297 Object

Document Element: MM51 (Main)

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

Summary:

Location of land uses should be defined by the local authorities in the DPD and not by the developer in a planning application otherwise it renders the DPD as completely ineffective as a policy document on which applications can be determined.

Full text:

Location of land uses should be defined by the local authorities in the DPD and not by the developer in a planning application otherwise it renders the DPD as completely ineffective as a policy document on which applications can be determined.

Change suggested by respondent:

New transport assessment should not have the power to undermine the modal
shift targets or the full build out of the link road before any houses are sold. Additionally the illustrative note in the DPD needs to be removed and land uses should be set via policy.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

368 Support

Document Element: MM51 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM51, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Whilst illustrative only, this is the only plan that shows vehicular access locations in the DPD so others may add weight to its interpretation.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM51, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Whilst illustrative only, this is the only plan that shows vehicular access locations in the DPD so others may add weight to its interpretation.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

453 Object

Document Element: MM51 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM 51 – We find the reasoning provided to be precisely why this illustrative plan is so problematic, as it acknowledges that foundational details such as points of vehicular access are not confirmed within the DPD. This modification does not resolve the problem as it remains the only mapping presented within the DPD to show these features, but is not supported by policy, despite many assumptions being based upon it.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

282 Object

Document Element: MM52 (Main)

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

Summary:

This amendment wouldn't be needed if the full link road was being delivered before housing. Without it the entire plan is unsound and unsustainable.
MM52 A ADDTIONAL MODICATION REQUIRED IN THIS CHAPTER. None of the issues raised by Highways England are covered in modifications. Yet resolution of these issues are critical and as such should form a backstop for the project in policy. Especially given the information now released on traffic modelling. That shows at only 1000 homes (within the GC or otherwise) mean the westbound carriageway suffers from unacceptable congestion.

Full text:

This amendment wouldn't be needed if the full link road was being delivered before housing. Without it the entire plan is unsound and unsustainable.
MM52 A ADDTIONAL MODICATION REQUIRED IN THIS CHAPTER. None of the issues raised by Highways England are covered in modifications. Yet resolution of these issues are critical and as such should form a backstop for the project in policy. Especially given the information now released on traffic modelling. That shows at only 1000 homes (within the GC or otherwise) mean the westbound carriageway suffers from unacceptable congestion.

Change suggested by respondent:

Should the insecurity remain with the delivery of the link road then flexibility is needed in the policy until a date is set to build the final phase. Otherwise, existing traffic that uses local lanes to cross the site and avoid congestion in town will be rerouted onto the already heavily congestion A133.

MM52A There should be a main mod that covers the resolution of all HE's concerns and sets a trigger to prevent housebuilding until the road is fully built out.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

369 Support

Document Element: MM52 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM52, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM52, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Latimer will be building new roads across the Garden Community to adoptable standards meaning the existing adopted lanes become surplus to requirements. However, these will be utilised and repurposed to become safe and attractive walking and cycling corridors, with existing hedgerows enhanced and buffered to become 'green movement corridors' which criss-cross the masterplan. They will be critically important active travel corridors for the neighbourhoods. This updated text recognises this ambition and the process which needs to be undertaken to realise this strategy.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

454 Object

Document Element: MM52 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM 52 – As per the reasoning presented it is acknowledged that the road network and capacities is not fully understood, if the DPD was an effective plan using an evidence led approach this problem would not exist. Such a degree of flexibility to alter established road networks already serving local communities, including Crockleford within the area in question, makes this modification a substantial change that would require additional consultation.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

296 Object

Document Element: MM53 (Main)

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

Summary:

Modal shift has been set. it is for the developer to achieve this, not say new evidence proves it's impossible. Otherwise, what is the point of the DPD policy in the first place?.

Full text:

Modal shift has been set. it is for the developer to achieve this, not say new evidence proves it's impossible. Otherwise, what is the point of the DPD policy in the first place?.

Change suggested by respondent:

This modification should be removed.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

370 Support

Document Element: MM53 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM53, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM53, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

The mode split targets reflect the land-use quanta tested in the DPD and the Transport Assessment will establish the targets based on detailed forecasting and will be agreed with the highway and planning authority based on the transport strategy proposed and linked to the phasing strategy for both the development, Park and Choose and Link Road. Review mechanisms for the DPD will allow updates to respond to the developing evidence base.

Monitoring and Managing transport over the lifetime of the project will be critical in being able to ensure appropriate mitigation is delivered at the right time. This regime will be secured in the S106 for the hybrid planning application. Modal shift targets and ambitions for reducing car use over time will be closely monitored and will allow the package of mitigation to better respond over the passage of time as new homes and infrastructure are delivered.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

295 Object

Document Element: MM54 (Main)

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

Summary:

This modification weakens policy.

Full text:

This modification weakens policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

'Ensure' is stronger policy and should remain.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

371 Support

Document Element: MM54 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM54, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The modification to the policy reflects that infrastructure can (alongside promotional measures) enable and encourage sustainable travel but not ensure it.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM54, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The modification to the policy reflects that infrastructure can (alongside promotional measures) enable and encourage sustainable travel but not ensure it.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

455 Object

Document Element: MM54 (Main)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM54 – this weakening of language is not effective plan making, encouraging such an effect does not guarantee any positive results, and there are sufficient assumptions based on the success of this policy that it must be guaranteed.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

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

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

456 Support

Document Element: MM55 (Main)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM55 – support this change to recognize alternate means of public transport may emerge as preferable over the timeframe of the development.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/3w

294 Object

Document Element: MM57 (Main)

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

Summary:

See below

Full text:

See below

Change suggested by respondent:

Replace ‘serve’ with 'directly serve'.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

372 Support

Document Element: MM57 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM57, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

How the RTS will serve each neighbourhood centre will be the subject of plot testing within detailed master planning, undertaken in support of the emerging planning application for the site. “Accessibility” rather than “a direct link” avoids introducing a potential conflict with other policies by being prescriptive about the alignment of RTS.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM57, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

How the RTS will serve each neighbourhood centre will be the subject of plot testing within detailed master planning, undertaken in support of the emerging planning application for the site. “Accessibility” rather than “a direct link” avoids introducing a potential conflict with other policies by being prescriptive about the alignment of RTS.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

457 Object

Document Element: MM57 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM57 – seems like an unnecessary watering down of an effective policy. For neighborhood center proposals to be an effective community placemaking principle, there needs to be direct access to the RTS, without the potential for varying interpretations of the 'serve' wording that could complicate decision makers process during planning applications.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

293 Object

Document Element: MM58 (Main)

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

Summary:

See below

Full text:

See below

Change suggested by respondent:

The wording in italics should be replaced with 'before any houses are sold'

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

325 Object

Document Element: MM58 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Peter Kay [94]

Summary:

Latimer have let the cat out of the bag by stating in their SCG that the RTS route only needs to be available 'early, where possible', and that the first part of the GC built can have an ordinary bus service instead. Effectively 'we will start the RTS when we feel like it'. They do not wish to act in accordance with the requirement on DPD p.99 that the RTS should be 'delivered up first, aligning with the build out of the GC'

Full text:

Latimer have let the cat out of the bag by stating in their SCG that the RTS route only needs to be available 'early, where possible', and that the first part of the GC built can have an ordinary bus service instead. Effectively 'we will start the RTS when we feel like it'. They do not wish to act in accordance with the requirement on DPD p.99 that the RTS should be 'delivered up first, aligning with the build out of the GC'

Change suggested by respondent:

'ready during the first residential parcels' is not proper English. What exactly is it supposed to mean? Also there is no definition of what constitutes the 'first' parcels - the plural gives scope to argue about how many constitute the 'first' batch.

'first phase of the development' in the existing wording presumably means 2026-2033, so meaning that the RTS must be running no later than 2033. (Which was in itself a degrading of the previous 'from first occupation' requirement). Now this quasi-dated term is proposed to be replaced by an undefined dateless vagueness.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

373 Support

Document Element: MM58 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM58, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM58, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

It is agreed that a quality public transport service must be available during the first phase that generates residential trips, and, where possible, the RTS segregated route be available early. However, MM58 introduces required flexibility in the wording to avoid the DPD prejudging the location of the first phase, i.e. that it must be adjacent to the safeguarded RTS corridor.

Reference to “first residential parcels” rather than “first phase” under MM58 provides useful clarity for interpretation and implication of the policy, given there may be a requirement for infrastructure enabling works relating to energy etc which would fall under the definition of “first phase” but wouldn’t have any homes associated with it to require an operational RTS.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

405 Support

Document Element: MM58 (Main)
Respondent: National Highways [172]
Agent: National Highways (Mr Mark Norman, Spatial Planner) [173]

Summary:

We welcome the tightening of the wording regarding the delivery of the raid transit service into Colchester town centre and the strengthening of policy regarding public transport in general. This will be essential in keeping the vehicular trips from the development to a minimum.

Full text:

Thank you for notifying us of the consultation on the modifications suggested by the inspector to the DPD.
We welcome the tightening of the wording regarding the delivery of the raid transit service into Colchester town centre and the strengthening of policy regarding public transport in general. This will be essential in keeping the vehicular trips from the development to a minimum.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/39

374 Support

Document Element: MM59 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM59, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The updated policy wording aligns with other policy references within the DPD, to the RTS being a 'fast' service.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM59, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The updated policy wording aligns with other policy references within the DPD, to the RTS being a 'fast' service.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

326 Object

Document Element: MM60 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Peter Kay [94]

Summary:

The intermediate section of the RTS has been assumed to involve the RTS buses using the existing A133 carriageway (why one assumes why nothing was sought from HIF on this section). If highways works were to be done, that would presumably fall to ECC? So what is the 'relevant permission' that Latimer have to obtain before their first planning application?

Any legal 'permission' would have to define where the eastern end of the intermediate section is, i.e. the point where the intra-GC section of the RTS leaves the A133. This remains quite unknown, as does the position of the P&C.

Full text:

The intermediate section of the RTS has been assumed to involve the RTS buses using the existing A133 carriageway (why one assumes why nothing was sought from HIF on this section). If highways works were to be done, that would presumably fall to ECC? So what is the 'relevant permission' that Latimer have to obtain before their first planning application?

Any legal 'permission' would have to define where the eastern end of the intermediate section is, i.e. the point where the intra-GC section of the RTS leaves the A133. This remains quite unknown, as does the position of the P&C.

Change suggested by respondent:

Latimer should be required by the DPD to define the alignment of the intra-GC section of the RTS (including the A133 junction position), replacing the current meaningless 'illustrative only' route, at a specified point in the forthcoming procedures. If it is not done in the DPD, the next opportunity would be in the outline planning application (which would also really be the last opportunity).

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

375 Object

Document Element: MM60 (Main)
Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]
Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer strongly object to MM60. In addition, the stated 'reason' for the modification is not agreed, as the proposed modification does not simply carry forward the requirement from the Section 1 Plan. MM60 would introduce a further constraint, beyond the Section 1 Plan.

Full text:

Latimer strongly object to MM60. In addition, the stated 'reason' for the modification is not agreed, as the proposed modification does not simply carry forward the requirement from the Section 1 Plan, which states:

Before any planning approval is granted for development forming part of the Tendring / Colchester Borders Garden Community, the following strategic transport infrastructure must have secured planning consent and funding approval:

a) A120-A133 link road: and

b) Route 1 of the rapid transit system as defined in the North Essex Rapid Transit System: From Vision to Plan document (July 2019

MM60 would therefore introduce a further constraint, beyond the Section 1 Plan.

The connection from the A133 section C of the RTS (delivered by ECC under the HIF programme) to the Park and Choose and through the Garden Community, would be detailed and proposed within the Hybrid Planning application for the site, but in the first instance would seek to utilise the existing dual carriageway

It is therefore not practical to restrict approval of a planning application for development forming part of the Garden Community, until this is provided. The proposed modification is not required, is unclear and would be overly restrictive.

The Section 1 Plan already forms part of the Development Plan for this site, therefore the policy does not need to be repeated in the DPD (or reworded to make it more onerous as proposed here). It is therefore strongly requested this modification is rejected.

Change suggested by respondent:

The proposed modification is not required.

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

406 Support

Document Element: MM60 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Graham Vine [197]

Summary:

The A133 to A120 link road is vital.
- Good routes to avoid excess Clingoe Hill traffic
- Good link to Harwich/Bathside Bay
- Reduction of problems due to Colchester's "partial junctions"
- Self-build in the new community should be encouraged

Full text:

It is vital that the link road between the A133 and the A120 be built and sooner rather than later. It can then be used to transport materials for the construction of the new community, which I fully support. The thought of all the extra traffic using Clingoe Hill, even with the improved public transport, is daunting to say the least. Colchester is already blighted with its "partial junctions" to its north.

In my experience, traffic from the east (eg Clacton, Frinton…) travelling to the west of Colchester (eg to Colchester Institute area) frequently travels along the A12 as far as the A1124 and then doubles-back to junction 27 towards the city, increasing traffic. That's because junction 27 is one of the "partial junctions", having no east-bound turn from the west-bound A12.

Another "partial junction" is at the Crown Interchange whereby traffic may enter the city along Newcomen Way but there is no way out of the city using that route. At least an extra little slip road north from the Newcomen Way junction with Stephenson Road to the A12 slip road would allow some traffic to head London-bound out of the industrial estate rather than having to queue along Severals Lane and Ipswich Road.

A similar problem arises due to there being no northern access to junction 28 / Park&Ride. A simple single carriageway link to Boxted Road/Straight Road would encourage use of the PnR from the north as currently the journey from the north to the PnR involves considerable driving, well into the city, in order to then drive back north to get to the PnR. Again, there is no incentive to do so as most users will just think they might as well carry on a little further into the city itself.

In order to encourage the start/completion of badly-needed houses rather than developers sitting on "banked" land that has planning permission, I recommend allocating a large number of plots to self-build applicants. These individuals are highly motivated to complete their properties, unlike some developers. This would make a significant contribution to hitting government targets, along with direct-build by Councils.

Still considering the vital link road between the A133 and the A120, the link to the new community community allowing traffic for the continent to easily access the Dovercourt and Harwich areas should be considered – not all traffic wants to head London-bound. With Bathside Bay being an important development, all communication links should be as high a quality as can be achieved in a reasonable timescale. It is to be hoped that the extensive rebuilding of the A120 over the next 6 months will facilitate the new link road rather than hinder it. Indeed, even an embryonic version of the link would assist in this important resurfacing.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

426 Support

Document Element: MM60 (Main)
Respondent: National Highways [172]
Agent: National Highways (Mr Mark Norman, Spatial Planner) [173]

Summary:

We welcome the tightening of the wording regarding the delivery of the raid transit service into Colchester town centre and the strengthening of policy regarding public transport in general. This will be essential in keeping the vehicular trips from the development to a minimum.

Full text:

Thank you for notifying us of the consultation on the modifications suggested by the inspector to the DPD.
We welcome the tightening of the wording regarding the delivery of the raid transit service into Colchester town centre and the strengthening of policy regarding public transport in general. This will be essential in keeping the vehicular trips from the development to a minimum.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/39

292 Object

Document Element: MM61 (Main)

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

Summary:

There are ways to ensure no on street parking. I.e. design, red routes and car bans. So, this modification is unacceptable

Full text:

There are ways to ensure no on street parking. I.e. design, red routes and car bans. So, this modification is unacceptable

Change suggested by respondent:

Leave policy as is

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

376 Support

Document Element: MM61 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM61, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. Design can seek to avoid these issues, it cannot 'ensure'. The monitoring strategy for TCBGC will ensure that unforeseen issues with parking are picked up and addressed in subsequent design phases. Car parking management and enforcement will also be a key tenet of the stewardship and estate management regime for the site.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM61, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. Design can seek to avoid these issues, it cannot 'ensure'. The monitoring strategy for TCBGC will ensure that unforeseen issues with parking are picked up and addressed in subsequent design phases. Car parking management and enforcement will also be a key tenet of the stewardship and estate management regime for the site.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

458 Object

Document Element: MM61 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM61 – strongly disagree with the assertion that design cannot ensure such matters, the drastic weakening of wording does not make for effective plan making, and the suggestion that significant issues with parking are merely rectified at later planning phases is unacceptable. A proposal may both seek to avoid such parking issues while evidence shows it will cause problems. The design of the development can functionally make significant negative parking impossible, so the policy should aspire to do this, not push rectifying foreseeable issues to future development phases to rectify.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

377 Support

Document Element: MM62 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM62, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

The Transport Assessment will define what is to be agreed for TCBGC and this should align with the ambitions established in the evidence base. Latimer agree that the RTS and active travel modes are the priority however some flexibility is required in the DPD, as provided by MM62, to fully understand network and road capacities and how this will inform the masterplan work and ultimate transport strategy, mitigation packages and mode split targets.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM62, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

The Transport Assessment will define what is to be agreed for TCBGC and this should align with the ambitions established in the evidence base. Latimer agree that the RTS and active travel modes are the priority however some flexibility is required in the DPD, as provided by MM62, to fully understand network and road capacities and how this will inform the masterplan work and ultimate transport strategy, mitigation packages and mode split targets.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

291 Object

Document Element: MM63 (Main)

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

Summary:

Wording and intent is unclear. Aiding access onto the link road from neighbourhoods will slow down the A1331.

Full text:

Wording and intent is unclear. Aiding access onto the link road from neighbourhoods will slow down the A1331.

Change suggested by respondent:

This evidence should also demand that no plot is sold until the link to A120 is in place. Policy should also state that access across the site to Bromley Road should be maintained until the full link road is built.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

328 Object

Document Element: MM63 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Philip Robinson CBE [74]

Summary:

Modelling, with its high degree of uncertainty (due to the unproven novel plans for travel behaviours) could result in the access road from the Tye Road roundabout into the Southern Community being opened unnecessarily. This would expose the adjacent major school complex to a high traffic flow alongside its boundary, contrary to the planned vehicle free zone around it.
It would be preferable to gate this access road for emergency vehicles only initially, and only open it to general traffic if regular traffic surveys at the Southern Community Link Road junction on the A133 roundabout prove its need.

Full text:

Modelling of predicted travel volumes in advance will have a high level of uncertainty, due to the novel plans for modal shifts in travel behaviour. However, since there will be an access road at the outset from Tye Road Roundabout into the Southern Community provided for emergency vehicles there is the opportunity to restrict this as a gated access point at the start of the housing developments. Then the actual traffic density at the A133/A1331roundabout can be regularly monitored as the housing occupancies grow and the “reality” will determine when, or indeed if, the additional access is needed.

The proposed access to the Southern Community to the Tye Road roundabout is likely to pass immediately adjacent to the major school complex (located in the south of the Northern Community).This aspires to have a vehicle free zone around it (MM40 refers). Therefore it is important that this potentially high traffic flow is not allowed next to the schools in advance of actual (rather than simulated) evidence justifying its need.

Change suggested by respondent:

The suggested modification is to restate the second point on p.104 as:

“Subject to regular survey of the traffic volumes on the junctions that access the “Link Road”, the Garden Community must aim to restrict vehicular connectivity between individual junctions of the “Link Road”, except for public transport and emergency vehicles, apart from the ‘Link Road’ itself”.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

378 Support

Document Element: MM63 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM63, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Latimer's initial testing of the capacity of the A133 junction indicates that the Southern Community will require two points of vehicular access to the Link Road. This will be confirmed through detailed modelling in the Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application, however MM63 enables this flexibility to protect the ability for the Southern Community to have access from the A133 and Tye Lane Roundabouts on the Link Road.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM63, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Latimer's initial testing of the capacity of the A133 junction indicates that the Southern Community will require two points of vehicular access to the Link Road. This will be confirmed through detailed modelling in the Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application, however MM63 enables this flexibility to protect the ability for the Southern Community to have access from the A133 and Tye Lane Roundabouts on the Link Road.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

459 Object

Document Element: MM63 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM63 – the insertion of 'aiming to' restrict vehicular access is another drastic weakening of an already effective policy. The current wording is far more effective plan making and so should not be altered. If by the reasoning presented for this modification there is evidence
that conflicts with the DPDs own evidence base, this would suggest that either one or both methods of testing are functionally flawed and so the DPD policies are based upon incorrect assertions. To only now be exploring the potential 'need' for a direct access from the A133 to
the southern community, when said junction is already under construction shows a significant shortcoming in planning thus far. To install such a connection would drastically alter many of the traffic models relied upon for the DPD. This modification represents a major alteration that would require additional public consultation and re-examination, alongside an updated evidence base to assess its effectiveness.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

290 Object

Document Element: MM64 (Main)

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

Summary:

Commitment to funding does not secure delivery.

Full text:

Commitment to funding does not secure delivery.

Change suggested by respondent:

A guarantee of who will
deliver the road is needed (with a design agreed in full by highways England). Also, a
completion date needs to be confirmed and specified in policy.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

460 Object

Document Element: MM64 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM64 – While we support the intention of the modification, a commitment to full funding must be more than demonstrated, it must be agreed upon in a legally binding contract to enable planning permission to progress. Demonstrated is not adequate phrasing for such an essential purpose.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

289 Object

Document Element: MM65 (Main)

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

Summary:

Do not agree with any part of the wording

Full text:

Do not agree with any part of the wording

Change suggested by respondent:

The infrastructure provision as
stated in section one policy is what made this a sustainable site. That distinction was made based on established traffic modelling. No flexibility on this should be given.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

379 Support

Document Element: MM65 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM65, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM65, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Monitoring progress towards the targets will be essential over the long build out of the development and flexibility must be built into infrastructure triggers to ensure that the transport infrastructure proposed within each development phase addresses the transport conditions at the time.

“In accordance with” as previously drafted could be interpreted to mean with the modal split targets and strategy in the evidence base. Latimer agree that the RTS and active travel modes are the priority, however MM65 introduces the flexibility required to understand network and road capacities and how this will inform the masterplan work, transport strategy, and mitigation packages which the Transport Assessment will address.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

461 Object

Document Element: MM65 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM65 – Once again the alteration to language is weakening an already effective policy – 'to reflect' is ambiguous and unenforceable, if the travel plan is utilizing best practice, it will be in accordance with the guidance. While we acknowledge the supporting evidences inclusion, this is effectively two modifications portrayed as one.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

288 Object

Document Element: MM66 (Main)

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

Summary:

The impact on the A133 will be very easy to monitor and when it gets too busy
- like it is now! - the building should be stopped.

Full text:

The impact on the A133 will be very easy to monitor and when it gets too busy
- like it is now! - the building should be stopped.

Change suggested by respondent:

It should be clearly stated in policy that
no building should start until the link road is operational and if modal shift targets aren't met then building should stop.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

380 Support

Document Element: MM66 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM66, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The modification will ensure that external modal split targets are appropriately measured and monitored.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM66, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The modification will ensure that external modal split targets are appropriately measured and monitored.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

287 Object

Document Element: MM67 (Main)

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

Summary:

This part of the policy and the modification do not align with Section 1 policy or the principle of a garden community

Full text:

This part of the policy and the modification do not align with Section 1 policy or the principle of a garden community

Change suggested by respondent:

The modification needs a clause that says any new findings cannot reduce modal shift targets. And must state clearly that phase 2 of the link road needs to be built BEFORE any occupation of homes occurs.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

381 Support

Document Element: MM67 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM67, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

The phased delivery of infrastructure is important. MM67 introduces flexibility into the DPD to fully understand network and road capacities within the Transport Assessment and how this will inform the masterplan work and ultimate transport strategy, mitigation packages and mode split targets.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM67, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

The phased delivery of infrastructure is important. MM67 introduces flexibility into the DPD to fully understand network and road capacities within the Transport Assessment and how this will inform the masterplan work and ultimate transport strategy, mitigation packages and mode split targets.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

286 Object

Document Element: MM68 (Main)

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

Summary:

This watering down of policy is unacceptable

Full text:

This watering down of policy is unacceptable

Change suggested by respondent:

see above

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

382 Support

Document Element: MM68 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM68, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The proposed modification reflects that infrastructure can (alongside promotional measures) enable and encourage sustainable travel, but not 'ensure' it.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM68, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The proposed modification reflects that infrastructure can (alongside promotional measures) enable and encourage sustainable travel, but not 'ensure' it.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

383 Support

Document Element: MM69 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM69, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The modification reflects that the completion of a Healthy Streets for Life Assessment may only be possible at particular stages of the planning process. The updated wording is clear that principles are incorporated early, but the assessment will follow.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM69, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The modification reflects that the completion of a Healthy Streets for Life Assessment may only be possible at particular stages of the planning process. The updated wording is clear that principles are incorporated early, but the assessment will follow.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

285 Object

Document Element: MM70 (Main)

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

Summary:

see below

Full text:

see below

Change suggested by respondent:

The policy wording should be - agreed BY the council. and not with the council.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

384 Support

Document Element: MM70 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM70, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

For a development this scale, annual monitoring does not give time for the full cycle of monitoring, review, agreement of measures, implementation of measures and evaluation of impacts of the interventions. MM70 reflects the frequency that will be agreed at a later date.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM70, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

For a development this scale, annual monitoring does not give time for the full cycle of monitoring, review, agreement of measures, implementation of measures and evaluation of impacts of the interventions. MM70 reflects the frequency that will be agreed at a later date.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

462 Object

Document Element: MM70 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM70 – removing the annual review to an undetermined timescale is a significant change when it is an unlimited change. While there are small changes to the policies annual frequency that would be acceptable such as every 2 years, if the frequency is instead changed to every decade it is unacceptable. An effective policy tool would have been to instead simply agree the preferred timeframe for this modification and we are concerned this seemingly wasn't possible.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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