76 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

Respondent: Mrs Sasha Phillips [91]

Summary:

' Where infrastructure cannot be provided within, or is not appropriate to be located on, the Garden Community site itself, developers will be expected to make a contribution to the cost to provide the infrastructure elsewhere'
So if needed, where will this end up being?????

Full text:

' Where infrastructure cannot be provided within, or is not appropriate to be located on, the Garden Community site itself, developers will be expected to make a contribution to the cost to provide the infrastructure elsewhere'
So if needed, where will this end up being?????

Change suggested by respondent:

If you are not sure, more planning is therefore needed!

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

101 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

Respondent: Mr Philip Robinson CBE [74]

Summary:

The TCBGC viability requires the early provision of the A120-A133 Link Road. In 2020 the GC team secured HIF funding for the Road which would be completed prior to any new homes' occupation.
The Councils announced in February 2023 insufficient funds for the full Road and would first build an A133 access section of the Road and would complete the Link Road an undefined time later, probably through s.106 funding, all within a non-binding MOU with the GC developer.
This radically different plan must be developed for, and examined in detail by, the Inspector to judge its soundness and viability.

Full text:

The Section 1 Examination of the TCBGC Plan emphasised an "infrastructure first" delivery approach in advance of any housing occupancy. This was most heavily emphasised for the A120-A133 Link Road due to the existing high traffic congestion particularly on the A133 approach road into Colchester. Now the A120-A133 Link Road Memorandum of Understanding document (non-binding) dated 24th February 2023, between ECC, CCC, TDC and Latimer Development Ltd envisages a first step to build a first portion of the Link Road to be constructed from the A133 to allow access to the Garden Community, this being caused by insufficient HIF funding being achieved. A second step is envisaged to complete the Link Road to its A120 junction.This second step could well be funded by the house builders via s.106 agreements at an undefined future date. After many years of planning, this non-binding MOU document (lacking any certainty and any detail)clearly represents a totally unsound plan at this stage for a major element of the GC.

Noting that the Colchester and Tendring shared Section 1 Local Plan requires funding of the Link Road to be secured prior to the approval of planning applications related to the TCBGC and noting the existing high traffic congestion on the A133 through Colchester (and particularly in the Clingoe Hill area) , the Plan outlined in the MoU may also not be viable. If the missing funding for the Link Road is paid by the house builders after (currently an undisclosed) number of houses are sold and occupied (under s.106 agreements), it is possible that the overload of traffic on the A133 from all the construction traffic and from new home owners could become unacceptably high before the Link Road is completed. This would render the current Garden Community project non-viable. This can only be established by the Councils being far more open on their revised Link Road plan with the public and the Section 19 Inspector, by developing a committed and detailed revised total Link Road plan within (or alongside) the Development Plan Document ie delivering to the Inspector a committed financial and time plan and, the related traffic density analyses to allow the Inspector to undertake an independent examination to establish whether this revised overall Link Road plan is sound and viable.

Change suggested by respondent:

As the A120-A133 Link Road is such a fundamental enabler for the GC, this radical change of approach (currently with no certainty re it's outcome) must be developed to a level of confidence in the approach (and in its impact on traffic congestion) and then included within, or linked to, the Development Plan Document .

In addition the detail of the feasibility of the new Road plan must be independently examined, under the direction of the Inspector. The plan and its examination must include the time frame for the completion of the complete Link Road, details of the total funding mechanism, the impact on traffic flows/congestion over the full construction period, the maximum number of dwellings to be occupied prior to the full road opening, and the contingencies included in the plan to ensure that this plan WILL deliver.

As this new Road Plan represents a fundamental change to the infrastructure first concept of the TCBGC, arguably this radically revised plan should also be subject to public consultation.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have commented on all previous rounds of Consultations and attended many of the public examinations. I have a keen interest in this project as I am a home owner within the beautiful rural and protected lane , that is Turnip Lodge Lane . This will be dramatically damaged in its setting by the GC developments and the new Link Road.

I am very keen to achieve the best result I can in minimising the impact on myself and my wife's lifestyle. I believe that helping to achieve the best result for the Garden Community as a whole is completely in line with this. I have a lifetime of experience in managing major engineering projects around the world.

Attachments: None

124 Support

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

Respondent: Anglian Water Services Ltd (Ms Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [40]

Summary:

Anglian Water welcomes the policy requirement to ensure developers work positively with other infrastructure providers throughout the planning process to ensure that the cumulative impact of development is considered and then mitigated, at the appropriate time. As outlined in the IDPFP, Anglian Water publishes an infrastructure charging schedule for connection to our water supply and wastewater networks. As most of the site is under the control of a master-developer, it is considered this should assist with preparing a consistent and efficient approach for planning and phasing infrastructure requirements across the site.

Full text:

Anglian Water welcomes the policy requirement to ensure developers work positively with other infrastructure providers throughout the planning process to ensure that the cumulative impact of development is considered and then mitigated, at the appropriate time, in line with their published policies and guidance. As outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan, Anglian Water publishes infrastructure charging schedule for connection to our water supply and wastewater networks. As most of the site is under the control of a master-developer, it is considered this should assist with preparing a consistent and efficient approach for planning and phasing infrastructure requirements across the site. We suggest that engagement with Anglian Water is undertaken at the earliest stage.

Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan (IDPFP):
Anglian Water has reviewed the IDPFP for the garden community in terms of water and wastewater infrastructure which is detailed in Section 8 Sustainable Infrastructure. We suggest that engagement with Anglian Water is undertaken at the earliest stage. It is noted that section 4.2 mentions contact has been made with the relevant utility providers – however, the list of utilities at the beginning of the section should include wastewater or sewerage, rather than only water supply.

4.2.4 Potable Water
The Water Resource Management Plans (WRMP24) have been updated for the period 2025 - 2050 in draft form and are available on the respective water companies' websites. As the statutory undertaker for water (within Colchester City local planning authority area, and sewerage undertaker for the entire Garden Community area, Anglian Water would welcome similar references to our Strategic Direction Statement and infrastructure funding requirements as per Affinity Water.

It is noted that reference is made to the ability for developers to work with a New Appointment and Variation (NAV) to provide water/wastewater services to a development. The text should also refer to Anglian Water rather than just Affinity Water, particularly in reference to sewerage connections. As the area covers both Anglian Water and Affinity Water water supply areas, there is no clear pathway on which company will supply water, unless a NAV is used by the developer who will then need to obtain a supply from either or both companies.

4.2.5 Wastewater
There is an error at the beginning of this section as it refers to the Anglian Water WRMP which should be referenced under 4.2.4 Potable Water. This section should refer to our recently finalised Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) which covers the period 2025 – 2050. The medium- and long-term strategy for Colchester water recycling catchment is wait and see, with population projected to increase by around 34,000 by 2050. The DWMP is updated every five years and will monitor growth and update with the latest information to guide our investments – this will be informed by growth in adopted development plans and the extent to which pre-development discussions have taken place with developers seeking connections. As we receive updated information, we will regularly review our figures internally to ensure our strategies are being implemented at the correct time and to the correct sizes.

We welcome the reference to engagement with Anglian Water regarding connections to our network and capacity enhancements. Early engagement ensures that the processes are in place and any upgrades can be provided in a timely manner to align with phasing of development across the new community.

Integrated Water Management Study Phase 2 (IWMS):
Anglian Water has published a draft Water Resources Management Plan for the period 2025 – 2050 which identifies strategic supply side options for the Essex South water resource zone, alongside the demand management options that will be taken forward across the Anglian Water region.

The final Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan 2025-2050 has now been published on our website. The medium- and long-term strategies for Colchester WRC have not changed from the draft version used in the study.

Both plans are referenced in further detail in our representation on the Plan and the IDPFP.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

159 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION
Respondent: Mrs Susan Burns [69]

Summary:
I have raised concerns in my previous statements that will address this matter.

Full text:
I have raised concerns in my previous statements that will address this matter.

Change suggested by respondent:
I have raised my concerns in previous statements that will address this matter.

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

167 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION
Respondent: Mr Christopher Burns [140]

Summary:
This is a very vague section of the Plan with little commitment to funding other than through references to possible sources. Given the link road was a key selling point of the scheme, it is concerning that full funding for this is not in place and that it is proposed to build a section rather than the whole road. A community of the scale planned will place significant demands on existing infrastructure and will impact upon existing roads and communities. The link road would help mitigate these.

Full text:
This is a very vague section of the Plan with little commitment to funding other than through references to possible sources. Given the link road was a key selling point of the scheme, it is concerning that full funding for this is not in place and that it is proposed to build a section rather than the whole road. A community of the scale planned will place significant demands on existing infrastructure and will impact upon existing roads and communities. The link road would help mitigate these.

Change suggested by respondent:
The link road must be built before development begins. If the intentions only to part build the road, the question arises as to whether the Plan is sound as it does not then meet garden community criteria.

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

172 Support

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [141]

Summary:

Need to ensure there are mechanisms in place to ensure the intent of this section is delivered.
Need to give a higher priority to the A133/A120 link road provision. That link road must be in place before development starts, otherwise other communities east of Colchester will suffer increased delay and disruption.

Full text:

Need to ensure there are mechanisms in place to ensure the intent of this section is delivered.
Need to give a higher priority to the A133/A120 link road provision. That link road must be in place before development starts, otherwise other communities east of Colchester will suffer increased delay and disruption.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

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

177 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

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

Summary:

We are concerned that the delay to the Link Road and the phased delivery of this may undermine the claim that the project will deliver infrastructure first. This is important at very stage for credibility of the project .

Consultation regarding expanded development area A triangular area around Jubilee Lane to the northwest of the maps was added in to the development area at the final stage. There are houses and businesses in this area which had hitherto been unaware that they may form part of the Garden Community. We asked in February for these residents to be directly notified.

Full text:

We are concerned that the delay to the Link Road and the phased delivery of this may undermine the claim that the project will deliver infrastructure first. This is important at very stage for credibility of the project .

Consultation regarding expanded development area A triangular area around Jubilee Lane to the northwest of the maps was added in to the development area at the final stage. There are houses and businesses in this area which had hitherto been unaware that they may form part of the Garden Community. We asked in February for these residents to be directly notified.

Change suggested by respondent:

Write to residents and businesses in the development area- especially the expanded area. Or confirm when this has happened.

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: As before
Attachments: None

187 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

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

Summary:

- Timely requires clarification, too ambiguous.
Part A
- Off-site capacity improvements supports rumours of temporary school classrooms, and compromises infrastructure first principles.

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: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: It is necessary for the Parish Council to represent the Parish.

Attachments:

EPC Representation - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tc

190 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION
Respondent: TCBGC Community Liaison Group [104]
Agent: Mrs Manda O'Connell [105]

Summary:

The CLG do not believe that the councils have gone far enough in identifying specifically the infrastructure required for each 'neighbourhood' together with formalising its introduction to align with building homes from the start; that this specification, found to a large part in the Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan (IDP) should be embedded within the policy where it prescribes these measures, a fundamental flaw has been introduced into the soundness of the DPD and the TCBGC project in allocating £21 million, needed to fully complete the A133-A120 link road, to an ill thought-out, time-limited and extraordinary costly RTS route.

Full text:

This policy states that 'Planning and delivering the required infrastructure is at the heart of sustainable development for the Garden Community' and that 'Proposals must demonstrate that the required infrastructure to support the development will be delivered in a timely and, where appropriate, phased manner'. Whilst the CLG fully supports these statements, we do not believe a) that the councils have gone far enough in identifying specifically the infrastructure required for each 'neighbourhood' together with formalising its introduction to align with building homes from the start, and that this specification, found to a large part in the Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan (IDP) should be embedded within the policy where it prescribes these measures, and b) a fundamental flaw has been introduced into the soundness of the DPD and the TCBGC project in allocating £21 million, needed to fully complete the A133-A120 link road, to an ill thought-out, time-limited and extraordinary costly RTS route. The CLG proposes instead that that same amount is used to fully complete the Link Road, introducing an RTS route that utilises the link road onto the A120 and in an anti-clockwise route around Colchester, using roads which are already fit for purpose, and in some cases (Elmstead Road, Capon Road and Boundary Road) are already dedicated bus routes (First Buses services S1 and 87).
It is the CLG's contention that the Housing Infrastructure Fund should indeed be spent on the necessary Link Road infrastructure it was provided to underpin, and doing this first, coupled with the better proposed RTS route described and shown in the attached document Alt_RTS_Route, will enable the Garden Community to achieve the modal shift required as well as relieving congestion on neighbouring road infrastructure, rather than adding to it as the current plan will do, and will replace the current plan which at great expense will only last 10 years by the author of the TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures report own admission (p5) for a plan which has the capacity to support a thriving population of 17K plus fifty years and beyond, and achieve the goals and aspirations of the TCBGC – in fact it is fundamental to their achievement.

Change suggested by respondent:

The CLG proposes instead that that same amount is used to fully complete the Link Road, introducing an RTS route that utilises the link road onto the A120 and in an anti-clockwise route around Colchester, using roads which are already fit for purpose, and in some cases (Elmstead Road, Capon Road and Boundary Road) are already dedicated bus routes (First Buses services S1 and 87).
It is the CLG's contention that the Housing Infrastructure Fund should indeed be spent on the necessary Link Road infrastructure it was provided to underpin, and doing this first, coupled with the better proposed RTS route described and shown in the attached document Alt_RTS_Route, will enable the Garden Community to achieve the modal shift required as well as relieving congestion on neighbouring road infrastructure, rather than adding to it as the current plan will do, and will replace the current plan which at great expense will only last 10 years by the author of the TCBGC Transport Evidence Base Part 2 Measures report own admission (p5) for a plan which has the capacity to support a thriving population of 17K plus fifty years and beyond, and achieve the goals and aspirations of the TCBGC – in fact it is fundamental to their achievement.

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: Because of detailed knowledge of the surrounding area and the proposed new RTS route.
Attachments:
Alt_RTS_Route.pdf - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/n
CLG Rep GC Policy 9 - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/td

196 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION
Respondent: Mr William Sunnucks [113]

Summary:

The challenges of delivery need to be recognised. New settlements of 7500 dwellings have rarely (if ever) been delivered since 1970. Please see my appendix 1.

The project isn't financially viable. Please see my appendix 2.

TCBGC doesn't own the land or have any agreement in place with the landowners for land value capture. Please see my appendices 3, 4 and 5.

Full text:

Please read my full submission and appendices which are available in the following dropbox https://www.dropbox.com/sh/skhjwuf7iswy8ej/AAA-lhfL-Wa67zIw_wbRQHu-a?dl=0 I will also send them by e-mail

Some specific points are listed here:

Phasing of infrastructure delivery:
The wording of Policy GC9 needs to be tightened if it is to provide adequate control, and the Infrastructure Delivery, Phasing and Funding Plan (IDPFP) needs to be legally tied to the Plan.

For example:
• it says that infrastructure will be delivered in a “timely and phased manner” (page 128).
• It should refer specifically to the IDPFP and require compliance with all its timings.
• If the developer wishes to deviate from IDPFP it should produce evidence showing that local residents will not be disadvantaged.
• Policy GC9 should be supported by a memorandum of understanding with Latimer acknowledging the IDPFP, the need to share land value uplift and the viability methodology.
• Policy GC9 should also be supported by a Phase 1 appraisal. Leaving it until planning application stage is too late in practice and in law (See the Viability PPG).

Reliance on a conventional planning application process is inappropriate given the scale of the project and the monopoly position of the applicant. The key commercial issues need to be resolved at plan stage, as per the Viability PPG : not left to a last minute s106 negotiation.

Community Infrastructure Levy: GC9 says that “the Councils will consider introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy” (page 129). £300m of cash infrastructure contributions are at stake (appendix 5), and it is a major weakness that the mechanism for collecting it is still so vague. If there is to be a CIL we should be know how it would work by now – who would collect it, how much per square metre, how it would cope with changing legislation, whether the housebuilder would pay or the master developer? Introducing it is a long process involving consultation and inspection and it needs to be planned. The idea either needs to be dropped or brought properly to life.

Definition of infrastructure to be paid for under s106: GC9 says that the “widest reasonable definition of infrastructure and infrastructure providers will be applied” page 129 and refers to the glossary. This is too vague and the developer’s s106 consultants will make hay. They will argue that much of the promised infrastructure isn’t directly needed to support the GC..

It is particularly important because most of the offsite transport infrastructure items listed in the IDFP are remote from the GC: the total is £110m including £21m contribution to the link road.

We clearly need a memorandum of understanding which ties Latimer into the scope of the project as defined in the IDFP and Gerald Eve appraisal.

Health provision: GC6 is vague and GC9 provides no further comfort. Well defined targets are needed, as with education where there is a well-established formula for the number of school places required . The developer needs to be committed to providing new surgery buildings, and we need something in writing from the NHS about funding for new staffing. At the Section 1 Inspection we heard high level strategic statements from the NHS about new models for primary care delivery but there was no practical commitment to delivery.

We can’t expect communities to support development if their existing over-stretched health facilities are to be further diluted.

HIF Agreement: GC9 requires applicants to comply with the conditions of the Housing Infrastructure Fund, but these are laid out in a secret document to which Colchester’s Councillors have no access. It isn’t clear how a sound plan can incorporate secret requirements such as this.

Homes England have refused a Freedom of Information request for the HIF agreement, arguing that publication is against the public interest, a position that should be challenged: if it must remain secret then the plan must refer to each relevant requirement rather than the document as a whole.

Contributions to the link road: the cost over-runs on the link road and Rapid Transit System are also secret and

fundamental to the plan. Their disclosure is in the public interest and the Inspector will need to understand them. I suggest that the details be published, with some redactions for commercially sensitive negotiations, eg for current land acquisition negotiations.

Monitoring: the DPD suggests that this 35 year project can be monitored through 15 worthy social objectives (page 132). Many will be difficult to measure in practice and responsibility will be hard to allocate: for example who is responsible if crime rates don't fall? And there can be no sanction if they are not achieved.

I suggest more tangible targets focussed mainly on practical infrastructure delivery. If these are achieved the social objectives will follow.

Infrastructure monitoring can best be done by breaking the project into phases, as with every other new town development I can find (see appendix 1). The Councils can retain some control by insisting that the promised infrastructure for each phase is delivered before the next phase is permissioned.

Compromises: my appendix 2 shows that the scheme isn't financially viable at present – it was always marginal and recent increases in build costs and interest rates together with lower house prices put it clearly under water. So compromises will be needed. It may be that the offsite transport schemes are funded from elsewhere or that the social housing numbers are moderated. It is clear that the plan isn't compliant with national planning policy (the Viability PPG) until the situation is resolved.

Change suggested by respondent:

The IDPFP needs to be legally integrated into the plan - particularly important for Colchester.

We need a phase 1 financial appraisal which shows how the first 10 years can be delivered and monitored.

We need further MOUs with Latimer and Tendring and an agreed procedure for negotiating s106.

Compromises will be needed. There are three possible areas for cut backs i) external transport infrastructure (currently costing £110m including £21m for the link road) ii) sustainable infrastructure (currently costing £94m) or iii) social housing (currently costing £410m).

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I participated in all sessions for the two section 1 Inspections and was able to make significant contributions on viability, land ownership and some of the legal issues. I hope that I can be of assistance to the Inspector on these same matters for TCBGC. Infrastructure delivery is the main focus of my submission.

Attachments:

0 Consultation response .docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/y
Appendix 1 - New towns - The track record.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/p
Appendix 2 - Viability.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/q
Appendix 3 - Colchester's resolution explained.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sr
Appendix 4 - Land Ownership - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sk
Appendix 5 - Cash Contributions - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sz
Appendix 6 - Extracts from Latimer's published accounts - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sm
Appendix 7.2 Welborne - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sn
Appendix 7.2 - The Master Developer Business Model - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sy

200 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

Respondent: Mr Mark Cory [147]

Summary:

This statement: "Proposals will need to make financial contributions to the wider local transport infrastructure, including the A120-A133 Link Road and Rapid Transit System in accordance with the conditions of the Housing Infrastructure Fund." is the only part of the consultation that gives some acknowledgement to the fact that the 'A120-A133 Link Road' is not fully funded and cannot be completed without further contributions.
I object to the DPD progressing without the 'A120-A133 Link Road' guaranteed to be completed as per Garden Principles and the planning application, in one phase, prior to house building.

Full text:

This statement: "Proposals will need to make financial contributions to the wider local transport infrastructure, including the A120-A133 Link Road and Rapid Transit System in accordance with the conditions of the Housing Infrastructure Fund." is the only part of the consultation that gives some acknowledgement to the fact that the 'A120-A133 Link Road' is not fully funded and cannot be completed without further contributions.
I object to the DPD progressing without the 'A120-A133 Link Road' guaranteed to be completed as per Garden Principles and the planning application, in one phase, prior to house building.

Change suggested by respondent:

The 'A120-A133 Link Road' must be fully funded and completion guaranteed in advance of house-building on the site.

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Yes
Appear exam: Appearance at the examination
Oral exam why: As County Councillor and as City Councillor for the site.
Attachments: None

216 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

Respondent: Mrs Manda O'Connell [105]

Summary:

- Insufficient detail on which areas of infrastructure will be brought forward at what time, and how this relates to phasing and timing.
- An alternative solution should be considered with regard to the delivery of the Link Road, utilising the funding for the RTS to ensure timely delivery of the link road with its mitigation of surrounding road infrastructure.

Full text:

See attached document.

Change suggested by respondent:

- The Link Road should be brought forward before the RTS and the RTS re-routed.
- Embed specific detail and timings about these key fundamentals of infrastructure that needs to be in place as the first occupants of the Garden Community move in.

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

Manda OConnell - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sv
Manda OConnell - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sb

238 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION
Respondent: Latimer (Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community) Developments Limited [127]
Agent: Lichfields (Miss Charlotte Walker, Planner) [124]

Summary:

Generally, the principle of Chapter 9, including GC Policy 9 'Infrastructure delivery and Impact Mitigation' of the DPD is supported. The Chapter seeks to ensure the Garden Community delivers the required infrastructure to support the development in a timely manner, but also recognition that where appropriate, infrastructure may need to be phased.

Full text:

See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:

- Part A, point 1, amendment proposed to S106 and CIL references.
- Part B, removal of requirement for a Viability Assessment is parties are in agreement regarding planning gain provisions (not including HIF recovery).

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

247 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION
Respondent: Wivenhoe Town Council (Mrs Joanne Beighton-Emms, Town Clerk) [96]

Summary:

We would like this chapter to include what would happen if the modal shift targets were not achieved. For instance - suspending all future building on site until modal shift targets were met.
Deeply concerned with viability work to date. Doubt would have passed section one hearings in current financial climate.
Refer Inspector to submission by William Sunnucks as we fully support the work on viability assessment.
We do not believe the project is currently viable.

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

249 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION
Respondent: Mr TIM BATTS-NEALE [131]

Summary:
Minor amendment to text required re. percentage of journeys and clarity required over levels of modal shift to be achieved.

Full text:
See attachment -

Change suggested by respondent:
See attachment.

Legally compliant: Not specified
Sound: No
Comply with duty: Not specified
Appear exam: Written Representation
Attachments:
DPD Submission Version comments All Tim Batts-Neale.docx - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/v

258 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION
Respondent: East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Ms Zoe May, Head of Business Relationships) [161]

Summary:
Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as the paragraph (para.1 page.127) omits reference to the basis for key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:
See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:
Change Requested: Amended Paragraph & 5th bullet point below it to read:
Paragraph change - "The main requirements covered in this Plan, as set out in the policies of the adopted Section 1 Local Plan, and based on the evidence of key infrastructure providers include:
5th bullet point change;
• "Addressing education, healthcare, ambulance, police, firefighting, leisure and sports"

Legally compliant: No
Sound: No
Comply with duty: No
Appear exam: Not specified
Attachments:
EEAST Reps - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/sq
EEAST Evidence - https://tcbgardencommunity.oc2.uk/a/tr

259 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

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

Summary:

Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as paragraph (para.1 page.129) omits reference to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:

See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read:
"The Garden community will require the provision of new physical infrastructure such as footways, cycleways, roads, and sewers; social infrastructure such as health, ambulance, police, firefighting, education and community facilities, and green infrastructure such as open and recreational spaces."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

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

260 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

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

Summary:

Soundness Objection: Plan text not fully 'justified' as it omits reference (para.1 page.131) to key infrastructure in the form of ambulance, police & firefighting facilities;

Full text:

See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:

Change Requested: Amended Paragraph to read:
"The councils will seek contributions from developers to fund improvements to existing infrastructure and the environment and new infrastructure contributions will be made through the Community Infrastructure Levy (if adopted) which applies a standard charge to developers to fund supporting infrastructure such as transport, schools, community facilities and health, ambulance, police and firefighting facilities, and/or Section 106 agreements which address the provision of affordable housing and more site-specific infrastructure requirements."
The Garden community will require the provision of new physical infrastructure such as footways, cycleways, roads, and sewers; social infrastructure such as health, ambulance, police, firefighting, education and community facilities, and green infrastructure such as open and recreational spaces."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

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

264 Object

Document Element: GC POLICY 9: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND IMPACT MITIGATION

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

Summary:

Infrastructure Delivery Phasing & Funding Plan
For the purposes of Strategic Masterplan assumptions, the requirements and phasing of ambulance infrastructure/ facilities and delivery can be assigned into the 4 x phases as shown in the table on page.16 of attached document.

Full text:

See attachment

Change suggested by respondent:

Update the 'Summary Table: Total Infrastructure Requirements and Phasing of Delivery' as shown in the table on page.16 of attached document.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

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