330 Support

Document Element: MM28 (Main)

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

Summary:

The proposed modification to GC Policy 3 directly responds to a representation made by Sport England on the Submission version of the DPD with respect to providing accuracy about the Active Design reference in the policy. The modified policy is therefore supported.

Full text:

The proposed modification to GC Policy 3 directly responds to a representation made by Sport England on the Submission version of the DPD with respect to providing accuracy about the Active Design reference in the policy. The modified policy is therefore supported.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

356 Object

Document Element: MM28 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer object to modification MM28 in that it refers to achieving a secure by design certification rather than to follow Secured by Design principles, as set out in Latimer's Regulation 19 representations (paragraph 5.3). Whilst Latimer support the ambition to ensure the Garden Community is a safe place to live, work and visit, as worded, Policy 3 as drafted, and the proposed amendment would be overly prescriptive, and these are ultimately matters of detail that will be addressed within a planning application.

Full text:

Latimer object to modification MM28 in that it refers to achieving a secure by design certification rather than to follow Secured by Design principles, as set out in Latimer's Regulation 19 representations (paragraph 5.3).

Whilst Latimer support the ambition to ensure the Garden Community is a safe place to live, work and visit, as worded, Policy 3 as drafted, and the proposed amendment would be overly prescriptive, and these are ultimately matters of detail that will be addressed within a planning application. Further, some designing out crime principles go against good placemaking so a more flexible application of the requirements should be applied in the round. It is therefore recommended that MM28 is not accepted and the list at Part D of GC Policy 3 is removed from Policy 3 but that a reference should be included either in policy or supporting text stating that developments should be designed with regard to user safety and seek to achieve relevant local or national principles relating to safety in accordance with good placemaking and design principles.

Change suggested by respondent:

It is recommended that MM28 is not accepted and the list at Part D of GC Policy 3 is removed from Policy 3 but that a reference should be included either in policy or supporting text stating that developments should be designed with regard to user safety and seek to achieve relevant local or national principles relating to safety in accordance with good placemaking and design principles.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

443 Support

Document Element: MM28 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM28 – support sports England's clarification.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

304 Object

Document Element: MM31 (Main)

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

Summary:

In principle we support this modification but it needs to be amended

Full text:

In principle we support this modification but it needs to be amended

Change suggested by respondent:

There must be specific mention of Wivenhoe Park
and the listed gatehouse on Colchester Road.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Attachments: None

420 Support

Document Element: MM31 (Main)
Respondent: Historic England [128]
Agent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planner Advisor) [195]

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

Full text:
see attachments for full submission

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Yes
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/37
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/38

444 Object

Document Element: MM31 (Main)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM31 – strongly support historic England's intention with the modification. However we are concerned that if a proposal has both significant positive and negative effects of these heritage assets the outcome is entirely subjective and this wording does not present decision makers with a method to reach a policy based conclusion.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

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

357 Support

Document Element: MM32 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM32, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The amendment provides additional clarity and brings the DPD in line with the NPPF.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM32, this being an amendment agreed between Latimer and the Councils in the joint Statement of Common Ground, dated 18 April 2024. The amendment provides additional clarity and brings the DPD in line with the NPPF.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

422 Support

Document Element: MM32 (Main)
Respondent: Historic England [128]
Agent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planner Advisor) [195]

Summary:
Welcome the proposed change for consistency with NPPF.

Full text:
see attachments for full submission

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Yes
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/37
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/38

445 Object

Document Element: MM32 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM32 – We believe this could be better worded to focus on avoiding conflict with the few heritage assets relevant to the site, with minimizing conflict as a last resort. The revised wording is concerning as it presents a binary choice to either enhance the historic environment OR better reveal the significance. We suggest better phrasing would encourage both in policy.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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

428 Support

Document Element: MM33 (Main)
Respondent: Historic England [128]
Agent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planner Advisor) [195]

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

Full text:
see attachments for full submission

Change suggested by respondent:
-

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: Yes
Comply with duty: Not specified
Attachments:
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/37
scanned representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/38

446 Support

Document Element: MM33 (Main)
Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]
Agent: Elmstead Parish Council (Mrs Angela Baxter, Parish Clerk) [145]

Summary:

MM 33 – support historic England's classification

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

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

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

331 Support

Document Element: MM34 (Main)

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

Summary:

The proposed modification to GC Policy 3 directly responds to a representation made by Sport England on the Submission version of the DPD with respect to providing clarity about how developers should demonstrate that they have considered Active Design opportunities. The modified policy is therefore supported.

Full text:

The proposed modification to GC Policy 3 directly responds to a representation made by Sport England on the Submission version of the DPD with respect to providing clarity about how developers should demonstrate that they have considered Active Design opportunities. The modified policy is therefore supported.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

358 Support

Document Element: MM34 (Main)

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

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

Summary:

Latimer support modification MM34 – the Active Design Assessment will be incorporated into the Design and Access Statement for the hybrid planning application, but the principles are embedded throughout the masterplan, prioritising people over cars, promoting active travel and making walking and cycling easier, safer and more convenient than the car.

Full text:

Latimer support modification MM34 – the Active Design Assessment will be incorporated into the Design and Access Statement for the hybrid planning application, but the principles are embedded throughout the masterplan, prioritising people over cars, promoting active travel and making walking and cycling easier, safer and more convenient than the car.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

447 Support

Document Element: MM34 (Main)

Respondent: Elmstead Parish Council [144]

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

Summary:

MM34 – support sport England's clarification.

Full text:

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

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

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

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

Change suggested by respondent:

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

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

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

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

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments:

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