6 Support

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr Kieran Franklin [22]

Summary:

The design of cycling infrastructure should consider the need to reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.
Provision should be included for A120 access from Bromley Road, either via the Garden Community or via a new junction, to reduce congestion at the busy and complex A133 junctions in East Colchester.
The RTS should form a loop to provide quick access from the Garden Community to the Northern Gateway and Colchester Business Park via the A120.
Long term, Ardleigh train station should be rebuilt to give residents of the Garden Community better access to the rail network than Hythe can provide.

Full text:

I broadly support the mobility strategy with a few notes:
- Pedestrian/cycle infrastructure should be designed to minimise conflict between pedestrians and cyclists, as well as between both groups and motor vehicles. A network of completely segregated cycle routes should be provided throughout the site for this purpose.
- Some thought should be given to allowing access from Bromley Road to the A120 via the link road, or including a linked scheme to provide a junction between the A120 and Bromley Road. This would provide residents of Greenstead, Longridge, Parsons Green and the new Crockleford neighbourhood direct access to the A120/A12 and reduce congestion on the Harwich Road and Greenstead Road roundabouts.
- The Rapid Transit scheme is currently planned as a fairly linear service from the Northern Gateway via the City Centre to the Garden Community. Some services could be run as a loop, running from the Garden Community to the Northern Gateway via the A120, Colchester Business Park and Axial Way, to provide a fast link between the Garden Community, Colchester Business Park and the Northern Gateway. Alternatively this could be run as a separate service.
- In the longer term, the councils engage with the DfT about the feasibility of rebuilding the train station at Ardleigh, as this would serve the new Garden Community as well as existing communities including Ardleigh and nearby villages. Provision could be made for a passing loop (similar to the one being included in the new Beaulieu Park station at Chelmsford) so that services calling at this new station do not disrupt fast trains to Norwich. Such a new station would be beneficial to the site, as the capacity for additional services via Hythe station is limited by level crossing at East Gates.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

7 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr Gary Plummer [23]

Summary:

The transport system is all pie in the sky, and a complete waste of money. As the new development is out of town most residents will use their own cars.
People do not and will not rely of public bus services as they are far to expensive, unreliable and also people like the comfort of their own vehicles.
Killing wild life and their habitat to build a "rapid transport system" is a disgrace, and i for one don't wish to fund a bus service that will carry about 5 people per bus.

Full text:

The transport system is all pie in the sky, and a complete waste of money. As the new development is out of town most residents will use their own cars.
People do not and will not rely of public bus services as they are far to expensive, unreliable and also people like the comfort of their own vehicles.
Killing wild life and their habitat to build a "rapid transport system" is a disgrace, and i for one don't wish to fund a bus service that will carry about 5 people per bus.

Change suggested by respondent:

The council needs to face facts and accept that people prefer their own vehicles, and a majority WILL NOT CYCLE, or WALK, or catch a bus.
There are far better things money could be spent on rather that waste it on cycle lanes and a rapid transport system that will see more Tumbleweed than cyclists or passengers.
Build a better road system that can cope with the additional traffic, rather than continue to be anti car!

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

10 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mr Gary Plummer [23]

Summary:

Whoever proposed this development is living in cloud cuckoo land. By definition a road is a place for vehicles it is not a playground. If the council continue with such ridiculous ideas i hope that they are prepared for all of the accidents which will follow.
Roads and streets are for vehicles, parks and playgrounds are for playing, you cannot mix the 2 as you are inviting problems.
You cannot dress up a rapid transport system, It is a bus.
The council can't vet all of the new residents to ensure they don't have cars!

Full text:

Whoever proposed this development is living in cloud cuckoo land. By definition a road is a place for vehicles it is not a playground. If the council continue with such ridiculous ideas i hope that they are prepared for all of the accidents which will follow.
Roads and streets are for vehicles, parks and playgrounds are for playing, you cannot mix the 2 as you are inviting problems.
You cannot dress up a rapid transport system, It is a bus.
The council can't vet all of the new residents to ensure they don't have cars!

Change suggested by respondent:

I think somebody needs to go and lie down in a dark room, as clearly they have had to much sun, and its sent them slightly insane.

Roads and street by definition are for vehicles and this notion needs to be maintained, the plan needs to change to reflect this. If you encourage people especially younger children you will be putting them at risk.

Roads = Vehicles
Parks and playgrounds = People

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

12 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mr Martin Crisp, Bridleways Development Officer) [25]

Summary:

There is no consideration for the equestrian user group in this Plan. The creation of a new Country Park provides opportunity to create new riding routes, but the equestrian user group has been completely ignored which is inequitable. A full response has been provided as have proposals for the incorporation new equestrian friendly routes.

Full text:

Tendering Colchester Borders Garden Community Submission Version Plan Response
Essex Bridleways Association wishes to make the following comments on the Submission Version of the Plan:
Essex Bridleways Association is extremely concerned that none of the issues raised in our response of 7th April 2022 to the Draft Plan have been addressed or acknowledged. Additionally, our response has neither been acknowledged or documented on the Consultation Statement spreadsheet, where responses from consultees have been logged. EBA has a receipt response e-mail dated 7th April 2022 at 12.08pm confirming the safe receipt of our comments, therefore one wonders if our comments have simply been ignored ?
We therefore provide further comments on the Submission Version of the Plan as requested, and sincerely hope that the comments will be properly addressed this time.
Overall, we are very concerned and disappointed at the apparent lack of consideration for equestrians in the Plan.
Movement and Connections in the Garden Community (Chapter 8)
Section 1 Local Plan
The Plan states that 'in respect of the topics covered under the theme of Movement and Connections, some of the main requirements expected to be covered in this Plan, as set out in the policies of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan, include':
• The network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways to enhance accessibility within the site and to the adjoining areas…..
However, beyond this initial statement, the emphasis and focus of the Movement and Connections section of the Plan moves firmly to the provision of walking and cycling infrastructure, with no reference to Bridleways. There is no detailed comment as to how the existing public footpaths will be treated as part of the development, we consider there should be more detailed commentary around the intentions for existing PROW within the development boundary.
It would seem logical to ensure that ALL vulnerable road users are considered within a major scheme such as this and we are disappointed that equestrians are given no consideration here. Highways England schemes proactively incorporate multi-user routes within their projects – the new A14 is a classic example here – and it would be encouraging if the Councils involved in this project were to follow their lead. After all, safety should be paramount, and it is discriminatory to exclude one user group from such a provision.
We note that the Plan proposes the creation of a new Country Park, (Salary Brook), including land and woodland at and around Salary Brook Local Nature Reserve that connects with a wider network of green corridors and walking/cycleways throughout the garden community. Again, seemingly no thought for equestrians. It is our strong view that consideration should be given to the creation of a new circular bridleway as part of the Country Park planning, extending into adjoining planned green spaces, and that further consideration should be given as to whether said new Bridleways could link with the Restricted Byway 162-21 situated within the radius of the proposed Garden Community.
If our reading of the plan is correct, it appears that the above-mentioned Restricted Bridleway is to become a Rapid Transit route. Therefore equestrians will presumably lose the ability to use this route, but there is no mention of this loss of use in the Plan.
It is noted that land within the 'Strategic Green Gaps' will be protected from development, and that the construction of new buildings will only be supported where they represent the provision of appropriate development for a countryside location of facilities for outdoor sports and recreation. As such the routing of a new Bridleway through such areas would seem entirely appropriate. We would again request that consideration be given as to how Restricted Byway 162-21 could be incorporated into a wider equestrian friendly PROW network to allow potential usage by horse and carriage driving.
Equestrians have been ignored as a user group in the preparation of this plan. We would ask that this be addressed please. Major developments such as this that will cater for the needs of future generations should consider the needs of all user groups to be considered equitable, balanced and sound.
M Crisp
Essex Bridleways Association

Change suggested by respondent:

We note that the Plan proposes the creation of a new Country Park, (Salary Brook), including land and woodland at and around Salary Brook Local Nature Reserve that connects with a wider network of green corridors and walking/cycleways throughout the garden community. Again, seemingly no thought for equestrians. It is our strong view that consideration should be given to the creation of a new circular bridleway as part of the Country Park planning, extending into adjoining planned green spaces, and that further consideration should be given as to whether said new Bridleways could link with the Restricted Byway 162-21 situated within the radius of the proposed Garden Community.

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

13 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr James Biltcliffe [26]

Summary:

I believe that the route to the A120 should be completed before any residential construction works occur. I feel that it would not be satisfactory to allow the additional traffic form the new residential dwellings to be routed via the existing Colchester to Elmstead A133 road.

Full text:

I believe that the route to the A120 should be completed before any residential construction works occur. I feel that it would not be satisfactory to allow the additional traffic form the new residential dwellings to be routed via the existing Colchester to Elmstead A133 road.

Change suggested by respondent:

Ensure A120 access is completed and mandated for use before construction of any residential dwellings occur

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

14 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mr Timothy Wood [29]

Summary:

1) the new link road to the A120 is ESSENTIAL before ANY houses are built, to avoid Clinghoe Hill becoming Colchester's biggest car park and imprisoning Wivenhoe residents in the village

2) the 'rapid transit' is a complete con and will be an ordinary bus, which no one will use.

3) the 'cycling plans' ignore that (a) the development is on the top of a big hill and so cycling into Colchester will be fine, but not coming back. It also rains a lot and no one will cycle in the rain.

Full text:

It is ESSENTIAL that the link road to the A120 is provided BEFORE any houses are built. Otherwise the traffic on Clinghoe Hill, which is already queuing back to before the University junction from 7 am to 10am every day, will be paralysed all day, effectively trapping Wivenhoe residents in the village. Each house built before that road is provided will bring AT LEAST two cars onto the existing roads, which already cannot cope with the traffic.

And please don't lie to us about the 'rapid transit system'! We all know that it will be an ordinary bus, probably a ramshackle, smoke-benching ex school bus, crawling slowly up the hill once an hour, if that. No one will use a system like that, especially as the fares are likely to be extortionate. The building of the 'bus lanes' for it will take one lane out of Clinghoe Hill, to give access for construction machinery. The road is jammed two lanes solid now! What is taking one lane out each way going to do? I suggest the planning inspector comes to see it at 8.30 am on any week day.....

The proponents of the wonderful cycling schemes have ignored the inconvenient facts that the development will be at the top of a hill, and it rains a lot!

The whole project was based on lies from the start. There never was a plan for a new A120 junction. There never was going to be a 'high quality rapid transit with services every two or three minutes'. It was all developers' lies, to get planning permission, and it's a shame that mug councillors and mug officials fell for it.

Change suggested by respondent:

The whole mad idea should be scrapped! But if it can't be, the new road and a viable 'rapid transit system' (not a ramshackle ex school bus) MUST be provided BEFORE any houses are built.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: To make sure the voice of common sense Wivenhoe residents is heard.

Attachments: None

15 Support

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mr Bryan Thomas [38]

Summary:

I am very much in favour of the new road linking the area to the A133 as a matter of urgency, not being pushed into the background. This could be such a boon to locals around here. The fact that it would clear jams on Clingoe Hill and divert traffic from the Colchester circuits for those going South or North suggest that Essex Highways and Colchester Borough should be funding it rather than the developers. There have been local pleas that public transport could and should benefit, too.

Full text:

The Tendring Colchester Garden Communities Project
I must apologise for being late with this and for it being an email, but my days of attending Committees and such are long gone. I am hoping, however, that a few thoughts might creep through the bureaucratic and over-long discussion times we live in.
• I am very much in favour of the new road linking the area to the A133 as a matter of urgency, not being pushed into the background. This could be such a boon to locals around here. The fact that it would clear jams on Clingoe Hill and divert traffic from the Colchester circuits for those going South or North suggest that Essex Highways and Colchester Borough should be funding it rather than the developers. There have been local pleas that public transport could and should benefit, too.
• I did, at one point, sit on the Colchester/Wivenhoe/Tendring Committee looking at our Wivenhoe town proposals, but I soon realised that Committees are, by no means, the best way forward design-wise. Please correct me if I am wrong, but I gather that the basic layout of this new Project, so far, includes the number and type of housing units, and things like local amenities and transport have been agreed. ******* (redacted personal information) tells me that an architectural practice is helping to coordinate the next stages. If correct, this would mean that the developers and the Planners, with opposing points of view, would not be left to fight it out, leaving the usual mess of pastiche that results.
• And this is where I would like to see more profound input from your good selves and specialists. We all want the scheme to succeed. This must start with inspirational design to create a community – again, not possible by committee or even with democracy as we know it. (70% don't vote – perhaps a tiny number knowing they don't have the expertise; "25% on Party lines and a minute fraction, who carry most of the decision-making – a mixture of tub thumpers or NIMBIs.) Who, for example, would expect a Concerto, a Novel, or a painting to be designed by a Committee?
• This is no way to decide on highly subjective design issues, and architecture is, or used to be, an Art. You only have to look at our pre-industrial revolution buildings to see that we have evolved no twentieth-century return of that art. For a trained architect, like me, with many years on the rock face, it is difficult enough. Of course, one can incorporate green open spaces, and one can and must make the housing efficient, ecologically, net zero and cutting CO2 emissions. But here, too, ideas continue to evolve – timber, an authentic Essex tradition (not pastiche, please), is now back in fashion because brick and concrete use a vast amount of energy in their manufacture, and prefabricating is making building more efficient and layouts more person orientated and flexible. More new homeowners are buying off the drawing board, so to speak. They would have some say in a well-ordered prefab system, with lots of choices about layouts – kitchen /dining, open plan, avoidance of waste of space in corridors and, almost as important as any, making the voids in roof spaces useable and not full of trusses. Although cheaper initially to the developers, this is a terrible waste of space, which, in the long term, is expensive to restructure.
• How can planners and developers, with their limited and conflicting goals, cope with rational answers for all our sakes? Even Mr Gove has got into the act! I came across a few helpful tips about creating a community recently, like, as a starting point, are there any features already on the site? Perhaps an old cottage or a barn. Are there some old trees or good hedgerows which can help form a sense of place? Are there some splendid views of the existing landscape that should be exploited? (Some of our new developments stick a garage in the most fabulous positions.)
• New homes must be exciting and stimulating places to live in and should incorporate peoples' own lifestyles. They must, too, foresee the owner's future needs as far as possible. It is all challenging, especially under the present systems, but it can be done. The Quakers managed it one hundred and fifty years ago.
• Finally, another mantra of mine has been that a building development is incomplete until it has a planted and thriving landscape. Here we are blessed with experts in the area who will be eager to contribute.
I trust that some of these thoughts might be helpful.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

25 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Gemma Robinson [54]

Summary:

Why do we need a link road?
Please don't say to reduce traffic when you are building the GC with 9000 homes averaging 27.000 people, not including the Industrial and travellers site and shops.
If this monstrosity was NOT being built we would not need this link road! A village meaning a "rural area" which this will be taken away from our village life! I moved to the countryside meaning "the land and scenery of a rural area" which is now being taken away from us and children of Elmstead. I cannot understand why an unfinished road that is costing £50 Million to build when the whole county/country is in poverty! Just because the council have a "pot" of money that you "need" to use otherwise it goes to another county, is not acceptable!
Distribute the money out to those that need it and change lives for the better! This is disgraceful behaviour from the council!

Full text:

Why do we need a link road?
Please do not say to reduce traffic when you are building the Garden community with 9000 homes averaging on over 27.000 people, not including the Industrial site, the traveller's site and shops.
If this monstrosity was NOT being built we would not need this link road!
A village meaning a "rural area" which this will be taken away from our village life! If I wanted to live in a built up area I would have stayed where I was before. But I moved to the country side meaning "the land and scenery of a rural area" which is now being taken away from us and children! Of Elmstead Market Village.
I can not understand if this goes ahead which I pray to God that it doesn't, why an unfinished road that is costing £50 Million to build when the whole county/ country is in poverty! And just because the council have a "pot" of money that you "need" to use otherwise it goes to another county , is not acceptable!.
Distribute the money out to those that need it and will change lives for the better! This is disgraceful behaviour from the council!.
Perhaps step away from your office and sit in your garden and see how lovely it is and then the council and developers saying "we are building a 'community ' of over 27,000 people, killing wild life and an A road that will create a lot of noise air pollution and disturbance and lots more and its only 1/2 mile away from your home!" How would that make you feel?.
Please do not ruin this county any more that you already have.
Its heartbreaking to think this will happen and ruin people's lives and health that already live nearby.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

27 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Elizabeth Thompson [53]

Summary:

There is a lack of road repairs, with a great number of potholes unrepaired. Increase in traffic flow would be detrimental to Elmstead and further damage our roads.
We don't have a dentist, fire station, secondary school or any other health facilities.
Only one small grocery store.
Increased traffic and homes would impact on our minimal street services ie street cleaning, fly tipping road repairs refuse service and bus route
There is also the Environmental Impact on our elderly residents through increased air pollution.

Full text:

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

34 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mrs Pam Cowell [56]

Summary:

Officers summary:No thought has gone into how our village can manage the volume of traffic when most local people have to travel to get medical treatment shopping and other important essentials to better their lives. The village has already grown to twice its size with new homes. No thought has gone into our villages, infrastructure for roads crossings and just to maintain quality of life. The increased traffic will cause more accidents and people not being able to access medical help via ambulances the traffic which is going to cause delays. people will die. Elmstead will become isolated with no way of getting to Colchester for the essentials to maintain a quality of life that we expect.

Full text:

comments re new development

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

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

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

38 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Miss Deborah Jones [62]

Summary:

Transport links must be improved for all residents in the area, not just those within the proposed development.
Expecting families or working-age residents not to own or use one or more vehicles is unrealistic.
Existing cycle routes in the city are ignored, so how is the very hilly proposed development area going to be any different?
Horse riding is mentioned more than once, where are these horses going to be kept, and who can afford to own one?

Full text:

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

Change suggested by respondent:

Please consider how existing villages and towns outside the proposed development will be integrated. Transport links must be improved for all residents, not just those within the proposed development. There does not seem to be any joined-up thinking, or consideration for how the proposed development will impact existing infrastructure and services.

There is not enough employment locally so many people will travel outside the city. It is unrealistic to expect people to only work on their doorstep, and not to own or use a car for travelling distances. If families rely on parents/grandparents for childcare, how will these visitors access the development as they will not necessarily live locally? Expecting visitors to walk up to 20 minutes or use public transport after travelling some distance would be unpopular, impractical, and potentially impossible for some.

There are many cycle routes around the city already, the majority are ignored. The hills around the city are huge, and the proposed development is miles from anywhere. Cycling will not be popular, and is impractical as a sole transport option for many.

Why promote horse-riding as a travel option? Where are all these horses, and who could afford the stabling and upkeep? Maybe a few residents would possibly choose horse-riding as a leisure pursuit, but not as a viable sustainable transport option.

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

46 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Ria Lockwood [71]

Summary:

Officers summary: This would cause huge amounts of traffic in a small village, causing more congestion and pollution. The back log of traffic along the A133 is very busy during rush making the road more dangerous than it already is. I have young children who attend the local school in Elmstead and crossing the A133 can sometimes take 6-7 minutes due to no crossing that has been promised for years. The roads are busy enough without adding more oncoming and outgoing traffic. This will just overpopulate the areas surrounding.

Full text:

To whom this may concern

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thankyou myself and Elmstead look forward to your reply.

Miss R Lockwood

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

56 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Wivenhoe Society (Prof Jane Black, committee member) [48]

Summary:

- Concerns raised with regard to the HIF funding and Link Road Phasing. No indication of how many dwellings etc might be built before the completion of the link road nor is there any guarantee that it will be 'practically and financially possible' for it to be funded.
- Insufficient detail with regard to the RTS route, operation and implications for Clingoe Hill.
- Demand for the proposed Park & Choose needs to be justified.
- Further detail is required for the junctions, crossing and roundabouts on the A133. With increased traffic levels the junction layout as shown on the Policies Map must be demonstrated to be workable.

Full text:

Consultation response from the Wivenhoe Society

The comments below relate mainly to Policy 1 and the Policies map but also include matters addressed in other policies as the Plan needs to be

considered as a whole. Also there are omissions in what is covered in the Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Wivenhoe and Brightlingsea which use Boundary Road.
Thirdly if the buses used Capon Road the bus stops serving it would be on average nearer to offices and academic buildings on the Campus and there would be no need for RTS users to cross the A133 to access a bus stop. It would also give better connectivity with the local buses from Wivenhoe and Brightlingsea as passengers using these could interchange to the RTS if they so wished. Similarly travellers from the Garden Community could interchange to the local bus (currently the S1) which gives access to the industrial/commercial buildings at Whitehall allowing a commute by public transport. It would give an, admittedly circuitous, public transport link from the Garden Community to Wivenhoe.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the general area as well as the Garden Community. Who would own and who would be responsible for managing this? It is difficult to believe that an endowment fund sufficient to meet costs in perpetuity could be provided by the developers.

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

Change suggested by respondent:

The phasing of the link road build out must be discussed. Details of the RTS off site need to be explained and justified. Access for this to the site should not be located at the A133/B1027 junction.

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

61 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Ms Jean McNeil [82]

Summary:

Travel into Colchester will result in very much increased congestion in Clinghoe Hill, roundabouts near Tesco, East Street and level crossing.

Full text:

Travel into Colchester will result in very much increased congestion in Clinghoe Hill, roundabouts near Tesco, East Street and level crossing.

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan needs to show how rapid transit and other vehicles will enter Colchester without putting any more pressure on present entry points.

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

65 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mrs Linda Forth [88]

Summary:

Imperative to build the "through road" first with construction traffic operating from A120 NOT A133 as this is a very congested road; not safe or viable to increase traffic even more down here.

Full text:

Imperative to build the "through road" first with construction traffic operating from A120 NOT A133 as this is a very congested road; not safe or viable to increase traffic even more down here.

Change suggested by respondent:

Imperative to phase the building works from A120, not A133, with proper slip roads from A120 as the access via A133 is not safe and will cause long term serious congestion.
Ensure Rapid Transit System and "through road" operational before start of these construction phases. RTS would need an extra lane on A133. It caters for the new garden community residents and not people travelling into Colchester from Tendering and surrounding areas, so will not improve traffic flow in that respect and it is already dangerously congested. Wivenhoe is the nearest railway station to the garden community, with the university running a regular bus service to it. It is a conservation area with very narrow roads, a weak railway bridge to cross and very narrow pavements. The RTS will not deter the new residents from trying to drive to Wivenhoe Station to commute rather than to Colchester Station. Naive to think they will choose to work on the site itself and the current Park&Ride in Colchester is barely used as it is, so why will the RTS be any different? 7000 new homes need bespoke doctors and dentists surgeries, not just regular visits to their local community centre as is currently proposed. Employment on site, please allow sufficient parking at the business park, bearing in mind people from outside the garden community may choose to work there and the RTS is planned to start from there and not from a park & ride on the eastern side of the development? 7000 houses/flats will result in parking issues. Ensure sufficient parking per household and enough space on roads for parking. People will continue to own cars, unless they're banned!! Environment/Nature - careful timing and handling of wildlife issues imperative.

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

70 Support

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

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

Summary:

The policy is supported for the reasons set out in the full comments.

Full text:

• The principles supporting this policy are welcomed as they would support encouraging physical activity through prioritising people over the car and promoting active travel. The reference in part A of the policy requiring proposals to have regard to Active Design principles and the Building for a Healthy Life process when designing the public realm and streets is also welcomed.
• Part B of the policy is particularly welcomed due to its detailed guidance on promoting active and healthy travel.
• Part G of the policy in relation to cycle parking is supported especially in relation to the expectation that cycle parking should be located in prominent and accessible locations a part of the design of new homes. This would be consistent with Sport England's Active Design principles relating to 'Providing Activity Infrastructure' and 'Active Buildings Inside and Out'.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

74 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

Summary:

'To ensure neighbourhoods are walkable, low traffic and livable, where residents can access most of their daily needs within a 20-minute walk or safe bike ride from their home'. I for one would not want to try and cycle or walk home with my 6-8 shopping bags after my weekly food shop!!!! Nor would I take the bus. People with always navigate towards using their cars as it is quicker and easier. Most houses tend to have 1-2 cars, add a couple of kids who drive and a family household can have 3 cars + !

Full text:

'To ensure neighbourhoods are walkable, low traffic and livable, where residents can access most of their daily needs within a 20-minute walk or safe bike ride from their home'. I for one would not want to try and cycle or walk home with my 6-8 shopping bags after my weekly food shop!!!! Nor would I take the bus. People with always navigate towards using their cars as it is quicker and easier. Most houses tend to have 1-2 cars, add a couple of kids who drive and a family household can have 3 cars + !

Change suggested by respondent:

There is no way Colchester can cope with 9000+ households with all their cars. The only change would be to dramatically reduce the size of the development.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

78 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mr Michael Watson [85]

Summary:

- The route of the RTS is too vague.
- The buses will always be in traffic struggling through bottlenecks. There are no plans to address these points by building new bridges or underpasses.
- A clear definition of the route and identification of the bottlenecks and costings for resolving them is required.
- There is no indication of how the RTS will be paid for.
- The RTS will be built in stages according to the sale of properties to fund each part. This means years of increased traffic, starting with Heavy Goods Vehicles.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

4) The description of the route of the Rapid Transit System (RTS) connecting the Garden Community with the rest of Colchester is too vague in stating “it will be in place to connect the Garden Community with the University of Essex, Colchester Town Centre, Colchester Railway Stations, Colchester Hospital, Community Stadium, Colchester Sports Park and the existing Park and Ride site in north Colchester”. Prospectively, the buses will always be in traffic struggling through bottlenecks at railway and river crossings from the East of Colchester right into the town. In the documents, there are no plans to address these points by building new bridges or underpasses.
There is no current map provided to indicate the exact route, therefore leaving the developers open opportunity to place the road at their discretion. We need a clear definition of the route and identification of the bottlenecks and costings for resolving them. There is no current indication of how the RTS will actually be paid for; except for the developer stating a (non binding) certain amount of houses will have to be sold first, to allow for the building of the RTS.
The RTS will be built in stages according to the sale of properties to fund each part. This means years of increased traffic, starting with Heavy Goods Vehicles, leading onto trade vans and domestic cars passing through the village of Elmstead and the adjoining back-roads for many years.
5) Affordable Housing Phasing: The public should have a definitive statement stipulating that the 30% affordable housing rule should apply at all stages of the development. Planning permission stage, housing starts and housing occupation. Otherwise the developers would use an “Affordable Housing Phasing Strategy” to justify the late delivery, or diminished quantity of affordable housing.
Accordingly, all ‘Affordable Housing’ should be first offered to locally living residents affected by the development; followed by Front line / Blue Light workers.
6) Within the guidelines of Gypsy and Traveller needs: the size of the gypsy and traveller provision is to be determined as part of Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment.
How are the developers and council going to deal with this issue?
Where is this site to be placed as it has not been shown in the context of the planners outline permission. The site needed would be very big in relation to the GC; and at what stage would this ‘mini development’ take place.

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

85 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Dr Christina Volkmann [102]

Summary:
This is a vital aspect of the whole project and at the same time the most ill-defined. It's not clear how the RTS will work, esp. financially. It is not clear how it ties in with the other public transport in Colchester. "Active travel" is highlighted, also linked to the RTS, but how does this tie in with wider national rail links and/or travel to and from airports or the port of Harwich, for example?

Full text:
This is a vital aspect of the whole project and at the same time the most ill-defined. It's not clear how the RTS will work, esp. financially. It is not clear how it ties in with the other public transport in Colchester. "Active travel" is highlighted, also linked to the RTS, but how does this tie in with wider national rail links and/or travel to and from airports or the port of Harwich, for example?

Change suggested by respondent:
I would like to see a lot more concrete information on the RTS - how it will be financed, how exactly it will work, how it ties in with other public transport infrastructure. The RTS should also be made a deal maker/breaker for the whole development.

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

92 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr David Mead [27]

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

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

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

GC Policy 1: Land Use and Spatial Approach.

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

Policies Map:

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

Policy 2: Nature.

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

Policy 3: Place Shaping Principles.

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

Policy 4: Meeting Housing Needs.

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

Policy 5: Economic Activity and Employment.

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

Policy 6: Community and Social Infrastructure.

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

Policy 7: Movement and Connections.

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

Policy 8: Sustainable Infrastructure.

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

103 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr Michael Lucking [112]

Summary:
It has already been decided that the link road will not be open before development. A key selling point of the Project was that it would be infrastructure led. Colchester roads will suffer. The rapid transit system is a fantasy that will not solve the traffic problems

Full text:
It has already been decided that the link road will not be open before development. A key selling point of the Project was that it would be infrastructure led. Colchester roads will suffer. The rapid transit system is a fantasy that will not solve the traffic problems

Change suggested by respondent:
The developers need to deliver the full link road before houses are built

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

109 Support

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Matthew Jericho, Spatial Planning and Local Plan Manager) [115]

Summary:
ECC as the highway and transportation authority, supports Chapter 8: Movement and Connections, which seeks to create high quality sustainable connections and an environment that make walking, cycling and public transport the most attractive method of travel. ECC has worked closely with Colchester City and Tendring District Councils to develop a place-based approach to achieving net zero carbon transport by 2050 for the Garden Community. The Draft Plan is in line and consistent with the current Essex Transport Strategy: the Local Transport Plan for Essex (LTP3).

Full text:
ECC as the highway and transportation authority, supports Chapter 8: Movement and Connections, which seeks to create high quality sustainable connections and an environment that make walking, cycling and public transport the most attractive method of travel.

ECC has worked closely with Colchester City and Tendring District Councils to develop a place-based approach to achieving net zero carbon transport by 2050 for the Garden Community. Chapter 8 has been drafted in coordination with ECC to ensure a cohesive approach.

The provisions in the Draft Plan fit with a number of the strategic aims for ECC. The movement and connection chapter supports a strong, inclusive and sustainable economy; it will support a high-quality environment by encouraging people to use public transport; and it will support health, wellbeing and independence for all by improving connectivity. In particular it looks to deliver a step change in sustainable travel, by growing passenger transport and active travel, and will ensure we support the move towards net zero, climate resilient developments within this new proposed garden community, by delivering sustainable, healthy neighbourhoods for the future. This is demonstrated further as the Draft Plan is in line and consistent with the current Essex Transport Strategy: the Local Transport Plan for Essex (LTP3), and the overarching five broad outcomes:
• Provide connectivity for Essex communities and international gateways to support sustainable economic growth and regeneration,
• Reduce carbon dioxide emissions and improve air quality through lifestyle changes, innovation and technology,
• Improve safety on the transport network and enhance and promote a safe travelling environment,
• Secure and maintain all transport assets to an appropriate standard and ensure that the network is available for use, and
• Provide sustainable access and travel choice for Essex residents to help create sustainable communities.

Additionally under the LTP3 a number of the priorities for the Haven Gateway Area/ North Essex are being supported through the infrastructure and measures to be delivered:
• Providing the transport improvements needed to accommodate housing and employment growth in a sustainable way;
• Tackling congestion within Colchester (including the provision of Park & Ride facilities);
• Improving the availability, reliability and punctuality of local bus services;
• Improving and promoting cycle networks; and improving the availability of travel choices and awareness of them; and
• Improving journeys for commuters travelling to London from Colchester and Braintree; particularly by improving access to railway stations and improving facilities for passengers.

Change suggested by respondent:
-

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

110 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr Shaun Raven [37]

Summary:

- Building 7,500 new homes without the A133-A120 Link Road constructed first will put additional pressure on an already busy network, in particular Clingoe Hill and the Hythe.
- New bus and rail links are unlikely to come to fruition. This will add additional load to the traffic system.
- The reduction in parking spaces in the GC will lead to cars being parked on green areas/pavements. The cars will be there and will be needed.
- Traffic from the industrial parks will also put pressure on the A133 if there is no link road.

Full text:

Response to updated plans - proposed development Tendring Garden Community

To whom It may concern,

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is Interesting that Tendring is proposing this garden community at the furthest point on Its borders, where it knows that most of the impact will be taken up by Colchester/Elmstead and Wivenhoe, Tendring says it has an obligation to provide homes for its community, but none of these homes will be in the reach of the average community buyers as they'll be priced too high (just look at the new housing estates off the Cowdrey Avenue in Colchester), so most of the buyers will be either private landlords or people from outside the community where wages are higher. Guess what, the population expands, rather than relocates.

By the way - Garden Community? Are you serious? This is going to be a high-density housing estate, poorly designed and poorly executed. Whoever the planners/designers/authorisers are, they obviously will not be living there - if they were, it would not even be considered.

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

117 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mrs Helen Byrne [32]

Summary:

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

Full text:

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

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

- Reduction in volume of houses to impact on traffic/air pollution.
- New road must be built early on in development.

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

129 Support

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:

As a regular cyclist, I approve the plans for cycling provision if they are as described. Compromises would diminish their success. The design of the homes needs to accommodate multiple bikes in each household and hubs for cycle repairs and servicing would help sustained use. Safe and easy access to cycle routes outside the GC, e.g. the Colchester Orbital is important. Easy routes to locations such as the city centre, hospital, coast, railway and libraries are needed.

Full text:

As a regular cyclist, I approve the plans for cycling provision if they are as described. Compromises would diminish their success. The design of the homes needs to accommodate multiple bikes in each household and hubs for cycle repairs and servicing would help sustained use. Safe and easy access to cycle routes outside the GC, e.g. the Colchester Orbital is important. Easy routes to locations such as the city centre, hospital, coast, railway and libraries are needed.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

131 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr TIM BATTS-NEALE [131]

Summary:
- Opportunity to strengthen policy and supporting documents – where there's potential to remove text saying "where appropriate" or "where necessary and appropriate"
- The transport evidence base documents would benefit from text or pointers to other documents to show expected RTS journey times to other destinations, given the importance afforded to this infrastructure. How long does modelling show RTS from TCBGC to eg University of Essex, Hythe station, City Centre, Colchester station, General Hospital, Severalls Business Park?

Full text:
See attachment -

Change suggested by respondent:
Attachment comments set out requests to generally: clarify text and assumptions in transport evidence reports including modelling; and proposing updating wording in DPD policies and justification.

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Written Representation
Attachments: DPD Submission Version comments All Tim Batts-Neale.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/v

133 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mrs Claudia Alsdorf [116]

Summary:
Concern about sequence and order of action, regarding RTS and link road between A120 and A133

Full text:
Concern about sequence and order of action, regarding RTS and link road between A120 and A133

Change suggested by respondent:
Link road is vital to be completed at the beginning of phase 1 housing development. Funding seems not secured completely, therefore priority might have to be changed from RTS to link road and funds reallocated, in order to complete link road first, with access to the business park in the corner off link road junction with A120 which would then attract businesses. The existing bus routes could be changed to create a reliable, frequent, affordable (say, flat fee of 2 pounds a trip, or smart card, free for residents), joined up loop linking new development with university, Hythe, north STation, hospital, stadium, and via link road back to A133.

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

140 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mrs Sarah Chandler [93]

Summary:
If Housing Infrastructure Fund monies are insufficient for the full cost of the A133-A120 link road how can planning approval be given to the Garden Community?
What happens if only the first phase at A133 end can be completed because rising costs make financial delivery of the second phase linking to A120 untenable?
I am concerned about the likely increase in traffic on the A133 affecting travellers from Elmstead Market, Wivenhoe, Alresford, Thorrington and Brightlingsea.
What is the exact route of the RTS alongside Clingoe Hill?
The impact of the RTS on Greenstead roundabout is unclear in the plan.

Full text:
If Housing Infrastructure Fund monies are insufficient for the full cost of the A133-A120 link road how can planning approval be given to the Garden Community?
What happens if only the first phase at A133 end can be completed because rising costs make financial delivery of the second phase linking to A120 untenable?
I am concerned about the likely increase in traffic on the A133 affecting travellers from Elmstead Market, Wivenhoe, Alresford, Thorrington and Brightlingsea.
What is the exact route of the RTS alongside Clingoe Hill?
The impact of the RTS on Greenstead roundabout is unclear in the plan.

Change suggested by respondent:
Explanation of the two phases of construction of the link road A133-A120.
The plan needs to include a detailed description of the RTS route outside of the Garden Community so its impact on Clingoe Hill and the Greenstead roundabout can be understood.

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

141 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Rev Pauline Scott [136]

Summary:
Currently the traffic down Clingoe Hill to the roundabout into Colchester is frequently heavily congested. The work to Clingoe Hill for the RTS will be horrendous as sensible alternative routes into Colchester don't exist. It is brilliant that so much work is being considered to reduce the use of cars in the garden community but realistically there will still be a considerable number. Local residents had been promised the link road to the A120 would be completed before the building commenced and this is no longer the case. Without this link road I cannot see how the plan can work.

Full text:
Currently the traffic down Clingoe Hill to the roundabout into Colchester is frequently heavily congested. The work to Clingoe Hill for the RTS will be horrendous as sensible alternative routes into Colchester don't exist. It is brilliant that so much work is being considered to reduce the use of cars in the garden community but realistically there will still be a considerable number. Local residents had been promised the link road to the A120 would be completed before the building commenced and this is no longer the case. Without this link road I cannot see how the plan can work.

Change suggested by respondent:
I think the money set aside for the RTS scheme should be used to complete the link road. In the interim, current bus services can be extended to cover some of what the RTS would offer - note current bus services are able to bypass Clingoe Hill by going through the university - a route banned for cars. The early days of the RTS scheme would be heavy on subsidy and the money could be used to more effect. The route for the RTS scheme also needs further work too in my opinion in order to maximise its effectiveness - up to date traffic surveys and proper consideration of where it is needed and whether Elmstead and Wivenhoe too could access its services. Doing the link road first would allow time for this work to be done.

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

143 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: TCBGC Community Liaison Group [104]
Agent: Mrs Manda O'Connell [105]

Summary:
The completed A133-A120 link road is critical to the success of the TCB Garden Community. The TCBGC Community Liaison Group strongly recommend its completion as a matter of priority BEFORE house building commences PLUS radical re-routing of the planned RTS to utilise the link road onto the A120 in an anti-clockwise circular route around and into Colchester, thus avoiding the need for expensive road widening works, saving million of pounds on Clingoe Hill and in central Colchester, and ensuring the TCB Garden Community meets the modal shift and sustainability goals outlined in the DPD and Section 1 Local Plan.

Full text:

It is the urgent belief and conviction of the TCBGC Community Liaison Group (CLG) that a radically different timeplan and approach should be taken with regard to the key components of this policy, namely the A120/A120 link road and the RTS (Rapid Transit System), in order to successfully achieve the policy's goals and aims as laid out in the DPD. Without these drastic alterations, outlined below, we do not believe the plan is sound, and worse, that it is in direct contravention of the principles underlying the HIF grant of 99.9M as a result of which at the previous inspection the TCB Garden Community was adjudged as being sound.

The current plan has allocated £21 million to the provision of an RTS which means that there is a shortfall of £21 million to complete the link road. It is the CLG's contention that

a) The £21 million ring-fenced for the RTS should be instead put towards completing the link road FIRST, so that it is in place before the first houses are built and
b) the route for the RTS should be drastically changed to a route which does not utilise the A133 Clingoe Hill, already hugely congested, or go through an equally hugely congested central Colchester necessitating millions to widen roads and introduce bus lanes. Instead it should be redrawn to use the route suggested by the CLG and shown in the attached file labelled Alt_RTS_Route. This is already in part dedicated bus routes and will all , once the link road is constructed, be fit for use for a modern RTS system. That suggested route is shown in the attached file. It avoids Clingoe Hill in favour of already dedicated bus routes through Elmstead Road, Capon Road and Boundary Road (used by First Buses, routes S1 and 87), links all the key destinations required including the Northern Gateway and Garden Community Park and Choose, the hospital and North Station, together with a stop at the top of Balkerne Hill to access central Colchester, and the University and Knowledge Gateway. It would operate in a loop in an anti-clockwise direction, utilising roads which are already fit for use for a modern RTS system, thus saving millions of pounds. It would be in place as soon as the link road is constructed in full linking the A133 and the A120, ready for the new residents to adapt to new patterns of travel behaviour without the car, achieving modal shift, because all key destinations as listed above are quick, frequent and accessible via the RTS.

The key stops that the new route would link are as follows, starting from the Park and Choose at the bottom edge of the TCB Garden Community on the A133:
- The Garden Community stops (initially the first (southernmost) developed community)
- The A120 employment park, top right of the Garden Community (providing fast transport to work for Garden Community residents who are employed there)
- Severalls Lane and Colchester Business Park, also an employment hub. Shown on the map as being accessed via the Ipswich Road and Severalls Lane, Colchester Business Park does have a route into and through the Business Park from the A120/A12 junction, which may be preferable and give a smoother curve on the route.
- The Stadium
- Colchester Sports and Leisure Park
- Northern Gateway Park and Ride
- Colchester General Hospital
- Colchester North Station
- Top of Balkerne Hill stop for the town centre (by the old Embassy Suite)
- St Botolphs train station
- Bottom of Hythe Hill (for walking access to Hythe station just over the bridge over the river Colne)
- Start of Elmstead Road (for access to Tesco The Hythe)
- End of Capon Road, on Boundary Road, for access to Essex University's Innovation Centre, Essex Business School and the Knowledge Gateway Science and Business Park
- Back to the start of the loop at the Park and Choose on the junction of the A133.

The link to this Google map is shown below. It allows the user to zoom in, move the map around and view in different ways just as you can with a regular Google map. https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=1jDmOLSmGRF5PHD61n7TSBD5HlZiP__0&usp=sharing

Benefits of this recommended revised approach
The benefits completing the link road in its entirety BEFORE commencement of homes being built together with an RTS that utilises the anti-clockwise route shown are as follows:

1) Using the route proposed, no building work for extra bus lanes etc needs to be done on Clingoe Hill, in either direction, thus avoiding the horrendous congestion that would result therefrom.
2) No expensive road alterations need to be made through central and historic Colchester. The new route would skirt the town centre, with a key stop at the top of Balkerne Hill by the Embassy Rooms to access the centre, and then again at St Botolphs train station.
3) This could potentially pave the way for central Colchester to be pedestrianised or remain as it is, being served by local bus routes.
4) The proposed alternative to Clingoe Hill (Elmstead Road, Capon Road, Boundary Road, B1028/27 back to A133) is already a dedicated bus route (First Buses Routes S1 and 87)
5) Much of the route is already in place and fit for purpose for an RTS (A120, Severalls Lane, Axial Way, Via Urbis, plus Elmstead Road avoiding Clingoe Hill above) thus presenting a huge cost saving.
6) The saved cost of works on Clingoe Hill alone would contribute a large proportion of the monies needed for the completion of the link road.
7) The completed link road would immediately begin to relieve pressure on Clingoe Hill by providing a through route for traffic going to North Station or the hospital or the A12.
8) Because of the immediate fast access via the RTS anticlockwise route to North Station or the A120 employment park in the north west corner of the Garden Community or even Colchester Business Park, or Colchester General Hospital, new Garden Community residents working in London or any of the other locations would very easily adopt this modal shift from the outset. If there is a wait of 5-16 years for the link road to be completed this opportunity will have been lost. Much of the soundness of the TCBGC derives from its having the link road and not having to be dependent upon routes into Colchester, either for employment, schools, hospital care, shopping or travel.
9) It would meet the previous inspection's criterion for soundness as the link road would be doing as it was intended in siphoning traffic with onward destinations beyond Clingoe Hill off from the A133 and onto the A120 or beyond.
9) The Park and Choose on the Garden Community with the new RTS anti-clockwise route to access these destinations then also becomes a very real possibility from the outset.
10) Already it is painfully difficult to get a parking space in the hospital car park because it is so overloaded and people often have to drive around waiting for someone to leave before they can park. This will only be exacerbated with a larger demographic. However, with a fast RTS system adopting the proposed anti-clockwise route, residents from all communities east of Colchester can use the Park and Choose on the Garden Community to not only avoid battling with the traffic on A133 Clingoe Hill and beyond but avoid driving to the hospital at all using the RTS with the looping anti-clockwise route proposed by the CLG.

Harm arising from the current approach
The current plan, to proceed with building houses with only three quarters of the link road complete and no specified date for its completion, if ever, together with the currently planned disastrous and hugely expensive RTS route down the A133 Clingoe Hill, will

a) ensure that the modal shift will fail because
b) the RTS will be unable to provide travel to key destinations rapidly such as the hospital and the main train station as limited to A133 routes into central Colchester and
c) by the time the link road is completed, in 5-14 years time, with the possibilities of a better looped anti-clockwise RTS route that that would have provided, the patterns of behaviour not supporting modal shift will already be in place.
d) It is in direction contravention of a key principle of the TCBGC which states that it will contain all the infrastructure and services for residents WITHOUT having to go into central Colchester
e) Congestion and traffic on the A133 and Clingoe Hill going into Colchester, already gridlocked at key times, will expand exponentially with both building bus lanes and the addition of RTS priority vehicles, together with the added traffic from the Garden Community who want to go to the A12, the hospital or North Station.
f) The addition of dedicated bus lanes to Clingoe Hill will narrow it and creating a further bottleneck, more congestion and tailbacks as more traffic attempts to squeeze through a single lane as opposed to the current dual carriageway provision which already has these problems.
g) It will cause even further distress to local communities and confirm all the fears and objections they have raised about the building of the Garden Community. The CLG proposal however would do the reverse in providing an RTS route that did not use Clingoe Hill, and a joined up link road that alleviated traffic on the A133 rather than exacerbated it.
h) The £21 million currently ring-fenced for this not fit for purpose RTS, which militates against all of the principles and aspirational and otherwise entirely achievable goals of the Garden Community, will ultimately be wasted, as well as sabotaging those goals, with the loss of £21 million, as the desired modal shift will not be achieved either in the Garden Community or in Colchester City Centre, and a wonderful opportunity to achieve both of these will have been lost.
i) With only one way in or out of the Garden Community, and the route to Bromley Road as a potential exit blocked from onward travel, the incomplete link road accessing or egressing the Garden Community from or onto the A133 will act as a bottleneck, inevitably causing huge congestion problems on the estate at key times of day, a phenomenon seen already on the Turner Rise Retail Park which was equally built within only one entry / exit road, but at least does not contain hundreds / thousands of homes. This will have the effect of making the Garden Community less desirable as a location to buy houses in, with the potential buyers and existing residents feeling that they are 'trapped' on the development once there, with the knock-on effect that the monies to fund any later completion of the link road become increasingly remote.

Conclusion
Very much of the strength and soundness of the TCBGC project relies on its provision of self sustainability ie for schools, healthcare, employment and shopping without having to travel outside of the Garden Community either to put added pressure on road infrastructure, or services found in surrounding communities. The RTS route plan shown in the current DPD, based on a link road that does not link, is in direct contradiction of this. As the point of the link road is to reduce traffic going into Colchester and a central tenet of the Garden Community is to be self-contained, why are huge sums being spent to provide an RTS to increase this traffic and access services outside the Garden Community? And this is at the expense of the mitigating link road, and using the very route whose traffic the link road was intended to alleviate. This is also in direct contravention of the key principles of the Garden Community and one of the chief causes of controversy, concern and dismay, expressed from the outset, in local communities.

We would contend that the TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures report commissioned by the Councils and provided by Ringway Jacobs is far too narrow and limited in its outlook and with its RTS proposals and routing is merely providing a very expensive sticking plaster which will not meet demands even 10 years into the future, as the report itself admits: p5 'The RTS HIF project is introducing priority measures on the approach to Greenstead roundabout which is expected to operate satisfactorily up to 2033 for RTS vehicles' but 'In the potential second phase of investment post 2033, it would be expected that the garden community would be continuing to grow but a general increase in car trips could be threatening RTS reliability and worsening RTS journey times on the route west of Greenstead roundabout, which would work against achieving mode share targets and sustainable travel aims.'

Recommended movement and travel routes must therefore adopt a much broader future-proofed approach to accommodate the transport needs of an additional 17,500 people (2.3 persons living in each of 7,500 homes) on the east of Colchester. This is represented by the proposal outlined here by the CLG in putting the unnecessary sticking plaster monies described above towards completion of the link road as originally intended by the Housing Infrastructure Fund, together with the wider circular and much more economical RTS revised route, shown in the attached file, which will accommodate a thriving community 50 years into the future and beyond, without impinging on or increasing congestion of surrounding road and central Colchester infrastructure. To do anything else is to render the whole of the good work done by the planners in other areas such as Land Uses and Spatial Approach, and the aspirations embodied in both the Section 1 Local Plan and other TCBGC policies hamstrung at best by this crippling and at best wholly inadequate approach.

Note: It is also of some concern that the plan currently proposed is based on a report (TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures) by an organisation (Jacobs part of Ringway Jacobs, who describe themselves thus: 'We design, create and maintain world-class, safe, efficient and environment-friendly highway infrastructure for local authorities') which may stand directly to gain commercially and financially from these very expensive and by their own admission inadequate and time-limited plans. It is also of concern that the proposal actually in real terms detracts from the soundness of and benefit to the TCBGC, by utilising funds which should go towards the full completion of the link road, as well as actually exacerbating harm to surrounding communities.

The CLG assert therefore that it is absolutely vital NOT to delay the completion of the link road – it was deemed to be fundamental to the soundness of the TCB Garden Community by the last inspection and on it hang very many of the Garden Community's goals and aspirations. To leave it undone is to strike at the very heart of the soundness of the project. We would therefore urge the Inspector to include our proposals – to complete the link road from the outset and to re-route the RTS – as main modifications in their inspection report to transform the DPD from what is otherwise an extremely unsound plan which may even see the vision of the TCBGC dashed entirely, to one that is sound, pragmatic and meets all of its aspirations.

Addendum
We also include another Google map showing the RTS route we propose with the completed link road extended to include the local communities of Wivenhoe and Elmstead Market, shown in the attached file labelled Alt_RTS_Route_inc_Wivenhoe+Elmstead. The link to this Google map is shown below. As before, it allows the user to zoom in, move the map around and view in different ways just as you can with a regular Google map:
https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=1l_2-lZXvKwFsP70t6eIlW-1Hk6ktVzk&usp=sharing

The benefits from this extension to include neighbouring communities are as follows:

1) The extended route would provide value and convenience to Wivenhoe and Elmstead as a spinoff of the Garden Community, helping to ameliorate public opinion
2) It would as well help to fund the service whilst the Garden Community population density is still low and usage alone will not do so.
3) It would also extend the modal shift desired for the Garden Community into neighbouring communities, whilst giving them much needed extra services.

Note: The only additional cost to this route would be the provision of traffic signals at the end of School Road in Elmstead Market where currently there are none with the result that traffic on School Road waiting to turn left onto the A133 heading down towards the Garden Community has to wait until a convenient gap in the traffic coming from Clacton to be able to do so.

Change suggested by respondent:

The CLG contends that
a) The £21 million ring-fenced for the RTS should be instead put towards completing the link road FIRST, so that it is in place before the first houses are built and
b) the route for the RTS should be drastically changed to a route which does not utilise the A133 Clingoe Hill, already hugely congested, or go through an equally hugely congested central Colchester necessitating millions to widen roads and introduce bus lanes. Instead it should be redrawn to use the route suggested by the CLG and shown in the attached file labelled Alt_RTS_Route. This is already in part dedicated bus routes and will all , once the link road is constructed, be fit for use for a modern RTS system. That suggested route is shown in the attached file. It avoids Clingoe Hill in favour of already dedicated bus routes through Elmstead Road, Capon Road and Boundary Road (used by First Buses, routes S1 and 87), links all the key destinations required including the Northern Gateway and Garden Community Park and Choose, the hospital and North Station, together with a stop at the top of Balkerne Hill to access central Colchester, and the University and Knowledge Gateway. It would operate in a loop in an anti-clockwise direction, utilising roads which are already fit for use for a modern RTS system, thus saving millions of pounds. It would be in place as soon as the link road is constructed in full linking the A133 and the A120, ready for the new residents to adapt to new patterns of travel behaviour without the car, achieving modal shift, because all key destinations as listed above are quick, frequent and accessible via the RTS.

The key stops that the new route would link are as follows, starting from the Park and Choose at the bottom edge of the TCB Garden Community on the A133:
- The Garden Community stops (initially the first (southernmost) developed community)
- The A120 employment park, top right of the Garden Community (providing fast transport to work for Garden Community residents who are employed there)
- Severalls Lane and Colchester Business Park, also an employment hub. Shown on the map as being accessed via the Ipswich Road and Severalls Lane, Colchester Business Park does have a route into and through the Business Park from the A120/A12 junction, which may be preferable and give a smoother curve on the route.
- The Stadium
- Colchester Sports and Leisure Park
- Northern Gateway Park and Ride
- Colchester General Hospital
- Colchester North Station
- Top of Balkerne Hill stop for the town centre (by the old Embassy Suite)
- St Botolphs train station
- Bottom of Hythe Hill (for walking access to Hythe station just over the bridge over the river Colne)
- Start of Elmstead Road (for access to Tesco The Hythe)
- End of Capon Road, on Boundary Road, for access to Essex University's Innovation Centre, Essex Business School and the Knowledge Gateway Science and Business Park
- Back to the start of the loop at the Park and Choose on the junction of the A133.

The link to this Google map is shown below. It allows the user to zoom in, move the map around and view in different ways just as you can with a regular Google map. https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=1jDmOLSmGRF5PHD61n7TSBD5HlZiP__0&usp=sharing

Benefits of this recommended revised approach
The benefits completing the link road in its entirety BEFORE commencement of homes being built together with an RTS that utilises the anti-clockwise route shown are as follows:

1) Using the route proposed, no building work for extra bus lanes etc needs to be done on Clingoe Hill, in either direction, thus avoiding the horrendous congestion that would result therefrom.
2) No expensive road alterations need to be made through central and historic Colchester. The new route would skirt the town centre, with a key stop at the top of Balkerne Hill by the Embassy Rooms to access the centre, and then again at St Botolphs train station.
3) This could potentially pave the way for central Colchester to be pedestrianised or remain as it is, being served by local bus routes.
4) The proposed alternative to Clingoe Hill (Elmstead Road, Capon Road, Boundary Road, B1028/27 back to A133) is already a dedicated bus route (First Buses Routes S1 and 87)
5) Much of the route is already in place and fit for purpose for an RTS (A120, Severalls Lane, Axial Way, Via Urbis, plus Elmstead Road avoiding Clingoe Hill above) thus presenting a huge cost saving.
6) The saved cost of works on Clingoe Hill alone would contribute a large proportion of the monies needed for the completion of the link road.
7) The completed link road would immediately begin to relieve pressure on Clingoe Hill by providing a through route for traffic going to North Station or the hospital or the A12.
8) Because of the immediate fast access via the RTS anticlockwise route to North Station or the A120 employment park in the north west corner of the Garden Community or even Colchester Business Park, or Colchester General Hospital, new Garden Community residents working in London or any of the other locations would very easily adopt this modal shift from the outset. If there is a wait of 5-16 years for the link road to be completed this opportunity will have been lost. Much of the soundness of the TCBGC derives from its having the link road and not having to be dependent upon routes into Colchester, either for employment, schools, hospital care, shopping or travel.
9) It would meet the previous inspection's criterion for soundness as the link road would be doing as it was intended in siphoning traffic with onward destinations beyond Clingoe Hill off from the A133 and onto the A120 or beyond.
9) The Park and Choose on the Garden Community with the new RTS anti-clockwise route to access these destinations then also becomes a very real possibility from the outset.
10) Already it is painfully difficult to get a parking space in the hospital car park because it is so overloaded and people often have to drive around waiting for someone to leave before they can park. This will only be exacerbated with a larger demographic. However, with a fast RTS system adopting the proposed anti-clockwise route, residents from all communities east of Colchester can use the Park and Choose on the Garden Community to not only avoid battling with the traffic on A133 Clingoe Hill and beyond but avoid driving to the hospital at all using the RTS with the looping anti-clockwise route proposed by the CLG.

Recommendation
Very much of the strength and soundness of the TCBGC project relies on its provision of self sustainability ie for schools, healthcare, employment and shopping without having to travel outside of the Garden Community either to put added pressure on road infrastructure, or services found in surrounding communities. The RTS route plan shown in the current DPD, based on a link road that does not link, is in direct contradiction of this. As the point of the link road is to reduce traffic going into Colchester and a central tenet of the Garden Community is to be self-contained, why are huge sums being spent to provide an RTS to increase this traffic and access services outside the Garden Community? And this is at the expense of the mitigating link road, and using the very route whose traffic the link road was intended to alleviate. This is also in direct contravention of the

key principles of the Garden Community and one of the chief causes of controversy, concern and dismay, expressed from the outset, in local communities.

We would contend that the TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures report commissioned by the Councils and provided by Ringway Jacobs is far too narrow and limited in its outlook and with its RTS proposals and routing is merely providing a very expensive sticking plaster which will not meet demands even 10 years into the future, as the report itself admits: p5 'The RTS HIF project is introducing priority measures on the approach to Greenstead roundabout which is expected to operate satisfactorily up to 2033 for RTS vehicles' but 'In the potential second phase of investment post 2033, it would be expected that the garden community would be continuing to grow but a general increase in car trips could be threatening RTS reliability and worsening RTS journey times on the route west of Greenstead roundabout, which would work against achieving mode share targets and sustainable travel aims.'

Recommended movement and travel routes must therefore adopt a much broader future-proofed approach to accommodate the transport needs of an additional 17,500 people (2.3 persons living in each of 7,500 homes) on the east of Colchester. This is represented by the proposal outlined here by the CLG in putting the unnecessary sticking plaster monies described above towards completion of the link road as originally intended by the Housing Infrastructure Fund, together with the wider circular and much more economical RTS revised route, shown in the attached file, which will accommodate a thriving community 50 years into the future and beyond, without impinging on or increasing congestion of surrounding road and central Colchester infrastructure. To do anything else is to render the whole of the good work done by the planners in other areas such as Land Uses and Spatial Approach, and the aspirations embodied in both the Section 1 Local Plan and other TCBGC policies hamstrung at best by this crippling and at best wholly inadequate approach.

Note: It is also of some concern that the plan currently proposed is based on a report (TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures) by an organisation (Jacobs part of Ringway Jacobs, who describe themselves thus: 'We design, create and maintain world-class, safe, efficient and environment-friendly highway infrastructure for local authorities') which may stand directly to gain commercially and financially from these very expensive and by their own admission inadequate and time-limited plans. It is also of concern that the proposal actually in real terms detracts from the soundness of and benefit to the TCBGC, by utilising funds which should go towards the full completion of the link road, as well as actually exacerbating harm to surrounding communities.

The CLG assert therefore that it is absolutely vital NOT to delay the completion of the link road – it was deemed to be fundamental to the soundness of the TCB Garden Community by the last inspection and on it hang very many of the Garden Community's goals and aspirations. To leave it undone is to strike at the very heart of the soundness of the project. We would therefore urge the Inspector to include our proposals – to complete the link road from the outset and to re-route the RTS – as main modifications in their inspection report to transform the DPD from what is otherwise an extremely unsound plan which may even see the vision of the TCBGC dashed entirely, to one that is sound, pragmatic and meets all of its aspirations.

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: As a local resident living on the east of Colchester, and representing other residents in the Community Liaison Group from communities surrounding the search area, I am very well aware of the A133 Clingoe Hill congestion problems, and having lived in Colchester for nearly 50 years and at my current address for 40 years, as well as working at Colchester Institute for 15 years on the other side of Colchester, and in Witham and Braintree for 10 years prior to that, I know Colchester and its road network and the frustrations pertaining to that extremely well. As a result of that in-depth knowledge, I am also aware that the current plan is both poorly thought-out, ill advised, unnecessary and actually harmful to the implementation of the TCBGC, about which I and the rest of the CLG are passionate and with which we have been involved, as CLG, for the last three years, and for some of us, since 2011. Having worked with the planners to agree a plan which is basically sound in all aspects apart from this policy, we do not want to see it fail when a much better, future proofed and more cost-effective alternative is available.
Attachments: Alt_RTS_Route.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/b
Alt_RTS_Route_inc_Wivenhoe+Elmstead.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/c
CLG Rep Policy 7 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tf

145 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr David Ward [134]

Summary:

Additional traffic onto A133

Full text:

A look at any recent new development confirms the fact that most individual properties have at least one car, more often two. There are no peak time queques at local bus stops and most buses seem to run well below capacity. 7,500 houses, so maybe 10,000 cars at least. This link road will feed into the already congested Clinghoe Hill / Greenstead Roundabout area as it combines with the A133. In addition the University is expanding, creating additional traffic.

People will always use the most convienient mode of transport and whilst I applaud the desire to encourage more sustainable modes of transport, not all journeys are local or are achievable by many folk.

Change suggested by respondent:

Vehicular access only available via the A120, no access to the A133, apart from public transport, cycles, footpaths etc.

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

147 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr James Marchant [138]

Summary:
The link road must be completed before the first houses are built, otherwise there will be significant extra congestion in Colchester.

Full text:
The link road must be completed before the first houses are built, otherwise there will be significant extra congestion in Colchester.

Change suggested by respondent:
The link road should be completed before housing development starts.
The RTS should use the link road, going anti-clockwise around Colchester, a route which would require minimal expenditure and avoids Clingoe Hill using already existent bus routes.
Please see submissions from Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Liaison Group.

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

155 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:
What a wonderful idea that people will walk, cycle to work, school, etc. realistically this will not happen. I feel that this report glosses over the fact that most people have at least two cars, mainly because they need vehicles for work, shopping, school runs etc. to suggest that by merely installing these utopian visions of a green, traffic free, we will ignore the reality that the roads around colchester will be more congested by this development, people will not do their weekly shop by bus, or cycle, the rapid transit system will not cater to the needs of everyone.

Full text:
What a wonderful idea that people will walk, cycle to work, school, etc. realistically this will not happen. I feel that this report glosses over the fact that most people have at least two cars, mainly because they need vehicles for work, shopping, school runs etc. to suggest that by merely installing these utopian visions of a green, traffic free, we will ignore the reality that the roads around colchester will be more congested by this development, people will not do their weekly shop by bus, or cycle, the rapid transit system will not cater to the needs of everyone.

Change suggested by respondent:
Drastically reduced and more realistic reports on the negative impacts this will have, as we know there will be many of them.

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

165 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Summary:
The concept of the community was presented as being infrastucture driven, with a link road being a key feature due to the increasing traffic issues affecting this side of Colchester. Without this being built/ completed before development begins, these issues will only increase. Existing roads within the search area are country lanes, in the main, that cannot sustain large numbers of vehicles. The RTS that is proposed is a bus service that will be 'demand led', yet does not fully recognise the increasing growth of out of town amenities around Colchester which mean people need transport to get to them.

Full text:
The concept of the community was presented as being infrastucture driven, with a link road being a key feature due to the increasing traffic issues affecting this side of Colchester. Without this being built/ completed before development begins, these issues will only increase. Existing roads within the search area are country lanes, in the main, that cannot sustain large numbers of vehicles. The RTS that is proposed is a bus service that will be 'demand led', yet does not fully recognise the increasing growth of out of town amenities around Colchester which mean people need transport to get to them.

Change suggested by respondent:
There should be a clear obligation for the link road to be completed before development begins.

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

170 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:

The Cling Hill access to Colchester is already very congested, with long delays at peak periods. The A133 to A120 link road needs to be in place before the development starts, to mitigate the impact of the new community on this choke point.
While the rapid transit system appears a good idea, it looks like it will need expensive subsidy and capital spend to deliver. Given that usage is likely to be low until there are a substantial number of houses in the new development, it would be better to complete the link road and delay the rapid transit system.

Full text:

The Cling Hill access to Colchester is already very congested, with long delays at peak periods. The A133 to A120 link road needs to be in place before the development starts, to mitigate the impact of the new community on this choke point.
While the rapid transit system appears a good idea, it looks like it will need expensive subsidy and capital spend to deliver. Given that usage is likely to be low until there are a substantial number of houses in the new development, it would be better to complete the link road and delay the rapid transit system.

Change suggested by respondent:

Complete the A120/A133 link road before development starts.
Explain how developers will ensure that streets in Wivenhoe are not used for new community residents parking for Wivenhoe train station.
Delay rapid transit system until there is a reasonable number of houses, using the funds released to complete the link road.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

176 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

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

Summary:

Our particular concern is Bromley Road. The policy states that 'The Garden Community must restrict vehicular connectivity, except for public transport and emergency vehicles, between the 'Link Road' and Bromley Road' meaning that Crockleford Hub residents will not be able to access the link road (although also meaning that residents of the other Hubs and people coming off the link road will not be able to drive to Bromley Road).

See earlier attachment.

Full text:

Our particular concern is Bromley Road. The policy states that 'The Garden Community must restrict vehicular connectivity, except for public transport and emergency vehicles, between the 'Link Road' and Bromley Road' meaning that Crockleford Hub residents will not be able to access the link road (although also meaning that residents of the other Hubs and people coming off the link road will not be able to drive to Bromley Road).

Chapter 8: Movement and Connections
Traffic impact and Bromley Road It appears that the only route that residents from the new Crockleford Hub, which straddles the Bromley Road, would be able to use to drive to Colchester would be along Bromley Road. Hence we remain very concerned about the impact on Bromley Road and the ongoing routes in to Colchester and/or through Ardleigh to join the A137.
We are also concerned about the short to medium term impact on traffic through Crockleford of any delay to the A120/A133 link road and to the rapid transport system. The DPD appears to be silent on the memorandum of understanding reported to the Joint Committee on 27 February due to the shortfall in funding for the Link Road, which we understood would delay the final stages of the link road until the first buildings were underway.
Our residents are also worried about construction traffic and noise of construction particularly for residents living on or using Bromley Road and the small lanes which connect to it. The experience of the recent development (145 houses) at the Salary Brook end of Bromley Road has been that this has been very disruptive indeed to residents. Any closures to parts of Clingoe Hill, or added congestion there, will inevitably lead to the lanes through Crockleford being used as rat runs (more than is already the case- confirmed as a current practice in the Wivenhoe Society submission).
We welcome the extension of the Rapid Transport System (RTS) in to the new Crockleford development as this will improve connections by public transport to the other hubs and to Colchester. We do not think there has been adequate modelling though and are sceptical as to whether the links to Colchester will be the ones most needed/ used. For example in our Neighbourhood Plan consultation Ardleigh residents highlighted links to Ipswich, Manningtree and countryside and coast and to the A12 and A137 as well as proximity to Colchester as key benefits/ strengths of our Parish.
To avoid further traffic congestion on Bromley Road and the routes from it, we broadly welcome North and South settlements not being able to drive to the Bromley Road, however, Crockleford hub residents will not be able to access the Link Road.
We are not convinced that changes to patterns of car use will happen quicky enough to avoid serious problems with congestion and road safety on the existing road network and the proposals seem to be based more on hope than evidence-based expectation.

Change suggested by respondent:

We are worried about the potential implications on and beyond Bromley Road and want to see more modelling and evidence that this can deliver the objectives and not have unintended consequences for our residents.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: As before. This area is a key concern for us and our residents. If there is a hearing we may wish to address it.

Attachments: None

185 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

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

Summary:

- Existing congestion in Elmstead village will be made worse. NO proposal to improve A133 in this location.
- Should make sustainable travel easier, not private car journeys harder.
- Streets should be primarily for travel, not play.
- Travel connections biased towards Colchester.
- Only connection to Tendring is by car.
- Concerns around illustrative plan, irregularities around access to southern neighbourhood and dead end connections, pedestrian connections over A133, indirect route of cycle route in north east.

Part A
- Unclear language and meaning.
- Modal share targets should be stronger and more aspirational.

Part B
- Concerned that parking control in GC will lead to problems elsewhere.

Part C
- Concerned over how convenient public transport will be.
- Greater distinction needed between RTS and other bus operators.

Part D
- Concerns regarding wider connectivity and effectiveness of RTS due to congested roads.

Part E
- Electric vehicle charging ranks will increase pressure on land use and density.

Part F
- Park and choose without direct access to A120 is ineffective.

Part G
- Concerned about moving parking problems elsewhere.
- No provision for HGV parking.

Part I
- Object to direct junction from A133 to GC. All access should be from the link road.
- Restricting car journeys between link road and Bromley Road will negatively impact existing residents of Bromley Road who have links to Elmstead.
- Horse riding shouldn't be a high priority.

Justification
- A single healthcare hub can't be accessible within 20-minutes from all neighbourhoods.
- Link road will lead to high to severe impact on breathable air quality in Elmstead (and GC site)
- Planning has been biased to Colchester's benefit.

Full text:

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

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: It is necessary for the Parish Council to represent its community.
Attachments: EPC Representations - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tv

189 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mrs Julie Young [146]

Summary:

I support the alternative proposal submitted by the community liaison group as supplied by email as this portal is not suitable to input the arguments

Full text:

I support the alternative proposal submitted by the community liaison group as supplied by email as this portal is not suitable to input the arguments

Change suggested by respondent:

The route of the RTS to enable a saving to be made available to ensure the link road is completed.

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Written Representation
Attachments: Movement and Connections Response 1.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/m

195 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

TCBGC risks serious traffic congestion in Colchester because:
* the modal shift assumptions are too optimistic
* there is doubt about whether the second phase of the A120/A133 link road will be delivered
* there is confusion about the traffic modelling - does it include the link road or not?
* the costs of the link road and RTS have not been disclosed, nor have the full terms of the HIF agreement

Full text:

Road capacity: The RTS is to run along the already congested Clinghoe Hill route. I'm concerned that it will cause further tailbacks for cars, and believe that the circular route suggested by the Community Liaison Group should be considered as an alternative.

Traffic modelling: I was very concerned to hear that the traffic modelling didn't need to be changed for the phasing of the link road. It undermines the credibility of the modelling: clearly the link road is fundamental to TCBGC's sustainability and any delay in its delivery will cause major traffic problems.

Modal shift: Progress has been made on planning the rapid transit system, but the modal shift assumptions are too optimistic. I cannot see how the proposed RTS will attract sufficient usage unless it can be competitive in terms of cost, time and convenience. The only way to achieve material modal shift without deliberately creating traffic jams is to bring in congestion charging, something not remotely on the political agenda.

The A120/A133 Link Road: Colchester was forced to accept the phased approach to the link road at the last minute, too late to consider alternative solutions. The developer is only promising to complete the second (and more complex) phase "when it is practically and financially possible to do so".

At present Colchester's only protection comes from the Section 1 Plan which states that "Before any planning approval is granted for development ….. the following strategic transport infrastructure must have secured planning consent and funding approval
a) A120-A133 link road: and
b) Route 1 of the RTS …."

Planning consent has already been granted, and the developer may well argue that it has received funding approval from its parent. But it could be years before anything is actually delivered.

Change suggested by respondent:

Two new restrictions are needed in addition to those in the Section 1 plan:
i) No new housing can be started until both phases of the A120-A133 link road are started on site, and
ii) no dwellings can be occupied before the link road is completed and operational.

Colchester needs reassurance that it won't be forced to accept further compromises on infrastructure provision without proper discussion. The duty to co-operate was tested by the last minute phasing of the link road, and the City Council's frustration was expressed in the formal resolution passed (see my appendix 3).

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I am in a position to help the Inspector understand Colchester's concerns about transport infrastructure provision and traffic congestion. Also to contribute on the costing and phasing issues.

Attachments: None

197 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mr Mark Cory [147]

Summary:

The DPD does not require the completion of the "Link Road" prior to housing development taking place. This must be a stipluation to ensure it carries out the fuction it is there for. The consultation page outlines: "The A120-A133 Link Road... is scheduled to open in 2026. Its objective is to support growth at the Garden Community, manage congestion in this wider locality and improve connectivity. " It simply will not meet Garden Community Policy requirements or requirements outlined in the planning permission if it is built in two phases and not completed before house-building commences.

Full text:

The DPD does not require the completion of the "Link Road" prior to housing development taking place. This must be a stipluation to ensure it carries out the fuction it is there for. The consultation page outlines: "The A120-A133 Link Road... is scheduled to open in 2026. Its objective is to support growth at the Garden Community, manage congestion in this wider locality and improve connectivity. " It simply will not meet Garden Community Policy requirements or requirements outlined in the planning permission if it is built in two phases and not completed before house-building commences.

Change suggested by respondent:

The A120-A133 Link Road must be completed in full prior to house-building starting. Full road completion is a requirement to carry out its strategic and directly important role for the local road network, delivering on its purpose and policy objectives.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: As County Councillor and City Councillor for the site - also attended and commented at the ECC Planning Application of the A120-A133 Link Road.

Attachments: None

201 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections

Respondent: Mr Phil Sadler [152]

Summary:

The Link Road must be built prior to the housing development commencing

Full text:

The DPD does not require the completion of the "Link Road" prior to housing development taking place. This must be a stipluation to ensure it carries out the fuction it is there for. The consultation page outlines: "The A120-A133 Link Road... is scheduled to open in 2026. Its objective is to support growth at the Garden Community, manage congestion in this wider locality and improve connectivity. " It simply will not meet Garden Community Policy requirements or requirements outlined in the planning permission if it is built in two phases and not completed before house-building commences.
Change to plan:
The A120-A133 Link Road must be completed in full prior to house-building starting. Full road completion is a requirement to carry out its strategic and directly important role for the local road network, delivering on its purpose and policy objectives.

Change suggested by respondent:

Change to plan:
The A120-A133 Link Road must be completed in full prior to house-building starting. Full road completion is a requirement to carry out its strategic and directly important role for the local road network, delivering on its purpose and policy objectives

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

203 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Liberal Democrats Colchester (Mrs michelle burrows, Local Cit Councillor) [151]

Summary:
The DPD does not require the completion of the "Link Road" prior to housing development taking place. This must be a stipluation to ensure it carries out the fuction it is there for. The consultation page outlines: "The A120-A133 Link Road... is scheduled to open in 2026. Its objective is to support growth at the Garden Community, manage congestion in this wider locality and improve connectivity. " It simply will not meet Garden Community Policy requirements or requirements outlined in the planning permission if it is built in two phases and not completed before house-building commences.

Full text:
The DPD does not require the completion of the "Link Road" prior to housing development taking place. This must be a stipluation to ensure it carries out the fuction it is there for. The consultation page outlines: "The A120-A133 Link Road... is scheduled to open in 2026. Its objective is to support growth at the Garden Community, manage congestion in this wider locality and improve connectivity. " It simply will not meet Garden Community Policy requirements or requirements outlined in the planning permission if it is built in two phases and not completed before house-building commences.

Change suggested by respondent:
The A120-A133 Link Road must be completed in full prior to house-building starting. Full road completion is a requirement to carry out its strategic and directly important role for the local road network, delivering on its purpose and policy objectives.

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

231 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]
Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:
Supports the principle of Chapter 8 which includes GC Policy 7, welcome the changes in language introduced since the Regulation 18 response across a number of key areas which provide flexibility as the design process evolves. Some objections remain, principally to assist with seeking to achieve the aims and objectives for the Garden Community through the planning application process, so that it is designed and built in a way that reduces the need to travel, especially by car; promotes sustainable travel modes and can adapt and respond to future transport challenges and emerging technologies such as connected and autonomous vehicles.

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
The DPD and accompanying evidence base is unclear on the vehicular access for the Crockleford Neighbourhood, including the approach stated in GC Policy 1 and GC Policy 7, Part A. It is unclear from reading these policies alongside the transport evidence base (para 1 and 2) whether the Crockleford Neighbourhood is expected to have vehicular access to the new A120 – A133 Link Road and/or the Bromley Road. Parts of the Crockleford Neighbourhood to the north of Bromley Road will require vehicular access from Bromley Road, however there are some references in the DPD to Bromley Road being a sustainable movement / active travel corridor only, which could restrict the use of Bromley Road and have an impact on existing homes and businesses as well as homes further north of the A120. It is important that the evidence base and policy wording across the DPD is clear and consistent on this point to identify a feasible strategy for movement to, from and within Crockleford and Bromley Road in the DPD. This will also enable the sustainable transport strategy required to support the Crockleford Community to be developed through the planning application.
Recommended detailed wording changes to the draft DPD text are provided at Appendix 3 of the attached document.

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

232 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:
Extremely worrying that DPD fails to mention extreme difficulties there are with the delivery of a link road. WTC do not see how it can still be considered the most appropriate site, or sustainable at all, without the link road and rapid transport system being proven as deliverable.
No confidence link road will be completed. There is no limit specified as to how many dwellings can be built before the completion of a link road.
Original HIF grant application set out road network would not be able to sustain more than 1000 new homes without the road.
No guarantee will be delivered in an infrastructure first capacity.

Full text:
See attached letter for full text

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: WTC councillors request that they can make representations at the Hearing.
Attachments: Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

233 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:
DPD does not detail design and delivery of RTS. No evidence that planning consent and funding have been secured.
Not credible to suggest classed as rapid, no evidence quicker or cheaper than using car.
RTS fundamentally flawed as existing roads not big enough for bus lanes and car traffic.
No detail on how traffic priority can be given to the bus.
No link to university campus or local bus routes from Brightlingsea via Wivenhoe to Colchester, new residents travelling from Garden Community would not be able to interchange to local bus network. University students would not finance the RTS.

Full text:
See attached letter for full text

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: WTC councillors request that they can make representations at the Hearing.
Attachments: Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

242 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:
The traffic modelling acompanying the DPD replies on demonstrably unachievable modal shifts.
Question independence and accuracy of modelling (work completed by Ringway Jacobs who are under direct appointment to ECC)
No plan to mitigate determinetal impact to overzealous emphais on active travel will have on getting other traffic moving.
Little detail on what mitgation measures will be, it is impossibnle to comment on if they will have a postive impact.
A more direct RTS route to a junction opposite the current Knowledge Gateway would be more productive and pedestrain and cycle crossings for A133 should be provided via bridges.
Disappointed not willing to introduce intiatives.
Modal shift predictions can go badly wrong. Looking too far into the future is inadvisable. Figures in DPD (pg 95) not fully explained.

Full text:
See attached letter for full text

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: WTC councillors request that they can make representations at the Hearing.
Attachments: Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

243 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:
Reduction in local adult rail communting.
Rail companies no apetite to increase number of trains per hour
Local bus services pushed into crisis
DPD policy needs to be bases on realistic and achieable propositions and robust enough it cannot be watered down at planning application
Nothing in evidence to justify RTS will be quicker than travelling by car
Park and Choose new route will not have incentive to attract enough users
Traffic modelling assumes full modal change being achieved. Creates overly optimisic figures. 2033 to 2041 figures need reworking.

Full text:
See attached letter for full text

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: WTC councillors request that they can make representations at the Hearing.
Attachments: Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

244 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:
To comply with Policy SP6.1 of Local Plan, DPD needs to give details of Route 1 (RTS).
Conflicting infromation on position of RTS stops.
Uncertainty of RTS line to Employment Areas.
Clarification needed on 'Express route' to north station and location of park and choose.
No clearly defined start date for RTS
Active travel comprised if sport pitches other side of A133 and link road being a through route.

Full text:
See attached letter for full text

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: WTC councillors request that they can make representations at the Hearing.
Attachments: Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

245 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:
Colchester's roads have no spare capacity, already suffer from chronic congestion and gridlock are an everyday event.
DPD is unambitious re public transport
DPD heavily dependent on Active Travel. Cyclingto and from Colchester along A133 is not attractive proposition. Greenstead roundabout is lethal.
City Centre is not cycle friendly.
DPD active travel modal shift for longer journeys are very unambitious at 10%. Multi modal journeys overlooked.
Walking and cycling to RTS stops will be easy enough but RTS will take 25 minutes to Colchester North, unlikely to be popular option for long distance journeys.

Full text:
See attached letter for full text

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: WTC councillors request that they can make representations at the Hearing.
Attachments: Wivenhoe Town Council - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sg

265 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: National Highways (Mr Mark Norman, Spatial Planner) [173]

Summary:

Concerns are raised around traffic Forecasting of Strategic Models. In particular, the phasing of development.

Traffic Forecasting of trips rates & mode shares.
Design and capacity of the new A120 junction.
Concerns over noise and air pollution from highway network on new development.

Concerns that drainage will be into the highway network system.

The base year CTM represents a 2019 Base Year and will reflect the pattern of trip making and travel behaviour that existed prior to the Covid-19 pandemic.

There are no detailed forecasts available to review and there has been no separate assessment of the traffic generated by the TCBGC proposals. Therefore, there is no information available in order to assess the impact of TCBGC on the highways network.

Full text:

See attachments.

Change suggested by respondent:

Further review of the evidence base work needs to be undertaken.
If the link road is to be delivered in two parts, impact on the highway network must be assessed for that time until the new junction is complete.
Proposed working with the Councils to address noise and air pollution issues. Consideration should be given for a bespoke Policy on noise and air pollution.
It is recommended that the advice on proportionate accounting for Covid 19 in prior calibrated models as set out in Appendix B of TAG M4 (Forecasting and uncertainty) issued in May 2023, should be taken into account to adjust the 2019 CTM matrices.

Forecasts prepared using CTM would require sensitivity testing to take account of the greater uncertainty arising from Covid-19.

When preparing forecasts from assessing TCBGC, to comply with advice set out in paragraph B2.3 of TAG M4 issued May 20223 sensitivity testing should be carried out to assess the further potential for change with respect to the long-term impact of Covid 19. This sensitivity testing should be carried out in line with best practice set out within DfT's Uncertainty Toolkit.

Further information is required on modelling. See representation for further details.

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: National Highways Full Rep - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/ts
Appendix 1 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tt
Appendix 2 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/t3

271 Object

Document Element: GC Policy 7. Movement and Connections
Respondent: Mr Peter Kay [94]

Summary:

- Over reliance on car journeys.
- Too much workplace parking in Colchester.
- Insufficient public transport.
- Insufficient explanation to current modal share figures, impact on local road and origins of TCBGC.
- No costs of RTS and insufficient detail of operation.
- Existing Park and Ride failed, Park and Choose will also fail.
- No evidence of current and predicted flows on other roads in vicinity of TCBGC.
- DPD non compliance with S1.Policy.SP6 (RTS).
- Contradictory of location of Park and Choose.
- Unsustainable financial position of RTS.

Full text:

Please see attachment for full submission

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Not specified
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments: Peter Kay - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tz