GC POLICY 4: MEETING HOUSING NEEDS

RE4

Support

Summary of representations:

I hope that those responsible for this development will make sure it is majority affordable homes, with access to green spaces which create biodiversity.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support noted.

Action:

None

125

Respondent: Miss Mary Dale [132]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

Very important that affordable housing ambitions are met and the need locally, particularly for lost cost rental properties, is met.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

138

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

No social housing. Affordable housing is at present not affordable for people on lower incomes.

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 policies of the plan aim to provide for the housing needs of a wide range of the population based on the data available. Policy GC4, Part B requires at least 30% of all new homes across the GC to be provided in the form of 'affordable housing'. The mix, size and tenure will be determined through a Housing Strategy which should have regard to the latest evidence of affordable housing need.

Action:

None

59

Respondent: Ms Jean McNeil [82]

Change suggested by respondent:

A percentage of social housing and housing for rent.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

Councils not in the best position to determine either number or location of additional student bedrooms required to facilitate University's growth.

Strategy set out in DPD would significantly alter University's character, ethos and culture in a manner which is unacceptable to the University.

Will not develop its own accommodation north of A133 in South Neighbourhoods. Private sector student accommodation for returning students may be acceptable in this location. Developing majority of student housing in South Neighbourhood would overwhelm communities living there. Policy should be amended as shown in attachment.

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 Wisher Report which provides an independent assessment of the University's land requirements set out in its Reg 18 representation and subsequent clarifications. The policy is considered to be sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of the University whilst balancing other competing land use demands.

Action:

Statement of Common Ground prepared between the Council's and the University of Essex.

277

Respondent: The University Of Essex [181]

Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP

Change suggested by respondent:

Part H Student Accommodation

The University of Essex has long term plans to expand student numbers and to extend its accommodation provision. Accommodation for students in their first year of study and other priority groups will be provided on land identified for University Expansion within the Proposals Map. Other student accommodation will be encouraged in accessible locations within the 'South Neighbourhood' where it would have good sustainable links to the University of Essex and where it will contribute to a mixed and diverse community. The size and specification of any student accommodation outside of the expanded Campus will be determined through the Housing Strategy (see Part B) and will be informed by evidence held by the Councils in partnership with the University of Essex.

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:

Representation questions the need for this many new homes, the affordability of the homes, and the percentage of affordable housing to be provided.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

N/a

Response:

The principle of development was considered at length as part of the examination of the Section 1 Local Plan, and that plan was found to be sound and formally adopted by the Councils in 2021. The affordable housing requirements in this policy are consistent with the adopted Section 1 Local Plan and national policy, and allow an adequate degree of flexibility for the development to meet future identified local needs as the various phases of delivery are brought forward. The definition of affordable housing is consistent with the NPPF.

Action:

N/a

26

Respondent: James Chable [55]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

Concerned that the proposals will not help people who require housing, questions affordability of the houses.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

N/a

Response:

The affordable housing requirements in this policy are consistent with the adopted Section 1 Local Plan and national policy, and allow an adequate degree of flexibility for the development to meet future identified local needs as the various phases of delivery are brought forward. The definition of affordable housing is consistent with the NPPF.

Action:

N/a

33

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

Affordable Housing Phasing: The public should have a definitive statement stipulating that the 30% affordable housing rule should apply at all stages of the development. Planning permission stage, housing starts and housing occupation. Otherwise the developers would use an “Affordable Housing Phasing Strategy” to justify the late delivery, or diminished quantity of affordable housing.
Accordingly, all ‘Affordable Housing’ should be first offered to locally living residents affected by the development; followed by Front line / Blue Light workers.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

N/a

Response:

The policy makes it clear that the phasing of affordable housing must ensure affordable housing will be integrated into the development in smaller clusters, and that it should be delivered in phases alongside market housing – rather than just in the later phases.

The requirements in this policy are consistent with the adopted Section 1 Local Plan and national policy, and allow an adequate degree of flexibility for the development to meet future identified local needs as the various phases of delivery are brought forward. The definition of affordable housing is consistent with the NPPF.

The mix, size, and tenure of the remainder of the affordable housing requirement will be determined through a Housing Strategy to be agreed by the Councils, having regard to latest evidence of affordable housing need.

Action:

n/a

79

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:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

N/A

Response:

The principle and scale of development was considered at length as part of the examination of the Section 1 Local Plan, and that plan was found to be sound and formally adopted by the Councils in 2021.

The affordable housing requirements in this policy are consistent with the adopted Section 1 Local Plan and national policy, and allow an adequate degree of flexibility for the development to meet future identified local needs as the various phases of delivery are brought forward.

The definition of affordable housing is consistent with the NPPF.

Action:

N/A

89

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

7500 homes is way to many! The roads around this area are far too busy as it is. This area is beautiful and will just be spoilt. Greedy builders charging extortionate prices and way out of reach for many. This will also create a lot of disruption to the surrounding villages. Please stop spoiling our countryside!

Summary of representation changes to plan:

N/A

Response:

The principle and scale of development in this location was considered at length as part of the examination of the Section 1 Local Plan, and that plan was found to be sound and formally adopted by the Councils in 2021. The affordable housing requirements in this policy are consistent with the adopted Section 1 Local Plan and national policy, and allow an adequate degree of flexibility for the development to meet future identified local needs as the various phases of delivery are brought forward. The definition of affordable housing is consistent with the NPPF.

Action:

N/A

95

Respondent: Mrs Wendy Lupton [103]

Change suggested by respondent:

Just scrap it! There are a lot of houses in this region that are not selling so why build more!!

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

- None of these homes will be in the reach of the average community buyers as they'll be priced too high, so most of the buyers will be either private landlords or people from outside the community where wages are higher. Guess what, the population expands, rather than relocates.

- By the way - Garden Community? Are you serious? This is going to be a high-density housing estate, poorly designed and poorly executed. Whoever the planners/designers/authorisers are, they obviously will not be living there - if they were, it would not even be considered.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

N/A

Response:

The affordable housing requirements in this policy are consistent with the adopted Section 1 Local Plan and national policy, and allow an adequate degree of flexibility for the development to meet future identified local needs as the various phases of delivery are brought forward. The definition of affordable housing is consistent with the NPPF.

The principle and scale of development in this location was established in Section 1, and issues around density and design are discussed elsewhere in the Plan.

Action:

N/A

114

Respondent: Mr Shaun Raven [37]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

Object

Summary of representations:

As previously mentioned this colossal new town needs further consideration. I appreciate the need for new housing, but realistically without concrete evidence to support the sustainability of this project it should be disbanded. There is no point in building thousands of homes with the 'promise' of schools, doctors etc. we all know that recruitment in these professions are limited at best. There is no strong evidence to state that these vacancies would be filled on such a humongous scale. We would then have a community with no facilities necessary for sustainable living.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

N/a

Response:

The principle of development was considered at length as part of the examination of the Section 1 Local Plan, and that plan was found to be sound and formally adopted by the Councils in 2021. Education and healthcare requirements set out elsewhere in the Plan have been established through ongoing engagement with the education authority (ECC) and relevant health bodies, to ensure they respond to the population growth predicted for this area.

Action:

N/a

152

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Change suggested by respondent:

Drastically reduced and a more realistic approach is needed.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

> The density is not proportionate for the area and the desire to build multi storey buildings is in disaccord with the local design of the Parish. In my opinion, either they have not told us the truth or they have under researched and therefore under estimated the project and what it means

Summary of representation changes to plan:

> N/A

Response:

> The principle and scale of development in this area was considered at length as part of the examination of the Section 1 Local Plan, and that Plan was found to be sound and formally adopted by the Councils in 2021. Although the DPD does not stipulate specific densities for different areas within the Garden Community, it does set out high level expectations around the character of each of the Neighbourhoods. This provides an appropriate policy framework against which more detailed proposals can be assessed.

Action:

> N/A

211

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Change suggested by respondent:

> Find a true place for such a project that size. Not build it in a countryside using fields grade 1 and destroying so many assets of the community. (ancient hedgerows, woodland, trees, a hamlet that is a natural place of beauty, protected lane, a grove, fauna and flora living in this area). Replacing it by a system that will need years to prove its effectiveness when we have a fully integrated and functional ecosystem in place is pure folly in my opinion.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

Part D
- Concerns around density and viability.

Part E
- Self-build should be provided elsewhere in the GC where there won't be such stringent design code requirements.

Part H
- Concerned about 2,000 units of student accommodation in addition to 7,500 homes.

Justification
- High density is not justified other than by figures carried forward from earlier stages.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

n/a

Response:

The principle and scale of development in this area was considered at length as part of the examination of the Section 1 Local Plan, and that Plan was found to be sound and formally adopted by the Councils in 2021. Although the DPD does not stipulate specific densities for different areas within the Garden Community, it does set out high level expectations around the character of each of the Neighbourhoods. This provides an appropriate policy framework against which more detailed proposals can be assessed.

The intention behind focusing development of self-build and custom housebuilding is to ensure the area receives an appropriate scale, density and rate of development to reflect its character as a separate neighbourhood and an area of special character. Self-built dwellings are often built to higher specification, and applications will need to demonstrate that individual proposals will adequately respond to and protect the character of the area. The Councils consider this to be an appropriate strategy.

The 2,000 units of Purpose Built Student Accommodation referenced by Elmstead Parish Council is not a policy requirement, but an assumption made by Gerald Eve to inform their viability testing. The university has expressed their ambitions to expand student numbers and have estimated the amount of additional accommodation that would be required.

Action:

n/a

182

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

Change suggested by respondent:

Please see Elmstead Parish Council official response submission document submitted to TCB Garden Community at tcbgardencommunity@colchester.gov.uk.

Attachments:

EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t7

Object

Summary of representations:

The current evidence suggests that 30% social housing is unlikely to be achievable without compromises elsewhere. See my appendix 2.

A further MOU between Tendring and Colchester is needed to agree an equal split of housing numbers, nomination rights and business rates in perpetuity.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

N/A

Response:

Viability testing conducted by GeraldEve has tested a policy compliant 30% affordable housing level and found that it produces a financially viable scheme. Further commentary around their methodology can be presented during the course of the examination.

The split of housing numbers etc between Tendring and Colchester Councils is established in the Section 1 Local Plan, and the DPD does not need to address this matter further.

Action:

N/A

198

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Change suggested by respondent:

A phase 1 appraisal is needed to show how the plan can be delivered over the next 10 years, and to identify any compromises needed and resultant changes to the plan.

Attachments:

Appendix 2 - Viability.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/f
Appendix 7.1 - The master developer business model - Urban & Civic.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/g
Appendix 7.2 - Welborne Viability Review - Edited.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/h

Object

Summary of representations:

No mention of affordable home provision to include split fo 80% affordable rent and 20% help to buy schemes. It needs to comply with CCC specifc planning document on this matter. No scope for conditions to change to reflect updated evidence.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Update policy to reflect affordable housing requirement Colchester City Council's S2 Local Plan.

Response:

The requirements in this policy are consistent with the adopted Section 1 Local Plan and national policy, and allow an adequate degree of flexibility for the development to meet future identified local needs as the various phases of delivery are brought forward. The definition of affordable housing is consistent with the NPPF.

The mix, size, and tenure of the remainder of the affordable housing requirement will be determined through a Housing Strategy to be agreed by the Councils, having regard to latest evidence of affordable housing need.

Action:

N/a.

239

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