5 Support

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:

There are pros and cons to providing one large secondary school or to smaller ones. Two smaller schools is more compatible with the aspiration for small, walkable neighbourhoods, and may work better as part of the phased development approach, but one large school could benefit from better facilities and provide better value for money for taxpayers.
Whichever approach is taken, at least one of the schools should include a sixth form from the very outset, in line with the desire for the garden community to be self-sufficient (and because Colchester Sixth Form College is running out of space to expand).

Full text:

There are pros and cons to providing one large secondary school or to smaller ones. Two smaller schools is more compatible with the aspiration for small, walkable neighbourhoods, and may work better as part of the phased development approach, but one large school could benefit from better facilities and provide better value for money for taxpayers.
Whichever approach is taken, at least one of the schools should include a sixth form from the very outset, in line with the desire for the garden community to be self-sufficient (and because Colchester Sixth Form College is running out of space to expand).

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

21 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Kathryn and Timothy Pugh [50]

Summary:

We have read of plans for "at least one new secondary school and at least five primary schools." Well yes, we would expect nothing less for children and young people in our community. Worrying not to have read of any new medical centres which will-be vital to the whole community, especially given the increasing older population.

Full text:

We write to briefly outline apprehensions we have with the Colchester Borders Garden Community.

We have been horrified at the destruction of green space that has occurred as more and more dwellings are built. Our main concern until last year was the devastating loss of wildlife habitats that we already know are under severe threat. Now, with increasingly uncertain international affairs Impacting our food prices (and longer term security), surely farmland should be afforded extra protection to bolster our means of food production here in the UK. To build these 7,000 homes on green space while proudly promoting a "new" Country Park is self-congratulatory and In our opinion hypocritical. Yes, protect Salary Brook; yes, protect Churn Wood but go further: protect the fields, hedges, trees and ditches that provide homes to Important flora and fauna. We have read of plans for "at least one new secondary school and at least five primary schools." Well yes, we would expect nothing less for children and young people in our community. Worrying not to have read of any new medical centres which will-be vital to the whole community, especially given the increasing older population.

May we refer you to an article from July 2022 on the BBC News website - we would prefer to send a link but despite registering, we found the feedback portal unnavigable - which details how vital green spaces are In terms of physical health during heatwaves.

For the reasons above, we would prefer that this housing development be substantially reduced.

*Please see "It's like an oven': Life In Britain's hottest neighbourhoods." Harriet Bradshaw, Rob England and Deidre Finnerty BBC News 18 July 2022

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments:

24 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Elizabeth Thompson [53]

Summary:

I strongly disagree with this development for the following reasons.
Elmstead is a small village with minimal Infrastructure.
Elmstead cannot cope with this level of development so close
There is 1 Doctors surgery and 1 primary school
I cannot see any positive benefits in this level of development prior to improvement in the current infrastructure of Elmstead.
My fear is that once the building of these homes are completed rising costs will result in reduced money available and the promised additional infrastructure will be greatly reduced.
I would urge that we stop this happening

Full text:

I strongly disagree with this development for the following reasons.
Elmstead is a small village with minimal Infrastructure.
Elmstead cannot cope with this level of development so close
There is only 1 Doctors surgery
There is only 1 primary school
There is a lack of road repairs at present, with a great number of potholes not being repaired now Increase in traffic flow would be detrimental to Elmstead and further damage our roads.
We don’t have a dentist ,fire station, secondary school or any other health facilities.
There is only one small grocery store.
Increased traffic and homes would impact on our minimal street services we currently have ie street cleaning, fly tipping road repairs refuse service and bus route
There is also the Environmental Impact on our elderly residents through increased air pollution.
I cannot see any positive benefits in this level of development prior to improvement in the current infrastructure of Elmstead.
My fear is that once the building of these homes are completed rising costs will result in reduced money available and the promised additional infrastructure will be greatly reduced.
I would urge that we stop this happening

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

28 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Miss Louise terry [30]

Summary:

I have just received a leaflet through the door in regards to the garden community.

I am new to the area but have been coming here since I was a baby due to family living here for over 30 years.{REDACTED}

I am for developments in bigger areas but am angry that they are building in a peaceful area. I moved here to be away from crime, over crowding, and built up areas. I've lived in both types of areas and I prefer the village life. To know that this is happening makes me regret buying our first home in this lovely village.
The hospital is under so much pressure and crowded with patients and to build more homes will make that worse, especially when they have {REDACTED} down halstead hospital.

It's hard to get a GP appointment and dentist here. Worried about school places being available.

Full text:

I have just received a leaflet through the door in regards to the garden community team regarding the new plans.

I am new to the area but have been coming here since I was a baby due to my Nan and grandad living here for over 30 years. I am currently living {REDACTED}

I am all with developments in bigger areas but I am highly angry now knowing that they are wanting to build in such a peaceful area. I moved here to be away from crime, over crowding, and just a built up area. It was hard enough for me to be able to get a job and at 23 years of age having to do an apprenticeship. I now have been at the hospital for 7 years and it's already under so much pressure and crowded with patients and to build more homes it'll just be a lot worse, especially when they have {REDACTED} down halstead hospital also.

It's hard enough to even get a GP appointment. I soon want to start a family but the pressure of trying to get your child into school will be hard with all these new developments. I moved to a village to Hope it stay a village for the peaceful, friendly people. I've lived in both types of areas and I can certainly agree on the village life. To know that this is happening makes me regret buying our first home in this lovely village with memories.

There needs to be space for nature to breathe and to help us breathe. Without the fields, the bees, the animals, birds we will just be a country full of concrete and a village of pollution, illness, overworked, no work, no space for appointments kind of village.

I am still having trouble trying to find a GP as it is and dentist around here so having to drive 30 minutes for an appointment is what I have to do.

So please, is there anywhere I can object to this. I am sure my family will also object due to this being a family village.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

31 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: James Chable [55]

Summary:

The garden community is a developers paradise for an upper class community, there are 3 estates built around me now without any infrastructure at all, so doctor surgeries none incorporated in the planning schools none incorporated in the planning roads no new roads built to take the ever increasing traffic, the tcb can gloss the website as much as they like but action speak louder than words.

Full text:

I am sending my comments on garden communities, though I don't believe they will be heard.

I agree that new housing helps, however 7,500 come on!! Garden community has started building these houses in Elmstead Market prices ranging from £350,000 to £500,000 anyone with any common sense knows this is out of middle class price range, oh but there are some social houses incorporated in the build, I'm guessing 3 per cent. The garden community is a developers paradise for an upper class community, there are 3 estates built around me now without any infrastructure at all, so doctor surgeries none incorporated in the planning schools none incorporated in the planning roads no new roads built to take the ever increasing traffic, the tcb can gloss the website as much as they like but action speak louder than words, from a personal point of view I am not overly concerned that the Elmstead country side is being buried in bricks and concrete by the time it is complete me like a lot of other residents would have moved away to somewhere that developers can't make their millions in profits without putting the residents before profits. Honesty is always the best policy so be more transparent on how building 7500 houses actually helps a community without including infrastructure. Not to mention additional air pollution in such a tight area

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

37 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Summary:

Officers summary:The New development has been prepared without thought for infrastructure. We are struggling at the moment to live and get medical treatment as the hospitals and doctors are over whelmed with 5/6 weeks wait for appointments. No thought of how our village can cope, this cannot be allowed to go on without some sensible input and constructive thinking, councillors cannot just do as they please forgetting the people that have paid their taxes. Education will not be available to all children as there are no places for them as no extra schools are being built this again is unacceptable the impact of the population is not possible. Government have no idea what they want regarding more homes no thought about quality of life. It will cause over crowding and no infrastructure to cope with the rise in the populous.

Full text:

comments re new development

The New development has been prepared with out thought on how the infrastructure is going to be available, we are struggling at the moment to live and get medical treatment as the hospitals and doctors are over whelmed with no capacity to treat the population as it is.
The village of Elmstead which has nothing but one shop and over subscribed doctors and not much else.
This project has been badly thought up it does not help normal people with housing ,just greedy builders who are jumping on the band wagon to build houses that the majority cannot afford. No thought has gone into how our village can manage with the volume of traffic when most local people have to travel to gat any medical treatment shopping and other important essentials availability to better their lives. The village has already grown to twice its size with new homes.

Elmstead will become out cast from all these things that are necessary to survive. The air pollution will become intolerable to many of our village with medical problems. No thought has gone into our villages, infrastructure for roads crossings and just to maintain quality of life. The increased traffic will cause more accidents and people not being able to access medical help via ambulances re the traffic which is going to cause delays . people will die.

Elmstead will become isolated with no way of getting to Colchester for the essentials to maintain a quality of life that we expect.

These buildings are not for the local populous but for out siders who have no empathy with the way of life that we have all struggled to achieve in our small village good quality of life and a peaceful existence., good air quality. We are aware that things need change but Colchester has built so many house without any more hospitals schools dentists and doctors as it is we have to wait 5/6 weeks for a doctors appointment and with what is proposed now with out realistic management for all is abominable, no thought of how our village can cope with this distraction of our way of life.

Education will not be available to all children as there are no places for them as no extra schools are being built this again is unacceptable the impact of the population is not possible as no thought has gone into the extra land available for the infrastructure it is madness to continue in this unthought out plan. Colchester will spread making us an urban jungle.

This can not be allowed to continue with no thought on how people can survive with out adequate hospitals doctors schools etc this cannot be allowed to go on without some sensible input and constructive thinking ,councillors can not just do as they please forgetting the people that have paid their taxes supported the councils all these years to be brushed aside.
This is insane thinking without a proper constructive plan to help all without out destroying our way of life.
Government have no idea as to what they want regarding more homes no thought about quality of life. It will cause over crowding and no infrastructure to cope with the rise in the populous. The health of the area will become impossible with no health care available as there will be no capacity in the one hospital that is suppose to serve all.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

50 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Summary:

Officers Summary: 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? Elmstead is a well-loved community with residents having lived here 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 potholes this list is endless.

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

54 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Miss Deborah Jones [62]

Summary:
Where are the doctors surgeries, dentists, community health and social care providers, nurseries/childcare to be located?

Full text:
1. Transport links must be improved for all residents in the area, not just those within the proposed development.
2. Where are the doctors surgeries, dentists, community health and social care providers, nurseries/childcare to be located?
3. Expecting families or working-age residents not to own or use one or more vehicles is unrealistic.
4. Existing cycle routes in the city are ignored, so how is the very hilly proposed development area going to be any different?
5. Horse riding is mentioned more than once, where are these horses going to be kept, and who can afford to own one?

Change suggested by respondent:
There does not seem to be any joined-up thinking, or consideration for how the proposed development will impact existing infrastructure and services. Schools are shown on the plan, but where are other necessary care and support services? Healthcare services in the city are already stretched beyond their limit, having thousands more residents without additional infrastructure, established in advance, is dangerous and prejudicial.

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

58 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

Summary:
Greater clarity is needed about the ownership of community assets and ultimate financial responsibility for these.

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:

More detail is required on ownership and maintenance responsibilities for community assets.

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

60 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Ms Jean McNeil [82]

Summary:

The social infrastructure will only become operative when a certain number of dwellings has been built. How long before the garden community becomes a community?

Full text:

The social infrastructure will only become operative when a certain number of dwellings has been built. How long before the garden community becomes a community?

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan needs to guarantee that this will happen as soon as possible, a time scale determined, and suitable services provided for residents in the mean time.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

69 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Summary:

The policy is broadly supported for the reasons set out in the full comments. However, it is requested that the policy is reviewed to address these points:
- The need to consider the planning implications of shared use of sports facilities on school sites;
- To set out the minimum sports facility requirements that should be provide for
- To acknowledge the role of the University's sports facilities in meeting the needs of the development
- To ensure that the Healthy Living and Play Strategy is informed by the evidence base.
- To secure community use of the school facilities

Full text:

• The principles of this theme especially those relating to 'A Place Where It's Easy to be Healthy and Happy' and 'A Place to Play and have Fun' are welcomed as they would support encouraging physical activity. The focus on the creation of environments that promote healthy living rather than just healthcare facilities is particularly welcomed as this would be consistent with Sport England's Active Design guidance which is promoted in the plan's policies;
• Support is offered for community and social infrastructure needs being determined in accordance with detailed assessments and strategies as this would be the appropriate approach to addressing community sport and physical activity facility needs generated by the development;
• Support is offered for part A of the policy as requiring neighbourhood centres to be accessible by a sustainable travel network and having community meeting places which can provide for a range of community uses and needs would accord with Active Design principles.
• The requirement in part B for multi-functional community buildings and spaces to be provided is supported as this offers potential to meet a variety of needs in close proximity to where people live which would include sport and physical activity needs;
• The vehicle free 'school zones' approach combined with schools being connected by safe and direct walking/cycling routes is welcomed as it would be consistent with Active Design principles. It is requested that the policy goes further by expecting schools to be designed to encourage health and wellbeing, especially physical activity, by the design and layout of the schools (e.g. storage facilities to support cycling and designing the school grounds to promote informal physical activity as well as providing the conventional sport and play facilities);
• Opportunities to provide community facilities in new schools through the shared use of sports, arts etc facilities should be fully explored as part of the masterplanning of the development as this would avoid the potential duplication of facilities within the development and provide facilities in close proximity to where people live. This is pertinent as the KKP 'Open Space, Playing Pitch, Outdoor Sports and Built Facility – Overarching Strategy' identifies that the potential that a secondary school in particular offers for meeting the needs for facilities such as 3G artificial grass pitches, tennis/netball courts and indoor sports facilities. The potential land take implications of providing shared use sports facilities on school sites should be accounted for in the masterplanning process as well as the need for developers to fund the uplift required to deliver dual use facilities that are suitable for meeting community needs. This should be referenced in part C or D of the policy together with a requirement for the community use of school facilities to be secured through formal community use agreements;
• The broad approach to sport, recreation and open space provision in part D of the policy is welcomed. However, as the Colchester and Tendring Sports Recreation and Open Space Strategy is now at an advanced stage and the abovementioned Overarching Strategy has been completed the policy should provide details of the expected minimum facility requirements to be provided within the Garden Community to provide clarity to developers and the community about what is expected based on the evidence base although this could be caveated to address potential changes in facility needs in the interim of the development being delivered given the expected long lead in time. This would be consistent with the approach taken in the policy to education facilities for instance where minimum school facility requirements are outlined.
• Part D should acknowledge the potential role of the University's existing or future sports facilities in meeting the needs of the development in view of the close proximity of the University site and the strategic shared use facilities that are or could be provided to help meet the needs of residents of the development;
• The requirement in part E of the policy for developments to account for healthy new towns principles and Active Design principles is welcomed. The requirement for a HIA to be prepared and for this to be prepared in accordance with EPOA's latest guidance is supported as this guidance incorporates Active Design principles which in turn would support the policy's requirement to account for these principles;
• The requirement in Part F of the policy for developer contributions to fund the initial set up and running costs of community development is welcomed. The reference in the justification to the stewardship strategy including an activation programme to include community development delivery is also welcomed as well as the examples given that relate to the establishment of community walking/cycling/running activities and sports club establishment.
• The requirement in part G of the policy for development to be supported by a Healthy Living and Play Strategy is welcomed as this would provide a strategic framework for informing and justifying the approach to sport and physical activity provision. Part G of the policy should clarify that this strategy should be informed by the recommendations of the 2022 Colchester and Tendring Open Space Strategy. This strategy should also be co-ordinated with other relevant strategies for the development such as the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Active Travel Strategy given the inter-relationship between them. As well as through the provision of sites and facilities the strategy should demonstrate how the broader design of the development has encouraged active lifestyles (e.g. through the use of the Active Design principles).
• While the requirement in part G of the policy for educational proposals to be accompanied by a Community Use Statement/Plan is supported, the policy or its justification should make it clear that the proposed community use would be secured in practice through the completion of formal community use agreements secured as part of any planning permission. A formal community use agreement is required to secure the community use of educational facilities in practice over a long term period and is the conventional approach to securing proposals for community use in practice as an agreement has legal status and can be monitored and enforced if required outside of planning enforcement. Without such a requirement it is unclear how the proposals in a Community Use Statement/Plan would be secured if planning permission was granted.

Change suggested by respondent:

- It is requested that part C expects schools to be designed to encourage health and wellbeing, especially physical activity, by the design and layout of the schools (e.g. storage facilities to support cycling and designing the school grounds to promote informal physical activity as well as providing the conventional sport and play facilities);
- It is requested that part C or D refers to the opportunities to provide community facilities in new schools through the shared use of sports, arts etc facilities and that this should be fully explored as part of the masterplanning. There should also be a requirement for the community use of school facilities to be secured through formal community use agreements.
- It is requested that part D details the expected minimum community sports facility requirements to be provided within the Garden Community
- It is requested that Part D acknowledges the potential role of the University's existing or future sports facilities in meeting the needs of the development
- It is requested that part G clarify that the Healthy Living and Play strategy be informed by the recommendations of the 2022 Colchester and Tendring Open Space Strategy. and be co-ordinated with other relevant strategies for the development such as the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Active Travel Strategy
- It is requested that part G of the policy or the reasoned justification make it clear that the proposed community use of school facilities would be secured in practice through the completion of formal community use agreements secured as part of any planning permission

-

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: Yes
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Written Representation
Attachments: None

77 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Summary:

Concerned that no infrastructure will be in place during the first stages of the development. There is not enough social, health or education provision initially planned. The report says these views have been taken on board but the consultation document does not address the concerns raised in any depth.

The suggestion that an initial 100+ houses may be required to begin funding the project before any infrastructure begins is alarming and directly in contradiction to the local plan.

Full text:

I oppose the building of the Garden Village on the Colchester / Tendering borders on the grounds listed below.
1. Infrastructure
2. Water Treatment
3. Salary Brook boundary
4. Rapid Transport System
5. Housing
6. Gypsy / Traveller site

1) Concerns have been raised that no infrastructure being in place during the first stages of the development. There is not enough social, health or education provision initially planned. The report says these views have been taken on board but the consultation document does not address the concerns raised in any depth.
Within the Community and Social infrastructure assets at the earliest stage of development, (for each development) there should be essential requirements for:
* Early years and nursery provision
*Primary school(s)
*Secondary school
*Dentist, GP surgery, Pharmacy and clinical facilities offering out-patient support that cannot be provisioned at Colchester General Hospital
*A Community multi-use building with sufficient self-contained spaces within it to accommodate use by different faith groups, clubs and societies, including youth clubs
The suggestion that an initial 100+ houses may be required to begin funding the project before any infrastructure begins is alarming and directly in contradiction to the local plan.

2) There is a gap in terms of lacking a policy on grey and black water treatment specifically. This being of particular concern because of the odour emitted from the sewage works by The Hythe.
The problems of water and air pollution for the local residents of Elmstead and Crockleford Heath caused by the building of up to 9,000 accommodation units. There is the importance of identifying the means and method for the treatment of these waste water types at DPD stage, so they can be properly costed and prepared in advance before the commencement of any building.
Currently any policy as to how sewage and water will be dealt with is missing; in view of the final size of the garden community development, surely there is a vital need to deal with this essential part of the infrastructure right at the start.
There is the problem of major road disruption, in an already heavily traffic congested area, for the whole of the East of Colchester during the pipe-work installation to link to at the groundwork stage.

3) In the area of the suggested Knowledge Gateway / Industrial expansion, there is a concern that the proposed development could end up spilling halfway down the Salary Brook slopes designated as country park area, which is at best a meagre offering of habitat for the size of the area to be desecrated. This would be a contradiction of two other agreed principles based on community and public input into the engagement process. Building on the ridgeline would cause buildings, not in character with a country park, to dominate these slopes and the whole surrounding landscape. The buildings would have a detrimental effect and be viewable from great distances, ie The University Towers.

4) The description of the route of the Rapid Transit System (RTS) connecting the Garden Community with the rest of Colchester is too vague in stating “it will be in place to connect the Garden Community with the University of Essex, Colchester Town Centre, Colchester Railway Stations, Colchester Hospital, Community Stadium, Colchester Sports Park and the existing Park and Ride site in north Colchester”. Prospectively, the buses will always be in traffic struggling through bottlenecks at railway and river crossings from the East of Colchester right into the town. In the documents, there are no plans to address these points by building new bridges or underpasses.
There is no current map provided to indicate the exact route, therefore leaving the developers open opportunity to place the road at their discretion. We need a clear definition of the route and identification of the bottlenecks and costings for resolving them. There is no current indication of how the RTS will actually be paid for; except for the developer stating a (non binding) certain amount of houses will have to be sold first, to allow for the building of the RTS.
The RTS will be built in stages according to the sale of properties to fund each part. This means years of increased traffic, starting with Heavy Goods Vehicles, leading onto trade vans and domestic cars passing through the village of Elmstead and the adjoining back-roads for many years.
5) 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.
6) Within the guidelines of Gypsy and Traveller needs: the size of the gypsy and traveller provision is to be determined as part of Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment.
How are the developers and council going to deal with this issue?
Where is this site to be placed as it has not been shown in the context of the planners outline permission. The site needed would be very big in relation to the GC; and at what stage would this ‘mini development’ take place.

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Written Representation
Attachments: Consultation document Garden Village.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/4

84 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

Summary:
I do wish the project well, but this chapter reads like pie-in-the-sky to me. For example: "Developer contributions will be required to fund the initial set up and running costs, including staff, premises, and equipment costs. This support will need to be provided for a minimum of 10 years, or until such time as stewardship activities are financially self-sustaining, before the occupation of the first home." What exactly does this mean? Who will finance what, and for how long? How are the "stewardship activities" going to become "financially self-sustaining"?

Full text:
I do wish the project well, but this chapter reads like pie-in-the-sky to me. For example: "Developer contributions will be required to fund the initial set up and running costs, including staff, premises, and equipment costs. This support will need to be provided for a minimum of 10 years, or until such time as stewardship activities are financially self-sustaining, before the occupation of the first home." What exactly does this mean? Who will finance what, and for how long? How are the "stewardship activities" going to become "financially self-sustaining"?

Change suggested by respondent:
I would like to see at least some financial planning included in the plan, esp. in terms of projected costs, who will commit to what, and in what time frame. I would also like to see some concrete scenarios and some contingency planning.

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

91 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Summary:
• 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.

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

112 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Mr Shaun Raven [37]

Summary:

If the first wave of building goes ahead at the Elmstead end, what happens to the local community services? Yes, we know that the proposal says there will be new schools, shops and a surgery, but these will not be in place straight away - if at all. Elmstead has one small general shop and a garage shop, and that is it. It has one Surgery which is already stretched, and one primary school - all of which will struggle to cope with an increase of the population, which is already occurring in other areas being developed around Elmstead.

Full text:

Response to updated plans - proposed development Tendring Garden Community

To whom It may concern,

When the original online consultations were proposed, I took part. I filled in the questionnaires, I watched and waited.

Now it appears, the final consultations are upon us - and as expected, the residents of Elmstead have seen their objections to this development ignored or overridden.

Firstly, the plans for the new road between the A133 and the A120 seem to have elther been forgotten, or now stand to be delayed until the first phase of building (at the Elmstead end naturally) is complete. We already deal with constant delays throughout the day on the A133 at Clingoe Hill, and on the Hythe in Colchester. Adding 7500 new homes without an additional road to take some of the burden is madness, and we have already seen results of this sort of bad planning around the areas of North Station and the northern approach - both of which can easily become unusable at certain times of the day.

There have been proposals for new rail and bus links to take the extra load, but nothing concrete - and let us be honest, in a time of cost cutting (which we have already seen In these plans) it is unlikely we will ever seen these links come to fruition. All of which will add additional load to the traffic system which is already creaking at the seams. Let us not forget the planned reduction In parking spaces in the garden community (to allow even more housing) which will lead to cars being parked on green areas and pavements. Those cars WILL be there, because the residents of the garden community WILL need them as all the places they will need to go will be on the outskirts of Colchester - because Colchester City Centre is dying, and all the shops and services you really NEED are relocating to the outskirts.

All of this will lead to a severe Impact on air quality in the general area - and both the residents of Elmstead AND the garden community will suffer for It.

If (as expected) the first wave of building goes ahead at the Elmstead end, what happens to the local community services? Yes, we know that the proposal says there will be new schools, shops and a surgery, but these will not be in place straight away - if at all. Elmstead has one small general shop and a garage shop, and that is it. It has one Surgery which is already stretched, and one primary school - all of which will struggle to cope with an increase of the population, which is already occurring in other areas being developed around Elmstead.

It is Interesting that Tendring is proposing this garden community at the furthest point on Its borders, where it knows that most of the impact will be taken up by Colchester/Elmstead and Wivenhoe, Tendring says it has an obligation to provide homes for its community, but none of these homes will be in the reach of the average community buyers as they'll be priced too high (just look at the new housing estates off the Cowdrey Avenue in Colchester), 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.

Oh, and let us not even get started on the idea of Industrial parks located 1/2 a mile from Elmstead Church, near the A120 - with no link road. Where will their traffic go - oh the A133 again. Oh dear.

It all adds up to a poorly thought out, poorly planned and poorly executed proposal. The most annoying this about it is that whatever objections are raised, we will be told "there's no alternative" and it will go ahead - and ruin this area. I am writing this because I want my objections on record, because in the long run, It's the only option I have available to me. No-one at Tendring will listen, and no one cares - because at the end of the day It does not really affect them.

I really hope that my concerns never happen - because if they do, both the residents of Elmstead and the proposed residents of the Garden Community will suffer.

One last thing. Just how difficult is it to raise concerns on this project? I am sending this via post because the design on your online portal is biased and flawed. It's designed in such a way to make inputting any comments difficult (unless you're moderately computer savvy - I'm a computer programmer, and the experience was frustrating to say the least, god knows how anyone else manages to make comments), and actually getting into the portal requires registering using a poorly designed registration screen where it's easy to hit the wrong button, I suggest your web developers attend some web interface design courses where you learn to make sites usable, not just pretty.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

116 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Mrs Helen Byrne [32]

Summary:
- The new houses would place increased pressure on existing schools in Elmstead Market. New schools need to be built first.
- There is a lack of existing healthcare facilities, bringing more people in to the area without purpose built facilities will make this worse.

Full text:
Since the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community was proposed, significant development has already taken place and continues to do so in the village of Elmstead Market. This has already placed pressure on Elmstead Primary School and caused increased traffic.
Parking at Elmstead Primary School can be unsafe due to the volume of parents driving in to school. In the initial phase of development children from the new houses will need to attend existing schools unless the new schools are built first.

It would be place additional pressure on Elmstead Primary which is already at capacity. Traffic levels from parents bringing children to the school would increase and parking would be very challenging.

At present traffic from Elmstead going into Colchester and beyond via the A133 is heavy and there can be significant delays at peak times. The additional traffic caused by the new development would be negative and result in increased wait times to travel into Colchester and beyond. This would have an impact of increasing air pollution and reduce quality of life for residents. The new link road would potentially not be built for a considerable time and the period in the lead up to it's use would be awful for those travelling and those affected by the air pollution.

Provision of healthcare is challenging to the current volume of residents in Elmstead Market.
There is a lack of GP provision, long wait for urgent care and no NHS dentistry. Bringing considerably more people into the area and there are inadequate facilities to manage. Using flexible spaces within centres is sensible for some NHS provision, but for many services they need purpose built facilities and equipment. The recruitment challenges within the NHS mean that already existing services have vacancies. So even if new facilities were included this would be an issue.

Proposed Modifications:
- New primary school(s) to be built prior to homes being occupied.
- Reduction in volume of houses to impact on traffic/air pollution.
- New road must be built early on in development.

Change suggested by respondent:
- New primary school(s) to be built prior to homes being occupied.

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

126 Support

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Miss Mary Dale [132]

Summary:
I hope a frequent and reliable bus service into Colchester and other places in the surrounding area is guaranteed.

Full text:
I hope a frequent and reliable bus service into Colchester and other places in the surrounding area is guaranteed.

Change suggested by respondent:
-

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

127 Support

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

Regarding Health care provision, I fully support creation of additional services especially GP practice professionals, pharmacists, dentist and buildings. Parsons Heath Medical Practice has been closed to new patients who need to register with a GP for some time as the practice is at full capacity. Local providers will not be able to meet increased demand so it is essential that adequate measures are taken. Expansion of hospital services will also be required to cope with the demands of an increased local population.

Full text:

Regarding Health care provision, I fully support creation of additional services especially GP practice professionals, pharmacists, dentist and buildings. Parsons Heath Medical Practice has been closed to new patients who need to register with a GP for some time as the practice is at full capacity. Local providers will not be able to meet increased demand so it is essential that adequate measures are taken. Expansion of hospital services will also be required to cope with the demands of an increased local population.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

128 Support

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

Provision of Neighbourhood Centres, Community Buildings, Education, Sports and Health are essential from the very beginning and with a national shortage of qualified professionals to provide these services, the facilities need to be carefully designed to both meet the needs of the local population and to be attractive to professionals. 'Infrastructure first' must always apply.

Full text:

Provision of Neighbourhood Centres, Community Buildings, Education, Sports and Health are essential from the very beginning and with a national shortage of qualified professionals to provide these services, the facilities need to be carefully designed to both meet the needs of the local population and to be attractive to professionals. 'Infrastructure first' must always apply.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

139 Support

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Summary:

Community infrastructure is so essential into the formation of communities rather than simply a housing development. For this timing - earlier rather than later - is essential. Surrounding communities are already under pressure for school places, GPs etc so these need to be put in place for the new community straight away.

Full text:

Community infrastructure is so essential into the formation of communities rather than simply a housing development. For this timing - earlier rather than later - is essential. Surrounding communities are already under pressure for school places, GPs etc so these need to be put in place for the new community straight away.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

154 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:
Having worked in the local food bank on the huge council estate near to this proposed plan, in my opinion social infrastructure is currently missing already! There is very little support for a huge community literally down the road! I believe it's a very idealistic notion to think there would be enough finances to support this long term. Promises will be made I'm sure, but unless there will be a guaranteed budget for the foreseeable future that is ringfenced, my belief is once built, these houses will be left with very little community facilities.

Full text:
Having worked in the local food bank on the huge council estate near to this proposed plan, in my opinion social infrastructure is currently missing already! There is very little support for a huge community literally down the road! I believe it's a very idealistic notion to think there would be enough finances to support this long term. Promises will be made I'm sure, but unless there will be a guaranteed budget for the foreseeable future that is ringfenced, my belief is once built, these houses will be left with very little community facilities.

Change suggested by respondent:
As previously mentioned, drastically reduced plans, and realistic expectations in the current climate and the impact on already local communities.

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

164 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Summary:
It is essential that there is appropriate infrastructure in place from the outset for the proposed community. Schools, health care, places of worship and community facilities must be provided so that new residents have access to these. There are significant demands upon facilities within Colchester and its surrounding areas that will only be exacerbated if infrastructure is not in place. Local schools are full; health facilities are under pressure; and, community hubs are under-resourced. If the Plan is to reflect need, these areas must be addressed.

Full text:
It is essential that there is appropriate infrastructure in place from the outset for the proposed community. Schools, health care, places of worship and community facilities must be provided so that new residents have access to these. There are significant demands upon facilities within Colchester and its surrounding areas that will only be exacerbated if infrastructure is not in place. Local schools are full; health facilities are under pressure; and, community hubs are under-resourced. If the Plan is to reflect need, these areas must be addressed.

Change suggested by respondent:
The provision of education, health and other facilities should be prioritised from the outset. If the community is to be sustainable, people need access to such facilities so that they do not go 'outside' the community in order to access them. If they do, the danger is that this becomes the norm and the new community risks having a 'hollowed out' feel.

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

169 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:
Then plan has tackled infrastructure provision within the new community. However it has failed to explain how the increased demands on infrastructure outside the community will be tackled. For example Colchester General Hospital is already tight for space, with insufficient parking space for those arriving by car. Public transport links are slow and not ideal for those who may not be in the best of health.

Full text:
Then plan has tackled infrastructure provision within the new community. However it has failed to explain how the increased demands on infrastructure outside the community will be tackled. For example Colchester General Hospital is already tight for space, with insufficient parking space for those arriving by car. Public transport links are slow and not ideal for those who may not be in the best of health.

Change suggested by respondent:
Explain how the impact on the wider infrastructure across Colchester and NE Essex will be mitigated.

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

175 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Summary:

Stewardship principles, governance and democracy It seems clear that the 'jurisdiction' and boundaries of the existing Parishes will need to change once the developments come to fruition.
We have asked in meetings and consultation events for details of what might be envisioned as far as governance and management of amenities and local democracy is concerned. There is no mention of local democracy in this section of the Plan and policies.

Full text:

Stewardship principles, governance and democracy It seems clear that the 'jurisdiction' and boundaries of the existing Parishes will need to change once the developments come to fruition.
We have asked in meetings and consultation events for details of what might be envisioned as far as governance and management of amenities and local democracy is concerned. There is no mention of local democracy in this section of the Plan and policies.

Change suggested by respondent:

We would welcome a firm commitment to actively involving the existing Parish Councils (who after all represent the residents already living in the area) at all stages of discussion about stewardship options and to an appropriate element of democratic/public ownership and management of amenities and assets. Some Crockleford residents have told us that they want to stay in Ardleigh, so, for example, it shouldn't be assumed that an entirely separate governance arrangement for this new hub is the only option.

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: see previous response.
Attachments: None

184 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Summary:

Principles
- Concerns that existing communities who steward the land are being excluded from long-term stewardship considerations.
- Governance and future is too uncertain.
- Concerns over consultation process.
- A neighbourhood can only have one 'centre'.
Part C
- Concern that Elmstead Primary School has not engaged in plan making process.
- Concerns around phasing of education provision, and pressure on existing facilities in the short term.
- Additional capacity needed to ease existing pressures.
- 'up to five new primary schools' is imprecise, and a definite link to phasing is required whereas 'at least five new… early years and childcare facilities' is better.
- A single secondary school is more efficient and suitable.
Part E
- Single health hub doesn't accord with 20-minute neighbourhood principle
- Details are imprecise, need greater emphasis on healthcare provision.
- Need provision for other healthcare facilities such as dentists and pharmacies.
Part F
- More robust and conclusive approach to stewardship is required at an early stage.
Part G
- Developers should not be proposing phasing – LPAs should take the lead.
- Assessing need for healthcare provision separately for each proposal is inefficient and can lead to inequality and poor supply.

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:

Principles
- An alternative name should be found for groups of services and facilities outside of the neighbourhood 'centre'.
Part C
- More precise wording needed regarding number and phasing of primary schools e.g. "one new primary school for every 1500 new dwellings".
- More detail around phasing of secondary school required.
Part E
- More precise detail around phasing of health provision needed.

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: It is necessary as the Parish Council representing its community.
Attachments: Elmstead PC Response - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tq

193 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

I'm concerned that GC Policy 6 is too vague.
• Parts A, B and C are strong and clear, but they need to commit to the phasing in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
• Part D could be more place specific
• Part E (health) needs to be much more specific. We need a plan including timings from the NHS

I fear that health provision will fall far behind population growth, and that surrounding communities will be adversely affected.

Full text:

I'm concerned that GC Policy 6 is too vague.
• Parts A, B and C are strong and clear, but they need to commit to the phasing in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
• Part D could be more place specific
• Part E (health) needs to be much more specific. We need a plan including timings from the NHS

I fear that health provision will fall far behind population growth, and that surrounding communities will be adversely affected.

Change suggested by respondent:

Part E (health) needs specific targets and commitment from the NHS as well as the developer. The NHS should commit at plan stage - application stage is too late.

The Infrastructure delivery phasing and funding plan (IDPFP) needs to be legally tied in to the DPD. If the IDPFP is to be changed the developer must produce evidence that residents will not be disadvantaged.

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: The cost of community and social infrastructure needs to be taken into account, especially as the scheme's viability is struggling. I have a good grasp of the numbers which may be of assistance to the Inspector.
Attachments: None

213 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Summary:

For me it is difficult to understand why it is so important to do this project, when the infrastructure of the existing residents is inadequate and insufficient. It appears that we are second rate citizens, have been muted and do not count at all if it is not paying our taxes and our money not spent where it should be.

Full text:

They say things, but I fear I do not believe them any more. They told us that link road was first, then infrastructure, then the housing development. Alas, when we ask questions they are always vague, When I pointed out what was the meaning of an empty school because of a lack of teachers? Or an hospital because of a lack of doctors and surgeons... they stay vague and imagine that all those posts will be filled.

What is worrying is that the local residents have children with no places at the local schools.school, or beds in hospital, and they are not prepared to help. But they can take our money and pay for a new project,

Change suggested by respondent:

too many to be put right.

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

230 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]
Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:
Latimer is supportive overall of the approach in Chapter 7 and the overall approach in GC Policy 6 'Community and Social Infrastructure' with only a few focused amendments suggested.

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
- More clarity is needed on deliverables and timescale expectations in regard to the DPD.
- Flexibility under Part C required to ensure that the number of schools is evidence led, based on need and demographic studies.
- Supporting text should have a recognition that an estate charge will be required and payable by future households.

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

241 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:
Healthcare – no mention of physical delivery of facilities and what these would be. Clarification of catchment of primary health care required. Proposals for a doctor's surgery at the university has confirmed there will be no access available for Wivenhoe residents, yet Rowhedge will have access to it.
Stewardship strategy will need to interact and work alongside existing local government arrangements including town and parish councils.
Country Park is mostly boundary of Wivenhoe, but no residential units contributing to locally superseived management of it.
Local chronic shortage of allotment spaces and cemetery spaces and more importantly school and doctors spaces. Would new residents of GC have claim on any of these if they lived within a parish boundary?

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

248 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Mr TIM BATTS-NEALE [131]

Summary:
- Specific design suggestions should be addressed under this policy or in future design code and outline applications and infrastructure delivery plans.
- Stewardship - Developer contributions to include an integral part TP monitoring as part of set up and running costs.

Full text:
See attachment -

Change suggested by respondent:
See attachment for suggested wording amendment.

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Written Representation
Attachments: DPD Submission Version comments All Tim Batts-Neale.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/v

254 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:
Plan text not fully 'justified' as the paragraph (para.1 page.78) omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read:
"This chapter contains the Council's expectations and policy ensuring the Garden Community is served by community services and facilities of the right type in the right location, including schools and sports facilities; as well as access to health, ambulance, police and firefighting services and how the development will incorporate measures to encourage including, healthy and happy lifestyles."

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

255 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:
Soundness Objection: Policy not fully 'justified' or 'effective' as the policy omits reference to key social infrastructure in the form of emergency services (incorporating ambulance, police & firefighting facilities);

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
Change Requested: Include reference to all the emergency services in the text of the policy under a new Part F following on after Part E: Health;

Amended Policy Excerpt to read:
"Part F: Emergency Services
The Garden Community will promote community safety and cohesion by providing for an appropriate level of ambulance, police and firefighting facilities to serve the needs of each neighbourhood and its residents, with the phasing of facilities to be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing & Funding Plan.
Developers should enter into early discussions with the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST), Essex Police and Essex Fire & Rescue to identify the physical and social infrastructure and facilities funding required, along with a strategy for phased implementation."

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

256 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:
Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as the paragraph (para.1 page.86) omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read (from line 3)
" . . . The Garden Community is an opportunity to explore, with service providers, new ways to provide and deliver the education, health, ambulance, police, firefighting and other community and social infrastructure and facilities needed to support the new community, and the Councils have worked with service providers throughout the production of the Plan."

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

257 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:
Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as the paragraph (para.2 pafe.86) omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read:
"Community and social infrastructure covers a wide range of facilities, such as health; ambulance; police; firefighting; education; sports; recreation and greenspace; places of worship; community halls; public houses and cultural infrastructure . . "

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

261 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:
DPD Ref – Appendix 1. Principles & Objectives: Community & Social Infrastructure subheading 'a Place where its easy to be healthy & happy' (Page 138)
Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as it omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
Change Requested: Amended bullet point 4 to read:
• "Provision of healthcare, ambulance, police, firefighting, leisure, social and community facilities accessible by all modes of transport."

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

262 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:
DPD Ref – Appendix 3: Planning Application/ Validation Requirements (Page 145)
Soundness Objection: Validation list not fully 'justified' as it omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
After bullet point 22 add a new bullet point 23 to read:
• "Strategy for addressing the requirement for ambulance, police, & firefighting infrastructure & facilities"

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

263 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:
DPD Ref – Glossary – reference to Infrastructure (Page 149)
Soundness Objection: the Glossary list not fully 'justified' as it omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
Change Requested:The subheading 'Infrastructure' to be amended to include reference to ambulance, police & firefighting facilities as follows:
"Infrastructure
Infrastructure means any structure, building, system, facility and/or provision required by an area for its social and/ or economic function and/ or well-being including (but not exclusively): footways, cycleways and highways; public transport; drainage and flood protection; waste recycling facilities; education and childcare; healthcare; ambulance, police, & firefighting facilities . . "

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

267 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: East Suffolk & North Essex NHS Foundation Trust (ESNEFT) [174]
Agent: Lawson Planning Partnership (Mrs Aarti O'Leary, Technical Director) [176]

Summary:
Concerns that the introductory paragraph of supporting text could place reliance on existing healthcare facilities over the plan period.

Concerns that secondary and acute healthcare is not specifically mentioned which does not highlight all healthcare needs.

Concern that the Policy does not fully consider off site facility provision.

Further flexibility is required around when the Health and Wellbeing Hub will be delivered and what it will contain.

Full text:
See attachment.

Change suggested by respondent:
Amendments to support text to clarify. Suggested wording:

"ensuring the Garden Community is served by community services and facilities of the right type in the right location, including healthcare, schools and sports facilities;" Remove text after this point.

Request to include secondary and acute healthcare provision. Suggested wording:

"Measures for increasing capacity in, and accessibility to, primary, secondary and acute healthcare – either through new infrastructure or the improvement, reconfiguration, extension, or relocation of existing medical facilities."

A request is made to clarify the position of offsite provision. Suggested wording:

"The Garden Community will require all developments to provide for the on and off-site infrastructure necessary to support the development and mitigate its impacts. The Garden Community will deliver local community services and facilities …"

Wording changes to allow further flexibility and timings of Hub delivery and mechanism for this. See full representation.

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: ESNEFT Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t4

272 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Respondent: Suffolk & North East Essex Integrated Care Board (Mr chris crisell, Estates Strategic Planning Manager) [180]

Summary:
Initial high level comments – intention for Statement of Common Ground an TCBGC Working Group established.
Topic Paper provides a strong foundation for what we would want to see within the development
Strongly support inclusion of health impact assessments and stress importance of this being carried out as early as possible. Need for environmental impact assessment to intergrade this into population and health chapter or have stand alone document.
Due to duration of build, single health impact assessment will not be acceptable to address changing health impact

Full text:

Holding statement from the Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care Board
The Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care Board welcomes the opportunity to be consulted on the development plan document for the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community (regulation 19 consultation).

The NHS Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care Board (ICB) plans and buys healthcare services for our population and is part of the Integrated Care System which also includes the Integrated Care Partnership which is formed of multiple stakeholders including local government, emergency services, secondary care health providers and third sector. The ICB has 4 ambitions:
1- To improve the health and health care outcomes of our population
2- To reduce health inequalities in outcomes, experience and access
3- To enhance productivity and value for money
4- To help the NHS support broader social and economic development
The ICB covers a large geography and an approximate population of 1 million people. Recognising the importance of place and the communities within our places we cover, the ICB works on 3 place- based geographies and have come together with partners to develop 'place-based partnerships' which are referred to as Alliances- covering North East Essex, West Suffolk and Ipswich and East Suffolk.

The ICB has delegated various functions from system to including primary care, medicines management, community services and various other service commissioning. The Alliances are also leading on addressing the wider determinants with partners (those influences beyond health care provision that impact on health and wellbeing outcomes) and health inequalities including those influenced by socio-economic factors and the physical environment such as housing and planning.

Our initial high-level comments to the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Development Plan Document (DPD) Regulation 19 Consultation May – June 2023 are as follows with the intention of this being a holding statement so that further input can be provided to the DPD. It would also be the intention for a statement of common ground to be developed between parties with a TCBGC working group consisting of local health stakeholders being brought together so that we can fully engage with the development as it progresses.
SNEE ICB recognises that the proposal has an ambition to support health and wellbeing and a supplementary health topic paper has recently (January 2023) been developed. It is felt that this topic paper provides a strong foundation of what we would wish to see within the development and highlight that health and wellbeing should be designed in to the development using the various established and recognised health and wellbeing design principles such as active design from Sport England and those within the Essex Design Guide and we would welcome working on these with the team.
We strongly support the inclusion of the health impact assessment and stress the importance of this being carried out as early as possible (from master planning) and the need for the environmental impact assessment to either integrate this into the population and health chapter or have this as a stand-alone document. We would also highlight that due to the duration of the build that a single health impact assessment will not be acceptable in being able to address changing health impact on our population and welcome the opportunity of work with you on the HIA and EIA.
Specific additional comments:

Chapter 7
Chapter 7 (page 84)
A new Health and Wellbeing Hub to be provided in the early phases of development (potentially via a phased approach to delivery). The facility shall be designed to deliver an integrated service for patients – including a cluster of general practitioners, a wide range of diagnostic services and primary care treatment – to minimise the requirement for secondary care treatment at hospital. It should be located on an accessible site close to other community facilities.

We would also advise that the HIA would enable us to work collectively to ensure that any health, wellbeing and care infrastructure including any proposed community hub/s required for this development would then be appropriately phased in so, again, stress the importance of the need for a robust HIA process. This process enables the ICB as a commissioner of health care services to be flexible regarding population needs for health and care infrastructure as well as flexibility to ensure that any infrastructure proposed is fit-for-purpose and future proofed.
Further discussion on the timing of such infrastructure will need to be discussed in depth as to the appropriate timing of this, type of infrastructure, value for money and be evidence based through the HIA process. In addition, we would need to ensure that this proposal considers constraints for delivery including, but not limited to, capacity in existing neighbouring primary care facilities, workforce recruitment, funding streams, NHS clinical and service strategies and NHS building design approaches. It will also need to be agreed through ICB governance processes so would emphasis the need to collaborate on this work.
Therefore proposed working would be advised as:
The current health strategy for the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community is dependent on various factors including capacity in existing neighbouring primary care facilities, workforce recruitment, funding streams, NHS clinical and service strategies and NHS building design approaches. A comprehensive, evidence-based health impact assessment will be carried out engaging with all local health and care partners and local communities to ensure that a robust view of need is assessed. The strategy shall be designed to ensure that health is designed into the TCBGC and that any new infrastructure delivers an integrated service for the population. A consideration on the wider impact of the development on key health stakeholders including Public Health, secondary care, blue light services and others within the local partnership will need to be taken into account and mitigation of any impact appropriately provided.

Conclusion and next steps

With this 'holding statement' SNEE ICB expects that this can be a means to further dialogue and cooperation between us and the local authorities involved in the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community. SNEE ICB would appreciate further discussion and the creation of a Statement of Common Ground to advance the work already carried out and align all of the components to create a brand-new place for people to live, work and play, which will be planned from the start to provide high quality, energy efficient and innovatively designed homes.
The Suffolk and North East Essex ICB would like to thank Colchester City Council, Tendring District Council and Essex County Council for inviting us to provide feedback on the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Development Plan Document (DPD) Regulation 19 Consultation May – June 2023.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: NHS-Suffok & North East Essex Integrated Care Board - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tj

273 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Respondent: Suffolk & North East Essex Integrated Care Board (Mr chris crisell, Estates Strategic Planning Manager) [180]

Summary:

Stress the importance of the need for a robust HIA process. Enables ICB to be flexible to population needs for health and care infrastucure and ensure its fit for purpose and future proof

Timing of infrastructure needs to be discussed in depth – timing, type, value for money and evidence procssed through HIA process.
Need to ensure proposal considers constraints for delivery - capacity existing facilities, workforce recruitment, funding, NHS clinical and service strategies, NHS budilng design apporaches.
Agreed through ICB governance process

Full text:

Holding statement from the Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care Board
The Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care Board welcomes the opportunity to be consulted on the development plan document for the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community (regulation 19 consultation).

The NHS Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care Board (ICB) plans and buys healthcare services for our population and is part of the Integrated Care System which also includes the Integrated Care Partnership which is formed of multiple stakeholders including local government, emergency services, secondary care health providers and third sector. The ICB has 4 ambitions:
1- To improve the health and health care outcomes of our population
2- To reduce health inequalities in outcomes, experience and access
3- To enhance productivity and value for money
4- To help the NHS support broader social and economic development
The ICB covers a large geography and an approximate population of 1 million people. Recognising the importance of place and the communities within our places we cover, the ICB works on 3 place- based geographies and have come together with partners to develop 'place-based partnerships' which are referred to as Alliances- covering North East Essex, West Suffolk and Ipswich and East Suffolk.

The ICB has delegated various functions from system to including primary care, medicines management, community services and various other service commissioning. The Alliances are also leading on addressing the wider determinants with partners (those influences beyond health care provision that impact on health and wellbeing outcomes) and health inequalities including those influenced by socio-economic factors and the physical environment such as housing and planning.

Our initial high-level comments to the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Development Plan Document (DPD) Regulation 19 Consultation May – June 2023 are as follows with the intention of this being a holding statement so that further input can be provided to the DPD. It would also be the intention for a statement of common ground to be developed between parties with a TCBGC working group consisting of local health stakeholders being brought together so that we can fully engage with the development as it progresses.
SNEE ICB recognises that the proposal has an ambition to support health and wellbeing and a supplementary health topic paper has recently (January 2023) been developed. It is felt that this topic paper provides a strong foundation of what we would wish to see within the development and highlight that health and wellbeing should be designed in to the development using the various established and recognised health and wellbeing design principles such as active design from Sport England and those within the Essex Design Guide and we would welcome working on these with the team.
We strongly support the inclusion of the health impact assessment and stress the importance of this being carried out as early as possible (from master planning) and the need for the environmental impact assessment to either integrate this into the population and health chapter or have this as a stand-alone document. We would also highlight that due to the duration of the build that a single health impact assessment will not be acceptable in being able to address changing health impact on our population and welcome the opportunity of work with you on the HIA and EIA.
Specific additional comments:

Chapter 7
Chapter 7 (page 84)
A new Health and Wellbeing Hub to be provided in the early phases of development (potentially via a phased approach to delivery). The facility shall be designed to deliver an integrated service for patients – including a cluster of general practitioners, a wide range of diagnostic services and primary care treatment – to minimise the requirement for secondary care treatment at hospital. It should be located on an accessible site close to other community facilities.

We would also advise that the HIA would enable us to work collectively to ensure that any health, wellbeing and care infrastructure including any proposed community hub/s required for this development would then be appropriately phased in so, again, stress the importance of the need for a robust HIA process. This process enables the ICB as a commissioner of health care services to be flexible regarding population needs for health and care infrastructure as well as flexibility to ensure that any infrastructure proposed is fit-for-purpose and future proofed.
Further discussion on the timing of such infrastructure will need to be discussed in depth as to the appropriate timing of this, type of infrastructure, value for money and be evidence based through the HIA process. In addition, we would need to ensure that this proposal considers constraints for delivery including, but not limited to, capacity in existing neighbouring primary care facilities, workforce recruitment, funding streams, NHS clinical and service strategies and NHS building design approaches. It will also need to be agreed through ICB governance processes so would emphasis the need to collaborate on this work.
Therefore proposed working would be advised as:
The current health strategy for the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community is dependent on various factors including capacity in existing neighbouring primary care facilities, workforce recruitment, funding streams, NHS clinical and service strategies and NHS building design approaches. A comprehensive, evidence-based health impact assessment will be carried out engaging with all local health and care partners and local communities to ensure that a robust view of need is assessed. The strategy shall be designed to ensure that health is designed into the TCBGC and that any new infrastructure delivers an integrated service for the population. A consideration on the wider impact of the development on key health stakeholders including Public Health, secondary care, blue light services and others within the local partnership will need to be taken into account and mitigation of any impact appropriately provided.

Conclusion and next steps

With this 'holding statement' SNEE ICB expects that this can be a means to further dialogue and cooperation between us and the local authorities involved in the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community. SNEE ICB would appreciate further discussion and the creation of a Statement of Common Ground to advance the work already carried out and align all of the components to create a brand-new place for people to live, work and play, which will be planned from the start to provide high quality, energy efficient and innovatively designed homes.
The Suffolk and North East Essex ICB would like to thank Colchester City Council, Tendring District Council and Essex County Council for inviting us to provide feedback on the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Development Plan Document (DPD) Regulation 19 Consultation May – June 2023.

Change suggested by respondent:

The current health strategy for the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community is dependent on various factors including capacity in existing neighbouring primary care facilities, workforce recruitment, funding streams, NHS clinical and service strategies and NHS building design approaches. A comprehensive, evidence-based health impact assessment will be carried out engaging with all local health and care partners and local communities to ensure that a robust view of need is assessed. The strategy shall be designed to ensure that health is designed into the TCBGC and that any new infrastructure delivers an integrated service for the population. A consideration on the wider impact of the development on key health stakeholders including Public Health, secondary care, blue light services and others within the local partnership will need to be taken into account and mitigation of any impact appropriately provided.

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: NHS-Suffok & North East Essex Integrated Care Board - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tj