## 1 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 18 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mr Carl Banks [46]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination
**Oral exam why:** Otherwise you will not really listen to residents concerns
**Attachments:** None

## 19 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Ms L G [49]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** Yes
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 22 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mr A Rayner [51]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

Elmstead does not need 7500 new homes as that is 15000 cars. Need new schools and doctors. I wish I was not so old as I would move are out of ELMSTEAD it was nice when 9 moved here 50yr ago.
We need new Roads now not in 2 years, the Hospital can not cope now, 15000 more people how CAN THEY cope, will they try and cope or not look after us as we would like.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:**

## 23 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mrs Karen Ewers [52]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

To say I'm shocked is a total understatement! How anyone could think building SO many homes so close to Elmstead Market when we've already had so many developments built or under construction right now, already. I understand the country need more homes but Elmstead is/was a small village with few amenities.
We have done our bit!!

I moved to Elmstead Market nine years ago because I wanted to live in the countryside. I wanted to walk with my dogs IN THE COUNTRYSIDE!! If this development goes ahead there will be no countryside. If Elmstead Market gets swallowed up, because that is what is happening, I will have to move house. Exactly why should I be forced to do that?

And something else why do the amenities, of which many will be needed with this size development, go in last! Why will people have to struggle with overcrowded/full nurseries and schools? What about our health services struggling as it is to serve the village of Elmstead?

These plans must have been drawn up by people supposedly claiming to be intelligent. BUT WHO IN THERE RIGHT MIND, COULD POSSIBLY THINK, THIS EVEN COMES CLOSE !!! TO BEING GOOD IDEA!!
Oh a great money making opportunity silly me.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:**

## 36 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

**Summary:**
Colchester will spread making us an urban jungle.

**Full text:**
comments re new development

The New development has been prepared with out thought on how the infrastructure is going to be available, we are struggling at the moment to live and get medical treatment as the hospitals and doctors are over whelmed with no capacity to treat the population as it is.
The village of Elmstead which has nothing but one shop and over subscribed doctors and not much else.
This project has been badly thought up it does not help normal people with housing ,just greedy builders who are jumping on the band wagon to build houses that the majority cannot afford. No thought has gone into how our village can manage with the volume of traffic when most local people have to travel to gat any medical treatment shopping and other important essentials availability to better their lives. The village has already grown to twice its size with new homes.

Elmstead will become out cast from all these things that are necessary to survive. The air pollution will become intolerable to many of our village with medical problems. No thought has gone into our villages, infrastructure for roads crossings and just to maintain quality of life. The increased traffic will cause more accidents and people not being able to access medical help via ambulances re the traffic which is going to cause delays . people will die.

Elmstead will become isolated with no way of getting to Colchester for the essentials to maintain a quality of life that we expect.

These buildings are not for the local populous but for out siders who have no empathy with the way of life that we have all struggled to achieve in our small village good quality of life and a peaceful existence., good air quality. We are aware that things need change but Colchester has built so many house without any more hospitals schools dentists and doctors as it is we have to wait 5/6 weeks for a doctors appointment and with what is proposed now with out realistic management for all is abominable, no thought of how our village can cope with this distraction of our way of life.

Education will not be available to all children as there are no places for them as no extra schools are being built this again is unacceptable the impact of the population is not possible as no thought has gone into the extra land available for the infrastructure it is madness to continue in this unthought out plan. Colchester will spread making us an urban jungle.

This can not be allowed to continue with no thought on how people can survive with out adequate hospitals doctors schools etc this cannot be allowed to go on without some sensible input and constructive thinking ,councillors can not just do as they please forgetting the people that have paid their taxes supported the councils all these years to be brushed aside.
This is insane thinking without a proper constructive plan to help all without out destroying our way of life.
Government have no idea as to what they want regarding more homes no thought about quality of life. It will cause over crowding and no infrastructure to cope with the rise in the populous. The health of the area will become impossible with no health care available as there will be no capacity in the one hospital that is suppose to serve all.

**Change suggested by respondent:**
-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 39 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

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

**Full text:**
Consultation response from the Wivenhoe Society

The comments below relate mainly to Policy 1 and the Policies map but also include matters addressed in other policies as the Plan needs to be considered as a whole. Also there are omissions in what is covered in the Plan.

1) Conformity with the Local Plan
The adopted section 1 of the Local Plan sets out various conditions that the Development Plan Document should meet in policies S6, S8 and S9. To be legally compliant the DPD needs to conform to these requirements.
SP9 of the Local Plan requires that 'the DPD..... will include a concept plan showing the disposition and quantity of future land-uses, and give a three dimensional indication of the urban design and landscape parameters which will be incorporated into any future planning applications; together with a phasing and implementation strategy which sets out how the rate of development will be linked to the provision of the necessary social, physical and environmental infrastructure to ensure that the respective phases of the development do not come forward until the necessary infrastructure has been secured. For the A133-A120 link road there is the requirement in SP6 that before any planning approval is granted for development forming part of the Tendring /Colchester Borders Garden Community the A120-A133 link road must have secured planning consent and funding approval.

HIF was secured towards the link road but increased costs mean that the amount is not adequate to fund the full link road. The three Councils, Colchester, Tendring and Essex have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Latimer, the developer, that the link road will be built out in two phases. Nowhere in the DPD is this detailed. The Memorandum of Understanding is not included in the list of evidence documents. The MOU can be viewed as one of the agenda documents on the following site

https://colchester.cmis.uk.com/colchester/MeetingCalendar/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1201/Committee/30/Default.aspx It sets out a phased delivery approach to the Link Road. Phase 1 will be the construction of the A133 roundabout plus a partial Link Road with multiple access arrangements to the Garden Community, terminating at a roundabout south of Allen's Farm. Phase 2 will include the completion of the Link Road with a new junction to the A120. Under the MOU a section 106 or other legally binding agreement to fund the second phase must be agreed before any planning permission is granted. However the text says 'Latimer as master developer of TCBGC, confirms its commitment to fund the delivery of the second phase of the Link Road as soon as is practically and financially possible to do so in accordance with the emerging Development Plan Document and the general 'infrastructure first' ethos and garden community principles that TCBGC is being planned upon.' There is no indication of how many dwellings etc might be built before the completion of the link road nor is there any guarantee that it will be 'practically and financially possible' for Latimer to fund it. This does not accord with the requirement that the DPD sets out phasing details or that it 'secures funding' for the Link Road as required in policy SP6 of the Local Plan. It is not clear that a binding section 106 agreement to fund an un-costed, inflation proofed, second phase of the Link Road would be feasible.

The soundness implications of a phased delivery of the link road are discussed in section 2 below

In policy SP6 it is stated the DPD must include details of the design and delivery of Route 1 of the rapid transit system and that before any planning permission for development is granted Route 1 of the rapid transit system as defined in the North Essex Rapid Transit System:.From Vision to Plan document (July 2019) must have secured planning consent and funding approval before planning applications are approved. Nowhere in the submission version itself are details of the design and delivery of the RTS apart from the routes within the Garden Community shown on the Policies map nor is there any evidence that planning consent and funding have been secured. There is a very sketchy report available for the July 2022 meeting of the Garden Community joint committee but this has not been put in the evidence base. The Transport Evidence Base Part 2 does show a route for the RTS running with dedicated lanes adjacent to the A133. Does this map form part of the DPD? There is no document discussing the merits of this proposal relative to the other alternatives suggested in the 2019 Vision to Plan document.

The soundness of the RTS system is discussed below in section 3.

2) Issues relating to the link road phasing
For Wivenhoe and other communities to the east the A133 is the only major route to Colchester. It is possible at present to use a diversionary route on country lanes via Slough Lane connecting to Bromley Road, or via Tye Road (more convenient for those living in Elmstead Market). The only other alternative is to go east to join the connection to the A120 east of Frating Green, a very long diversion. Boundary Road which runs through the University is not open as a through route for general traffic. The A133 already experiences high levels of congestion and delays. This is not solely a peak hour problem. In the following document (2017) produced by Essex Highways (EXD/071)
https://www.braintree.gov.uk/downloads/file/750/exd071-presentations-to-cbc-councillors-on-a-future-transport-strategy-for-colchester Clingoe Hill is shown as having the highest volume of daily traffic flows (34,146) of any of the radial routes into Colchester. There may be more up to date evidence on traffic flows but the two transport evidence base documents do not quantify current or potential flows. The two transport evidence base documents focus on the sustainable transport mitigation measures. These do not discuss the impact of phasing the delivery of the full link road. All the additional traffic from the first stage of development will need to use the A133. Even with the most optimistic predictions about modal split this will inevitably lead to increases traffic volume. The modelling of likely journey times and frequency of delays presented in the evidence base for the Part 1 Hearings assumed that the link road would be in place. An analysis of the number of likely trips based on destination in the absence of a full link and the impact on congestion is required and should not be left to the planning application stage.

The Quod Economic and Employment report states 'the prospects for a business park (B2/B8 logistics, industrial and ancillary office) with direct access to the A120 are strong in the short term'. It also suggests the northern employment site might be used for a modular house construction plant. Without a link to the A120 it is unlikely there would be demand for the site.

3) RTS issues
The RTS route will have implications for the A133, Clingoe Hill section. The 2019 Vision to Plan document gave various options for the RTS route. Judging from the Transport Evidence Base Part 2 the proposals appear to be that this should run on dedicated lanes adjacent to the A133. There is no discussion of the alternatives. Soundness requires that reasonable alternatives are considered. In the Vision to Plan document the possibility of the RTS entering the University Campus at West Lodge, connecting to Nessfield Road and then Capon Road was suggested, though it is not clear if this was intended to provide a separate leg for some of the buses or whether this would continue via Elmstead Road to join Colne Causeway. The current buses from Wivenhoe and Brightlingsea use Boundary Road and then Capon Road and Elmstead Road. The section from Capon Road westbound is reasonably fast except for delays at the junction with Colne Causeway. If the section of Elmstead Road which is currently closed to traffic was made available for the RTS with controlled lights at the Colne Causeway junction then this delay could be mitigated. If this route were followed then the RTS system could enter the Garden Community opposite West Lodge with no need to use the A133 at all. There seem various advantages to this.

Firstly it is not clear to the lay person that there is sufficient space on the approach to the Greenstead roundabout to construct dedicated RTS lanes. If this is not possible then this would give a pinch point at the roundabout affecting traffic flows.
Secondly it would avoid the severe disruption costs from adding the segregated lanes to the A133. It is easy to draw lines on a map but to the lay person it is not clear that additional lanes could be built without closing one side of the dual carriageway while they were installed. There is no discussion of the likely need to fell trees on the central reservation. The report to the joint committee mentioned above gave a fifteen month build out for construction. With only one side of the dual carriageway functioning, the traffic delays would be very severe given the volume of traffic on Clingoe Hill. This would be likely to cause queuing to connect with this stretch of the A133 both at the Greenstead roundabout and at the junction of the B1027 and the A133. The B1027 and the B1028, which leads to Wivenhoe, are not dual carriageways. Delays at the junction with the A133 can cause tailbacks which if they reach as far as back as the Boundary Road/B1028 junction can impact on the journey time for buses from Wivenhoe and Brightlingsea which use Boundary Road.
Thirdly if the buses used Capon Road the bus stops serving it would be on average nearer to offices and academic buildings on the Campus and there would be no need for RTS users to cross the A133 to access a bus stop. It would also give better connectivity with the local buses from Wivenhoe and Brightlingsea as passengers using these could interchange to the RTS if they so wished. Similarly travellers from the Garden Community could interchange to the local bus (currently the S1) which gives access to the industrial/commercial buildings at Whitehall allowing a commute by public transport. It would give an, admittedly circuitous, public transport link from the Garden Community to Wivenhoe.

4) Roundabouts and crossings on the A133
Much of the DPD seems to be illustrative rather than definitive. The Policies Map does however show an access point at the junction of the A133 and the B1027 for the RTS, a Park and Choose site, access to Knowledge based employment land and adjoining uses (whatever that means). On one of the illustrative maps pedestrian/cycle crossings are also shown at this junction. It is difficult to see the logic of locating this access point at the junction which is crucial for access to and from roads leading to Wivenhoe and the communities on the Brightlingsea Road. This junction works reasonably efficiently at present, though there can be delays and tailbacks. Relatively recently there was an experiment when the timings of the traffic lights was altered but they had to be changed back because of delays caused. Reconfiguration works of this intersection would make Wivenhoe virtually a no go location while the works were being done. Locating the entry point further to the west would seem to give fewer problems, maybe opposite West Lodge if the RTS system were to use the route suggested in section 3) above but the suggestion of a more western entry point does not depend on altering the entire RTS route outside the Garden Community. With increased traffic levels the junction

layout as shown on the Policies Map must be demonstrated to be workable.

The University favours having a bridge to link the current Knowledge based employment land with any new provision rather than a pedestrian/cycle crossing. If the proposed cycle route into Colchester ran on the north side of the A133 within the boundaries of the Garden Community and then on the south side of the A133 it too could use this bridge.
Other 'tiger' crossings are shown on the illustrative map. These will slow down traffic flows on the A133. It would be better to provide two bridges, the one to the west suggested above and one to link the proposed sports facilities on the land to the south of the A133. This would be better for traffic flow and would be safer; particularly as some of the users of the sports fields are likely to be children. The Policies Map shows a potential park and choose site to the south of the A133. Having to cross a dual carriageway using a pedestrian crossing to access the RTS buses would not make it a very attractive proposition.

5) Park and Choose
An estimate of the likely demand for the Park and Choose should be provided. Wivenhoe is currently fortunate in having a good bus service, admittedly not very fast but it would seem unlikely that Wivenhoe residents would use the Park and Choose as there would be potential traffic delays reaching it and time costs of switching from one mode to another.

6) Location of Knowledge based employment, University needs
It is not clear what the merit is of stringing the employment development along the north side of the A133 rather than focussing on land opposite the current Knowledge Gateway. There appears to be some land to the southwest which is proposed for housing. How is this to be accessed? If this housing is itself connected by roads to the rest of the southern neighbourhood then it cannot be accessed directly from the A133 as this would mean other southern neighbourhood traffic would use the A133 access point. It would seem sensible for the southwest corner to be used for employment land and possibly student accommodation with only active travel mode connections to the southern neighbourhood. If a bridge across the A133 were provided as suggested above the student accommodation would be fairly well connected with the Campus.

The Local Plan specifies in SP9 para 25 that there should be an allocation of additional land within the garden community, to accommodate University expansion, which is at least equivalent in size to the allocation in the Colchester Local Development Framework Site Allocations document October 2010. It is not clear that this condition is met unless the land allocated for University sports facilities is included as part of University expansion. The DPD does not specify how much student accommodation is proposed, nor does it make clear if dwellings equivalent of any student housing is included in the overall housing provision totals (the usual formula is 2.5 student rooms equals one dwelling, though depending on the nature of the accommodation a lower figure than 2.5 is sometimes used).

7) Land South of the A133
The Society welcomes the fact that the latest proposals do not include any Knowledge based employment land at this location and agree that it is a suitable location for additional University sports grounds (though the ecological impact of any floodlighting needs to be examined given its proximity to Wivenhoe Park). It is less clear that this is a good site for providing sports provision for the new community. It is appreciated that there are overall land constraints if a target of 7,500 dwellings is to be achieved but the land south of the A133 is remote from much of the future development and a location more central to the new community would be desirable. A potential Park and Choose site is also shown on the map. This would entail crossing the A133 to access the RTS route which could well deter people from using it.

8) Neighbourhoods and connectivity
The layout is being left to future Master Plan proposals. However it is not clear whether one garden community or three small ones is being proposed. To encourage sustainable and active travel modes the suggestion appears to be that there will be no routes between the neighbourhoods for private vehicular transport. A policy of no private car travel between neighbourhoods, except by using the link road will create problems for access to the health hub and the secondary school. It is not feasible to provide one for each of the neighbourhoods. A connected community of 7,500 could support a supermarket, a post office, library,a relatively large community building and possibly other shared facilities and specialist shops. Active travel is certainly to be encouraged and neighbourhood facilities need to be provided but the synergies of a larger community should not be overlooked. If it is very difficult to access one neighbourhood from another by car this could well reduce total car journeys but the total distance travelled by car could increase if drivers have to make journeys via the link road. There is also a proposal that there should be no direct connection for private vehicular travel from the Bromley Road to the A133/A120 link road. Given land to the north of the Bromley Road is shown for housing use it is difficult to see how residents on this land could access say the health hub or the secondary school by car which on occasion could be necessary. Would they have to use the Bromley Road to connect to the Greenstead roundabout, then use the A133 and the link road connections?

9) Stewardship and ownership
Greater clarity is needed about the ownership of community assets and ultimate financial responsibility for these. There is discussion of stewardship in part F of Policy 6 of the DPD. To quote:
A detailed Stewardship Strategy, supported by a (independently reviewed) business case, will need to be prepared and agreed in writing with the Councils which will need to establish the scope of
the stewardship and community governance arrangements, how it will evolve and develop over time, and the long-term financial sustainability of the model. This strategy will need to show how the
arrangements proposed will successfully interact with and work alongside existing local governance arrangements including town/parish councils.
Consider open spaces and take the example of the proposed new countryside park at Salary Brook. This falls almost entirely in Colchester and will to some extent benefit Greenstead residents as well as those in the new community. What body would actually own it and who would pay for the maintenance costs? Similarly the proposed sports area south of the A133 falls within Tendring. This might be considered an asset of value to the general area as well as the Garden Community. Who would own and who would be responsible for managing this? It is difficult to believe that an endowment fund sufficient to meet costs in perpetuity could be provided by the developers.

10) Main Conclusions
i) The Wivenhoe Society recognises that the Local Plan specifies a Garden Community in the area of search shown in the Plan and we would hope that it could be successful. However the link road from the A133 to the A120 was recognised as essential for the development. The DPD does not make it clear that the entire link road will not be provided from the outset and no timing for its full delivery is given nor the implications of this discussed. Traffic issues on the A133 will not only affect existing local communities but also Garden Community residents.
ii) There is no discussion of the RTS route outside of the Garden Community in the DPD itself nor is justification given for the route implied in the supporting Transport evidence. The disruption costs of building the RTS and reconfiguring the junction of the B1027/A133 are not discussed at all and there is no consideration of how these could be minimised.
iii) There is insufficient discussion of the justification of the location of various activities/facilities. In particular it is not explained why the Knowledge based employment is strung out along the A133, why the south of the A133 could be a good location for a Park and Choose site and why the proposed main sports facilities are so far from the majority of the future housing
iv) The suggested neighbourhood structure for the Community does not seem designed to exploit the potential synergies of a development on the scale proposed.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Yes
**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination
**Oral exam why:** The Wivenhoe Society was represented at the Local Plan hearings and has a membership of several hundred residents.
**Attachments:** None

## 40 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mrs Carolyn Mason [64]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** Yes
**Sound:** Yes
**Comply with duty:** Yes
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 43 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr Hiran Perera [65]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 45 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Prof Anthony Vickers [68]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

The green links indicated in this section are not defined in terms of a width, and 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 search area.

The area within the proposed 100m wide green links should also have specified tree preservation and woodland/nature conservation management specifications.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** Yes

**Sound:** No

**Comply with duty:** No

**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

**Oral exam why:** I am a resident of Crockleford Heath, the only existing community within the broad search area and the spokesperson for the Crockleford and Elmstead Action Group (CEAG).

**Attachments:** None

## 49 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Ria Lockwood [71]

**Summary:**

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

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

KEEP ELMSTEAD A VILLAGE KEEP IT SEPERATE FROM COLCHESTER.

**Full text:**

To whom this may concern

I am writing this email to give my opinions and objections as to why I feel and many other Elmstead residents are against the new Development planned on the Colchester/Tendering boarder.

1. This would cause a huge amount of traffic influx in a small village community this would Cause more congestion as well as pollution this would then also cause back log of traffic that would build up along the A133 which is busy enough during rush hour both am & Pm this would cause more traffic coming into Elmstead making this road more of a danger than it already is. I have young children who attend the local school in Elmstead and crossing the road of the A133 can sometimes take up to 6-7 minutes due to no crossing that has been promised for many years. This causes danger for small children the roads are busy enough without adding more oncoming and outgoing traffic.

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

3. The noise and building traffic this development would cause in such a beautiful area there is so many new housing developments going up everywhere there is too many as it is the noise and dust is not acceptable for residents to have to live with.

4. Elmstead has many elderly residents who have lived here for many years its a beautiful picturess village when entering in either direction, the drive into Elmstead from the direction of Colchester is lovely and green why do you feel you need to change this??? Why do you have to join Tendering with Colchester?? Making Greenstaed part of the village?? Greenstead has a very high crime rate this will spread further and further into the suburbs. Causing run down parts of the area bringing the wrong type of people into such a well loved area.

5. Traveller site??? Why there is no reason this has to be here they are known to cause lots of rubbish and destruction to their own living environment as well as again I mention attracting more crime to areas of elderly and families this seems like a really un thought about idea which needs to be re considered.

6. 9000 new homes not 7,500 as previously mentioned where on earth are these families going to register with a doctors, dentists??? Schools???? this is a very large number of homes for such a small area is this necessary?

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

8. Colchester is a busy enough town to have any more property developments everywhere you go you sit in traffic upon traffic its absolute chaos, this will just over populate the areas surrounding. Elmstead and surrounding villages should be left alone and kept how they have been over centuries these developments cause upset and heart ache to local people whom have seen the changes over the years loss of wildlife and woodland.

9. Loss of homes for wildlife has been a major worry over the years with all the new homes being built everywhere it just seems today's world all is thought about is money and no consideration for local people and their families this is a huge concern as I believe the local residents should have their say and this should be listened too.

10. Elmstead is a well loved community with residents having lived here the majority of their lives. Money should be put into areas to improve them for example a zebra crossing across the A133 from Affells road to make it safer and easier to access the local school. A speed camara at the start of the village to slow down incoming vehicles that speed through the village there is lots of children in Elmstaed and is a major worry to parents. Resurfacing roads reducing the pot holes this list is endless.

I hope these are taking in to consideration, and looked into my objections as well as many others. KEEP ELMSTEAD A VILLAGE KEEP IT SEPERATE FROM COLCHESTER.

Thankyou myself and Elmstead look forward to your reply.

Miss R Lockwood

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 55 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mr Ian Yexley [76]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

The plan is currently posted as "Broad" and needs to be more focused and complete before people can really see how it will impact them and their communities. I need to see roads named on plans, routes for new roads fully agreed and boundaries finalized before any really constructive comments can be submitted, particularly those for the buffer zone between the new development and the western edge of Elmstead Market. The proposal for the new A133 to A120 link road needs to be firmed up and built before any housing is started or Elmstead Market will be come a no go zone because of traffic levels and have a serious detrimental impact on the local population. The rush hour delays into Colchester on Clingoe Hill are already a headache for locals and any further negative impact on traffic will have a serious impact on Elmstead. The very significant level of daily lorry movements throughout the whole of the plans lifecycle needs to be published along with an agreement that weekend lorry movements will not be used to provide some respite to locals using the local road network.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No

**Sound:** No

**Comply with duty:** No

**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

**Oral exam why:** I feel local opinion will be overlooked and the plan will be pushed through regardless of known impacts on Elmstead Market following this discussion phase. The plan needs to fully commit to the road and infrastructure phase being complete before house building is started, or at least to a point where construction vehicles are not blocking or impacting the A133 in any way at all. I would prefer the A133 to A120 road be fully open before any other construction takes place to provide as much relief for the A133 as possible and would gladly provide a voice for this.

**Attachments:** None

## 64 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mr Michael Watson [85]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

I oppose the building of the Garden Village on the Colchester / Tendering borders on the grounds listed below.
1. Infrastructure
2. Water Treatment
3. Salary Brook boundary
4. Rapid Transport System
5. Housing
6. Gypsy / Traveller site

1) Concerns have been raised that no infrastructure being in place during the first stages of the development. There is not enough social, health or education provision initially planned. The report says these views have been taken on board but the consultation document does not address the concerns raised in any depth.
Within the Community and Social infrastructure assets at the earliest stage of development, (for each development) there should be essential requirements for:
* Early years and nursery provision
*Primary school(s)
*Secondary school
*Dentist, GP surgery, Pharmacy and clinical facilities offering out-patient support that cannot be provisioned at Colchester General Hospital
*A Community multi-use building with sufficient self-contained spaces within it to accommodate use by different faith groups, clubs and societies, including youth clubs
The suggestion that an initial 100+ houses may be required to begin funding the project before any infrastructure begins is alarming and directly in contradiction to the local plan.

2) There is a gap in terms of lacking a policy on grey and black water treatment specifically. This being of particular concern because of the odour emitted from the sewage works by The Hythe.
The problems of water and air pollution for the local residents of Elmstead and Crockleford Heath caused by the building of up to 9,000 accommodation units. There is the importance of identifying the means and method for the treatment of these waste water types at DPD stage, so they can be properly costed and prepared in advance before the commencement of any building.
Currently any policy as to how sewage and water will be dealt with is missing; in view of the final size of the garden community development, surely there is a vital need to deal with this essential part of the infrastructure right at the start.
There is the problem of major road disruption, in an already heavily traffic congested area, for the whole of the East of Colchester during the pipe-work installation to link to at the groundwork stage.

3) In the area of the suggested Knowledge Gateway / Industrial expansion, there is a concern that the proposed development could end up spilling halfway down the Salary Brook slopes designated as country park area, which is at best a meagre offering of habitat for the size of the area to be desecrated. This would be a contradiction of two other agreed principles based on community and public input into the engagement process. Building on the ridgeline would cause buildings, not in character with a country park, to dominate these slopes and the whole surrounding landscape. The buildings would have a detrimental effect and be viewable from great distances, ie The University Towers.

4) The description of the route of the Rapid Transit System (RTS) connecting the Garden Community with the rest of Colchester is too vague in stating “it will be in place to connect the Garden Community with the University of Essex, Colchester Town Centre, Colchester Railway Stations, Colchester Hospital, Community Stadium, Colchester Sports Park and the existing Park and Ride site in north Colchester”. Prospectively, the buses will always be in traffic struggling through bottlenecks at railway and river crossings from the East of Colchester right into the town. In the documents, there are no plans to address these points by building new bridges or underpasses.
There is no current map provided to indicate the exact route, therefore leaving the developers open opportunity to place the road at their discretion. We need a clear definition of the route and identification of the bottlenecks and costings for resolving them. There is no current indication of how the RTS will actually be paid for; except for the developer stating a (non binding) certain amount of houses will have to be sold first, to allow for the building of the RTS.
The RTS will be built in stages according to the sale of properties to fund each part. This means years of increased traffic, starting with Heavy Goods Vehicles, leading onto trade vans and domestic cars passing through the village of Elmstead and the adjoining back-roads for many years.
5) Affordable Housing Phasing: The public should have a definitive statement stipulating that the 30% affordable housing rule should apply at all stages of the development. Planning permission stage, housing starts and housing occupation. Otherwise the developers would use an “Affordable Housing Phasing Strategy” to justify the late delivery, or diminished quantity of affordable housing.
Accordingly, all ‘Affordable Housing’ should be first offered to locally living residents affected by the development; followed by Front line / Blue Light workers.
6) Within the guidelines of Gypsy and Traveller needs: the size of the gypsy and traveller provision is to be determined as part of Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment.
How are the developers and council going to deal with this issue?
Where is this site to be placed as it has not been shown in the context of the planners outline permission. The site needed would be very big in relation to the GC; and at what stage would this ‘mini development’ take place.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** Yes
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** Consultation document Garden Village.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/4

## 66 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

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

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

• The requirement for proposals to contribute positively to the health, wellbeing and resilience of communities and the natural environment is welcomed as this would be consistent with Government policy in paragraph 92(c) of the NPPF and Sport England's Active Design guidance;
• The principle of providing a new 'Salary Brook' country park within the development is welcomed as this will provide a strategic informal recreation space that would encourage physical activity associated with walking and cycling;
• The principle of providing a Sports and Leisure Park to serve the local community and the expansion of the University of Essex's sports facilities is welcomed as the concept of a hub site is needed to support the scale of sports facilities required to support the Garden Community and it would be appropriate to co-locate this with facilities needed to support the University's expansion so that shared use of the facilities can be facilitated. However, it is requested that the policy should address the following matters:
- Clarity should be provided on the scope of sports facilities that may be accommodated in the sports and leisure park i.e. will indoor facilities and floodlit facilities be permitted. This would help avoid potential misinterpretations of the scope of what would be considered acceptable in this location especially as many of the facilities required to support the community needs and potentially the University's needs will be indoor or floodlit. This is pertinent if this location is considered to be environmentally sensitive. If the location is not considered to be suitable for indoor or floodlit facilities then the location of the Sports and Leisure Park should be reviewed as a site which is only suitable for outdoor facilities that are not floodlit would not be responsive to the community's needs identified in the evidence base.
- The preparation of a masterplan for the Sports and Leisure Park should be an explicit requirement of the policy in order to ensure that a co-ordinated approach is taken to meeting the sports facility needs of the community and the University, the possible accommodation of a 'Park and Choose' facility and meeting the policy's environmental objectives. A scenario where the Sports and Leisure Park is developed on an incremental basis (e.g. the Park and Choose facility first) in the absence of a masterplan framework should be avoided as this may compromise the delivery of the policy objectives. A masterplan is also required to demonstrate that the site has the capacity to meet all of the needs that is proposed to accommodate. While part K of the policy requires Area Specific Masterplans to be prepared, the policy should make it explicit that a masterplan is specifically required for the Sports and Leisure Park given the importance of a co-ordinated approach and to avoid disputes over the scope of the detailed Area Specific Masterplans;

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** Yes
**Sound:** Yes
**Comply with duty:** Yes
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 72 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 81 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Ms Rose Clarke [99]

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

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**
-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 82 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

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

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**
Be a lot firmer in the commitment to the RTS.

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 94 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr David Mead [27]

**Summary:**
Officers Summary
•The GC Principles unproven. Vision overly aspirational and adopts naive perception of way in which communities are established and of human behaviour- is not simply determined by environment.
•The GC unlikely to address local housing need, unless a greater proportion of rented housing is included. Present proposed approach will encourage further migration from London suburbs, by the property wealthy whose pattern of work has changed post Covid-19.
•Many prospective residents occasionally commuting to London and WFH.
•Unrealistic assumptions made to extent to how private car usage will be reduced by the RTS.
•The practicalities of community ownership are unclear.
•Shared ownership(SO) and rented housing included in the DPD as separate categories and transferring from rent to SO included.
•I was told at a consultation event that environmental requirements for new homes cannot exceed current building regulations, this is not clear from the DPD, which suggests the environmental requirements will be much higher.
•The neighbourhood map does not clearly distinguish between the North and Crockleford neighbourhoods.
•Not justifiable to concrete over large part of rural Essex.
•Why is this GC viable, while others in Essex were not.

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

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

GC Policy 1: Land Use and Spatial Approach.

• The Garden Community Principles unproven. The GC vision overly aspirational and adopts a naive perception of the way in which communities

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

Policies Map:

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

Policy 2: Nature.

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

Policy 3: Place Shaping Principles.

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

Policy 4: Meeting Housing Needs.

• There has been significant housing development around Colchester in recent years. Predominantly this has not met a local housing need, but has fuelled movement of people from other areas, particularly London It is difficult to imagine that if it proceeds the TCBGC will not have a similar pattern of home ownership.
• Residents on low income are likely to seek rented housing, from a provider of social housing and in this respect the chosen developer may be well placed to meet this need.
• To conflate shared ownership and rented housing in 30% figure for affordable housing is misleading. A greater proportion of rented housing may be necessary to meet local need.

Policy 5: Economic Activity and Employment.

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

Policy 6: Community and Social Infrastructure.

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

Policy 7: Movement and Connections.

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

Policy 8: Sustainable Infrastructure.

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

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

## 96 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Chris Went [109]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

I wish to complain in the most strongest terms possible about the proposed development of 7,500+ new homes on our doorstep. It is the most craziest idea and whoever came up with this ludicrous idea obviously doesn't live in this area.
Can't they see the roads in this area can't already cope with the excess traffic in peak hours. Clingo Hill is
forever grid locked and what do you go and do plan another 7,500+ homes. It's all well and good planning more homes if an Infrastructure is already in place but you try getting Into work in the mornings and you will certainly see it isn't.
Plus the hospital can't cope now with the amount of patients they see let alone building all these new houses.
The same also applies the schools, doctors and dental surgeries across the whole of Colchester.
I don't like saying this but Colchester and surrounding areas like Elmstead Market used to be a lovely place to live. But the way it's going it will be totally spoilt if this proposed development is allowed to go ahead.
So please please think hard before you go any further.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:**

## 97 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Affinity Water (Mrs Hannah Wilson, Environmental Planner) [108]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 100 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr Peter Halsall [111]
**Agent:** Mr Richard Halsall [110]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

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

**Legally compliant:** Yes
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Yes
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 102 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr Michael Lucking [112]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 104 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

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

**Summary:**

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

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

**Full text:**

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

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

ECC has informed, supported and helped refine the formulation of the development strategy and policies to be delivered by the DPD. Our involvement is necessary and beneficial because ECC is:
• the Highway and Transportation Authority, including our responsibility for the delivery of the Essex Local Transport Plan; lead authority for Education including early years and childcare (EYCC), SEND, and Post 16 education; Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA); lead advisors on public health; and has responsibilities for adult social care in relation to securing the right housing mix which takes account of the housing needs of older people and adults with disabilities;
• an infrastructure funding partner which seeks to ensure that development proposed is realistic and does not place an unnecessary (or unacceptable) cost burden on the public purse and, specifically, ECC's capital programme;
• a major provider and commissioner of a wide range of local government services throughout the county (and where potential cross boundary impacts need to be considered); and
• advocate of the Essex Climate Action Commission (ECAC) report "Net Zero – Making Essex Carbon Neutral" providing advice and recommendations for action on climate change mitigation including setting planning policies which minimise carbon. This work has been tailored for use in the county of Essex.

ECC considers that Colchester City and Tendring District councils have met its obligations under Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 regarding the duty to cooperate with regard to those statutory responsibilities of the County Council, namely highways and transportation, education, minerals, waste, Public Health, Lead Local Flood Authority and adult social care.

There is strong support for the policies provided in the Draft Plan, which align with ECC priorities and commitments contained in our corporate plan Everyone's Essex, and relevant service plans and strategies, such as:
• proposals for growth and development to meet housing and economic needs and the policy position to create balanced well-designed places;
• policies that relate to adaptable and accessible housing, and care assisted living and other specialist housing;
• policies, evidence and provision for education requirements and the need for a demographic study to confirm school requirements;
• policies and approach to health and well-being and the requirement to undertake Health Impact Assessments;
• policies and approach to surface water management, sustainable drainage, and multifunctional green and blue infrastructure;
• policies and approach to movement and connections, and the evidence and provision of transportation infrastructure and modal share targets;
• policies and approach to net zero and wider climate change ambitions;
• policy and approach to digital infrastructure;
• policy requiring a Minerals Resource Assessment to ensure the prior extraction of minerals is coordinated through masterplanning and the planning application process; and
• policies that relate to securing developer contributions to effectively deliver the necessary infrastructure and contributions so that ECC's role as an infrastructure provider is not jeopardised, and that this is consistent with national policy and ECC's Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions;

ECC will contribute to the examination in public and provide support for the Councils as appropriate and where this reflects our statutory role and responsibilities.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 118 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mrs Claudia Alsdorf [116]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 119 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

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

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Yes
**Sound:** Yes
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** Braintree District Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/8

121 **Support**

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

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

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

Anglian Water welcomes the strategic aims of the policy in addressing the reduction of operational and embodied carbon across the new Garden Community, including through ensuring resource efficiency and prioritisation of renewable energy.

Anglian Water's own long-term ambition to become net zero business by 2030 and reduce capital (embodied) carbon by 70% against a 2010 baseline, through innovative and optimised designs and material efficiencies, means that we encourage a quantitative approach to assessing growth options. This includes utilising available capacity at our Water Recycling Centres to accommodate future growth at locations informed by a Water Cycle Study or Integrated Water Management Study (IWMS). Anglian Water recognises that the Garden Community exemplifies this approach to utilise existing infrastructure capacity to reduce emissions from building new infrastructure to support growth. Furthermore, the Garden Community represents a quantum of growth that means investment in new infrastructure provides the greatest carbon efficiencies in relation to embodied/capital carbon in water supply and water recycling infrastructure. Our calculations show that developments that represent 5,000 population equivalent (more than 2,000 dwellings) will provide four times the carbon efficiencies than smaller developments.

The strategic masterplan identifying the Salary Brook Country Park as an important corridor for wildlife conservation, informal recreation, and education, with connections to the wider network of green and blue infrastructure is welcomed. Anglian Water considers that good design and on-site green and blue infrastructure can facilitate high quality developments that provide health and wellbeing benefits, manage surface water run-off through effective integration of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and deliver biodiversity net gain.

Part K: Planning application requirements

Anglian Water supports the requirement for a comprehensive site wide Garden Community Masterplan, detailed Area Specific Masterplans and Design Codes for relevant phases of development to be prepared by the developers.

Whilst site wide enabling costs and phasing of provision have been considered in the Infrastructure Delivery, Funding and Phasing Plan, Anglian Water would welcome further engagement on masterplans and design codes to ensure that rainwater/stormwater harvesting and greywater recycling opportunities are included as a key component of the strategic infrastructure provision to ensure the garden community demonstrates the fundamental principle of building climate resilient large-scale new communities in terms of utilising water resources sustainably through integrated water management systems.

Anglian Water is part of an innovative project, Enabling Water Smart Communities (www.ewsc.org), which was awarded £5.5 million by Ofwat as part of its Water and Breakthrough Challenge. Anglian Water is working with a range of partners including other water companies, universities, several developers and housing associations to deliver a project that will address the current barriers to integrated water management in residential development. The project would welcome the opportunity to engage with the masterplan and design code process and support implementation of integrated water management solutions for the benefit of the community, wider water resources and supply, and environmental sustainability.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 130 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 134 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mrs Claudia Alsdorf [116]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 136 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Rev Pauline Scott [136]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 144 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr David Ward [134]

**Summary:**

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

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

**Full text:**

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

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

Simply abandon the project!

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:**

## 146 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr James Marchant [138]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 148 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mrs Susan Burns [69]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 156 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr William Sunnucks [113]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

Policy GC1 – Land Use
I have three comments:

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

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

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

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

## 157 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr William Sunnucks [113]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

Policy GC1 – Land Use
I have three comments:

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

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

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

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 161 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr Christopher Burns [140]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** Yes
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Yes
**Appear exam:** Written Representation
**Attachments:** None

## 166 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mr Andrew Scott [141]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified

**Sound:** Not specified

**Comply with duty:** Not specified

**Appear exam:** Not specified

**Attachments:** None

## 173 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

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

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No

**Sound:** No

**Comply with duty:** No

**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

**Oral exam why:** If there is a hearing our Parish Council may well wish to participate.

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

## 180 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

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

**Summary:**

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

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

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

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

Part D
- Wivenhoe SGG is important to Elmstead.

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

Part F
- Sports facilities unsuitable for SGG

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

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

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

Part K
- EPC want to be more involved with masterplanning.

Justification
- Concern over density.

**Full text:**

Please see Elmstead Parish Council official response submission document submitted to TCB Garden Community at tcbgardencommunity@colchester.gov.uk.
The complete document is also attached at the next step.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

- Policy should address impact on nearby communities.

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

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

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

Part D
- Importance of Wivenhoe SGG to Elmstead should be included.

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

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

Part G
- Change location of employment area.

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

Part K
- Lower range of houses more suitable.

**Legally compliant:** Yes

**Sound:** No

**Comply with duty:** Yes

**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

**Oral exam why:** As the Parish Council representing the most affected land area and community we have a number of concerns that haven't been adequately addressed and we should be able to represent the Parish community at the hearing.

**Attachments:** GC response v3.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/j

188 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** TCBGC Community Liaison Group [104]

**Agent:** Mrs Manda O'Connell [105]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

We support the following:
Part B: The Garden Community Neighbourhoods including the 'special character' designation of the Crockleford Heath neighbourhood with its own design codes portecting 'its heritage assets and their settings, its distinctive network of green lanes, small fields and land parcels', is supported strongly by the CLG together with the concept of 20 minute neighbourhoods to support less dependence on the car, and with walkable hubs in each neighbourhood centre including shops, primary school, healthcare and community facilities. We believe that building in neighbourhoods will inculcate a sense of community in each of these centres and combat many of the ills, both physical and mental, of living in large anonymous developments without a community centre or identity. The CLG believes it is important to develop one neighbourhood at a time, for example, the southern neighbourhood closest to the A133, to focus on its development as an integrated whole with its own character and identity.
Part C: Salary Brook Country Park and
Part G: Knowledge-Based Employment Land
The CLG were able, because of their intimate knowledge of and love for this part of the local area, to propose an alternative option to the two options proposed by the planners to accommodate Knowledge Gateway and University of Essex expansion land including sports facilities needs, which was adopted by planners with some good tweaks such as extending the Knowledge Gateway expansion land as a narrow border to the A133 beyond the ridgeline. We particularly welcome the requirement of 'an appropriate transition between built development and open countryside'. Thus the area designated for Salary Brook Country Park area with its nature reserve, including wetland habitat, and the slopes with public rights of way, meadows and ancient woodland with their rich biodiversity and flora and fauna, has been safeguarded as a precious resource for both existing residents of east Colchester and future generations of the TCB Garden Community. It will also form an important strategic green gap like the other two mentioned in this policy to ensure the new Garden Community keeps its own identity and prevents coalescence with neighbouring settlements .
Part D: Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap and
Part F: Sports and Leisure Park and University of Essex Expansion
Although some of the land south of the A133 and to the east of the B1027 will be used for sports field extension for the University of Essex, to be also available for local community use, the CLG support the use of this land for this purpose, with the proviso that the intended 'strong landscaped edge', including screening such as trees and 'new enhanced habitats for a range of biodiversity' takes place. We would also support broadly its use for cemeteries/ burial grounds or allotments.
Part E: Elmstead Strategic Green Gap – Whilst the CLG support this green gap and its intended designation as 'rural' thus limiting development to suitable uses consistent with this designation, we would like to see an approach by the Garden Community, perhaps in the future, to landowners to consider rewilding schemes or adoption of woodland by the Woodland Trust, to maintain or enhance biodiversity further.
Part H: A120 Business Park
The siting of this area south of the A120 and east of the A120-A133 link road is ideally located to ensure quick access by commercial vehicles from the A120 (which leads to Harwich Docks and ferry services to the continent to the east) – providing of course the link road is completed prior to house building and occupation. This would ensure that there are employment opportunies readily accessible to TCBGC residents, which is one of the goals of the Garden Community, that employment opportunities will be provided within it whereever possible, and its siting in this location will make it attractive to business investment and accessible from outside the community.
This however would not be the case if the Link Road was not complete, where the only access to this area would be from the A133 – already hugely congested – and if visitors and deliveries were coming from the south, eg the A12, there would be a huge detour until the junction of the A120 and A133 considerably further on on the A120, with then another trip back down the A133 to gain access to this site. Clearly, commercial vehicles travelling through Colchester on the A133 is not desirable either due to existing congestion and travel times (40 minutes on Cowdray Avenue and St Andrews Avenue at peak times for a 6 minute journey). It is thus essential if the A120 Business Park is to be a success that the A133-A120 link road is built in full before the commencement of house building.
Part I: Provision for Gypsies and Travellers
The CLG support the accommodation of a site for Gypsies and Travellers in the planned location, and acknowledge that it will be developed 'in response to need', as stated.
Part J: A133 Park and Choose Facility
The policy states 'One new 'Park and Choose Facility' will be developed on land adjacent to the A133 in one of the two the broad locations shown on the 'Policies Map', where only one location is shown on this map, located at the junction of the A133 and B1027.
Whilst the CLG supports Park and Choose Facilities at this location, we do NOT accept the intended RTS route making use of this location. Instead we support the A133-A120 link road completed in its entirety and a revised RTS route which utilises the same Park and Choose facility as its starting point, then proceeding along the link road to the A120 in an anti-clockwise direction around Colchester, on a route that connects key locations such as the A120 business park, the hospital, Colchester Business Park, North Station, the Northern Gateway and returning in a loop from the station up Balkerne Hill A134 and following the A134 all the way to Elmstead Road, then Capon Road onto Boundary Road, these last 3 being dedicated bus routes which avoid the horrendously congested A133 Clingoe Hill. The route then joins up with the B1028/7 leading back to the A133 Park and Choose facility. This route is shown in the accompanying uploaded file, labelled Alt_RTS_Route.
The CLG supports the Park and Choose facility in this location but only in conjunction with a fully completed link road and the anti-clockwise RTS route around Colchester utilising the A120, because of the huge range of benefits it presents which align wholly with those of the Garden Community. This alternative plan also has the benefits of avoiding huge road improvement costs which are in any case time-limited and on avoiding additional congestion on existing overloaded routes and bottlenecks for both Garden Community residents and those of surrounding communities and traffic coming into Colchester on A133. Whereas the Rapid Transit System route based on a completed link road proposed by the CLG without huge road improvement costs and without adding to the congestion on local road infrastructure with a capacity for 50 years and beyond whilst expanding active travel and modal shift for both Garden Community and neighbouring communities.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** Alt_RTS_Route.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/z
CLG Rep GC Policy 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tw

## 191 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Mr Mark Cory [147]

**Summary:**

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

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

**Full text:**

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

See below extracts from ECC, CCC and TDC about the A120-A133 as it was gaining planning permission. On each occasion and within the planning documentation for the A120-A133 Link Road application, the strategic and local importance of this link road was explained clearly - please see below:

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Yes
**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination
**Oral exam why:** As County Councillor and City Council for the development site, I should participate in the hearing. Having voted on the Garden Community Principles, Section 1 and 2 of the Local Plan for Colchester and this DPD, I should participate and put forward the comments attached.
**Attachments:** None

## 204 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

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

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No

**Sound:** No

**Comply with duty:** No

**Appear exam:** Written Representation

**Attachments:** None

## 205 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Mrs Margaret Campbell [148]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

I object to the site of the Garden Community so close to existing neighbourhoods.

I object to reduction of trees and use of land by the University south of the A133 because there will be no reasonable buffer between the garden community and Wivenhoe. Wivenhoe already suffers from light pollution from the University expansions.

I object to the reduction of vehicle lanes, green verges and green tree central reservation on the A133 to make room for the Rapid Transport System. The A133 approach to Colchester is blocked with traffic in rush hours morning and evening. There is no mention of the park and ride for ALL traffic on the A133. The park and choose is the wrong side of the A133 for All traffic approaching Colchester.

I object to no guarantee that the link road between the A133 and the A120 will be built during the 1st phase of building of the Garden Community. There is already I need for a link road for travellers beyond Colchester.

I object to Garden Community residents using the overstretched facilities in Wivenhoe. Of the chemist and doctors and train station and parking in Wivenhoe if facilities in the Garden Community are yet to be built.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No

**Sound:** No

**Comply with duty:** Yes

**Appear exam:** Written Representation

**Attachments:** None

206 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Ms Martine Ward [137]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

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

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No

**Sound:** No

**Comply with duty:** No

**Appear exam:** Written Representation

**Attachments:** None

## 208 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

**Respondent:** Ms Martine Ward [137]

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

The language used makes believe that it will be all roses and sweet. But they are for this destroying an existing ecosystem that works, excellent fields (grade1), ancient hedgerows, trees, grove, protected lane, and the rural aspect of the countryside. Fauna and flora are the true victims of a lack of understand what they are doing. There are so many discrepancies between the illustrative plan and policies map. The maps are difficult to read as there are too often nothing clear to recognise. For example: the inclusion of Strawberry Grove – an area of ancient woodland in Elmstead Parish and the project area of search that has astonishingly been discussed, has potentially been removed and used as a construction compound. It is very concerning that this is shown on the illustrative plan, but deliberately excluded from the definitive policies.
Elmstead Parish has already suffered from a decade of speculative development. It had as a result that the number of dwellings to double, losing so much of its countryside. main concern until last year was the devastating loss of wildlife habitats that we already know are under severe threat. It has become vital with the uncertainty of the precarious international situation impacting on our food import and food prices , it is common sense and intelligence to keep farmland and it should be should be given extra protection to bolster our means of food production here in the UK. To build these 7,000 homes on green space while proudly promoting a "new" Country Park is arrogant, self-congratulatory and it is my feeling that it is totally hypocritical.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

**Legally compliant:** No

**Sound:** No

**Comply with duty:** No

**Appear exam:** Written Representation

**Attachments:** None

## 214 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

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

**Summary:**

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

**Full text:**

Thank you for consulting us on the Submission version of the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Development Plan Document, May - June 2023 (hereafter referred to as the Plan). As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process, and therefore welcome the opportunity to comment on this document.

Summary

We have reviewed the Regulation 19 Development Plan Document (DPD) and consultation material with a view to providing advice on heritage matters. As a general comment, Historic England welcomes emerging plan and work undertaken to date. Whilst we consider many aspects of the DPD to be sound, we have identified some issues which do compromise the overall soundness of the plan. Under paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework, some aspects of this Plan are unsound as they have not been positively prepared, are not justified, effective, or consistent with national policy.

In particular we remain concerned regarding the timescales for some of the technical evidence needed to inform this Plan. Without this information the Plan is not is not effective in protecting and enhancing the historic environment and is therefore not sound.

GC POLICY 3: PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES

Timescales for technical evidence - Potential mitigation and enhancements not included in policy

We remain concerned that the preparation of a mitigation strategy for heritage is being deferred to the planning application stage, hampering the effectiveness (and therefore the soundness) of GC Policy 3: Place Shaping Principles. This advice is consistent with your own adopted local plan policy below, that confirms that this evidence is needed to inform this further DPD. Tendring District Local Plan 2013 - 2033 and Beyond Section 1, Policy SP 9 - Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community states:

The adoption of the DPD will be contingent on the completion of a Heritage Impact Assessment carried out in accordance with Historic England

guidance. The Heritage Impact Assessment will assess the impact of proposed allocations upon the historic environment, inform the appropriate extent and capacity of the development and
establish any mitigation measures necessary (our emphasis).

Whilst a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been prepared (Turley's, February
2022), it (by its own admission) lacks proper consideration of what mitigation and enhancement measures might be required and how this/these could be achieved. On this point, paragraph 5.9 of the Councils' HIA recommended that:

…. a landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) for the whole TCBGC development is undertaken (in addition to those prepared for the road application) to consider the implications of the development on the landscape, visual impact and heritage of the area. This is of particular importance to assist the assessment of impacts in the Elmstead area which has been highlighted in this report as being particularly sensitive to the proposals. Representative views should encompass heritage viewpoints to inform the understanding of the effects on the identified heritage assets. This can then be used to inform any mitigation strategy (including landscaping), although it is suggested that if possible the location/extent of the
proposed employment area is reconsidered (our emphasis).

GC Policy 3: Place Shaping Principles, Part I: Planning Application Requirements of the Draft Plan, attempts to plug this gap by requiring an LVIA, HIA and Mitigation Strategy prior to the determination of any planning application for the site (GC Policy 3: Place Shaping Principles, Part I: Planning Application Requirements).

However, given the potential impacts identified within the HIA (the Councils' HIA

suggests that the development of the TCBGC site allocation would potentially result in significant effects to the Grade II* listed Elmstead Hall, the Grade I listed Church of St Anne and St Laurence and the Grade II listed Allen's Farmhouse) then this work should be undertaken now so that any specific recommendations for mitigation and enhancement can be incorporated into the Draft Plan.

This approach would also help satisfy NPPF paragraph 16d which requires Plan policies to be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals, and PPG at paragraph 027 Reference ID: 61-
027-20180913 Revision date: 13 09 2018 that states, 'Where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interested parties about the nature and scale of development'. The best way to achieve this is with site-specific criteria, and ideally accompanied by a concept diagram.

To this end we recommend that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and (further) Heritage Impact Assessment and Mitigation Strategy should be prepared prior to Examination, and mitigation and enhancement measures included within GC Policy 3: Place Shaping Principles, to ensure that these are implemented. If this is not feasible, then Part I, bullet 2 of the policy should be amended to require that this work is prepared prior to the further masterplanning so that it can inform this work. This will ensure that the policy (and therefore the DPD) is effective in protecting and enhancing the historic environment, and in so doing help the Council to demonstrate that its' Plan sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment, as per NPPF paragraph 190.

Finally, whilst we welcome the reference to heritage assets within Part I of the policy, their setting is not mentioned. This omission is important as these heritage assets are most likely to experience harm via development within their settings. We therefore recommend that criterion 2 is revised to read, "…significance of the Grade II* listed Elmstead Hall, the Grade I listed Church of St Anne and St Laurence and the Grade II listed Allen's Farmhouse, and the Round Barrows (Scheduled Monument) on Annan
Road, and their settings…"

Potential for Non-designated heritage assets of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments with the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Plan are

Linked to the need for additional assessment to inform further masterplanning of the site, we take this opportunity to highlight the potential for archaeology of national

significance within the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Plan area, and that this should be investigated as part of the further HIA.

The Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Plan area is within the wider setting of two Scheduled Bronze Age barrow cemeteries; one immediately to the south-west of the site (the Group of barrows at Annan Road, LEN 1464139), and another to the north (the Crop Mark S of Ardleigh SM, LEN 1002146).

The Scheduled Monument at Ardleigh (Crop mark site S of Ardleigh, LEN 1002146 comprises cropmarks across a large area indicating many ring-ditches and an extensive complex of trackways and ditches enclosures. Limited archaeological excavations have identified the remains of a large Bronze Age cemetery complex, comprising the remains of both barrows and urnfield, as well as Iron Age occupation, a Roman pottery production centre and a small later Roman cemetery.

The Scheduled Monument is situated within a similar landscape setting to the Garden Community Plan area - within (or above) the valley of a tributary of the River Colne - Salary Brook (the Scheduled Monument is right at the head of the valley).

At the other end of the tributary, where it meets the River Colne, there is also a group of Scheduled Bronze Age Barrows (Group of barrows at Annan Road, LEN 1464139), and their location is surely not by chance either.

Both Scheduled Monuments seem deliberately located within similar landscape settings, and consequently, there is high potential for further archaeological remains to be located between them, above the floodplain of the Salary Brook (as well as good environmental within the floodplain itself), within the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Plan area. If present, these could be of national significance as per NPPF footnote 68 and would therefore be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

We would therefore expect this to be investigated as part of the further HIA and Mitigation Strategy, ideally now, but if this is not feasible ahead of further masterplanning so that it can inform (if required) how development will be laid out, and which areas will be protected from development. We therefore recommend that Part I, criterion 3 is expanded to cover this aspect. Again, this information will ensure that the DPD is effective in protecting and enhancing the historic environment and help the Council to demonstrate that its' Plan sets out a positive strategy for the historic

environment, as per NPPF paragraph 190.

GC Policy 1: Land uses and spatial approach
Part E: Elmstead Strategic Gap

Whilst we welcome that there are specific measures for the historic environment in
Part E of this policy, we request that it is amended to read:

The 'Business Park' will be designed and landscaped in a manner that ensures an appropriate transition between built development and the open countryside forming part of the 'Elmstead Strategic Green Gap'. Development will be required to respect the setting of the designated heritage assets of the Grade I listed Church of St. Anne and St. Lawrence, Grade II* listed Elmstead Hall and Grade II listed Allens Farmhouse
and the Round Burrow.

This will clarify that these are designated heritage assets, therefore providing justification for (and therefore supporting the soundness of) the identification of a Strategic Gap in this location.

Finally, Part E, second paragraph states:

"Development will only be supported where….it represents the provision of appropriate development for a countryside location…"

We take this opportunity to remind you that what is considered 'appropriate development' should be informed by the further HIA (referred to throughout this letter) in consultation with Historic England.

Conclusions

I hope that you find the above comments helpful. We'd like to stress that this response is based on the information provided by the Councils in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise as a result of this plan, where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** Historic Engalnd - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/s7

## 217 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Sir Bob Russell [162]

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

**Full text:**
The promise - the entire understanding - of the "Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community" was sold on the promise that a link road would be built between the A134 and the A120.
If that is not going to happen from the outset then I question whether the scheme is legally compliant.
Having all the traffic from the development, as it proceeds over many years, added to the already congested Clinghoe Hill is a travesty of what we have been led to believe would happen.
Without the link road, the development should not be allowed to proceed.
Hitherto my comments have been entirely related to ensuring that the whole of the Salary Brook Valley, the eastern slopes and then beyond easterly, should not be developed AND that no new development should be seen from the existing communities of Greenstead and Longridge on the western side of the Valley.
I seek confirmation that there will be no backtracking on what has been agreed. In view of the breach of promise with the link road, how can anyone trust that the Salary Brook Valley protection - a country park - will happen?

**Change suggested by respondent:**
-

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 218 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Dr & Mrs Roy J Crooks [163]

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

**Full text:**
We wish to register the following concerns:
1. the planned development is much too large
2. Clingoe Hill, A133, is congested already
3. The green space at Salary Brook has already been developed at the Bromley Road end (Crockleford Hill)
4. What would happen to the bluebell wood (Home Wood) which gives annual pleasure to local residents?
5. What would happen to the central green reservation and trees on Clingoe Hill (St Andrew's Ave)?
6. Colchester is already congested with traffic from major new developments in other directions
7. The Hospital is already struggling to cope and has been in and out of special measures
8. We understand the local schools are at capacity.

**Change suggested by respondent:**
-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 220 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Collins & Coward Planning and Development Consultancy (Mr Tony Collins) [58]

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

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

**Full text:**
see attached letter

**Change suggested by respondent:**
-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** Collins & Coward - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sc

## 222 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** bill marshall [153]

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

**Full text:**

1. Yesterday, S25 June 2023, having followed the guidelines on the portal to draft and then submit my comments I experienced great difficulty in achieving a submission. I therefore emailed Officers that evening to explain my difficulties and the guidelines I followed on the portal. Thus, this morning I have been allowed to submit my comments by this email. This does raise questions of accessibility experienced by residents wishing to submit their comments.

2. This whole GC proposal does have resemblance to Allana Slater's experience at the 2000 Sydney Olympics where she was the only one to observe that the event she was taking part in was 'Coming Up Short'...

3. I attended each of the nine Consultation Meetings to (again) gauge the public engagement concerning the Tolchester Garden Community proposals. Similar to the previous consultations and public examination meetings the actual number of the members of the public taking an active or any interest was dismally low. With the combined populations of Tendring & Colchester c400,000 the percentage of residents that bothered to attend over the nine meetings was less than 0.04% of the combined Tolchester populations. (Parish, town and district councillors numbers excluded from the 0.04% resident turnout.) The Main Developers did not attend any of the nine Consultation Meetings. However, Latimer did attend the January 2023 Tolchester GC Joint Committee Meeting and Latimer's spokesperson stated that Latimer was part of the Clarion Group; was reputable; and fully engaged with residents ! No council members of the Tolchester GC JC attended any of the nine Consultation Meetings - these councillors will take decisions on matters arising. When Councillors and Officers were asked directly if any of them would be moving into the Tolchester GC themselves, only Cllr King was brave enough to answer. The Right Honourable Michael Gove Minister of State slated Clarion in the Awaab Report - Councillors and Officers declined to comment. Public engagement has therefore failed on these points.

4. At each of nine Consultation Meetings I, as well as others, asked for paper copies of the documents displayed. The paper documents were not made available to the residents to take, fully consider and study.
Public engagement therefore failed.

5. At the Section 1 Public Examination Hearings the planning authorities lauded 'Garden Community' principles citing numerous previous models that were based on other models that were in turn derived from earlier models. And so, the Tolchester Garden Community was to be based on Garden Communities Principles. However, there will be :
a. No completed A120-A133 Link Road;
b. No reasonable Main Line Rail connection, only a disjointed Rapid Transit Bus provision;
c. Few homes with 'gardens' are planned, instead the plans indicate high level high density units, with some 7,500 units on 143ha of development land; (this deviates considerably from the original cited model of Letchworth and earlier documentation for the scheme).
d. The proposed Rapid Transit System is half baked and reliant upon the ECC/HE HIF of £34.5M. Most of this funding will be spent on the Colchester City transport improvements not the Tolchester GC !
e. The A120-A133 Link Road ECC/HE HIF of £64.5M is now inadequate to build the Link Road - it has been described as a 'Cul de Sac'. Latimer will now be expected to deliver any shortcomings, and be reimbursed from residents contributions.
f. The Tolchester GC will be sited on +700ha of good quality agricultural land.
g. Large scale light, noise pollution, and wildlife issues will be experienced near, far and wide.
h. For years the impact of roadworks around Clingo Hill will seriously affect local people's lives. There are solutions, but ECCH will not listen and consider them. ECCH has a known dismal record of new road provision and highway maintenance issues.

6. On T11 January 2022 the TDC Section 2 LP was recommended for adoption by the TDC Officers, PP&LP Ctte Members to TDC Full Council, it was subsequently adopted T25 January 2022 - after all the so-called scrutiny by Officers, Councillors and Inspectors the S2 LP contained errors in the tabled figures (and continues to do so).

7. A TDC Officer stated at a PP7LP Ctte Mtg that Tendring DC was not reliant on the housing to be delivered by the Tolchester GC to meet housing requirements within the 2013 to 2033 S2 LP. So there is no need for the development.

8. If Officers, Cllrs or Planning Inspectors wish to consult with me I am available.

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** None

## 225 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]
**Agent:** Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

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

**Full text:**
See attachment

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

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination
**Oral exam why:** Developer
**Attachments:** Latimer Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sp

## 235 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

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

**Full text:**
See attached letter for full text

**Change suggested by respondent:**
-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination
**Oral exam why:** WTC councillors request that they can make representations at the Hearing.
**Attachments:** Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

## 250 Support

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** Frinton & Walton Town Council (Mrs Jennifer Woodland, Town Clerk) [79]

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

**Full text:**
Further to the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community 'Submission Version Plan' Consultation (Regulation 19): 15th May - 5pm 25th June 2023, I write on behalf of all Members of Frinton & Walton Town Council who at their full council meeting of the 8th June, moved approval of their support that they consider the plan to be legally compliant, sound and complies with the duty to co-operate.

**Change suggested by respondent:**
-

**Legally compliant:** Yes
**Sound:** Yes
**Comply with duty:** Yes
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** Frinton & Walton Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tg

## 253 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

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

**Full text:**
See attachment

**Change suggested by respondent:**
Include reference to all the emergency services in the text of Part B, paragraph 7 of the policy referable to the South and North Neighbourhoods;

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

**Legally compliant:** No
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** No
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

## 266 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** East Suffolk & North Essex NHS Foundation Trust (ESNEFT) [174]
**Agent:** Lawson Planning Partnership (Mrs Aarti O'Leary, Technical Director) [176]

**Summary:**
Healthcare facilities should be included in the vision.

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

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

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

Typo in Part 1 Part K.

**Full text:**
See attachment.

**Change suggested by respondent:**
Amend wording of Vision to include healthcare facilities. Suggested wording:

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** Not specified
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** ESNEFT Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t4

## 274 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** The University Of Essex [181]
**Agent:** The JTS Partnership LLP (Mr Nick Davey) [87]

**Summary:**

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

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

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

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

**Full text:**

Please see attachment for full submission

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** University Of Essex Submission - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tm
The University of Essex- Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tn
The University of Essex- Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ty
The University of Essex- Appendix 3 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tp

## 275 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** The University Of Essex [181]
**Agent:** The JTS Partnership LLP (Mr Nick Davey) [87]

**Summary:**

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

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

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

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

**Full text:**

Please see attachment for full submission

**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** University Of Essex Submission - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tm
The University of Essex- Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tn
The University of Essex- Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ty
The University of Essex- Appendix 3 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tp

276 Object

**Document Element:** GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH
**Respondent:** The University Of Essex [181]
**Agent:** The JTS Partnership LLP (Mr Nick Davey) [87]

**Summary:**

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

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

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

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

**Full text:**

Please see attachment for full submission

**Change suggested by respondent:**

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

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

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

Part G: Knowledge-Based Employment Land

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

**Legally compliant:** Not specified
**Sound:** No
**Comply with duty:** Not specified
**Appear exam:** Not specified
**Attachments:** University Of Essex Submission - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tm
The University of Essex- Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tn
The University of Essex- Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ty
The University of Essex- Appendix 3 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tp