4 Support

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:
The policy mentions that a hotel could be permitted on the A120 business park, but not on the southern employment site, but for various reasons I believe this should be the other way round.

Full text:
The provision and protection of employment land will be critical to the success of these communities, and the wider area.
Part B specifically mentions that a hotel could be permitted within the A120 Business Park if it supports the primary use, but not within the Knowledge area. This should be reversed: a hotel close to the University and Knowledge Gateway would be more beneficial than one on an industrial park next to the A120, as the kinds of businesses that are based in the Knowledge Gateway, and those that will occupy the future Knowledge based employment area, would be more likely to require accommodation for visitors. This is in addition to visiting academics to the university, parents of university students etc. who would all benefit from a hotel close to the University. Being located closer to the denser southern neighbourhood, rather than on the Northern edge of the community, would encourage hotel guests to spend money with local businesses e.g. restaurants in the Southern Neighbourhood centre, and being closer to the Park and Choose site will encourage visitors to travel into the city centre and spend money there, and even to arrive by train/transit, rather than driving.

Change suggested by respondent:
-

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

42 Support

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Mrs Carolyn Mason [64]

Summary:
When thinking about local jobs consider local food production. Crockleford, rather than becoming another housing development, instead should be considered for food production, as well as providing public access to an extended country park. The land is top quality agricultural/horticultural land and has historically been a fruit growing area. Locally, there are vegetables, top and soft fruit, salad and vineyards grown commercially.
Consider local cooperatives, employing local people that could provide sustainable, local food for the Garden Community.
Crockelford has special characteristics developed over centuries around horticulture and agriculture that should be sustained and not destroyed.

Full text:
When thinking about local jobs consider local food production. Crockleford, rather than becoming another housing development, instead should be considered for food production, as well as providing public access to an extended country park. The land is top quality agricultural/horticultural land and has historically been a fruit growing area. Locally, there are vegetables, top and soft fruit, salad and vineyards grown commercially.
Consider local cooperatives, employing local people that could provide sustainable, local food for the Garden Community.
Crockelford has special characteristics developed over centuries around horticulture and agriculture that should be sustained and not destroyed.

Change suggested by respondent:
-

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

51 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

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

Full text:

To whom this may concern

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thankyou myself and Elmstead look forward to your reply.

Miss R Lockwood

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

57 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

Summary:

Without a link to the A120 it is unlikely there would be demand for the northern business park.
It is not clear what the merit is of stringing the employment development along the north side of the A133 rather than focussing on land opposite the current Knowledge Gateway.

Full text:

Consultation response from the Wivenhoe Society

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

1) Conformity with the Local Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Wivenhoe and Brightlingsea as passengers using these could interchange to the RTS if they so wished. Similarly travellers from the Garden Community could interchange to the local bus (currently the S1) which gives access to the industrial/commercial buildings at Whitehall allowing a commute by public transport. It would give an, admittedly circuitous, public transport link from the Garden Community to Wivenhoe.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:
The Knowledge based employment area should be to the south west of the site.

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

73 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

Summary:
'The aim of achieving a minimum of one job per household, either close to home or within a sustainable commuting distance'. An aim is not a requirement, it is highly unlikely that one person in every household will be employed within the development. Therefore, referring back to my first point that most people will jump in their cars to get to work rather than use public transport.

Full text:
'The aim of achieving a minimum of one job per household, either close to home or within a sustainable commuting distance'. An aim is not a requirement, it is highly unlikely that one person in every household will be employed within the development. Therefore, referring back to my first point that most people will jump in their cars to get to work rather than use public transport.

Change suggested by respondent:
Again, less housing. Colchester and the surrounding area cannot cope with increased traffic and increased demand for jobs.

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

90 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

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

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

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

GC Policy 1: Land Use and Spatial Approach.

• The Garden Community Principles unproven. The GC vision overly aspirational and adopts a naive perception of the way in which communities are established and of human behaviour. The latter is not simply determined by environment.
• The GC is unlikely to address a local housing need, unless a greater proportion of rented housing is included. The present proposed approach will encourage further migration from the London suburbs, by the property wealthy whose pattern of work has changed post Covid-19.
• Many prospective residents of the GC will not be seeking local jobs, they will be occasionally commuting to London and working from home.
• Unrealistic assumptions are made in relation to the extent to which private car usage will be reduced by the RTS and other more sustainable transport initiatives.
• The practicalities of community ownership are unclear.
• Shared ownership and rented housing should be included in the DPD as separate categories and the possibility of transferring from rent to shared ownership should be included.
• I was told at a consultation event that environmental requirements for new homes cannot exceed current building regulations, this is not clear from the DPD, which suggests the environmental requirements will be much higher.

• The neighbourhood map does not clearly distinguish between the North and Crockleford neighbourhoods.
• The development of the TCBGC does not justify the concreting over of a large part of rural northeast Essex.
• It does not seem logical that two proposed garden communities in north Essex were not considered to be viable, while the TCBGC is considered viable.

Policies Map:

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

Policy 2: Nature.

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

Policy 3: Place Shaping Principles.

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

Policy 4: Meeting Housing Needs.

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

Policy 5: Economic Activity and Employment.

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

Policy 6: Community and Social Infrastructure.

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

Policy 7: Movement and Connections.

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

Policy 8: Sustainable Infrastructure.

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

153 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:

In light of the economic climate we are facing where people are struggling to pay mortgages, companies are struggling to provide employees with salaries to compensate the increased cost of living, how many firms are realistically able to set up new businesses providing people with competitive salaries to purchase homes on such an enormous scale. Where are the teachers, dentists, doctors, and the already over stretched community care going to miraculously appear from? I believe there is a very real prospect, a serious prospect that thousands of homes are going to be massively under supported in vital areas.

Full text:

In light of the economic climate we are facing where people are struggling to pay mortgages, companies are struggling to provide employees with salaries to compensate the increased cost of living, how many firms are realistically able to set up new businesses providing people with competitive salaries to purchase homes on such an enormous scale. Where are the teachers, dentists, doctors, and the already over stretched community care going to miraculously appear from? I believe there is a very real prospect, a serious prospect that thousands of homes are going to be massively under supported in vital areas.

Change suggested by respondent:

A more realistic smaller approach

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

183 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

- Higher target of jobs per household is required.
Part A
- Concerned phasing of business accommodation is tied to occupation of housing, but education and healthcare are not.
Part C
- Employment land should be available to public services if necessary in short to mid term.
Justification
- Although employment land must be near A120 link road, it does not have to be East of it.

Full text:

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: As the Parish Council representing the most affected land area and community we have a number of concerns that haven't been adequately addressed and we should be able to represent the Parish community at the hearing.
Attachments: EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t8

192 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:
Policy GC5: Economic Activity and Employment
The business park should be better integrated with the garden community. It is severed from the GC by a road, and is likely to draw in employees using the A120 rather than the GC. Some heavy uses need to be segregated but many of the B1/E uses could be sensibly integrated with the housing.

Full text:
Policy GC5: Economic Activity and Employment
The business park should be better integrated with the garden community. It is severed from the GC by a road, and is likely to draw in employees using the A120 rather than the GC. Some heavy uses need to be segregated but many of the B1/E uses could be sensibly integrated with the housing.

Change suggested by respondent:
Words should be added to make it clear that B1/E employment uses are permitted within residential areas.

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

212 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Summary:
business park is too close to the church and is a threat to this listed grade 1 building.

Full text:
The business park will have a negative impact on a listed building (Church and cemetery) and damage to architectural value of listed grade 1 Church. It is coming very close and the report shows that it will be damaging to it.
A business park will increase the traffic on the roads, steal the peaceful settings of the area, increase air and noise pollution while being built, increase air pollution In a world becoming increasingly aware that we need to encourage and protect the environment we have, why destroying it to bring more problems to the locals? There are many businesses already in the parish. We need to encourage food growing, animal farming as these will save the people in a near future. We do not need more businesses increasing the demand for transport and the demand for electricity production, for rubbish disposal, for uses of sewers and water supplies. By always taking and destroying the same things that help us to live, we are pushing to the destruction of our world, already blinded by such projects that are not needed and forced upon the locals.

Change suggested by respondent:
The business park needs to be built where it is needed in any urban area, but not in a rural community.

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

229 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT
Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]
Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:
Latimer is supportive of the approach to this policy in general. However, there will be a need for detailed master planning and need based evidence to inform future planning applications, and suggestions are made to ensure there is flexibility to do so.

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
Greater clarity should be provided with regard to Part A along with amendment to wording to provide flexibility.
Clarity over quantum of employment land specified in Part B to allow greater flexibility and clarity.

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

240 Object

Document Element: POLICY 5: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT

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

Summary:

Economic and Employment Study concluded that business park with direct access to A120 was a very strong offer whereas the knowledge gateway provision was a more long term opportunity. However, deliverability of link road bring into question as to whether the project can now live up to its one job per household expectation

Full text:

See attached letter for full text

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: WTC councillors request that they can make representations at the Hearing.

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