Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Sustainability Appraisal

RE11 Object

Summary of representations:

I wish to object to this development as it does not have adequate infrastructure and therefore, cannot meet its objectives.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

SA report considers the Garden Community's potential impact on traffic congestion, air quality and sustainable transport through SA objectives: 3: health, 7: sustainable travel and 13: air quality. Conclusions on the effects of the Garden Community DPD as a whole and in-combination effects with large-scale residential developments in the vicinity of the Garden Community site are set out in Chapter 5 of the SA report.

A mixture of positive and negative effects was recognised:
Positive due to: provision of local services and facilities and employment opportunities; promotion of travel by walking cycling and public transport (including Rapid Transit System)

Negative due to: large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

As such, there are considered to be no significant, additional effects beyond those recorded in the policy assessments and cumulative effects assessment within the SA report.

Action:

None

17

Respondent: Mr Perry Coleman [41]

Change suggested by respondent:

You have to deliver the complete road infrastructure in order to make this a viable proposition. Failure to do so leads to a catastrophic traffic condition in Elmstead Market, Parsons Heath and the Knowledge Gateway. If the funding is not available as initially agreed then FIND IT.

Do this properly and meet ALL objectives or not at all. It's not just about the people that live there, it is the wider impact that needs consideration.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

Lack of definition for the green links.
Chapter 3

Green links not defined in terms of width .. which I understand will be left to developer.
These green links are the ONLY internal boundaries between the 3 communities.
Crockleford Heath community is within the broad development and is only granted an unspecified green link .
This is smaller than the buffers afforded to Wivenhoe and Elmstead Market. There are no tree preservation orders or woodland and nature conservation management.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

The SA recognises that green links will be incorporated within the Garden Community and concludes that these will support connectivity by active travel modes across the site, helping to provide positive effects in relation to SA objective 7: sustainable travel and other related objectives.

The SA also recognises the positive effects in relation to SA objective 6: biodiversity of green-blue infrastructure provision, tree planting and biodiversity net gain requirements in the Nature policy. Negative effects are also recognised due to potential in habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance from this large scale, greenfield development.

The SA also notes that the Nature policy requires a Green-Blue infrastructure plan to be prepared for the site to show how the green links reflect the landscape setting.

Action:

None

52

Respondent: Mrs Pamela Hull [72]

Change suggested by respondent:

Green links should be specified and not left to developers to decide.
Buffers need to be the same for crockleford heath as they are for Wivenhoe and Elmstead market.
Need tree and wild life preservation orders
The deer and wildlife of Crockleford Heath need protecting as does their habitat.
Crockleford Heath could not sustain anymore traffic movement in and around the hamlet.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

The green links indicated are not defined in terms of a width I understand that the width will be left to the discretion of the developers. These green links are the only internal green boundaries between the three communities, and as such should be defined in terms of a width of at least 100m In particular the Crockleford community, the only existing community within the broad development area, is only been granted an unspecified 'green link', separating it from the northern community. This is far below the green buffers being afforded to Wivenhoe and Elmstead, communities outside the broad area.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

The SA recognises that green links will be incorporated within the Garden Community and concludes that these will support connectivity by active travel modes across the site, helping to provide positive effects in relation to SA objective 7: sustainable travel and other related objectives.

The SA also recognises the positive effects in relation to SA objective 6: biodiversity of green-blue infrastructure provision, tree planting and biodiversity net gain requirements in the Nature policy. Negative effects are also recognised due to potential in habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance from this large scale, greenfield development.

The SA also notes that the Nature policy requires a Green-Blue infrastructure plan to be prepared for the site to show how the green links reflect the landscape setting.

The SA recognises long term limitations on further abstraction from the water resources supplying Colchester Borough (para. 3.115). Nevertheless, positive effects are identified for the DPD in relation to the water resources aspect of SA objective 11: Water resources and quality as the Sustainable Infrastructure policy requires all buildings to include water efficiency measures and seek to achieve water neutrality and the Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation policy requires appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development.

Action:

None

53

Respondent: Mr Adam Hall [70]

Change suggested by respondent:

The area within the proposed 100m wide green links should also have specified tree preservation and woodland/nature conservation management specifications
The whole scheme is to large and the basics have not been investigated as in assess to water as all water in the area is from bore holes and not reservoirs and there will not be sufficient to support such a vast scheme.
The whole project should be abandoned.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

The Sustainability Appraisal does not adequately appraise the impact on congestion on the existing road network, in particular Clingoe Hill. The criteria on congestion focus on sustainable transport mitigation measures but do not address the question of whether these will offset the impact of the development to an acceptable level. The implications of a phased delivery of the A133/A120 link road need to be reviewed in this context.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

SA report considers the Garden Community's potential impact on traffic congestion, air quality and sustainable transport through SA objectives: 3: health, 7: sustainable travel and 13: air quality. Conclusions on the effects of the Garden Community DPD as a whole and in-combination effects with large-scale residential developments in the vicinity of the Garden Community site are set out in Chapter 5 of the SA report.

A mixture of positive and negative effects was recognised:

Positive due to: provision of local services and facilities and employment opportunities; promotion of travel by walking cycling and public transport (including Rapid Transit System)

Negative due to: large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

As such, there are considered to be no significant, additional effects beyond those recorded in the policy assessments and cumulative effects assessment within the SA report.

In relation to the Link Road, the SA recognises:
- planning permission was granted in 2021 (para 1.10), which will improve already good access of site to Harwich Port / Freeport East via A120 (para 3.57)
- potential negative effects on health and wellbeing due to noise, air and light pollution affecting development close to the Link Road, A120 and A133 (para 4.99), with the environmental mitigation conditioned in the planning permission helping to limit these (para 4.124)
- mixed effects in relation to sustainable travel due to integration of the Garden Community with the link road (para 4.164)

More detailed consideration of congestion, including quantification of expected changes in traffic flows on particular roads is beyond the scope of the SA .

In relation to phasing of the Link Road, the SA report notes that Policy 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation of the DPD requires that proposals for the Garden Community demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered in a timely and, where appropriate, phased manner by the proposal. Should delivery of the link road be delayed such that significant occupation of the development occurs in advance of the road being available then it is accepted that this could lead to short term negative effects on traffic congestion and air quality within the area.

Action:

None

62

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

Change suggested by respondent:

More clarity on phasing is required

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

Since the plan was approved there have been developments of consequence that challenge the initial decision. When the proposal when approved a link road to offset additional traffic was included. On grounds of affordability the new road is no longer proposed until after 1000 + houses built, in the meantime cost will rise further and an ever repeating cycle of "let us build more to afford the contribution" will occur. Clingoe Hill congestion features daily on local radio traffic news. Essex University continues to expand and students using the pedestrian crossing at the roundabout further exacerbating the congestion.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

SA report considers the Garden Community's potential impact on traffic congestion, air quality and sustainable transport through SA objectives: 3: health, 7: sustainable travel and 13: air quality. Conclusions on the effects of the Garden Community DPD as a whole and in-combination effects with large-scale residential developments in the vicinity of the Garden Community site are set out in Chapter 5 of the SA report.

A mixture of positive and negative effects was recognised:

Positive due to: provision of local services and facilities and employment opportunities; promotion of travel by walking cycling and public transport (including Rapid Transit System)

Negative due to: large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

As such, there are considered to be no significant, additional effects beyond those recorded in the policy assessments and cumulative effects assessment within the SA report.

In relation to the Link Road, the SA recognises:
- planning permission was granted in 2021 (para 1.10), which will improve already good access of site to Harwich Port / Freeport East via A120 (para 3.57)
- potential negative effects on health and wellbeing due to noise, air and light pollution affecting development close to the Link Road, A120 and A133 (para 4.99), with the environmental mitigation conditioned in the planning permission helping to limit these (para 4.124)
- mixed effects in relation to sustainable travel due to integration of the Garden Community with the link road (para 4.164)

More detailed consideration of congestion, including quantification of expected changes in traffic flows on particular roads is beyond the scope of the SA .

In relation to phasing of the Link Road, the SA report notes that Policy 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation of the DPD requires that proposals for the Garden Community demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered in a timely and, where appropriate, phased manner by the proposal. Should delivery of the link road be delayed such that significant occupation of the development occurs in advance of the road being available then it is accepted that this could lead to short term negative effects on traffic congestion and air quality within the area.

The SA (paras 5.16-5.17) concluded that as part of a wider policy approach to promoting use of sustainable transport modes, the Rapid Transit System is likely to contribute to a significant proportion of residents making use of more sustainable transport options. The SA also recognised that the large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

Action:

None

63

Respondent: Mr Alexander Stanmore [83]

Change suggested by respondent:

> The scheme proposes provision of a rapid transit service into Colchester City. Since initial approval all but 1 significant shop in Colchester has relocated and most employment locations, the main railway station and shops will not be served by the rapid transit alternative . The Park and Ride use figures will confirm that Rapid Transit looks good but to what purpose? No road = Clingoe Hill junction becoming as congested than the Dartford Crossing. If further development without infrastructure is allowed it is highly unlikely the air quality in the area will comply.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

> Having attended a community presentation. Event. I find the whole plan unsound. In as much as traffic chaos and congestion will make life hell for residents of Elmstead and Clingo Hill will be gridlocked thus life for residents and workers will be at a standstill going nowhere.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

> None

Response:

SA report considers the Garden Community's potential impact on traffic congestion, air quality and sustainable transport through SA objectives: 3: health, 7: sustainable travel and 13: air quality. Conclusions on the effects of the Garden Community DPD as a whole and in-combination effects with large-scale residential developments in the vicinity of the Garden Community site are set out in Chapter 5 of the SA report.

A mixture of positive and negative effects was recognised:

Positive due to: provision of local services and facilities and employment opportunities; promotion of travel by walking cycling and public transport (including Rapid Transit System)

Negative due to: large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

As such, there are considered to be no significant, additional effects beyond those recorded in the policy assessments and cumulative effects assessment within the SA report.

The SA identifies positive effects in relation to SA objective 3: Health and SA objective 8: Services and infrastructure from a variety of the DPD's policy requirements, notably the following:

Policy 6: Community and Social Infrastructure:
- Multifunctional community buildings and spaces must be provided throughout the Garden Community, including to accommodate faith groups, social prescribing activities, community fitness, play and cultural activities.
- Land is allocated or protected for a new country park, for a Sports and Leisure Park to serve the local community and for the expansion of sports facilities for the University of Essex. Sports and recreation requirements of the Garden Community must be met in full.
- All centres must include a diverse range of uses, including, but not limited to, education, retail, community space and a dedicated or flexible space to enable activities to support the wider determinants of health.
- Proposals must include a new Health and Wellbeing Hub, flexible space for health provision within community buildings and any off-site mitigation.
- The Garden Community will provide for early years and childcare facilities, and schools, that are located centrally to the Neighbourhoods they serve and away from primary traffic routes.

Policy 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation of the DPD:
- Proposals for the Garden Community must demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered in a timely and, where appropriate, phased manner by the proposal.

Action:

None

135

Respondent: Mrs Janet K Green-Whitfield [135]

Change suggested by respondent:

Too many houses insufficient infrastructures doctors, dentists, poly clinics. Roads traffic permanently gridlocked and pollution unbearable. Elmsted, Colchester/Clacton Road speed limits not adhered to now! This will only get worse. Our local villages will be lost and will turn into an urban sprawl of Colchester no way a garden community. The plan for the Braintreeand Great Tey community have just been cut and paste into the plans for TGC. I object strongly! Too many houses not enough to do for residents for leisure purposes! Needs a complete rethink or cancellation.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

The misnamed “garden” community will exacerbate traffic problems on the eastern side of Colchester. Since the pandemic there has been a 120% increase in the number of cars in the road, and the queues along Clingoe Hill are getting worse - several times a week, there are queues of traffic banked up all the way up to near the university turn-off. This causes pollution and has a significant impact on the health of Colchester and its citizens. The new development will make this situation CONSIDERABLY worse.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

SA report considers the Garden Community’s potential impact on traffic congestion, air quality and sustainable transport through SA objectives: 3: health, 7: sustainable travel and 13: air quality. Conclusions on the effects of the Garden Community DPD as a whole and in-combination effects with large-scale residential developments in the vicinity of the Garden Community site are set out in Chapter 5 of the SA report.

A mixture of positive and negative effects was recognised:

Positive due to: provision of local services and facilities and employment opportunities; promotion of travel by walking cycling and public transport (including Rapid Transit System)

Negative due to: large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

As such, there are considered to be no significant, additional effects beyond those recorded in the policy assessments and cumulative effects assessment within the SA report.

The SA (paras 5.16-5.17) concluded that as part of a wider policy approach to promoting use of sustainable transport modes, the Rapid Transit System is likely to contribute to a significant proportion of residents making use of more sustainable transport options. The SA also recognised that the large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

Action:

None

149

Respondent: Mr David Huggon [139]

Change suggested by respondent:

This situation will NEVER be resolved unless alternatives are provided to the private car. The proposed new link road out towards the north of Colchester will not alleviate traffic problems. In fact, I think it will make people think that they can just carry on driving as if things were all hunky dory.
1. Much better cycle lanes are needed. At the moment there is no proper cycle path from the East side of Colchester into town. It is possible to get down to the Wivenhoe Trail, but to get there is in itself a tricky journey. Cycling needs to be made a lot more attractive to people. The cycle paths need to be segregated, and not just added in to planning as an afterthought. In fact, they should be prioritised ahead of road building.
2. The same applies for walkways. Safe footways should be built along cycle paths, so that walking is a viable alternative.
3. A tram style system into town. This would encourage people to use public transport and not just jump in to the car. This would also have economic benefits for the regeneration of the city centre.
4. A car sharing system should be introduced eg for Clingoe Hill.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

The broad location in fig 1.1 does not match the final DPD as it doesn't include the area around Jubilee Lane in Crockleford.

The Sustainability Appraisal does not adequately appraise the impact on congestion on the existing road network, in particular Clingoe Hill and Bromley Road. The criteria on congestion focus on sustainable transport mitigation measures but do not address the question of whether these will offset the impact of the development to an acceptable level.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Figure 1.1 within the SA report shows the broad location of the Garden Community and matches Figure 1 within the DPD. As stated at para 4.96 of the SA report, the appraisal of Policy 1: Land Uses and Spatial Approach was based on the Councils preferred approach for the spatial layout of the site as described in the policy text and accompanying key diagram rather than the broad location.

SA report considers the Garden Community's potential impact on traffic congestion, air quality and sustainable transport through SA objectives: 3: health, 7: sustainable travel and 13: air quality. Conclusions on the effects of the Garden Community DPD as a whole and in-combination effects with large-scale residential developments in the vicinity of the Garden Community site are set out in Chapter 5 of the SA report.

A mixture of positive and negative effects was recognised:

Positive due to: provision of local services and facilities and employment opportunities; promotion of travel by walking cycling and public transport (including Rapid Transit System)

Negative due to: large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

As such, there are considered to be no significant, additional effects beyond those recorded in the policy assessments and cumulative effects assessment within the SA report.

In relation to the Link Road, the SA recognises:
- planning permission was granted in 2021 (para 1.10), which will improve already good access of site to Harwich Port / Freeport East via A120 (para 3.57)
- potential negative effects on health and wellbeing due to noise, air and light pollution affecting development close to the Link Road, A120 and A133 (para 4.99), with the environmental mitigation conditioned in the planning permission helping to limit these (para 4.124)
- mixed effects in relation to sustainable travel due to integration of the Garden Community with the link road (para 4.164)

More detailed consideration of congestion, including quantification of expected changes in traffic flows on particular roads is beyond the scope of the SA.

In relation to phasing of the Link Road, the SA report notes that Policy 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation of the DPD requires that proposals for the Garden Community demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered in a timely and, where appropriate, phased manner by the proposal. Should delivery of the link road be delayed such that significant occupation of the development occurs in advance of the road being available then it is accepted that this could lead to short term negative effects on traffic congestion and air quality within the area.

Action:

None

178

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

Change suggested by respondent:

The implications of a phased delivery of the A133/A120 link road on both Clingoe Hill and Bromley Road need to be reviewed in this context.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

Colchester town has a lot of traffic problems. the population is getting ever larger with no increased infrastructure to support it. ie Small size of hospital. Schools having to have ever increasing class sizes. Too many cars, as most people have a car to get to get around. Go to London or elsewhere to work. Public transport is appalling.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

SA report considers the Garden Community's potential impact on traffic congestion, air quality and sustainable transport through SA objectives: 3: health, 7: sustainable travel and 13: air quality. Conclusions on the effects of the Garden Community DPD as a whole and in-combination effects with large-scale residential developments in the vicinity of the Garden Community site are set out in Chapter 5 of the SA report.

A mixture of positive and negative effects was recognised:

Positive due to: provision of local services and facilities and employment opportunities; promotion of travel by walking cycling and public transport (including Rapid Transit System)

Negative due to: large scale of development at the site will undoubtedly result in an increased number of journeys within and beyond it, and some of these will be by private car.

As such, there are considered to be no significant, additional effects beyond those recorded in the policy assessments and cumulative effects assessment within the SA report.

The SA identifies positive effects in relation to SA objective 3: Health and SA objective 8: Services and infrastructure from a variety of the DPD's policy requirements, notably the following:

Policy 6: Community and Social Infrastructure:
- Multifunctional community buildings and spaces must be provided throughout the Garden Community, including to accommodate faith groups, social prescribing activities, community fitness, play and cultural activities.
- Land is allocated or protected for a new country park, for a Sports and Leisure Park to serve the local community and for the expansion of sports facilities for the University of Essex. Sports and recreation requirements of the Garden Community must be met in full.
- All centres must include a diverse range of uses, including, but not limited to, education, retail, community space and a dedicated or flexible space to enable activities to support the wider determinants of health.
- Proposals must include a new Health and Wellbeing Hub, flexible space for health provision within community buildings and any off-site mitigation.
- The Garden Community will provide for early years and childcare facilities, and schools, that are located centrally to the Neighbourhoods they serve and away from primary traffic routes.

Policy 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation of the DPD:
- Proposals for the Garden Community must demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered in a timely and, where appropriate, phased manner by the proposal.

Action:

None

207

Respondent: Mrs Susan Gheorghiu [158]

Change suggested by respondent:

A Doctor`s surgery should be in situ.Also it should be noted Colchester hospital is already too small for the present population. The local schools , will have even bigger classes. Plus the road lay outs are unsuitable for greatly increased traffic. Already Crowdry Avenue is very very busy at rush hour.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

Objective 3:

A request is made that the appraisal consider both on site and off site facilities.

Not only the distance to a healthcare facility should be included, but its service capacity.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

The SA Framework has included indicators that are considered appropriate and reasonable for the Councils to monitor. Although the wording suggested by the reg.18 rep was not included in the appraisal questions of the SA framework for SA objective 3, it considered that this has been adequately and appropriately addressed.

The SA report notes that Policy 6 of the DPD seeks to create neighbourhoods with local centres that include a diverse range of uses, including community and healthcare space in addition to an inclusive public realm that is safe and connects the community with the natural environment. Additionally, proposals must include a new Health Centre, flexible space for health provision and enhancements to existing facilities, including those in locally accessible locations. As such, the needs of the new residents of the Garden Community should be met through new healthcare facilities.

The SA also notes that Policy 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation of the DPD requires proposals for the Garden Community to demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered in a timely and, where appropriate, phased manner by the proposal. It is accepted that in the short term there may be additional pressure placed on existing healthcare facilities should the phasing of new provision lag behind the occupation of new housing.

Action:

A Statement of Common Ground is being prepared between the Councils and the Health bodies including the ESNEFT, and a review of monitoring indicators taking place.

268

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

Agent: Lawson Planning Partnership

Change suggested by respondent:

Amendment proposed to Objective 3 to include off site provision.

Suggested wording:

"… including through the provision of new on- and off-site infrastructure of this type?"

Facilities capacity should also be included as an indicator in Objective 3

Attachments:

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