339 Support

Document Element: MM1 (Minor)
Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]
Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support proposed MM1. Latimer's planning application will be robust in respect of health and any facilities as required, embedding principles to support health and well-being into the site wide illustrative masterplan and design codes. The proposed amendment will support the DPD to provide the appropriate framework through which to plan for health needs, and for decision makers to assess this part of the proposal.

Full text:

Latimer support proposed MM1. Latimer is progressing a hybrid planning application for the Garden Community which is currently at pre-application stage with submission of the application anticipated in 2025. From an early stage, Latimer has engaged with relevant stakeholders from the NHS and Integrated Care Board ('ICB') and continues to do so to ensure the Garden Community fully plans for the health needs arising, in accordance with the NHS requirements. Latimer's planning application will be robust in respect of health and any facilities as required, embedding principles to support health and well-being into the site wide illustrative masterplan and design codes. The proposed amendment will support the DPD to provide the appropriate framework through which to plan for health needs, and for decision makers to assess this part of the proposal.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

408 Support

Document Element: MM1 (Minor)

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

Agent: Lawson Planning Partnership (AArti Oleary) [198]

Summary:

East Suffolk and North Essex NHS Foundation Trust (ESNEFT) welcomes Proposed Modifications Refs: MM1, MM2, MM4, MM13, MM39, MM45, MM46, MM50 and MM87 and considers them to be an appropriate reflection of the representations previously submitted by ESNEFT.
Adoption of these modifications will help ESNEFT to plan for the acute and secondary healthcare facilities and services required to meet needs arising from the proposed Garden Community.

Full text:

East Suffolk and North Essex NHS Foundation Trust (ESNEFT) welcomes Proposed Modifications Refs: MM1, MM2, MM4, MM13, MM39, MM45, MM46, MM50 and MM87 and considers them to be an appropriate reflection of the representations previously submitted by ESNEFT.

Adoption of these modifications will help ESNEFT to plan for the acute and secondary healthcare facilities and services required to meet needs arising from the proposed Garden Community.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/3c

417 Support

Document Element: MM1 (Minor)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM1 - support for additional emphasis on health and wellbeing services

Full text:

While we support a number of modifications suggested by statutory bodies such as natural England and sport England, we have listed numerous concerns where policy wording is being unnecessarily weakened to the extent it is no longer effective.

As noted there a small number of modifications we believe contradict one another with regards to effective transport planning, and require significant changes, or the omission of illustrative mapping with no planning purpose that obfuscate the policies they're intended to support.

We remain concerned that an evidence based approach has not been taken with regards to effective transport and movement, especially given the reasoning for main matter 63 which itself concludes the existing traffic modelling is fundamentally flawed. This, and other modifications require substantial changes that need additional evidence, and further consultation to constitute a proper plan making process.

We can only reiterate representations made at the examination in public that we believe too much detail has been pushed to later stages of the planning process, which is supported by the numerous reasonings suggesting policy must be loosened to allow for a wider flexibility.

Change suggested by respondent:

Strengthened policy wording to ensure policies are effective and not merely suggestive.

Updated traffic modelling and re-examination of transport and movement policies to form an effective, evidence based approach.

Completion of the full link road, to be operational before domestic development commences. (as promised in previous rounds of consultation, and removed without adequate opportunity for additional input)

Integrated phasing plan overview enshrined in policy. Updated viability study to confirm potential proposal is above viability threshold as currently queried in evidence base: financial viability study confirms a 15% profit on cost was approved during section 1, appropriate range reduced to 10-14% but the same document establishes liability at 9.65% - below acceptable thresholds and which we believe will only have fallen further due to changing economic circumstance. By the DPDs own evidence base's assertion – it does not meet the threshold to be viable.

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:

scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/3w