GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

RE1

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

1

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

81

Respondent: Ms Rose Clarke [99]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

Statement of Common Ground

97

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

102

Respondent: Mr Michael Lucking [112]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

104

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

118

Respondent: Mrs Claudia Alsdorf [116]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

119

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

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

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

Statement of Common Ground

121

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

130

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

134

Respondent: Mrs Claudia Alsdorf [116]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

136

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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 biodiversity and wildlife. This idea makes the plan sound.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

146

Respondent: Mr James Marchant [138]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

156

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

157

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

166

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

188

Respondent: TCBGC Community Liaison Group [104]

Agent: Mrs Manda O'Connell

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

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

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

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

250

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amend GC Policy 1, Part F to read:
Approximately 25 hectares of land south of the A133 and north of the proposed 'Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap', is allocated on the 'Policies Map' for new a 'Sports and Leisure Park'. This will facilitate the enhancement of sports facilities required by the University of Essex as part of its plans for long-term expansion and will provide sports and leisure facilities which will be available for use by residents and clubs in the existing community, the proposed Garden Community and the University. Where appropriate this will include the provision of indoor and outdoor floodlit facilities.

Response:

Comment on scope of sports facilities noted. The policy is considered sound, however, to ensure it is clear and upon further assessment, the Councils consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate.

Policy GC 1, Part K requires the development of a comprehensive site wide Masterplan and detailed Area Specific Masterplans. This requirement is not exclusive, nor limited to area designations and would thus include comprehensively Sports and Leisure delivery across the Garden Community site in accordance with the requirements of GC Policy 6, Part D.

Policy GC 6, Part G requires the phased delivery of community and social infrastructure and the development of a Phasing and Implementation Strategy.

This approach is considered sufficiently robust to ensure the delivery of policy objectives to meet the future needs of the Garden Community in a timely and phased manner.

The Councils consider the policy to be sound in its current form.

Action:

SoCG prepared with Sport England and modification to policy suggested.

66

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

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

Further transport assessment and impact mitigation will be required secured as part of any future planning application.

Action:

None.

72

Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

Further transport assessment, community and social infrastructure, and impact mitigation will be required and secured as part of any future planning application. This will include a Health Strategy, Health Impact Assessment and demographic studies assessing educational demand.

Action:

None.

96

Respondent: Chris Went [109]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

Object

Summary of representations:

The DPD does not make proper provision for the expansion of the University of Essex as required by Policy SP9 of the Section 1 Local Plan (Requirement F25); and

The DPD does not make appropriate provision for employment land linked to the Knowledge Gateway as required by Policy SP9 of the Section 1 Local Plan (Requirement C5).

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base, including the QUOD Economic and Employment Study, and The Wisher Report which provides an independent assessment of the University's land requirements.

The DPD allocates 25 ha of land, south of the A133, aimed at facilitating the growth of the University of Essex and this is of a size well in excess of the 11.5 ha "equivalent in size to the allocation in the Colchester Development Framework Site Allocations document October 2010", as referred to in Part F of Policy SP9 in the adopted Section 1 Local Plan for North Essex.

The DPD makes total provision for more than 25ha of employment land, as required by Part C in Policy SP9 of the Section 1 Local Plan and that, in respect of land for knowledge-based employment land provides 8ha north of the A133, as close as practical to the existing Knowledge Gateway, which is the best location for this allocation – taking into account the University's representations and acknowledging the need to protect the slopes of Salary Brook.

The independent report produced by Quod investigates opportunities, demand and time horizons. Taking this into account, the report recommended:
"Up to 8ha of "Knowledge Gateway 2", on a parcel in the south west corner of the TCBGC developable area, north of the A133. This should support university-linked commercial space and/or higher density office and lab space. It may allow ancillary uses such as food and beverage and hotel/conferencing (predominantly E(g) with ancillary E(a), E(b), E(c) and C1). It is likely that this will develop over the medium to long-term including at least some outside the plan period." (Para.8.1 (3)).

The TCBGC masterplan (p54, point 2 and 5) states that access to the Knowledge Gateway will be from the A133 and potentially shared by Park and Choose. Crossings of the A133 for pedestrians and cyclists should be provided that reduce potential severance and connect the Knowledge Gateway, Park and Choose, the Garden Community and potential sports facilities. It continues (p68,point 9) "the employment buildings will allow for flexibility in providing buildings with generous floor-ceiling heights. Building heights of up to 3-4 storeys will be required for the Knowledge Gateway so as to provide a suitable noise barrier against the A133, shielding homes to the north."

Action:

SoCG prepared with the University of Essex.

274

Respondent: The University Of Essex [181]
Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

Respondent: The University Of Essex [181]

Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

Respondent: The University Of Essex [181]

Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP

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'.

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. With the exception of the Policy Map, the plans/images within the DPD have been replicated from the Strategic Framework Masterplan and are, as noted, illustrative only. Further detail will come forward as as part of the required masterplanning work as part of a future planning application. The route of the RTS on the Policy Map is indicative only, whilst Policy GC1 and GC7 is considered sufficiently robust to secure its provision.

Action:

None

82

Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

Change suggested by respondent:

Be a lot firmer in the commitment to the RTS.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which under Policy SP6 requires requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning
approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

Action:

None.

204

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

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

Action:

None.

144

Respondent: Mr David Ward [134]

Change suggested by respondent:

Simply abandon the project!

Attachments:

Object

Summary of representations:

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).

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amend GC Policy 1, Part B, page 22, 5th Para. 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)…."

Response:

Comment Noted. The policy is considered sound, however, upon further assessment the Councils consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate.

Action:

SoCG prepared with Health Bodies, modification to policy suggested.

253

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

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)"

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amend Chapter 2, page 16, Community and Social Infrastructure, to read:
"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 GC Policy 1, Part A, first bullet to read:
"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 GC Policy 1, Part B to read:
"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'."

Response:

Comment Noted. The policy is considered sound, however, upon further assessment the Councils consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate.

Action:

SoCG prepared with Health Bodies, modifications to policy text suggested.

266

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

Agent: Lawson Planning Partnership

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".

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.
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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies. Further transport evidence/assessment will be required as part of any future planning application. The position of the Link Road and A120 junction already has planning permission and further consent is not required.

Action:

None

43

Respondent: Mr Hiran Perera [65]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

> 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.
> 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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

> None.

Response:

> Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies. The DPD will require future planning applications to be support by extensive evidence with regard to health, education, transport and air quality, along with appropriate mitigation of heritage assets considered. Any future development will be required to appropriate mitigate its impact.

Action:

> None.

18

Respondent: Mr Carl Banks [46]

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies. The DPD will require future planning applications to be support by extensive evidence with regard to health, education, transport, air quality and infrastructure provision to meet the needs of the development. Any future development will be required to appropriately mitigate its impact.

Action:

None.

19

Respondent: Ms L G [49]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

Action:

None.

22

Respondent: Mr A Rayner [51]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

Whilst Crockleford Heath is located within the broad location established under the Section 1 Local Plan, it has been recognised through the evidence base and Policy Map with an allocation as an Area of Special Character. Policy GC1, Part B is considered sufficiently robust to to ensure its intrinsic character is preserved and enhanced through the development of future plans.

All Ancient Woodland must be protected by a minimum of 30m buffer as noted on the Policy Map. All other green corridors are indicative only and subject to future masterplanning, Policy GC2 is considered sufficiently robust to ensure future provision and protection is secured.

Action:

None

45

Respondent: Prof Anthony Vickers [68]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD requires the provision of health and education facilities to meet needs of the development, whilst the Policy Map and GC1, Part E secures the provision of Elmstead Strategic Green Gap.

Action:

None

23

Respondent: Mrs Karen Ewers [52]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

Object

Summary of representations:

Colchester will spread making us an urban jungle.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base, including transport and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD requires the provision of health and education facilities to meet needs of the development, whilst the Policy Map and GC1, Part E secures the provision of Elmstead Strategic Green Gap.

Action:

None

36

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base, including Transport, Infrastructure Delivery, and gypsy/traveller need. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD requires the provision of health and education facilities to meet needs of the development, whilst the Policy Map and GC1, Part E secures the provision of Elmstead Strategic Green Gap.

Action:

None

49

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which under Policy SP6 requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

The Policy Map clearly defines the extent of the allocated Elmstead Strategic Green Gap on the eastern boundary of the GC, which would be robustly secured by Policy GC1, Parts A and E.

Action:

None

55

Respondent: Mr Ian Yexley [76]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which under Policy SP6 requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

GC Policy 1 and the Policy Map allocates the Salary Brook Slopes as a Country Park. The impact on existing views and vantage points would be considered during the assessment of future applications which will need to be informed by detailed Landscape Visual Impact Assessments

Action:

None

217

Respondent: Sir Bob Russell [162]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

Whilst Crockleford Heath is located within the broad location established under the Section 1 Local Plan, it has been recognised through the evidence base and Policy Map with an allocation as an Area of Special Character. Policy GC1, Part B is considered sufficiently robust to to ensure its intrinsic character is preserved and enhanced through the development of future plans.

Action:

None

40

Respondent: Mrs Carolyn Mason [64]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. Crockleford Heath is located within the broad location established under the Section 1 Local Plan, and has been recognised through the evidence base and Policy Map with an allocation as an Area of Special Character to ensure that future development respects and enhances its intrinsic character including protection of identified heritage assets within the vicinity.

The position of the 'Green Corridors' as illustrated on the Policy Map are noted as a broad location only and therefore do not establish their final position which would be subject to detailed masterplanning, design work and further ecological reports as required through the future planning application process. An appropriate mix of housing, including tenure, type and size will be provided to reflect the housing needs for the area and should reflect the latest available evidence. The character of development will be determined through further masterplanning and design coding.

Action:

None

100

Respondent: Mr Peter Halsall [111]

Agent: Mr Richard Halsall

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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!

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD requires the provision of health and education facilities to meet needs of the development.

Action:

None

148

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence, housing need, economic and viability. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies. The examination of the Section 1 Plan determined that the TCBGC was viable and capable of being delivered.

The policies of the DPD aim to provide for the housing needs of a wide range of the population based on the most up to date housing needs and demographic data.

Detailed design will come forward at planning application stage, including the character, layout and placemaking associated with the identified neighbourhoods. The Strategic Framework Masterplan is illustrative only, whilst the Policy Map provides sufficient clarity and flexibility to secure and respond to the long-term aspirations and demands of the development.

Stewardship and Governance arrangements will be secured by a Stewardship Strategy supported by a business case that establishes the scope of community arrangements and which will need to set out how they will evolve over time.

Action:

None

94

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comments noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

Policy SP6 of the Section 1 Local Plan requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

The DPD requires the provision of health and education facilities to meet needs of the development, whilst the Policy Map and GC1, Part D secures the provision of Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap which is an extension of the Wivenhoe Coalescence Break in the NP. It represents the provision of appropriate development for a countryside location, whilst the impact on light pollution could effectively be controlled.

Further transport assessment and impact mitigation will be required secured as part of any future planning application, with further details relating to the provision and operation the RTS to be established.

Action:

None

205

Respondent: Mrs Margaret Campbell [148]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.'

Summary of representation changes to plan:

No changes to Policy GC1.

Response:

The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. However, upon further assessment and following advise from HE the Councils have commissioned a further HIA and consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate. Please see SoCG with HE for further details.

Action:

A Statement of Common Ground is being prepared between Historic England and the Councils, and additional work commissioned on further HIA evidence.

214

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Remove: "with an expectation that the early phases of development will begin in the 'South Neighbourhood'." from GC Policy 1, Part B.

See SoCG with Latimer for further details.

Response:

Comments noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. However, upon further assessment the Councils consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate with regard to GC Policy 1, Part B relating to phasing of the development to be agreed at planning application stage.

The Councils do not agree that further flexibility with regard to land use parameters, neighbourhood centres and land south of the A133 is justified or required.

Action:

Statement of Common Ground is being prepared between the Councils and Latimer. Modification suggested to wording of GC Policy 1, Part B.

225

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

Agent: Lichfields

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).

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comments noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport, integrated water management, housing and economic need, infrastructure delivery and gypsy/traveller needs.

Further transport assessment and impact mitigation will be required and secured as part of any future planning application and the DPD requires the provision of community, health and education facilities to meet needs of the development. The Policy Map provides an indicative route for the RTS the details of which would be determined at planning application stage through detailed masterplanning and design development.

The Country Park allocation provides a clear and distinct boundary which would protect encroachment onto the Salary Brook Slopes. The impact on existing views and vantage points would be considered during the assessment of future applications which will need to be informed by detailed Landscape Visual Impact Assessments.

The impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application with infrastructure secured and brought forward in response to evidenced need.

Action:

None

64

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD is supported by a illustrative Framework Masterplan which has explored the competing land use requirements and demands for the GC. This has provided a robust evidence base which has informed the preparation of the DPD and Policy Map, and resulted in an evidenced refinement of the housing figures. The provision of Strategic Green Gaps to Wivenhoe, Elmstead Market and the Country Park allocation ensures sufficient coalescence breaks are provided to protect existing communities, whilst the special character of Crockleford Health has been identified. The Policy Map does not extend the boundaries of the GC outside of the original broad area of search.

Action:

None

206

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community which includes Crockleford Heath within its boundary. Notwithstanding this, it is recognised within the DPD that this area generally will have a lower density, smaller buildings scale and a smaller local centre. A strong landscape buffer to Crockleford Heath special character area will be secured which will define the extents and protect the character of this area.

The DPD will ensure that the GC will incorporate and enhance important existing landscape features and establish a high degree of connected green infrastructure linking to existing green corridors and networks. Policy requires that further masterplanning work will be required to establish the principles and build on the evidence base including that within the Strategic Framework Masterplan.

Action:

None

161

Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

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).

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which under Policy SP6 requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community.

Further transport assessment and impact mitigation will be required secured as part of any future planning application, as will appropriate ecological surveys and the establishment of long term management and maintenance biodiversity mitigation.

Action:

None

222

Respondent: bill marshall [153]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies. With the exception of the Policy Map, the maps and diagrams within the DPD are taken from the Strategic Framework Masterplan and are clearly noted as illustrative only providing evidenced support to the policy. Further masterplanning working and design development will come forward as part of a future planning application.

Policy GC2 'Nature' requires that all proposals are supported by appropriate ecological surveys where necessary and that proposals must deliver a minimum of 10% BNG across the whole site.

Action:

None

208

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD requires the provision of health and education facilities to meet needs of the development, whilst a further transport assessment and impact mitigation will be required and secured as part of any future planning application.

Existing woodlands will be protected and the provision of a 30m buffer will be secured to all areas of ancient woodland. Detailed masterplanning and design will develop during the application process and existing trees on the site should be retained where appropriate in accordance with Policy GC3, Part E.

Action:

None.

218

Respondent: Dr & Mrs Roy J Crooks [163]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None.

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. Crockleford Heath is located within the broad location established under the Section 1 Local Plan, and has been recognised through the evidence base and Policy Map with an allocation as an Area of Special Character to ensure that future development respects and enhances its intrinsic character including protection of identified heritage assets within the vicinity.

The position of the 'Green Corridors' as illustrated on the Policy Map are noted as a broad location only and therefore do not establish their final position which would be subject to detailed masterplanning, design work and further ecological reports as required through the future planning application process.

Action:

None.

220

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

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

GC POLICY 1: LAND USES AND SPATIAL APPROACH

Object

Summary of representations:

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."

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport evidence and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which under Policy SP6 requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed in full before development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application along with appropriate triggers for the delivery of the full Link Road, relating to housing and employment delivery. Full details of development phasing will be secured at application stage.

Further transport assessment and impact mitigation will be required secured as part of any future planning application.

Action:

None

191

Respondent: Mr Mark Cory [147]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport and economic evidence, and infrastructure delivery.

The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which under Policy SP6 requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

The Policy Map provides the broad location of the Knowledge Based employment land whilst the allocation for University Expansion is at least equivalent in size to the allocation in the Colchester Local Development Framework Site Allocations document October 2010 as required by Policy SP9 of the Section 1 Local Plan.

The Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure other matters raised and that matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage.

Action:

None

39

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

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

Whilst Crockleford Heath is located within the broad location established under the Section 1 Local Plan, it has been recognised through the evidence base and Policy Map with an allocation as an Area of Special Character. Policy GC1, Part B is considered sufficiently robust to to ensure its intrinsic character is preserved and enhanced through the development of future plans.

Action:

None

173

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

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!

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including transport and infrastructure delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies including a numerical range of housing which has been refined by the DPD in response to evidence.

Whilst Crockleford Heath is located within the broad location established under the Section 1 Local Plan, it has been recognised through the evidence base and Policy Map with an allocation as an Area of Special Character. Policy GC1, Part B is considered sufficiently robust to to ensure its intrinsic character is preserved and enhanced through the development of future plans, whilst protecting the residential amenity of existing residents. All areas of ancient woodland would be provided with a minimum 30m buffer zone.

The Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure other matters raised, including phasing, heritage protection, enhancement and mitigation, and matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage. The provision of the Strategic Green Gaps, Country Park, employment area and sports facilities have been appropriately sited to balance the conflicting land use demands to meet the needs of the future community whilst ensuring protection of existing settlements can be secured. The impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application which will be subject to full consultation with existing communities.

Action:

None

180

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

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.

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community, which included land south of the A133, and which sets the Strategic Policies. The requirements of the S1 Plan have been fully encompassed in the DPD.

The Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure that matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage, including landscape and acoustic barriers where required, and uses which may be considered appropriate within the Strategic Green Gaps. The exact position of the P&C will be subject to further evidence which will be required and secured as part of any future planning application.

Action:

None

235

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

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