GC POLICY 6: COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

RE6

Support

Summary of representations:

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).

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

5

Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

126

Respondent: Miss Mary Dale [132]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

127

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

128

Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Support

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Support Noted

Action:

None

139

Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amend GC Policy 6, Part C to read:
Vehicle free 'school zones' must be provided around schools, with the area around the main pupil entrance entirely traffic free and away from streets and car parks, connected by safe and direct walking and cycling routes to the Neighbourhood the school serves. All schools should be well connected to the natural environment to provide the option of providing forest school sessions, and through their design and layout encourage health and wellbeing, especially physical activity (e.g. storage facilities to support cycling, and the promotion of informal physical activity as well as providing conventional sport and play facilities).

Amend GC Policy 6, Part D to include:
The land take implications of providing shared use sports facilities on school sites must be accounted for in the masterplanning process and developer contributions will be required to fund the uplift required to deliver dual use facilities that are suitable for meeting community needs and secured through formal community use agreements.

Amend GC Policy 6, Part D to read:
The sports and recreation requirements of the Garden Community, as set out in the Colchester and Tendring Sports, Recreation and Open Space Strategy (2022) or any updates to this Strategy, must be met in full in terms of the typology, quantity, quality, and location of facilities provided. Proposals will have regard to 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 both the development and the University.

Amend GC Policy 6, Part G to read:
6. Proposals must be supported by a Healthy Living and Play Strategy, which will be informed by the Colchester and Tendring Sports, Recreation and Open Space Strategy (2022) or any updates to this Strategy. This Strategy should demonstrate how the development will be designed to encourage active lifestyles, independence, and wellbeing, through the provision of sites, facilities, and informal opportunities for people to play, socialise, play sport, keep fit and have fun. It must be co-ordinated with other relevant strategies for the development such as the Green Infrastructure Strategy, the Active Travel Strategy and the Active Design Assessment.

Amend GC Policy 6, Part G to read:
9. Proposals for educational use/buildings should be accompanied by a 'Community Use Statement/Plan' to be agreed by the authorities and which must be approved as part of any planning permission granted and secured by way of a Community Use Agreement through an appropriate legal agreement.

Response:

Comment Noted. The policy is considered sound, however, to ensure it is clear and upon further assessment, the Councils consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate with regard to Parts C, D and G relating to vehicle free 'school zones', shared sports facilities on school sites, balancing/accounting of university and general use need of sports facilities, healthy living and play strategy, and community use statement/plan.

With regard to sport, recreation and open space provision, the comment is noted, however the request to detail minimum facility requirement specifications are considered unnecessary within the DPD. Such an approach is considered to be overly restrictive and would not allow sufficient flexibility to adapt where required.

Policy GC 6, Part D requires that the requirements of the most up-to-date evidence base must be met in full which is considered the most appropriate mechanism to secure the requirements of the development in the long term.

The Councils consider the policy to be sound in its current form.

Action:

Statement of Common Ground prepared between Sport England and the Councils. Modifications suggested to Parts C, D and G of GC Policy 6.

69

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

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

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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)

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amend GC Policy 1, Part B, page 22, 5th Para. to read:
"….The councils will work with the University of Essex and other partners as appropriate, to deliver the key infrastructure (health, education, ambulance, police, firefighting and other community uses)…."

Amend GC Policy 6, Para.1 page 78 to read:
"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; as well as access to health ambulance, police and firefighting services …"

Amend Justification Text: Para 2, Page 86 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..."

Response:

Comments Noted. The policy is considered sound, however, upon further assessment the Councils consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate.

Action:

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

254

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

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."

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

255

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

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."

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

256

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

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."

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

257

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

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 . . "

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

261

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

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."

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

262

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

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"

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

263

Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

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 . . "

Attachments:

EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amend Para.1 page 78 to read:
“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;"

Amend GC Policy 6, Part E to read:
"… Appropriate health and wellbeing services including primary, secondary and acute inpatient and outpatient facilities must be provided to new residents and occupiers of the Garden Community from first occupation. Proposals for the development of the Garden Community could include:

• 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.

• Flexible space for health provision, located within the Neighbourhood Centres and community buildings.

• Enhancements to existing facilities, including improvements to healthcare services and facilities at Colchester Hospital to support the provision of acute and secondary care.

Developers should enter into early conversations with the local NHS Integrated Care Board, the North East Essex Health and Wellbeing Alliance, and other relevant partners to ensure that proposals reflect current health and social care models."

Response:

Comments Noted. The policy is considered sound, however, upon further assessment the Councils consider that a proposed change to the DPD could be appropriate.

Action:

SoCG prepared with Health Bodies, modifications to policy text suggested.

267

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

Agent: Lawson Planning Partnership

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.

Attachments:

ESNEFT Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t4

Object

Summary of representations:

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.
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 budling design approaches.
Agreed through ICB governance process.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Amend Justification Text: Insertion of new paragraph after Para 3, Page 88 to read:

The health strategy for the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community will be 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 HIA 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 Garden Community 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, primary, secondary and acute inpatient and outpatient facilities, ambulance, police, firefighting and others within the local partnership will need to be taken into account and mitigation of any impact appropriately provided.

Response:

Comment Noted. The policy is considered sound and sufficiently robust to ensure that developers enter into early discussions with the relevant partners which is being facilitated through the pre-application process.

Part E of Policy GC6 requires that 'each' planning application must be supported by an HIA. This is carried forward into Part G of Policy GC 6 which details Planning Application Requirements and Appendix 3 which details Validation Requirement documents. This is considered sufficient to ensure that HIAs are regularly submitted, updated and appropriately respond to evidenced need throughout the duration of the development.

Upon further assessment the Councils consider that a proposed change to the justification text of Policy GC 6 could be appropriate to incorporate suggested wording.

Action:

SoCG prepared with Health Bodies, modifications to policy text suggested.

272

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

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

273

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

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.

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

Modification GC Policy 6, Part C
Include: "the capacity and quantum of schools and early years provision will be subject to an appropriate assessment of the need at the time of submission of future planning application(s)".

Response:

Latimer have suggested flexibility in the DPD under Part C that the number of schools is evidence led, based on need and demographic studies at the time. The Councils consider the Plan to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. However, upon further assessment the Councils agree with the additional wording suggested which provides additional clarity.

Action:

Statement of Common Ground prepared between the Councils and Latimer. Suggested modification to be added the Schedule of Modifications.

230

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

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.

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development.

Action:

None

21

Respondent: Kathryn and Timothy Pugh [50]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

Object

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development.

Action:

None

24

Respondent: Elizabeth Thompson [53]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development.

Action:

None

28

Respondent: Miss Louise terry [30]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development.

Policy SP6 of the Section 1 Plan requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

Action:

None

31

Respondent: James Chable [55]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development.

Policy SP6 of the Section 1 Local Plan requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

Future planning applications will need to be supported by an appropriate Air Quality Impact Assessment.

Action:

None

37

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery, and transport evidence. The principle of development has been established by way of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan which has identified the broad location of the Garden Community and sets the Strategic Policies.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development.

Policy SP6 of the Section 1 Local Plan requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

Further transport assessment and impact mitigation will be required secured as part of any future planning application.

Action:

None

50

Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education, including early years, nursery, primary and secondary, community and health provision which will be phased with development.

Action:

None

54

Respondent: Miss Deborah Jones [62]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. Part F of Policy GC6 requires the the long term governance and stewardship of the GC must be agreed as part of the planning permission and planning obligation agreements, and developer contributions will be required and secured to fund the initial set up with on-going support until such activities are self-sustaining. Further details of a Stewardship Strategy cannot be determined at this stage of plan making as the detail of assets is not yet available.

The justification text to Policy GC6 provides further detail on the expected stewardship arrangements with principles established that will need to be achieved. The Councils consider that the policy is sufficiently robust whilst providing appropriate flexibility to ensure a sustainable model is secured for the lifetime of the GC.

Action:

None

58

Respondent: Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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?

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

Action:

None

60

Respondent: Ms Jean McNeil [82]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

> 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

> None

Response:

> Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.
>
> The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.
>
> The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development.

Action:

> None

77

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments:

Consultation document Garden Village.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/4

Object

Summary of representations:

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"?

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The viability evidence prepared by Gerald Eve has considered the viability of the scheme including all identified infrastructure requirements. This has concluded that the scheme is viable and deliverable, with suitable costed allowances for a broad range of new and improved local and strategic infrastructure. Delivery of the infrastructure has been phased based upon an assumed overall development trajectory and approach to scheme phasing.

Part F of Policy GC6 requires the the long term governance and stewardship of the GC must be agreed as part of the planning permission and planning obligation agreements, and developer contributions will be required and secured to fund the initial set up with on-going support until such activities are self-sustaining. Further details of a Stewardship Strategy cannot be determined at this stage of plan making as the detail of assets is not yet available.

The justification text to Policy GC6 provides further detail on the expected stewardship arrangements with principles established that will need to be achieved. The Councils consider that the policy is sufficiently robust whilst providing appropriate flexibility to ensure a sustainable model is secured for the lifetime of the GC.

Action:

None

84

Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

• 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education, including early years, primary and secondary, and health provision which will be phased with development. Detailed designs for multifunctional spaces will come forward at planning application stage and will be developed in consultation with the appropriate health bodies.

Part F of Policy GC6 requires the long term governance and stewardship of the GC must be agreed as part of the planning permission and planning obligation agreements, and developer contributions will be required and secured to fund the initial set up with on-going support until such activities are self-sustaining. Further details of a Stewardship Strategy cannot be determined at this stage of plan making as the detail of assets is not yet available.

The justification text to Policy GC6 provides further detail on the expected stewardship arrangements with principles established that will need to be achieved. The Councils consider that the policy is sufficiently robust whilst providing appropriate flexibility to ensure a sustainable model is secured for the lifetime of the GC.

Action:

None

91

Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery. The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development, with any impact needing to be appropriately mitigated.

Action:

None

112

Respondent: Mr Shaun Raven [37]

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

Object

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery, and transport evidence.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination. The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development.

Policy SP6 of the S1 Local Plan requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

Action:

None

116

Respondent: Mrs Helen Byrne [32]

Change suggested by respondent:

- New primary school(s) to be built prior to homes being occupied.

Attachments:

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery, and viability.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The viability evidence prepared by Gerald Eve has considered the viability of the scheme including all identified infrastructure requirements. This has concluded that the scheme is viable and deliverable, with suitable costed allowances for a broad range of new and improved local and strategic infrastructure. Delivery of the infrastructure has been phased based upon an assumed overall development trajectory and approach to scheme phasing.

Action:

None

154

Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Change suggested by respondent:

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

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development and any impact of the development must be appropriately mitigated, this will be considered as part of a future planning application. Policy GC 6 requires that the needs of the community are met from the outset and that the development meets the principle of 'infrastructure first'.

Action:

None

164

Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD includes policy requirements for health provision which will be phased with development and any impact of the development must be appropriately mitigated, this will be considered as part of a future planning application. Policy GC 6 requires that the needs of the community are met from the outset and that the development meets the principle of 'infrastructure first'.

Planning obligations and contributions can only be used to mitigate the impact of the development itself, and cannot be used to solve existing capacity requirements unrelated to the GC. Part A of GC Policy 9 details that where a proposal requires additional infrastructure outside the GC, such as increased capacity at the hospital, such measures may include contributions towards new or expanded existing facilities and off-site capacity works.

Action:

None

169

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Change suggested by respondent:

Explain how the impact on the wider infrastructure across Colchester and NE Essex will be mitigated.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. Part F of Policy GC6 requires the the long term governance and stewardship of the GC must be agreed as part of the planning permission and planning obligation agreements, and developer contributions will be required and secured to fund the initial set up with on-going support until such activities are self-sustaining. Further details of a Stewardship Strategy cannot be determined at this stage of plan making as the detail of assets is not yet available.

Part F of Policy GC6 goes on to require collaboration between developers, the Councils, and other relevant stakeholders (which would include Parish and Town Councils) to agree and determine the preferred solution for stewardship arrangements. Any change to local governance boundaries would be subject to the required statutory processes and consultation.

Action:

None

175

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

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education and health provision which will be phased with development and any impact of the development must be appropriately mitigated, this will be considered as part of a future planning application. Policy GC 6 requires that the needs of the community are met from the outset and that the development meets the principle of 'infrastructure first'.

Planning obligations and contributions can only be used to mitigate the impact of the development itself, and cannot be used to solve existing capacity requirements unrelated to the GC. Part A of GC Policy 9 details that where a proposal requires additional infrastructure outside the GC, such as increased capacity at the hospital, such measures may include contributions towards new or expanded existing facilities and off-site capacity works.

Policy SP6 of the Section 1 Local Plan requires planning consent and full funding approval for the Link Road to have been secured before planning approval is granted for any development at the garden community. There is no requirement for the Link Road to be completed before other development is commenced. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any development must be appropriately mitigated and this will be considered as part of a future planning application.

Action:

None

213

Respondent: Ms Martine Ward [137]

Change suggested by respondent:

too many to be put right.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

The DPD includes policy requirements for education based on up to date demographic and population data, along with health provision this will be phased with development. The detailed trigger points for the delivery of facilities will be established as part of any future planning application and secured through the associated S106.

Appropriate health and wellbeing services must be provided to new residents and occupiers of the GC from first occupation as required by Part E of Policy GC6, and developers are required to enter into early discussions with the local health bodies to ensure that proposals reflect current health and social care needs.

Planning obligations and contributions can only be used to mitigate the impact of the development itself, and cannot be used to solve existing capacity requirements unrelated to the GC.

Part F of Policy GC6 requires the the long term governance and stewardship of the GC must be agreed as part of the planning permission and planning obligation agreements, and developer contributions will be required and secured to fund the initial set up with on-going support until such activities are self-sustaining. Further details of a Stewardship Strategy cannot be determined at this stage of plan making as the detail of assets is not yet available. Part F of Policy GC6 goes on to require collaboration between developers, the Councils, and other relevant stakeholders (which would include Parish and Town Councils) to agree and determine the preferred solution for stewardship arrangements.

Action:

None

184

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

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.

Attachments:

Elmstead PC Response - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tq

Object

Summary of representations:

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?

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

Appropriate health and wellbeing services must be provided to new residents and occupiers of the GC from first occupation as required by Part E of Policy GC6, and developers are required to enter into early discussions with the local health bodies to ensure that proposals reflect current health and social care models. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

Planning obligations and contributions can only be used to mitigate the impact of the development itself, and cannot be used to solve existing capacity requirements unrelated to the GC. Part A of GC Policy 9 details that where a proposal requires additional infrastructure outside the GC, such measures may include contributions towards new or expanded existing facilities and off-site capacity works.

Part F of Policy GC6 requires the the long term governance and stewardship of the GC must be agreed as part of the planning permission and planning obligation agreements, and developer contributions will be required and secured to fund the initial set up with on-going support until such activities are self-sustaining. Further details of a Stewardship Strategy cannot be determined at this stage of plan making as the detail of assets is not yet available. Part F of Policy GC6 goes on to require collaboration between developers, the Councils, and other relevant stakeholders (which would include Parish and Town Councils) to agree and determine the preferred solution for stewardship arrangements.

Action:

None

241

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Attachments:

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

Object

Summary of representations:

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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base including infrastructure provision, phasing and delivery.

The DPD 'Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan' (IDP) provides details on infrastructure provision for the garden community. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination. The IDP will need to be monitored, reviewed and updated as the policy framework evolves over time (at both local and national levels), and as planning applications come forward. The actual scope and scale of infrastructure requirements will be subject to change as a result of more detailed consideration of specific proposals and their impacts, changes in the wider context and ways of living, and potential changes to plans/strategies or priorities provided by infrastructure providers. The schedule of infrastructure requirements is therefore treated as 'live' to be updated regularly and monitored over time.

The viability evidence prepared by Gerald Eve has considered the viability of the scheme including all identified infrastructure requirements. This has concluded that the scheme is viable and deliverable, with suitable costed allowances for a broad range of new and improved local and strategic infrastructure. Delivery of the infrastructure has been phased based upon an assumed overall development trajectory and approach to scheme phasing.

Appropriate health and wellbeing services must be provided to new residents and occupiers of the GC from first occupation as required by Part E of Policy GC6, and developers are required to enter into early discussions with the local health bodies to ensure that proposals reflect current health and social care models. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination.

Action:

None

193

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

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.

Attachments: None

Object

Summary of representations:

- 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.

Summary of representation changes to plan:

None

Response:

Comment noted. The Plan is considered to be sound, is in accordance with the NPPF and based on a robust evidence base. Appropriate health and wellbeing services must be provided to new residents and occupiers of the GC from first occupation as required by Part E of Policy GC6, and developers are required to enter into early discussions with the local health bodies to ensure that proposals reflect current health and social care models. This will be a detailed matter for any future garden community planning application and associated Section 106 agreement when it comes forward for determination. Specific design objections and principles are illustrated and addressed within the Strategic Masterplan which forms part of the evidence base for the DPD. Part K of Policy GC1 requires that a comprehensive GC Masterplan, detailed area masterplans and design codes are prepared as part of future planning applications and that these should have regard to the Council's Strategic Masterplan.

Part F of Policy GC6 requires the the long term governance and stewardship of the GC must be agreed as part of the planning permission and planning obligation agreements, and developer contributions will be required and secured to fund the initial set up with on-going support until such activities are self-sustaining. Further details of a Stewardship Strategy cannot be determined at this stage of plan making as the detail of assets is not yet available, however this will need to be linked in the long term to travel plan monitoring and will need to address community engagement.

Action:

None

248

Respondent: Mr TIM BATTS-NEALE [131]

Change suggested by respondent:

See attachment for suggested wording amendment.

Attachments:

DPD Submission Version comments All Tim Batts-Neale.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/v