Submissions from the Wivenhoe Society

Main Matter 1

Question: *does the content and timescale for the preparation of the DPD accord with the latest version of the Local Development Scheme*

The Tendring Local Development scheme states that the DPD '*will include a concept and master 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. It will also include 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.'* . This is close to the wording of SP9 of Section 1 of the Local Plan

The Colchester Local Development scheme is less explicit on the contents of the DPD

Section 1 of the Local Plan sets out requirements for the DPD in policies SP6, SP8 and SP9. The DPD does not satisfy all of these.

i)Phasing: Both SP6 and SP9 require that the phasing of development is specified in the DPD. One issue here is that it now appears to be proposed that the Link Road is built in two phases. The DPD does not make this clear and there is no policy on how many dwellings could be built be built with only half a link road nor is there any evidence in the document base on the traffic implications of this.

ii) Policy SP9 (para 25) requires '*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'*. Land is allocated for additional sports fields but not for building. (The University is opposed to student housing to the north of the A133. A possible partial solution would be for the DPD to allocate additional Knowledge Gateway land to the north of the A133 and for the land not yet developed on the existing Knowledge Gateway site to be re-designated by Colchester for university accommodation.)

Question: *Has the DPD been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal* ....
The SA examines various options and appraises the policies in the final DPD version. It does not directly address the issue of the impact of increased traffic both on journey times and air pollution issues (for example at the Greenstead Roundabout).

Question: *Does the policies map correctly illustrate geographically the policies of the DPD?*
The maps shown in the various policy statements are described as 'illustrative' so it is not clear what there geographical implications are. There are differences between these illustrative maps and what is shown on the Policies Map. For example the Policies Map shows a possible park and ride and some University buildings on land to the south of the A133 (without making it clear whether these are sports associated) but the Strategic Illustrative Framework Master Plan shows its use for sports grounds. The Movements and Connections illustrative framework plan shows potential crossing points on the A133 but these are not included on the Policies Map.

Question: *Do the policies in the DPD provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?*

i)The Local Plan specifies that no planning approval can be given until funding has been secured for the Link Road. The DPD does not discuss the issue that to date insufficient funding has been approved. It needs to specify what is meant by funding being secured and whether any planning permissions can be granted and for what number of dwellings before the full (inflation proofed) funding is guaranteed.

ii)There is insufficient detail on layout, on provision and location of social facilities and on phasing and location of dwelling numbers in the DPD for any planning permission to be granted.

iii)Additional evidence on the traffic implications of a partial link road should be provided before development proposals can be assessed.

Main Matter 2, Land Uses (GC Policy 1)

Question: *Is the DPD's spatial strategy and the distribution of development supported by robust and up to date evidence and otherwise soundly based*

i)There is little or no robust evidence on the impact on traffic congestion of the suggested layout. A particular instance is the suggested entry point to the Knowledge Gateway employment land adjacent to the A133. This is shown on the policies map at the existing junction of the A133 and the B1027 which also shows this as the entry point for the RTS. Evidence on the effects on traffic flows is needed before this is adopted as a policy. There is also no study of the congestion implications of building the Link Road in two phases.

ii)The main sports facilities appear to be to the south of the A133 which is a busy dual carriageway which would be a safety hazard, particularly for children. and is remote from parts of the garden community.

Main Matter 5 Economic Activity and Employment (GC Policy 5)

The full link road is necessary for the delivery of the employment land allocated adjacent to the A120. Evidence is needed on how many jobs the employment land adjacent to the A133 would come forward in the initial years and whether these and any employment in local centres would be sufficient to meet the targets for employment within sustainable commuting distance before the full link is provided.

Main Matter 7 Movements and Connections (GC Policy 7)

Question: Are the requirements of the policy justified?

Making sustainable travel attractive is a desirable but people will still need to use cars. The policy appears to be that the South and North neighbourhoods will each have an access road to the link road with no vehicular connections between the neighbourhoods other than via the link road and the access roads apart for emergency vehicles and that there should be no vehicular access (apart from public transport and emergency vehicles) from the link road to the Bromley Road. This seems to imply that residents of Crockleford Heath (adjacent to the Bromley Road) either will not be able to access their homes by car from Bromley Road or will not be able to access the link road and so will be unable to connect to the other neighbourhoods using the link road. This would mean, for example that if they needed to go by car they would have to take a very circuitous route using the Bromley Road, Avon Way (a residential road) and the A133 in order to reach the proposed secondary

school. Similarly they would have to take this circuitous route to reach the sports fields to the south of the A133. This would reduce traffic in the southern and northern neighbourhoods but at the cost of increasing traffic in residential areas in Greenstead. No location is shown for a health hub but if just one is provided then the same problem would apply to this.

It is also the case that local residents use the existing link (via Slough Lane or Tye Road)) from the A133 to Bromley Road in the event of severe hold-ups/road closures on the A133 into Colchester. If only part of the link road is built and there is no link from it to Bromley Road then residents of Wivenhoe etc would have to take a very long detour going east to the junction with the A120 east of Frating. It is also possible that the residents of the southern and northern neighbourhoodsmight wish to access the various Bromley villages.

The proposal to have no vehicular access between the Link Road and Bromley Road needs to changed both from the point of view of having a functional garden community and for the sake of existing local residents.