340 Support

Document Element: MM2 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support proposed MM2. Latimer's planning application will be robust in respect of health, embedding principles to support health and well-being into the site wide illustrative masterplan and design codes. The proposed amendment will support the DPD to provide the appropriate framework through which to plan for heath needs, and for decision makers to assess this part of the proposal.

Full text:

Latimer support proposed MM2. Latimer is progressing a hybrid planning application for the Garden Community which is currently at pre-application stage with submission of the application anticipated in 2025. From an early stage, Latimer has engaged with relevant stakeholders from the NHS and Integrated Care Board ('ICB') and continues to do so to ensure the Garden Community fully plans for the health needs arising, in accordance with the NHS requirements. Latimer's planning application will be robust in respect of health, embedding principles to support health and well-being into the site wide illustrative masterplan and design codes. The proposed amendment will support the DPD to provide the appropriate framework through which to plan for heath needs, and for decision makers to assess this part of the proposal.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

409 Support

Document Element: MM2 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

The councils will work with the University of Essex and other partners as appropriate, to deliver the key infrastructure (health, education, ambulance, police, fire and rescue (prevention, protection and response), and other community uses) ….
East Suffolk and North Essex NHS Foundation Trust (ESNEFT) welcomes Proposed Modifications Refs: MM1, MM2, MM4, MM13, MM39, MM45, MM46, MM50 and MM87 and considers them to be an appropriate reflection of the representations previously submitted by ESNEFT.
Adoption of these modifications will help ESNEFT to plan for the acute and secondary healthcare facilities and services required to meet needs arising from the proposed Garden Community.

Full text:

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

416 Support

Document Element: MM2 (Main)
Respondent: Fire & Rescuse [196]
Agent: Fire & Rescuse (Mr John Webster) [199]

Summary:

With reference to the below paragraph, our Service would like to request the phrase 'firefighting' be replaced with the below suggested wording of which we feel fully incorporates all of our Service's functions -

Mod Ref Part Modification Reason MM2 (Main) Part B Amend fifth para, page 22: EEAST Rep ID.253 To add emergency services

....The councils will work with the University of Essex and other partners as appropriate, to deliver the key infrastructure (health, education, ambulance, police, fire and rescue (prevention, protection and response), and other community

Full text:

With reference to the below paragraph, our Service would like to request the phrase 'firefighting' be replaced with the below suggested wording of which we feel fully incorporates all of our Service's functions -
Mod Ref Part Modification Reason MM2 (Main) Part B Amend fifth para, page 22: EEAST Rep ID.253 To add emergency services
....The councils will work with the University of Essex and other partners as appropriate, to deliver the key infrastructure (health, education, ambulance, police, fire and rescue (prevention, protection and response), and other community

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

418 Support

Document Element: MM2 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM2 - support for additional emphasis on health and wellbeing services

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

341 Support

Document Element: MM3 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support proposed MM3. However, within the draft DPD and evidence base there has been no reference to the need for the Garden Community to provide any specific facilities for ambulance, police and/or firefighting services. Should any infrastructure be required from the Garden Community, this should be communicated at the earliest so it can be considered within the masterplan proposals as part of Latimer's hybrid planning application for the Garden Community, which is currently at pre-application stage with submission of the application anticipated in 2025.

Full text:

Latimer support proposed MM3. However, within the draft DPD and evidence base there has been no reference to the need for the Garden Community to provide any specific facilities for ambulance, police and/or firefighting services. Should any infrastructure be required from the Garden Community, this should be communicated at the earliest so it can be considered within the masterplan proposals as part of Latimer's hybrid planning application for the Garden Community, which is currently at pre-application stage with submission of the application anticipated in 2025.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

419 Support

Document Element: MM3 (Main)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM3-– support for additional emphasis on health and wellbeing services

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

Integrated phasing plan overview enshrined in policy.

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

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

342 Support

Document Element: MM4 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support proposed MM4. Health and Wellbeing services and facilities will be important for new residents in the Garden Community. Critical to this is understanding how the NHS is able to ensure the right number of Nurses, GPs and other health practitioners are delivering the required services effectively and efficiently within the new communities, so we look forward to further and ongoing work with the health services around how this will be delivered.

Full text:

Latimer support proposed MM4. Latimer is progressing a hybrid planning application for the Garden Community which is currently at pre-application stage with submission of the application anticipated in 2025. From an early stage, Latimer has engaged with relevant stakeholders from the NHS and Integrated Care Board ('ICB') and continues to do so to ensure the Garden Community fully plans for the health needs arising, in accordance with the NHS requirements. Latimer's planning application will be robust in respect of health, embedding principles to support health and well-being into the site wide illustrative masterplan and design codes. The proposed amendment will support the DPD to provide the appropriate framework through which to plan for health needs, and for decision makers to assess this part of the proposal. Health and Wellbeing services and facilities will be important for new residents in the Garden Community. Critical to this is understanding how the NHS is able to ensure the right number of Nurses, GPs and other health practitioners are delivering the required services effectively and efficiently within the new communities, so we look forward to further and ongoing work with the health services around how this will be delivered.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

410 Support

Document Element: MM4 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

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

Full text:

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

421 Support

Document Element: MM4 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM4-support for additional emphasis on health and wellbeing services

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

Integrated phasing plan overview enshrined in policy.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

343 Support

Document Element: MM5 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM5, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Development phasing will be agreed via an illustrative phasing plan for the Garden Community, submitted with the hybrid planning application. Without the amendment, the statement is not effective – the amended wording will ensure the DPD does not prejudice the design process and future opportunities.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM5, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Development phasing will be agreed via an illustrative phasing plan for the Garden Community, submitted with the hybrid planning application. Without the amendment, the statement is not effective – the amended wording will ensure the DPD does not prejudice the design process and future opportunities.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

423 Object

Document Element: MM5 (Main)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM5 – Strongly object to the modification. The suggestion the effective plan making policy to support important decision making in the near future determining the first phases of development should be deleted for a yet to be determined phasing plan that is itself entirely illustrative is a weaker policy. The DPD wording already allows for a degree of flexibility by using the phrasing 'expectation' instead of stronger wording. It is vital for other stakeholders to have a definitive understanding of where development will begin to best make their own preparations in a timely fashion and consider how these may interact with the first planning applications.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

Integrated phasing plan overview enshrined in policy.

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/3w

280 Object

Document Element: MM6 (Main)

Respondent: Mrs Anne Thornhill [188]

Summary:

The government has provided the funding for the link road, therefore there is no consultation in phases required. There is already a need for the road now, hence the funding. Build the link road, with corresponding roundabouts, so that the impact on local communities is in part mitigated, by giving all those construction lorries, clear access to the A120 and not via A133. Locals, except some Council members, all believe the new rapid transport road is a joke, a total waste of money. We need the bypass, to improve our lives now.

Full text:

The government has provided the funding for the link road, therefore there is no consultation in phases required. There is already a need for the road now, hence the funding. Build the link road, with corresponding roundabouts, so that the impact on local communities is in part mitigated, by giving all those construction lorries, clear access to the A120 and not via A133. Locals, except some Council members, all believe the new rapid transport road is a joke, a total waste of money. We need the bypass, to improve our lives now.

Change suggested by respondent:

Document should state vehicular access MUST be via new link road. Inference no link road, no new houses.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

313 Object

Document Element: MM6 (Main)

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

Summary:

The wording is unclear and so could be interpreted as allowing access for new neighbourhoods directly onto the strategic road network. i.e. the A133 and the A120. Which would be completely unacceptable. It needs to be rewritten to make clear its intent.

Full text:

The wording is unclear and so could be interpreted as allowing access for new neighbourhoods directly onto the strategic road network. i.e. the A133 and the A120. Which would be completely unacceptable. It needs to be rewritten to make clear its intent.

Change suggested by respondent:

It needs to be rewritten to make clear its intent.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

344 Support

Document Element: MM6 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM6, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Active travel modes and the Rapid Transport System are the priority for Latimer for the future Garden Community and vehicle access zones will form a key part of the masterplan. However, this amendment is required to ensure there is sufficient flexibility in the DPD to fully understand the highway network and junction capabilities as part of the more detailed planning application evidence base, to inform how this will impact the masterplan work.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM6, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Active travel modes and the Rapid Transport System are the priority for Latimer for the future Garden Community and vehicle access zones will form a key part of the masterplan. However, this amendment is required to ensure there is sufficient flexibility in the DPD to fully understand the highway network and junction capabilities as part of the more detailed planning application evidence base, to inform how this will impact the masterplan work.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

425 Object

Document Element: MM6 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM6 – Highly concerned at the modification. The DPD is purported to have taken an evidence based approach, and the suggestion that such a major aspect of the interior road network is not only undecided but is still having information gathered to inform this decision is worrying. With no parameters for what evidence may support or over rule this policy it is not an effective tool for decision makers. Significant future changes would invalidate much of the traffic modelling upon which other decisions accepted within the DPD examination were based. We are concerned there is ambiguity in the proposed wording that could allow additional junctions onto the A133 and A120 which is a significant alteration to the plan making process thus far which has not been consulted upon.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

Integrated phasing plan overview enshrined in policy.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

278 Object

Document Element: MM7 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Simon Higgins [92]

Summary:

Crocklefrod Heath is the only community within the GC boundary and should be respected as stated in the GC principles. It is not respectful of the Crockleford Heath community to suggest that Crockleford Heath would be spit into areas with access to the link road and areas with access to Bromley Road.

Full text:

Crocklefrod Heath is the only community within the GC boundary and should be respected as stated in the GC principles. It is not respectful of the Crockleford Heath community to suggest that Crockleford Heath would be spit into areas with access to the link road and areas with access to Bromley Road.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan should respect the complete community of Crockleford Heath comprising Chapel Lane, Green Lane, Bromley Road, and Wivenhoe Road.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Attachments: None

312 Object

Document Element: MM7 (Main)

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

Summary:

Without a full link road there is a need for everyone to be able to access Bromley Road from the partial link road. This needs to be confirmed in policy, unless more security can be given for the trigger for phase two completion.

Full text:

Without a full link road there is a need for everyone to be able to access Bromley Road from the partial link road. This needs to be confirmed in policy, unless more security can be given for the trigger for phase two completion.

Change suggested by respondent:

Needs to be set in policy that no houses should be built until the full link road is operational.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

314 Object

Document Element: MM7 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Adam Hall [189]

Summary:

I attended the recent Joint Committee Meeting.
The meeting it became clear that a formal decision had been made to remove Crockleford Heath from the APC Neighbourhood plan.
This has taken away my democratic right as I do not have a Neighbourhood plan on which I can vote.
I am now very concerned about the modifications in the document.
In particular the demotion of the aim for 50% open space the failure to specify the area of the Green buffers between the three Neighbourhoods and Crockleford Heath residents the modification MM7.

Full text:

I attended the recent Joint Committee Meeting.
The meeting it became clear that a formal decision had been made to remove Crockleford Heath from the APC Neighbourhood plan.
This has taken away my democratic right as I do not have a Neighbourhood plan on which I can vote.
I am now very concerned about the modifications in the document.
In particular the demotion of the aim for 50% open space the failure to specify the area of the Green buffers between the three Neighbourhoods and Crockleford Heath residents the modification MM7.

Change suggested by respondent:

To stop the proposed development and review the whole DP as it is not compliant.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Attachments: None

315 Object

Document Element: MM7 (Main)

Respondent: Prof Anthony Vickers [68]

Summary:

Crockleford Heath is the only established community within the proposed Garden Community area. As such it should be protected. This modification can lead to the cutting of Crockleford Heath into two part, one with vehicular access to Bromley Road and one with vehicular access to the link road. This is disrespectful of Crockleford Heath residents and not in the spirit of respecting existing communities as laid down in the original garden community principles.

Full text:

Crockleford Heath is the only established community within the proposed Garden Community area. As such it should be protected. This modification can lead to the cutting of Crockleford Heath into two part, one with vehicular access to Bromley Road and one with vehicular access to the link road. This is disrespectful of Crockleford Heath residents and not in the spirit of respecting existing communities as laid down in the original garden community principles.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan should respect the area of Crockleford Heath as recognised by the residents of Crockleford Heath and not separate it by access decisions that pander to the request of the developer.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Attachments: None

345 Support

Document Element: MM7 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM7, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Depending on the outcomes of local junction modelling along Bromley Road into Colchester, undertaken to support the hybrid planning application, some parcels of development within the Crockleford Neighbourhood may need to access the Link Road instead of Bromley Road. The amendment is required to ensure there is sufficient flexibility in the DPD to respond to the outcome of the detailed modelling work, with the principles of vehicle access zones being agreed.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM7, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Depending on the outcomes of local junction modelling along Bromley Road into Colchester, undertaken to support the hybrid planning application, some parcels of development within the Crockleford Neighbourhood may need to access the Link Road instead of Bromley Road. The amendment is required to ensure there is sufficient flexibility in the DPD to respond to the outcome of the detailed modelling work, with the principles of vehicle access zones being agreed.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

429 Object

Document Element: MM7 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM7 – While we share concerns that the original DPD wording was not coherent, with the idea of physical separation but interconnectivity being at odds with one another as worded, we do not find the suggested modification to fix the issue, indeed it makes it worse. The suggestion the Crockleford neighborhood could be segregated within itself is bad enough – this is not good placemaking and would not create a cohesive neighborhood causing numerous concerns regarding internal travel and the practicalities of a community living within it. However our main concern from the initial wording is worsened by the modification, being that the existing Crockleford community would be cut in two by both versions of the policy wording. This policy would lead to absurd journeys whereby short journeys such as those made by people with mobility impairments or delivery drivers, to reach only a few hundred meters away within the same neighborhood, would require driving upwards of 6 miles, into and out of Colchester, putting additional strain on the traffic models recognized points of stress in the local road network, only to renter the garden community via the link road and cause significantly more traffic. If the Crockleford neighborhood is to be an effective neighborhood and maintain the special character identified elsewhere in the DPD, partially by protecting the established Crockleford heath community, the DPD needs stronger protections to ensure there is an integrated road network across this neighborhood, with no public traffic access to the other neighborhoods.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

279 Object

Document Element: MM8 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Simon Higgins [92]

Summary:

Crockleford Heath should not be developed without the access to the RTS and this modification should be withdrawn to maintain the Crockleford Heath development as being in phase 3.

Full text:

Crockleford Heath should not be developed without the access to the RTS and this modification should be withdrawn to maintain the Crockleford Heath development as being in phase 3.

Change suggested by respondent:

Crockleford Heath community should not be listed as being potentially developed in any phase. It should only be developed in phase 3 after connection to the RTS.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Attachments: None

311 Object

Document Element: MM8 (Main)

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

Summary:

Existing public transport is not financed by Latimer so cannot be used as mitigation for them in this context. Therefore, determination of phasing can only refer to new transport measures funded as part of a 106 agreement for this development.

Full text:

Existing public transport is not financed by Latimer so cannot be used as mitigation for them in this context. Therefore, determination of phasing can only refer to new transport measures funded as part of a 106 agreement for this development.

Change suggested by respondent:

Phasing should follow the Infrastructure Phasing Document produced by the local authorities and should be be legally bound to the policy.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

316 Object

Document Element: MM8 (Main)

Respondent: Prof Anthony Vickers [68]

Summary:

Crockleford Heath, in the original DP, was to be developed in Phase 3. It does not benefit the residents of Crockleford Heath to bring this forward to either phase 1 or 2.

Full text:

Crockleford Heath, in the original DP, was to be developed in Phase 3. It does not benefit the residents of Crockleford Heath to bring this forward to either phase 1 or 2.

Change suggested by respondent:

The DP should state clearly that Crockleford Heath will not be developed until Phase 3.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Attachments: None

346 Support

Document Element: MM8 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM8, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM8, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

The phasing for the Garden Community will be agreed via an illustrative phasing plan, submitted with the hybrid planning application. Therefore, the DPD wording should not link the delivery of homes at Crockleford to only the RTS being present – as this pre-empts the phasing at Crockleford as either first or last (given the RTS will need to be phased alongside the delivery of homes). MM8 is therefore important as it acknowledges that existing, enhanced and other public transport can support homes as well as the RTS.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

430 Support

Document Element: MM8 (Main)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM8 - We recognize the potential for other means of public transport.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

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

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

310 Object

Document Element: MM9 (Main)

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

Summary:

We don't object in principle to the modification but it is inadequate as it stands.

Full text:

We don't object in principle to the modification but it is inadequate as it stands.

Change suggested by respondent:

This modification should include the registered park and listed gatehouse to the east of Colchester Road. Also, when referring to Wivenhoe's strategic green gap a a reference to the coalescence break of the local plan and Wivenhoe's neighbourhood plan should be included.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

404 Support

Document Element: MM9 (Main)

Respondent: Historic England [128]

Agent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planner Advisor) [195]

Summary:

Welcome proposed change to improve consideration of designated heritage assets and their settings, per SOCG.

Modify for consistency with SOCG, which had removed Round Burrow. This setting is not a factor here and its inclusion will make the policy unsound.

Full text:

see attachments for full submission

Change suggested by respondent:

Amend 4th paragraph p. 24:
Land east of the new A120-A133 Link Road and the new 'Business Park' south of the A120, is designated as a Strategic Green Gap. This designation will provide protection to the open countryside to the east of the Garden Community; maintain the long-term physical and visual separation to Elmstead Market, and to assist in protecting the setting of the designated heritage assets of the Grade I Listed Church of St. Anne and St. Lawrence, Grade II* Listed Elmstead Hall, and Grade II Listed Allens Farmhouse. (Remove *and the Round Burrow*)

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/37
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/38

431 Support

Document Element: MM9 (Main)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM9 – We appreciate Historic England's input and support the improved recognition of Elmstead's listed heritage assets.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/3w

281 Object

Document Element: MM10 (Main)

Respondent: Mrs Anne Thornhill [188]

Summary:

There is no "proposed 'Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap' ". There is a Wivenhoe gap or protected green belt land, as voted on by the community in village plan, in a legally binding referendum.

Full text:

There is no "proposed 'Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap' ". There is a Wivenhoe gap or protected green belt land, as voted on by the community in village plan, in a legally binding referendum.

Change suggested by respondent:

The word proposed should be removed and "existing legal" should be inserted. Thus removing any doubt, that it can ever be built on.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Attachments: None

309 Object

Document Element: MM10 (Main)

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

Summary:

Outdoor floodlit facilities will create significant visual, noise and light pollution for the listed park and Wivenhoe. Any built form will also interrupt valued landscapes from these areas too. Therefore, conditions on any such facility should be stated in the DPD and not left to a planning application condition.

Full text:

Outdoor floodlit facilities will create significant visual, noise and light pollution for the listed park and Wivenhoe. Any built form will also interrupt valued landscapes from these areas too. Therefore, conditions on any such facility should be stated in the DPD and not left to a planning application condition.

Change suggested by respondent:

The alternative wording therefore should read - Where appropriate (in the context of existing heritage elements and settlements' this will include the provision of indoor and outdoor floodlit facilities. And only providing there is no adverse impact on the environment, existing residents, or the sky at night.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

318 Support

Document Element: MM10 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Dave Wendon [190]

Summary:

MM10 Floodlighting on the Sports fields adjacent to B1027 should be limited. The floodlights on the existing university sports field creates more light pollution than the football floodlights at the Colchester United Community Stadium.

Full text:

Having followed the proposals for the Garden Community development and the RTS for years I have been confused and misled by the vast array of colour blocking out the existing road system that I have made inappropriate comments on consultations.

I'd seen one of the plans showing the RTS stop on off A133 Clingo Hill on Boundary Road and thought it a temporary arrangement until the P&R (or Park and Choose, as you like to call it on) is provided directly opposite Boundary Road. However it seems it was always going to be a bit further up the hill and now the proposal is for P &R to be either north or south of the A133/B1027 junction.

MM11 That being the case what plans are there for getting the RTS from either of these sites to the new A133 Clingo Hill bus lane because if the RTS is expected to join the normal traffic to the new bus lane that is being created its not going to be very rapid?

MM11 The policies map does not indicate he entrance and egress points of the park and chose sites. My view is that the P&C should be south of the A133 with car parking access and egress off the new roundabout at the end of the A1133 Link Road. I would make sense for RTS egress to be directly on to the westbound carriageway of A133 via a long slip road.

MM10 Floodlighting on the Sports fields adjacent to B1027 should be limited. The floodlights on the existing university sports field creates more light pollution than the football floodlights at the Colchester United Community Stadium.

MM21 Its a waste of valuable farmland to create the woodland buffer zone and is best left as arable land. The planting alongside A1133 Link Road should be sufficient to screen the road and housing development.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

329 Support

Document Element: MM10 (Main)

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

Summary:

The proposed modifications to Policy GC Policy 1 directly respond to representations made by Sport England on the Submission version of the Local Plan. The modified policy is therefore supported as it would provide clarity on the scope of sports facilities that may be accommodated in the sports and leisure park

Full text:

The proposed modifications to Policy GC Policy 1 directly respond to representations made by Sport England on the Submission version of the Local Plan. The modified policy is therefore supported as it would provide clarity on the scope of sports facilities that may be accommodated in the sports and leisure park

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

347 Support

Document Element: MM10 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support MM10. The amendment will support the delivery of successful and effective sports and leisure uses on land to the South of the A133, as is envisaged in the DPD and set out in the Open Space, Playing Pitch, Sport & Recreation Study evidence base.

Full text:

Latimer support MM10. The amendment will support the delivery of successful and effective sports and leisure uses on land to the South of the A133, as is envisaged in the DPD and set out in the Open Space, Playing Pitch, Sport & Recreation Study evidence base.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

432 Object

Document Element: MM10 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM10 – we are concerned the additional emphasis on floodlighting does not ascertain how decision makers may tell where it is appropriate, and suggest effective policy would relate back to an evidence base used to determine where is appropriate. We have significant concerns about the impact of such floodlight facilities and believe the DPD should provide the policy to protect from potential substantial environmental harm to meet its aspirational high standards.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

308 Object

Document Element: MM11 (Main)

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

Summary:

There physically isn't room for a park and ride south of the A133 and the sports facilities proposed that will also allow for an adequate green buffer for Wivenhoe.

Full text:

There physically isn't room for a park and ride south of the A133 and the sports facilities proposed that will also allow for an adequate green buffer for Wivenhoe.

Change suggested by respondent:

Therefore, this modification should state that only one of these facilities can be sited south of the A133. It should also be stated that neither facility should prejudice the area shown as the green buffer for Wivenhoe.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

317 Support

Document Element: MM11 (Main)

Respondent: Mr Dave Wendon [190]

Summary:

MM11 That being the case what plans are there for getting the RTS from either of these sites to the new A133 Clingo Hill bus lane because if the RTS is expected to join the normal traffic to the new bus lane that is being created its not going to be very rapid?

MM11 The policies map does not indicate he entrance and egress points of the park and chose sites. My view is that the P&C should be south of the A133 with car parking access and egress off the new roundabout at the end of the A1133 Link Road. I would make sense for RTS egress to be directly on to the westbound carriageway of A133 via a long slip road.

Full text:

Having followed the proposals for the Garden Community development and the RTS for years I have been confused and misled by the vast array of colour blocking out the existing road system that I have made inappropriate comments on consultations.

I'd seen one of the plans showing the RTS stop on off A133 Clingo Hill on Boundary Road and thought it a temporary arrangement until the P&R (or Park and Choose, as you like to call it on) is provided directly opposite Boundary Road. However it seems it was always going to be a bit further up the hill and now the proposal is for P &R to be either north or south of the A133/B1027 junction.

MM11 That being the case what plans are there for getting the RTS from either of these sites to the new A133 Clingo Hill bus lane because if the RTS is expected to join the normal traffic to the new bus lane that is being created its not going to be very rapid?

MM11 The policies map does not indicate he entrance and egress points of the park and chose sites. My view is that the P&C should be south of the A133 with car parking access and egress off the new roundabout at the end of the A1133 Link Road. I would make sense for RTS egress to be directly on to the westbound carriageway of A133 via a long slip road.

MM10 Floodlighting on the Sports fields adjacent to B1027 should be limited. The floodlights on the existing university sports field creates more light pollution than the football floodlights at the Colchester United Community Stadium.

MM21 Its a waste of valuable farmland to create the woodland buffer zone and is best left as arable land. The planting alongside A1133 Link Road should be sufficient to screen the road and housing development.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

348 Support

Document Element: MM11 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer note MM11. The draft DPD provides two possible locations for the Park and Choose, one north and one south of the A133. Ongoing masterplan testing undertaken by Latimer to date demonstrates that the Park and Choose Facility can be accommodated on land south of the A133, without prejudicing the University of Essex expansion requirements, or sports, leisure and open space requirements of the wider Garden Community. Pre-application discussions on this matter have been undertaken with the LPAs, and appropriate evidence and design work will be submitted with the application, in support and justification of this approach.

Full text:

Latimer note MM11. The draft DPD provides two possible locations for the Park and Choose, one north and one south of the A133. Ongoing masterplan testing undertaken by Latimer to date demonstrates that the Park and Choose Facility can be accommodated on land south of the A133, without prejudicing the University of Essex expansion requirements, or sports, leisure and open space requirements of the wider Garden Community. Pre-application discussions on this matter have been undertaken with the LPAs, and appropriate evidence and design work will be submitted with the application, in support and justification of this approach.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

433 Object

Document Element: MM11 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM11 – We remain concerned at the urbanizing effects of substantial parking facilities in this space south of the A133, and would stress nowhere in the evidence base is there support for the principle that there is sufficient area of land for both this parking facility and the sport and recreation grounds to meet open space requirements.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

349 Support

Document Element: MM12 (Main)

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

Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM12, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM12, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024.

Latimer support and will adopt a sustainable infrastructure first approach at TCBGC – Latimer will work with the Councils to ensure the RTS can be provided alongside a Park and Choose facility from the first residential development parcel phases. MM12 introduces “first residential” rather than “early phases” as there may be a requirement for infrastructure enabling works (for example energy, earthworks etc.) that would fall under the definition of “first phase” but wouldn’t have any homes associated with it.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

434 Object

Document Element: MM12 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM12 – We're very concerned that the suggested modification uses the term phases – plural, instead of first phase, as without an infallible phasing plan this is undefined and could refer to a significant number of houses. AS the modification is suggested its ineffective planning language. We would also query the logic behind removing the association between the park and chose and RTS becoming operational, as even if this is significantly before the first residential phases this could provide meaningful benefits, both reducing local traffic and mitigating some effects of construction.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

411 Support

Document Element: MM13 (Minor)

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

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

Summary:

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

Full text:

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

435 Support

Document Element: MM13 (Minor)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM13 – correction of typo. Support.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

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

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