

I think the money set aside for the RTS scheme should be used to complete the link road. In the interim, current bus services can be extended to cover some of what the RTS would offer - note current bus services are able to bypass Clingoe Hill by going through the university - a route banned for cars. The early days of the RTS scheme would be heavy on subsidy and the money could be used to more effect. The route for the RTS scheme also needs further work too in my opinion in order to maximise its effectiveness - up to date traffic surveys and proper consideration of where it is needed and whether Elmstead and Wivenhoe too could access its services. Doing the link road first would allow time for this work to be done.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

147 Object

Respondent: Mr James Marchant [138]

Summary:

The link road must be completed before the first houses are built, otherwise there will be significant extra congestion in Colchester.

Change suggested by respondent:

The link road should be completed before housing development starts.
The RTS should use the link road, going anti-clockwise around Colchester, a route which would require minimal expenditure and avoids Clingoe Hill using already existent bus routes.
Please see submissions from Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Liaison Group.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

165 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Summary:

The concept of the community was presented as being infrastucture driven, with a link road being a key feature due to the increasing traffic issues affecting this side of Colchester. Without this being built/ completed before development begins, these issues will only increase. Existing roads within the search area are country lanes, in the main, that cannot sustain large numbers of vehicles. The RTS that is proposed is a bus service that will be 'demand led', yet does not fully recognise the increasing growth of out of town amenities around Colchester which mean people need transport to get to them.

Change suggested by respondent:

There should be a clear obligation for the link road to be completed before development begins.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

170 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:

The Cling Hill access to Colchester is already very congested, with long delays at peak periods. The A133 to A120 link road needs to be in place before the development starts, to mitigate the impact of the new community on this choke point.
While the rapid transit system appears a good idea, it looks like it will need expensive subsidy and capital spend to deliver. Given that usage is likely to be low until there are a substantial number of houses in the new development, it would be better to complete the link road and delay the rapid transit system.

Change suggested by respondent:

Complete the A120/A133 link road before development starts.
Explain how developers will ensure that streets in Wivenhoe are not used for new community residents parking for Wivenhoe train station.
Delay rapid transit system until there is a reasonable number of houses, using the funds released to complete the link road.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

176 Object

Respondent: Ardleigh Parish Council (Ms Rachel Fletcher, Parish Clerk) [143]

Summary:

Our particular concern is Bromley Road. The policy states that 'The Garden Community must restrict vehicular connectivity, except for public transport and emergency vehicles, between the 'Link Road' and Bromley Road' meaning that Crockleford Hub residents will not be able to access the link road (although also meaning that residents of the other Hubs and people coming off the link road will not be able to drive to Bromley Road).

See earlier attachment.

Change suggested by respondent:

We are worried about the potential implications on and beyond Bromley Road and want to see more modelling and evidence that this can deliver the objectives and not have unintended consequences for our residents.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

185 Object

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

Summary:

- Existing congestion in Elmstead village will be made worse. NO proposal to improve A133 in this location.
- Should make sustainable travel easier, not private car journeys harder.
- Streets should be primarily for travel, not play.
- Travel connections biased towards Colchester.
- Only connection to Tendring is by car.
- Concerns around illustrative plan, irregularities around access to southern neighbourhood and dead end connections, pedestrian connections over A133, indirect route of cycle route in north east.

Part A

- Unclear language and meaning.
- Modal share targets should be stronger and more aspirational.

Part B

- Concerned that parking control in GC will lead to problems elsewhere.

Part C

- Concerned over how convenient public transport will be.
- Greater distinction needed between RTS and other bus operators.

Part D

- Concerns regarding wider connectivity and effectiveness of RTS due to congested roads.

Part E

- Electric vehicle charging ranks will increase pressure on land use and density.

Part F

- Park and choose without direct access to A120 is ineffective.

Part G

- Concerned about moving parking problems elsewhere.
- No provision for HGV parking.

Part I

- Object to direct junction from A133 to GC. All access should be from the link road.
- Restricting car journeys between link road and Bromley Road will negatively impact existing residents of Bromley Road who have links to Elmstead.
- Horse riding shouldn't be a high priority.

Justification

- A single healthcare hub can't be accessible within 20-minutes from all neighbourhoods.
- Link road will lead to high to severe impact on breathable air quality in Elmstead (and GC site)
- Planning has been biased to Colchester's benefit.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

EPC Representations - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tv

197 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Cory [147]

Summary:

The DPD does not require the completion of the "Link Road" prior to housing development taking place. This must be a stipluation to ensure it carries out the fuction it is there for. The consultation page outlines: "The A120-A133 Link Road... is scheduled to open in 2026. Its objective is to support growth at the Garden Community, manage congestion in this wider locality and improve connectivity. " It simply will not meet Garden Community Policy requirements or requirements outlined in the planning permission if it is built in two phases and not completed before house-building commences.

Change suggested by respondent:

The A120-A133 Link Road must be completed in full prior to house-building starting. Full road completion is a requirement to carry out its strategic and directly important role for the local road network, delivering on its purpose and policy objectives.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

203 Object

Respondent: Liberal Democrats Colchester (Mrs michelle burrows, Local Cit Councillor) [151]

Summary:

The DPD does not require the completion of the "Link Road" prior to housing development taking place. This must be a stipluation to ensure it carries out the fuction it is there for. The consultation page outlines: "The A120-A133 Link Road... is scheduled to open in 2026. Its objective is to support growth at the Garden Community, manage congestion in this wider locality and improve connectivity. " It simply will not meet Garden Community Policy requirements or requirements outlined in the planning permission if it is built in two phases and not completed before house-building commences.

Change suggested by respondent:

The A120-A133 Link Road must be completed in full prior to house-building starting. Full road completion is a requirement to carry out its strategic and directly important role for the local road network, delivering on its purpose and policy objectives.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

201 Object

Respondent: Mr Phil Sadler [152]

Summary:

The Link Road must be built prior to the housing development commencing

Change suggested by respondent:

Change to plan:
The A120-A133 Link Road must be completed in full prior to house-building starting. Full road completion is a requirement to carry out its strategic and directly important role for the local road network, delivering on its purpose and policy objectives

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

265 Object

Respondent: National Highways (Mr Mark Norman, Spatial Planner) [173]

Summary:

Concerns are raised around traffic Forecasting of Strategic Models. In particular, the phasing of development.

Traffic Forecasting of trips rates & mode shares.
Design and capacity of the new A120 junction.
Concerns over noise and air pollution from highway network on new development.

Concerns that drainage will be into the highway network system.

The base year CTM represents a 2019 Base Year and will reflect the pattern of trip making and travel behaviour that existed prior to the Covid-19 pandemic.

There are no detailed forecasts available to review and there has been no separate assessment of the traffic generated by the TCBGC proposals. Therefore, there is no information available in order to assess the impact of TCBGC on the highways network.

Change suggested by respondent:

Further review of the evidence base work needs to be undertaken.
If the link road is to be delivered in two parts, impact on the highway network must be assessed for that time until the new junction is complete.
Proposed working with the Councils to address noise and air pollution issues. Consideration should be given for a bespoke Policy on noise and air pollution.
It is recommended that the advice on proportionate accounting for Covid 19 in prior calibrated models as set out in Appendix B of TAG M4 (Forecasting and uncertainty) issued in May 2023, should be taken into account to adjust the 2019 CTM matrices.

Forecasts prepared using CTM would require sensitivity testing to take account of the greater uncertainty arising from Covid-19.

When preparing forecasts from assessing TCBGC, to comply with advice set out in paragraph B2.3 of TAG M4 issued May 20223 sensitivity testing should be carried out to assess the further potential for change with respect to the long-term impact of Covid 19. This sensitivity testing should be carried out in line with best practice set out within DfT's Uncertainty Toolkit.

Further information is required on modelling. See representation for further details.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

National Highways Full Rep - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ts
Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tt
Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t3

GC POLICY 8: SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE

123 Object

Respondent: Anglian Water Services Ltd (Ms Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [40]

Summary:

Anglian Water welcomes the policy focus on water conservation and wastewater, but considers that the policy should be more representative of the North Essex Authorities Shared Strategic Plan policy requiring delivery of a smart, innovative and sustainable water efficiency and reuse solutions that foster climate resilience and forward looking approach to water supply, water and wastewater treatment. We propose introduction of new policy text for water efficiency and reuse given the scope for, and policy drivers to deliver rainwater/stormwater harvesting and reuse and greywater recycling, to move beyond the optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres/person/day (l/p/d).

Change suggested by respondent:

Anglian Water suggests that the government's Environment Improvement Plan (Water Efficiency Roadmap) intention to require 100 l/p/d in water stressed areas should be used as a minimum water efficiency standard with developers required to meet this and encouraged to demonstrate how they can go further utilising integrated water management and a fittings-based approach to minimise potable water use.

We propose that the policy clearly directs a criteria-based approach that is proportionate to new non-household developments and requires applicants to demonstrate water efficiency measures and water reuse have been incorporated in proposals. Where significant non-domestic water use is required, developers should be required to submit a Water Resources Assessment with the planning application following consultation with the relevant water company to ascertain water availability and feasibility of the proposed scheme.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

93 Object

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:

• 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

Attachments: None

71 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr Roy Warren, Planning Manager) [90]

Summary:

The policy is supported in relation to its approach to requiring developers to make provision for infrastructure which will include sport as provision is made for both on-site and off-site provision to be made which is likely to be necessary for sport.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

142 Support

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Summary:

Absolutely essential that this new community is built to the highest eco standards. I trust that gas will not be connected to the site as this would be short sighted.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

171 Support

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:

Approach seems sensible. Need to ensure that planning permissions have the clout needed to ensure that the intentions set out are delivered.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

221 Support

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Giles Ward, Planning Officer) [165]

Summary:

- Note that previous comments specifically on ‘a water efficiency calculator report’ have been taken on board. Therefore have no further detailed comments to make in relation to this plan.
- Comments submitted on flood risk and foul drainage capacity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Environment Agency - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sd

32 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Summary:

The air pollution will become intolerable to many of our village (Elmstead) with medical problems.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

158 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

Once again the comment that residents will have much reduced need to travel. This is beyond ridiculous, most people travel everyday and not just on routes served by public transport ! I believe it's time to accept that carbon emissions will increase massively, low emission boilers, cars and other household environs, will increase considerably. The convenience factor will far outstrip the idealistic notion of a carbon zero way of life. Nobody is going to travel on maybe two buses to their destination when your car is parked on the drive!

Change suggested by respondent:

Drastically reduced. More realistic expectations need to be factored in to this idealistic dream.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

80 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Summary:

- Policy on grey and black water treatment is lacking.
- Concern due to odour emitted from the sewage works by The Hythe.
- Water / air pollution for the local residents of Elmstead and Crockleford Heath.
- Importance of identifying the means and method for the treatment of these waste water types at DPD stage, so they can be properly costed and prepared in advance of any building.
- Policy on sewage and water is missing.
- Major road disruption during pipe-work installation to link to at the groundwork stage.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan is too vague and has not addressed issues raised by groups and individual members of the public.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Consultation document Garden Village.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/4

75 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

Summary:

'A PLACE DESIGNED FOR THE IMPACTS WHILE MINIMISING ITS CONTRIBUTION TO CLIMATE CHANGE'
More cars on the road, more time spent in traffic = more pollution!!
The destruction of nature, ploughing up a whole area of agricultural and grassland to make way for houses and concrete roads= releasing into the atmosphere heat-trapping carbon dioxide that plants, trees, and soil stored safely.
This is not minimising the contribution to climate change!

Change suggested by respondent:

Significantly reducing the amount of housing!

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

246 Object

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

Summary:

Disappointed this chapter is not driven by bespoke design code.
Lacks ambition of setting high standards of envrionmentally sound building conditions
Too much reliance that developer would choose to build at a higher spec than already set by legislation
No caveat to conform to future new policy or locally set standards through project lifetime
All power generated should come from green energy. Opportunity to focus on climate emergency.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

99 Object

Respondent: Affinity Water (Mrs Hannah Wilson, Environmental Planner) [108]

Summary:

Change requirement for minimum 110 l/p/d to 100l/p/d
Include requirement for applicants requiring significant non-domestic water supply to submit a Water Resource Assessment in consultation with the relevant water company. This will look at maximising water efficiency and water reuse.

Change suggested by respondent:

Affinity Water propose a criteria based approach that is proportionate to new non-household developments that requires applicants to demonstrate water efficiency measures and water reuse have been incorporated in proposals.
Where significant non-domestic water use is required developers should be required to submit a Water Resource Assessment with the planning application following consultation with the relevant water company.

The requirement of 110 l/p/d should be replaced with 100 l/p/d

Garden Communities are exemplars of sustainable and resilient development and should push boundaries to demonstrate that positive steps can be taken to deliver smarter and more efficient designs

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

202 Object

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

The financial cost of the sustainable infrastructure requirements doesn't appear to have been considered properly. And the cost of upgraded the Colchester Waster Recycling Centre appears to have been forgotten.

Change suggested by respondent:

It may be necessary to review GC8 and make compromises to reduce build cost which is currently in the model at £94m.

A costed and phased plan for Colchester Wastewater Recycling Centre upgrade should be included in the financial appraisal.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

113 Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:

GC Policy 8, Part I (page 120). The justification for GC Policy 8 and Part E states it is essential to demonstrate how the proposed planting palette includes adaptable/resilient plant species. It then states that details should be submitted as part of the application of appropriate biosecurity standards for sourcing, quarantining, and inspecting plant material supplied to the development. To ensure consistency and clarity, Part I should reiterate the need for this to be set out in the Green and Blue Infrastructure Plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

115 Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:

ECC welcomes that the Essex Climate Action Commission (ECAC) is mentioned in the justification. The Garden Community is situated within the ECAC's recommended Climate Focus Area (CFA), which is formed of the Blackwater and Colne River catchment areas. The principal objective of the CFA is to become net zero carbon and the GC can contribute to the CFA targets. Accordingly, the Policy Justification can include a new sentence at the end of the second paragraph to state this.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

234 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

Summary:

Generally, Latimer support the Councils' aspirations and expectations for creating a community fit for the future and which embraces Garden Community principles and incorporates measures aimed at tackling climate change, minimising carbon emissions and climate change adaptation. However, a few points of clarification and wording amendments are suggested within the representations, relating to Net Zero Carbon, Design and Construction.

Change suggested by respondent:

- Part A of GC Policy 8 has been expanded upon, and requirements are now more detailed. As such, the wording should make it clear that this is because the Garden Community will be 'aspirational' in achieving net zero carbon and make reference to advances in Building Regulations.
- Recommend the removal of reference to a District Heating Network.
- Latimer fully supports the potential that renewable energy could be provided in the Strategic Green Gaps ('SGG'). However, there is different language used to describe allowable development in the SGGs. The Wivenhoe SGG refers to "renewable energy"' whereas the Elmstead SGG refers to "low carbon energy generation". Renewable energy generation will be critical to supporting a resilient community but there should be an aligned approach to terminology to provide a consistent strategy for future planning applications to follow.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

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

186 Object

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

Summary:

- Question intention behind the illustrative plan

Part A

- Need to assess how homes will continue to met standards for a set period of time after construction.
- Schools and business premises must also have energy efficiency requirements.
- Ineffective language.

Part B

- 'Encouraging' is imprecise language that means policy is ineffective.

Part C

- 'where feasible' makes policy is too weak.

Part D

- Poor wording about water efficiency calculator report.

Justification

- 1.5C target is expected to be broken in 2027 – not a valid justification for policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

Part A

- Energy efficiency standards for non-domestic buildings required.

Part B

- Passivhaus standard should be compulsory.

Part C

- Stronger wording required for policy to be effective.

Part D

- Change word 'should' to 'shall'.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tb

199 Support

Respondent: Mr Mark Cory [147]

Summary:

I support the net-zero carbon objectives and policy requirements.

We should go further in the following areas:
Part D - Water Conservation - I believe with the evidence of water supply and climate effects locally we must update the policy from optional water consveration to complusory greywater and rain harvesting systems.

Part J should be created to make a requirement upon the highest insulation standards to conserve energy, beyond current Building Regulation stipulations.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

159 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

I have raised concerns in my previous statements that will address this matter.

Change suggested by respondent:

I have raised my concerns in previous statements that will address this matter.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

249 Object

Respondent: Mr TIM BATTS-NEALE [131]

Summary:

Minor amendment to text required re. percentage of journeys and clarity required over levels of modal shift to be achieved.

Change suggested by respondent:

See attachment.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

DPD Submission Version comments All Tim Batts-Neale.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/v

124 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water Services Ltd (Ms Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [40]

Summary:

Anglian Water welcomes the policy requirement to ensure developers work positively with other infrastructure providers throughout the planning process to ensure that the cumulative impact of development is considered and then mitigated, at the appropriate time. As outlined in the IDPFP, Anglian Water publishes an infrastructure charging schedule for connection to our water supply and wastewater networks. As most of the site is under the control of a master-developer, it is considered this should assist with preparing a consistent and efficient approach for planning and phasing infrastructure requirements across the site.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

187 Object

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

Summary:

- Timely requires clarification, too ambiguous.

Part A

- Off-site capacity improvements supports rumours of temporary school classrooms, and compromises infrastructure first principles.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tc

101 Object

Respondent: Mr Philip Robinson CBE [74]

Summary:

The TCBGC viability requires the early provision of the A120-A133 Link Road. In 2020 the GC team secured HIF funding for the Road which would be completed prior to any new homes' occupation.
The Councils announced in February 2023 insufficient funds for the full Road and would first build an A133 access section of the Road and would complete the Link Road an undefined time later, probably through s.106 funding, all within a non-binding MOU with the GC developer.
This radically different plan must be developed for, and examined in detail by, the Inspector to judge its soundness and viability.

Change suggested by respondent:

As the A120-A133 Link Road is such a fundamental enabler for the GC, this radical change of approach (currently with no certainty re it's outcome) must be developed to a level of confidence in the approach (and in its impact on traffic congestion) and then included within, or linked to, the Development Plan Document .

In addition the detail of the feasibility of the new Road plan must be independently examined, under the direction of the Inspector. The plan and its examination must include the time frame for the completion of the complete Link Road, details of the total funding mechanism, the impact on traffic flows/congestion over the full construction period, the maximum number of dwellings to be occupied prior to the full road opening, and the contingencies included in the plan to ensure that this plan WILL deliver.

As this new Road Plan represents a fundamental change to the infrastructure first concept of the TCBGC, arguably this radically revised plan should also be subject to public consultation.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

76 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

Summary:

' Where infrastructure cannot be provided within, or is not appropriate to be located on, the Garden Community site itself, developers will be expected to make a contribution to the cost to provide the infrastructure elsewhere'
So if needed, where will this end up being?????

Change suggested by respondent:

If you are not sure, more planning is therefore needed!

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

247 Object

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

Summary:

We would like this chapter to include what would happen if the modal shift targets were not achieved. For instance - suspending all future building on site until modal shift targets were met.
Deeply concerned with viability work to date. Doubt would have passed section one hearings in current financial climate.
Refer Inspector to submission by William Sunnucks as we fully support the work on viability assessment.
We do not believe the project is currently viable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

216 Object

Respondent: Mrs Manda O'Connell [105]

Summary:

- Insufficient detail on which areas of infrastructure will be brought forward at what time, and how this relates to phasing and timing.
- An alternative solution should be considered with regard to the delivery of the Link Road, utilising the funding for the RTS to ensure timely delivery of the link road with its mitigation of surrounding road infrastructure.

Change suggested by respondent:

- The Link Road should be brought forward before the RTS and the RTS re-routed.
- Embed specific detail and timings about these key fundamentals of infrastructure that needs to be in place as the first occupants of the Garden Community move in.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Manda OConnell - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sv
Manda OConnell - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sb

190 Object

Respondent: TCBGC Community Liaison Group [104]

Agent: Mrs Manda O'Connell

Summary:

The CLG do not believe that the councils have gone far enough in identifying specifically the infrastructure required for each 'neighbourhood' together with formalising its introduction to align with building homes from the start; that this specification, found to a large part in the Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan (IDP) should be embedded within the policy where it prescribes these measures, a fundamental flaw has been introduced into the soundness of the DPD and the TCBGC project in allocating £21 million, needed to fully complete the A133-A120 link road, to an ill thought-out, time-limited and extraordinary costly RTS route.

Change suggested by respondent:

The CLG proposes instead that that same amount is used to fully complete the Link Road, introducing an RTS route that utilises the link road onto the A120 and in an anti-clockwise route around Colchester, using roads which are already fit for purpose, and in some cases (Elmstead Road, Capon Road and Boundary Road) are already dedicated bus routes (First Buses services S1 and 87).

It is the CLG's contention that the Housing Infrastructure Fund should indeed be spent on the necessary Link Road infrastructure it was provided to underpin, and doing this first, coupled with the better proposed RTS route described and shown in the attached document Alt_RTS_Route, will enable the Garden Community to achieve the modal shift required as well as relieving congestion on neighbouring road infrastructure, rather than adding to it as the current plan will do, and will replace the current plan which at great expense will only last 10 years by the author of the TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures report own admission (p5) for a plan which has the capacity to support a thriving population of 17K plus fifty years and beyond, and achieve the goals and aspirations of the TCBGC – in fact it is fundamental to their achievement.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

Alt_RTS_Route.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/n

CLG Rep GC Policy 9 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/td

196 Object

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

The challenges of delivery need to be recognised. New settlements of 7500 dwellings have rarely (if ever) been delivered since 1970. Please see my appendix 1.

The project isn't financially viable. Please see my appendix 2.

TCBGC doesn't own the land or have any agreement in place with the landowners for land value capture. Please see my appendices 3, 4 and 5.

Change suggested by respondent:

The IDPFP needs to be legally integrated into the plan - particularly important for Colchester.

We need a phase 1 financial appraisal which shows how the first 10 years can be delivered and monitored.

We need further MOUs with Latimer and Tendring and an agreed procedure for negotiating s106.

Compromises will be needed. There are three possible areas for cut backs i) external transport infrastructure (currently costing £110m including £21m for the link road) ii) sustainable infrastructure (currently costing £94m) or iii) social housing (currently costing £410m).

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

0 Consultation response .docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/y
Appendix 1 - New towns - The track record.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/p
Appendix 2 - Viability.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/q
Appendix 3 - Colchester's resolution explained.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sr
Appendix 4 - Land Ownership - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sk
Appendix 5 - Cash Contributions - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sz
Appendix 6 - Extracts from Latimer's published accounts - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sm
Appendix 7.2 Welborne - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sn
Appendix 7.2 - The Master Developer Business Model - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sy

238 Object

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

Agent: Lichfields

Summary:

Generally, the principle of Chapter 9, including GC Policy 9 'Infrastructure delivery and Impact Mitigation' of the DPD is supported. The Chapter seeks to ensure the Garden Community delivers the required infrastructure to support the development in a timely manner, but also recognition that where appropriate, infrastructure may need to be phased.

Change suggested by respondent:

- Part A, point 1, amendment proposed to S106 and CIL references.
- Part B, removal of requirement for a Viability Assessment is parties are in agreement regarding planning gain provisions (not including HIF recovery).

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments:

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

167 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Summary:

This is a very vague section of the Plan with little commitment to funding other than through references to possible sources. Given the link road was a key selling point of the scheme, it is concerning that full funding for this is not in place and that it is proposed to build a section rather than the whole road. A community of the scale planned will place significant demands on existing infrastructure and will impact upon existing roads and communities. The link road would help mitigate these.

Change suggested by respondent:

The link road must be built before development begins. If the intentions only to part build the road, the question arises as to whether the Plan is sound as it does not then meet garden community criteria.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

172 Support

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:

Need to ensure there are mechanisms in place to ensure the intent of this section is delivered.
Need to give a higher priority to the A133/A120 link road provision. That link road must be in place before development starts, otherwise other communities east of Colchester will suffer increased delay and disruption.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

177 Object

Respondent: Ardleigh Parish Council (Ms Rachel Fletcher, Parish Clerk) [143]

Summary:

We are concerned that the delay to the Link Road and the phased delivery of this may undermine the claim that the project will deliver infrastructure first. This is important at very stage for credibility of the project .

Consultation regarding expanded development area A triangular area around Jubilee Lane to the northwest of the maps was added in to the development area at the final stage. There are houses and businesses in this area which had hitherto been unaware that they may form part of the Garden Community. We asked in February for these residents to be directly notified.

Change suggested by respondent:

Write to residents and businesses in the development area- especially the expanded area. Or confirm when this has happened.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

200 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Cory [147]

Summary:

This statement: "Proposals will need to make financial contributions to the wider local transport infrastructure, including the A120-A133 Link Road and Rapid Transit System in accordance with the conditions of the Housing Infrastructure Fund." is the only part of the consultation that gives some acknowledgement to the fact that the 'A120-A133 Link Road' is not fully funded and cannot be completed without further contributions.
I object to the DPD progressing without the 'A120-A133 Link Road' guaranteed to be completed as per Garden Principles and the planning application, in one phase, prior to house building.

Change suggested by respondent:

The 'A120-A133 Link Road' must be fully funded and completion guaranteed in advance of house-building on the site.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None

258 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully ‘justified’ as the paragraph (para.1 page.127) omits reference to the basis for key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended Paragraph & 5th bullet point below it to read:
Paragraph change - “The main requirements covered in this Plan, as set out in the policies of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan, and based on the evidence of key infrastructure providers include:
5th bullet point change;
• “Addressing education, healthcare, ambulance, police, firefighting, leisure and sports”

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

259 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as paragraph (para.1 page.129) omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read:
"The Garden community will require the provision of new physical infrastructure such as footways, cycleways, roads, and sewers; social infrastructure such as health, ambulance, police, firefighting, education and community facilities, and green infrastructure such as open and recreational spaces."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

260 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as it omits reference (para.1 page.131) to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read:
"The councils will seek contributions from developers to fund improvements to existing infrastructure and the environment and new infrastructure contributions will be made through the Community Infrastructure Levy (if adopted) which applies a standard charge to developers to fund supporting infrastructure such as transport, schools, community facilities and health, ambulance, police and firefighting facilities, and/or Section 106 agreements which address the provision of affordable housing and more site-specific infrastructure requirements."
The Garden community will require the provision of new physical infrastructure such as footways, cycleways, roads, and sewers; social infrastructure such as health, ambulance, police, firefighting, education and community facilities, and green infrastructure such as open and recreational spaces."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

264 Object

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:

Infrastructure Delivery Phasing & Funding Plan
For the purposes of Strategic Masterplan assumptions, the requirements and phasing of ambulance infrastructure/ facilities and delivery can be assigned into the 4 x phases as shown in the table on page.16 of attached document.

Change suggested by respondent:

Update the 'Summary Table: Total Infrastructure Requirements and Phasing of Delivery' as shown in the table on page.16 of attached document.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

Monitoring

11 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Plummer [23]

Summary:

The NHS and in particular Colchester general hospital is already at breaking point and the envisaged demands placed on it by the influx of another 18 thousand plus people is unstainable.
Unless the development is going to have its own hospital current services will only be made worse.

Change suggested by respondent:

The development is unsustainable and the number of people and houses will be an even bigger burden on our health facilities.
The development needs to be abandoned, as no developer is going to have the funds require to facilitate the wealth fare system required.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

179 Object

Respondent: Mr Philip Robinson CBE [74]

Summary:

Monitoring is a powerful tool in assessing the effectiveness of this DPD if the target for every important parameter (that can positively differentiate the outcome of this GC from previous housing developments)is numerically specified from the outset. Only a proportion of the relevant parameters are listed in this DPD and there are no numerically specified targets. The latter is important to inform the Inspector of the expectation for the GC and can later be used by the Councils in their controls to achieve successful outcomes throughout the delivery process. This Monitoring plan as currently stated is not a sound approach.

Change suggested by respondent:

As examples, I will concentrate my comments on para 9 and para 6 of the Monitoring List, although a similar process should be applied to all the paras listed in the DPD:

- as currently stated in para 9 the conservation of historic and cultural heritage is to be recorded only if Grade1 and 11+ buildings ,nationally important assets ,and assets on the Colchester Local List are lost.The list must clearly be expanded to include harm as well as loss and, to those assets from the Tendring and Essex County Council lists . For example, the ECC list includes the protected lane that is Turnip Lodge Lane. As defined by the National Planning Policy Framework loss or harm to all designated or non-designated assets and their settings should be recorded and importantly avoided wherever possible.
The Councils should list all these assets and set a target of retaining all (as the list is small) and they should also commit to take all reasonable steps to minimise the detrimental effect on those assets whose setting is affected

- as the DPD has emphasised the importance of the current existing green infrastructure within the GC area, para 6 should set targets for a high percentage of existing hedgerows to be retained; similarly targets should be set for the percentage of existing trees to be retained and; the proclaimed “quiet lanes” should be stated to be retained. Separate green percentage area targets should be identified for the GC overall, for each of the housing development areas, and for the percentage of their accessibility by all.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Attachments: None