

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE
HELD ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 7.30 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL
OFFICES, THORPE ROAD, WEELEY**

Present: Councillors Turner (Vice-Chairman in the Chair), Amos, Bray, Broderick, G V Guglielmi, V E Guglielmi, Howard, Land, Newton, Platt, Scott, M J D Skeels and Stephenson

Also Present: Councillors Bucke, McWilliams and White

In Attendance: Head of Planning Services (Cath Bicknell), Head of Governance and Legal Services & Monitoring Officer (Lisa Hastings), Planning and Regulation Manager (Simon Meecham) and Committee Services Officer (Janey Nice)

Also in Attendance: Planning Officer (Will Fuller)

6. CHAIR

In the absence of Councillor Stock, the Chair was occupied by the Vice-Chairman (Councillor Turner).

7. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Stock (who was substituted by Councillor V E Guglielmi), Cawthron and I J Henderson.

8. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee, held on 9 June 2016, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Howard declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in that he was currently an employee of Essex University.

10. PUBLIC SPEAKING

The Chairman invited the following persons to address the Committee:

Item A.1 – Local Development Scheme 2016 - 2019

Mrs Carol Bannister

Mrs Bannister, a resident of Weeley, made a statement concerning the University Garden Community Plan and the Local Development Plan (LDLP) and the location of the proposed Garden Community on the west of the Tendring District. She raised concerns about the timetables of the different Plans which she thought should be brought in line with each other rather than at separate dates. She also commented that no decisions had been made yet about boundary areas and numbers.

Item A.2 – Local Plan Evidence Update

Mrs Bannister made a statement concerning the proposed number of 550 houses to be built per year and raised her concerns about the junctions that are used by commuters and are gridlocked in rush hours, particularly at Weeley and Frating roundabouts and many other junctions. She believed that the figure of 550 new homes per annum had been derived from simulated theoretical modelling exercises which were vastly removed

from the experiences the commuters faced on a daily basis. Commenting that the next meeting of the Committee would be examining new data, released from the Government, she hoped that the proposed number of both housing and employment needs in Weeley were actually being reduced to a more realistic, fair, proportionate and manageable figure. Mrs Bannister commented that Consultants had said that the greatest demand for employment came from the Colchester area with the use of employment sites which concluded that that provision should be in West Tendring, with easily accessible commuter routes by road and rail.

Mr Smith-Daye, a resident of Weeley, made a statement that the Courts had made judgements that a strong evidence base was key in setting objective needs for Local Plan purposes. He also commented that the Committee had made a resolution at a previous meeting to lower the number of required properties to 479 but this had not been done and he failed to see how the number of 550 properties could be correct. He further commented that the figure was overstated and perhaps guided by the wishes of Central Government to maximise housing growth at the expense of actual local needs and wishes of local residents. He said he appreciated the need for the Local Plan to be completed to stem the flow of inappropriate development and he further stressed the need for the Committee to take into account the strong local opinion

Ms Angela Hastings a resident of Weeley made a statement on the proposed 350 houses development on land around Thorpe Hall (Lifehouse) and pointed out the land contained a listed garden with many species of plant life. She said such a large proposal in the centre of the village was inappropriate even though Lifehouse had stated that they were not a sustainable business. She pointed out that Thorpe was a very busy village with a very heavy flow of traffic which was already making houses shake in the High Street; Thorpe also contained two schools which also added to the heavy traffic, particularly in Landamere Road. She gave figures of the already approved developments and said the proposal for 350 houses at Lifehouse would not be of any benefit to the village, it would destroy an historical habitat and heritage which was the lifeblood of the village.

Ms Sue Jiggins, a resident of Weeley, asked:

“What measures are you going to put in place, as a result of the strategy you have chosen, to ensure that gridlock, increased rat running along narrow country lanes, more accidents and reduced air quality will NOT be the future for Tendring District and Weeley and Tendring villages in particular?”

The Chairman responded on behalf of the Local Plan Committee:

“As can be seen by the transport evidence update in today’s agenda – the impacts of our strategy have been modelled by the County Council and where needed junction design improvements have been suggested.

Essex County Council (ECC) is working in partnership with Tendring District Council on the Local Plan to ensure that the transportation impacts of the proposed developments are fully understood and mitigation measures are secured through the planning system.

This council has a good record in campaigning for road improvements as can be seen with the A120 where accident numbers have fallen dramatically. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Neil Stock has had numerous meetings to ensure improvements are also made to the A133 - as a matter of urgency.

As to air quality – Tendring is one of few authorities that does not have the need for Air Quality Management Zones and long may that continue to be the case. Through modelling the impacts of our strategy, we can help to ensure that we will always be a step ahead”.

Item A.3 – Comments on Braintree and Colchester’s Preferred Options Local Plan Consultation Documents

Mrs Bannister said that she thought the planned Garden Community plan was inspirational and commented that the plan was going to cover a 30 year period when the current draft Local Plan was for up to 2023. She commented that the timetable needed to be closer to the Local Authority’s plans and mentioned the need for decisions to be made about land boundaries.

11. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2016 - 2019

Mr Meecham introduced the Local Development Scheme Local Plan (LDS) and the Committee’s agreement was sought to publish a new Local Development Scheme (LDS) and to update the proposed timetable for preparing the new Tendring District Local Plan and other planning documents.

The proposed LDS included the anticipated timetable of consultation periods, examinations and expected dates of adoption. Publishing the LDS also ensured that stakeholders, including members of the public, Town and Parish Councils, landowners and developers, partner organisations and the Planning Inspectorate were kept aware of the timetable the Council was working to and organise their time and resources accordingly.

It was reported that the updated LDS proposed a revised timetable for the Local Plan and the Community Infrastructure Levy and introduced the preparation of an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the proposed east of Colchester garden community in the west of the Tendring District.

Members were informed that this LDS was the first one to be produced that aligned Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils’ Local Plan and AAP timetables.

Mr Meecham said that the revised Local Plan would be going out for consultation in February/March 2017

A Member mentioned about the number of schools and surgeries which would be needed and the need for the infrastructure to be in place before houses were built, especially as many schools and surgeries were already full. Mr Meecham responded by saying that the LDS was about the actual timetable for the documents to be prepared and that the evidence supporting the plan was available on-line and more would come later.

A Member commented that on page 22 of the Report of the Head of Planning that the Geographical Area for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) covered all of the Tendring District, although some areas of Tendring may be CIL exempt and wanted an explanation for the CIL. Mr Meecham responded by explaining that the levy is viability tested across the whole District, where it proved unviable to charge a levy, for example where land values were low, the levy may be zero. Also some large schemes could be made exempt and developer contributions would come from Section 106 Agreements. When asked again about the CIL. Mr Meecham said that the Section 106 would continue to cover affordable housing.

The Committee having considered all of the information provided, it was moved by Councillor G V Guglielmi and seconded by Councillor Stephenson and:

RESOLVED that the Committee approved the Local Development Scheme (LDS) 2016-2019, attached as Appendix 1 to item A.1 of the Report of the Head of Planning Services, and agreed to its publication on the Council’s website.

12. LOCAL PLAN EVIDENCE UPDATE

The Committee was provided with an update on the progress of the evidence that was necessary to underpin the content of the new Local Plan particularly with regard to the Objectively Assessed housing Need, retail, employment and transport evidence.

Evidence summaries were reported to the Committee under the following headings:-

- (1) Objectively Assessed housing Needs (OAhN);
- (2) Transport Junction Modelling Phase 2;
- (3) Retail Study; and
- (4) Other studies underway or to be commissioned.

Mr Meecham informed the Committee that the Office for National Statistics had published new population projections and the Government had used those to create new household projections. He said that the Council's evidence needed to be updated to reflect the data and that Peter Brett Associates had been appointed to advise the Council on any changes to Tendring's housing requirements. Mr Meecham added that, if available, this would be presented to the meeting of the Local Plan Committee in November 2016.

In regards to the transport modelling evidence, Mr Meecham said that each stage of the Local Plan was reviewed by Essex County Council (ECC) and that ECC had considered the preferred options for employment and housing in the Local Plan and assessed the need for any design changes to junctions to accommodate the growth. He said that for the Preferred Options Local Plan ten junctions had been modelled. He added that five of the ten junctions were already having issues at peak hours and evidence showed where that was and was actually happening.

Mr Meecham informed the Committee that each arm of the current junction layouts were considered to see if the existing design could take the additional peak time traffic and if not, modest design changes would be applied to the applicable junction. He added that those would increase the ratio of the flow of traffic through the junctions and that employment and mixed use allocations would have an impact on the junction flow.

With reference to retail Mr Meecham informed the Committee that the retail study had looked at the health of the District's town centres and the headroom for additional growth in retail, this was based on the population growth that was being planned for in Tendring District's Local Plan. He added that the study had found that Clacton, Frinton-on-Sea, Dovercourt and Brightlingsea had good retail occupancy rates with good accessibility making them healthy and viable centres. He also commented that the study had found Walton-on-the-Naze had higher than average vacancy rates and the study considered it would benefit from the development of some regeneration sites, for example, the Town Hall site but said the study had considered Walton-on-the-Naze to be generally healthy.

Mr Meecham confirmed that the study had found Manningtree to be healthy with good retail occupancy levels but suggested it would benefit from more comparison shops, (non-food shops). That the study showed that Harwich had high vacancy rates with a low footfall and did not perform a town centre role. The Preferred Options Local Plan had already classified Harwich a District centre rather than a town centre.

The Committee was informed that the study had considered two population catchment areas, one including Colchester, the other focussing on Tendring and for Tendring the study considered there to be potential growth of retail expenditure between 2015 and 2032 of:

- £48m Convenience goods (e.g. foods); 980 – 1850 sq. metres (after existing commitments); and

- £366.4 Comparison goods (e.g. clothes, white goods) 11,880 – 19,800 sq.m (after existing commitments).

Mr Meecham gave further details on other studies which included: Employment Land Review; Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence studies.

A Member commented that the evidence appeared to be commissioned more by Chelmsford and Colchester and asked why the Tendring District was not part of the evidence required. Mr Meecham replied that a shared evidence base was important to underpin the Duty to Co-operate, to plan effectively across the sub-region and it was also about efficiency, frameworks, and Tendring took a full role in the development of the briefs, assessment of tenders and steering the consultants commissioned.

A Committee member said he was pleased that the junctions were being considered as in the early evenings and during the summer months congestion was a serious problem. He added that he had seen maps concerning the new road proposals for the A133 and A120 and suggested that this road should be added when looking at junctions on the A.133 and A120 and that the seasonal summer months did not appear to be considered. Mr Meecham responded that the link road would be considered by Ringway Jacobs as part of the Concept Framework for the east of Colchester garden community highlighted in the report. In terms of the months of July and August, that had been raised with ECC in regards to phase 1 of the transport modelling and the phase 2 report addressed that matter.

The Member further commented that Tendring was a different area, and the modelling did not take into account the seasonal issues especially during the summer and for tourism.

Councillor G V Guglielmi said that as an Essex County Councillor, he would be more than happy to take to the Transport Board the extra consideration needed in the junction modelling and the extra traffic in the Tendring District and said that he believed a new transport report had just been released. This was welcomed by the Committee member who had raised the issue and wanted this matter to be added to the Committee's recommendation.

Another Committee Member commented about the problems at the Frating roundabout and expressed surprise that Weeley roundabout had not been mentioned, he added again, that Tendring is a holiday resort and was not being treated as such. He added that far more attention was needed to look at the bottleneck at both ends of the A133.

In addition to the above the Committee raised concerns about a number of issues which included:

- The High Street at Thorpe-le-Soken which had dreadful traffic problems, engagement was needed to engage both Tendring and ECC Councillors;
- Transport modelling gave the impression that Tendring had had no input into the study and it was said that the Transport Modelling should have been modelled on the District's behalf;
- The different approach to the presentation of figures on pages 35 and 39 percentages and others not, and no figures being provided on page 42, raised concern;
- It was noted that the site at Horsley Cross was not to be allocated due to the weakness of the site, there had been a long-standing debate about Horsley Cross and it had previously been decided that the site be added to the Draft Local Plan. Questions were raised as to why it had now been taken out; and
- That the Committee was still considering various figures and forecasts after many months and there needed to be progressed quickly otherwise there was a real risk of the Local Plan timetable not being met.

Mr Meecham replied in response to the above comments, that ECC/Ringway Jacobs used different software models for the junctions and this was why some had percentages and the red/amber/green was the easiest way to see which junctions had the poorest flow. He said that the County Council should be asked to consider the issues in Thorpe-le-Soken and this need not be part of the Local Plan as there were few allocations in that vicinity. He read out the occupancy levels for Dovercourt and that the Town Centre Manager had stated this was the highest level ever recorded for Dovercourt and shops were being occupied with good footfall. He also explained the reasons for not including Horsley Cross, these included lack of viability and that if sites were known to be unviable were put into the Local Plan, then that would make the Local Plan unsound.

Horsley Cross was again discussed by Members with one commenting that in the 2012 draft document it had been decided that the A120 was the best place to regenerate the area, especially Harwich. It was also commented there was sufficient land for 7,000 houses at Horsley Cross and if built there it would regenerate the whole area.

A Member commented that there was an opportunity not to upset little settlements and if development at Weeley went ahead it was needed to sort roads and schools first.

Road issues in Thorpe-le-Soken were mentioned again by a Member saying that Thorpe needed to be assessed on its own merits due to the huge amount of traffic going through, with tourist traffic going through to the Frinton-on-Sea and Walton-on-the-Naze resorts. It was also added that Tendring Technology College in Landmere Road caused a great amount of traffic including a large amount of school buses, there appeared to be no mention of Thorpe in the documents with the roads now no longer capable of the increasing amount of heavy traffic, there had been a recent sink hole in Thorpe High Street with Anglia Water needing assurances that the road was being considered. Mr Meecham said that that particular area had 100 homes allocated.

Members of the Committee further discussed the modelling and a suggestion that a meeting be held with Essex County Council officers on the road issues and in relation to the traffic count. It was made clear by Members that they were concerned about Frating roundabout figures which did not appear to be correct with a number of cars seeming to be missing from the figures with the survey needing to be retaken. The Committee also discussed the roundabout on the A133 which had previously been mentioned and Cox's Hill which had not taken into account the impact on the road of extra traffic, except mention of a planning application for that stretch of road. It was also mentioned that land ownership had not been taken into account.

Mr Meecham, in response to the above comments, said that the modelling was not to everyone's taste but it was required by the National Planning Policy Framework and that transport professionals were employed to look at the modelling. He added that figures for a.m. and p.m. traffic would be different because of the spread of the traffic and not a case of losing cars from the figures.

The Head of Governance & Legal Services Manager (Lisa Hastings) suggested it might be appropriate to arrange a session with the Local Plan Committee and the Officer and Consultants to listen to concerns about transport assessments and to enable a question and answer session..

A Committee Member said that his biggest concern was when asking for something to be done, the Committee's previous requests had been ignored completely and when questioned as to why a matter was not done, an answer was generally unhelpful, he said he did not want the Committee to enter into Phase 3 when Phases 1 and 2 were not completed.

The Chairman (Councillor Turner) agreed that there was a need for the Committee to be firm in what needed to be done and agreed with Mrs Hastings' suggestion. He reminded the Committee that the Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for

Enforcement and Community Safety (Councillor G V Guglielmi) had mentioned he would take transport issues to the appropriate person at Essex County Council and it was necessary for the Committee to be in full agreement. A Committee Member requested that Councillor G V Guglielmi make his request to the County Council as quickly as possible.

The Committee and having discussed the recommendations and their additional concerns, it was moved by Councillor Scott and seconded by Councillor M J D Skeels Senior that it was:

RECOMMENDED

- (a) The Local Plan Committee noted the latest progress on the evidence base to justify the content of the Local Plan and that the Head of Planning continued to commission/prepare the outstanding studies as set out in Table 1 of the Report of the Head of Planning – item A.2 Local Plan Evidence Updates, providing updates to the Local Plan Committee on an ongoing basis;
- (b) That it was requested that Essex County Highways address the seasonal movements in their transport model and engage Tendring District Council representatives in their future studies and evidence gathering before final reports were issued; and
- (c) That it was requested that a briefing and question and answer session was to be organised with the Highway Transport Consultants for members of the Local Plan Committee as a matter of urgency due to the impending timescale.

13. COMMENTS ON BRAINTREE AND COLCHESTER COUNCILS' PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS

The Local Plan Committee's endorsement was sought with regard to the Officers' responses to Braintree District Council and Colchester Borough Council's Part 2 Preferred Options Local Plans.

It was reported that Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils had each agreed the content of Part 1 of their respective Local Plans. The individual councils had agreed part 2 of each Local Plan. The consultations on those Local Plans had now finished. Officers had therefore provided comments to Braintree District Council and Colchester Borough Council on their Local Plans, subject to the endorsement of this Committee.

The submitted Officer comments on both the Colchester and Braintree Preferred Options Local Plans supported the progress that those Authorities had made in producing the strategic policies in Part 1.

Braintree Preferred Options Local Plan

The officers' comments were that, in both Parts 1 and 2, the starting date of the Braintree Local Plan be aligned with both Tendring and Colchester. Additionally, the officer comments had requested that it be made clear how the shortfall in housing completions from April 2013 had been dealt with within their housing requirement.

Colchester Preferred Options Local Plan

Officers had expressed concern that housing growth had been included within the area of search for the east of Colchester garden community in Part 2 of the Colchester Local Plan. This growth would be in addition to that already proposed in Part 1 of the Colchester Local Plan. In addition, Officers had made Colchester aware that part of a potential allocation for the expansion of the University of Essex

had been allocated within Tendring District Council's boundary and had requested discussions to address this matter should the allocation go forward in either, or both, of the next versions of the Colchester and Tendring Local Plans.

Mr Meecham informed the Committee that Officers support both Braintree and Colchester's approach to Part 1 of their Local Plans and that Part 1 was the same for Braintree, Colchester and Tendring. However, it was recommended that Braintree Council be asked to align its Local Plan start date with Colchester and Tendring which was for 2013 and requested Braintree took into account the housing completion shortfalls from April 2013.

The recommended response to Colchester requested that it did not allocate growth above that agreed in the Part 1 of the Local Plan within the area of search for the east of Colchester garden community and had also that an allocation for the University of Essex expansion be removed from their Policies map as this was within the Tendring District.

A Member commented that Colchester Borough Council (CBC) did have land in the wrong area and raised a query about the boundaries coming off the land of the University and which side it was.

Mr Meecham said there were two areas for University expansion, one was north of the A.133 which is in Colchester Borough and the other south of the A.133 near to the gates of Wivenhoe House.

The Member said that if CBC was planning to expand in the University area it brought into question the very busy junction and it was needed to think about the safety of that area very carefully. If expansion went ahead there would be more students and more traffic in what was a traffic hot area especially in the early morning.

A Member applauded the work the Officers had done in working with the other two Councils, Braintree and Colchester and the concerns that they had raised. Having considered and discussed all of the information provided, it was moved by Councillor G V Guglielmi, seconded by Councillor Scott and:

RESOLVED that the Local Plan Committee endorsed the comments provided by Officers in regards to Braintree District Council and Colchester Borough Councils' Preferred Options Local Plan consultation documents, as set out below:

“Braintree District Council

Tendring District Council supports Braintree District Council in its commitment to establish a new Local Plan for its district. Tendring District Council is committed to working with Braintree District Council on an active and on-going basis and is particularly proud that the councils along with Colchester Borough Council and Essex County Council have agreed a common strategic framework in Part 1 of the Local Plans for Braintree, Colchester and Tendring.

Part 1 is an excellent output from the four Councils' Memorandum of Co-operation and the agreement to collaborate on evidence, development of options and addressing economic growth across the sub-region. Part 1 also presents a strong and specific joint strategic planning framework for the Councils' ground breaking work on Garden Communities and Tendring District Council looks forward to further developing these options as the Councils move to implementation.

Tendring District Council offers the following officer observations to meet Braintree's consultation timetable. These will be presented to Tendring's Local Plan Committee on September 27 2016 for comment and to seek endorsement.

Vision and Objectives. Tendring District Council welcomes the positive approach taken by Braintree especially in relation to aspirational economic growth and improvements to the road and rail networks.

Part 1.

The Objectively Assessed housing Needs (OAN) evidence for Braintree, Colchester and Tendring has a common start date of April 2013. It would be helpful if Policy SP2 was amended to reflect that bringing the Braintree plan in-line with the 2013-2033 plan period of Colchester and Tendring. This is important to a common assessment of any under or oversupply against our annualised housing requirements within the shared housing market area. It is accepted that the plan periods and housing requirements may change as new evidence emerges and Tendring Council will continue to work with Braintree, Chelmsford and Colchester Councils in this regard.

Part 2.

As the Councils' Objectively Assessed housing Needs (OAN) evidence has a common start date of April 2013 it would be helpful if 6.67 was amended to reflect that the Braintree plan is in-line with the 2013-2033 plan period of Colchester and Tendring. This is important to the common assessment on any under or oversupply against the annualised housing requirements within the shared housing market area. It is accepted that the plan periods and housing requirements may change as new evidence emerges and Tendring Council will continue to work with Braintree, Chelmsford and Colchester Councils in this regard.

Colchester Borough Council

Tendring District Council supports Colchester Borough Council in its commitment to establish a new Local Plan for the borough. Tendring District Council is committed to working with Colchester Borough Council on an active and on-going basis and is particularly proud that the councils along with Braintree District Council and Essex County Council have agreed a common strategic framework in Part 1 of the Local Plans for Braintree, Colchester and Tendring.

Part 1 is an excellent output from the four Councils' Memorandum of Co-operation and the agreement to collaborate on evidence, development of options and addressing economic growth across the sub-region. Part 1 also presents a strong and specific joint strategic planning framework for the Councils' ground breaking work on Garden Communities and Tendring District Council looks forward to further developing these options as the Councils move to implementation.

Tendring District Council offers the following officer observations to meet Colchester's consultation timetable. These will be presented to Tendring's Local Plan Committee on September 27 2016 for comment and to seek endorsement.

Vision and Objectives. Tendring District Council welcomes the positive approach taken by Colchester especially in relation to job creation, public transport improvements and quality of design.

Part 1 - Tendring District Council has no further comments to make on Part 1 of the Local Plan in relation to Colchester.

Part 2 – Policy EC1. Tendring District Council supports the economic resource and job generation from the protection and expansion of the Knowledge Gateway and its integration in to the east of Colchester garden community as well as the wider sub region. Tendring District Council supports the expansion of Zone 1, subject to

further joint work on land use zones and access within the east of Colchester garden community. Tendring District Council notes that the majority of Zone 2 falls within the boundary of the Tendring district. We understand this is an error in mapping but that the intention would be to secure Tendring District Council's agreement to designate the appropriate parts of Zone 2 in its Submission version of the Local Plan. Tendring District Council requests further dialogue on this matter with both the University of Essex and Colchester Borough Council to inform the next stage of both our Local Plans.

Table SG2. Tendring District Council welcomes the identification within Table SG2 on the potential hierarchy of settlements and the potential growth within these settlements to meet Colchester Borough Council's housing requirement. In developing Part 1 of the Local Plan agreement was reached to make provision for up to 1250 homes in each of the authorities boundaries within the broad area of search for the proposed east of Colchester garden community. To this end no further allocations within this broad area of search were deemed appropriate until the boundaries for the garden community had been agreed.

It is therefore of concern that an allowance for up to 930 houses has been provided for in the Colchester housing figures with a view to this provision being on sites to the east of Colchester, within the current broad area of search for the garden community albeit these being determined following the definition of the boundary for the garden community.

Our concern includes that;

- 1) If the entire areas of search is taken then this 930 would need to be part of the garden community – not a separate allocation. The delivery of 930 plus 2500 housing units up to 2033 is beyond current delivery expectations; and
- 2) If the area of search is reduced would any of the 930 have a detrimental impact on the ethos or the delivery of the garden community. This could include access, landscape, market price and delivery impacts.

Tendring District Council has not allocated any additional growth within the area of search and requests that Colchester reviews this additional 930 units in line with the concerns expressed here for the submission versions of our Local Plans. Any further allocation to the east of Colchester which is not part of the garden community is of a concern to Tendring District Council and it is requested that Colchester reviews the approach to this additional 930 units in line with the concerns expressed.”

The meeting was declared closed at 9.17 p.m.

Chairman