GC POLICY 3: PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES

RE3

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

3

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

16

Respondent: Mr Bryan Thomas [38]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Change the third bullet in GC Policy 3: Part B (page 54) to read as follows:
“Provide for a network of integrated multifunctional green and blue infrastructure features.”

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

Add suggested change to Schedule of Modifications

108

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

137

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

163

Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

168

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amend GC Policy 3, Part J to read:
4. Design & Access Statement (incorporating an Active Design Assessment).

Response:

Comment 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.

Action:

Statement of Common Ground prepared between Sport England and the Councils. Modification to policy suggested.

68

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Modification to policy to be suggested to refer to updated evidence with regard to mitigation and enhancement measures. Please see SoCG with HE for further details.

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.

Action:

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

215

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amendment to GC3, Part H to include:
"In all cases there will be an expectation that any new development will avoid or minimise any conflict between preserving the significance of a specific heritage asset and any aspect of the proposal. It should enhance the historic environment or better reveal the significance of the heritage asset unless there are no identifiable opportunities available."

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 the Councils consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate with regard to GC Policy 3, Part H to better align the text to the language of the NPPF to provide clarity relating to heritage assets.

The Councils do not agree that further flexibility should be provided to the wording of Policy GC3 relating to detailed masterplans, design codes, future planning applications and vehicular access. The criteria is considered to be sufficiently flexible whilst establishing fundamental principles. See SoCG for further details.

Action:

Statement of Common Ground prepared between the Councils and Latimer. Modification to policy suggested.

228

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

Agent: Lichfields

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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

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 is established within the Section 1 of the Council Local Plans. The Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure other matters raised and matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage.

Action:

None

48

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

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

Action:

None

83

Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

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

Action:

None

87

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

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 is established within the Section 1 of the Council Local Plans. The Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure other matters raised and matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage.

Action:

None

151

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

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

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 Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure other matters raised and matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage. The Councils consider that the design requirements are sufficiently flexible whilst establishing fundamental principles.

Action:

None

162

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

- Question the use of the word beautiful in official planning policy.

Intro

- Respecting existing character should not be secondary to creating unique/distinctive neighbourhoods.

Part B

- Concern that re-prioritising parking will be detrimental in the mid-term.

Part C

- Design quality requirements is too brief and ambiguous.

Part D

- Street lighting should be directional to avoid light pollution.
- Designing out crime in GC will push crime into Elmstead.

Part G

- High housing density in conflict with adequate private amenity space.

Part H

- Impact of employment area will harm setting of Elmstead church.
- Non-listed heritage assets need extra protection.

Part I

- Heritage assets should be within an expanded Strategic Green Gap.
- Need further explanation around GC being 'self sufficient'

Justification

- HIA is insufficient.

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 Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure other matters raised and matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage. The Councils consider that the design requirements are sufficiently flexible whilst establishing fundamental principles.

Further work is being undertaken with regard to the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in line with advise from Historic England (HE). See SoCG with HE.

Action:

None

181

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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

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 Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure other matters raised and matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage. The Councils consider that the design requirements are sufficiently flexible whilst establishing fundamental principles.

Action:

None

210

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

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 Councils consider that the DPD provides an appropriate policy framework to ensure other matters raised and matters of detail are fully considered at the appropriate stage including the impact on and mitigation required to identified heritage assets.

Action:

None

237

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