

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

3 NOVEMBER 2016

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

A.1 2016 LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUMMARY

(Report prepared by Simon Meecham)

PART 1 – KEY INFORMATION

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To provide the Local Plan Committee with a summary of the consultation responses received by Tendring District Council and update on the position in regards to the Objectively Assessed Needs.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tendring District Council, Preferred Options Local Plan consultation took place from 14 July 2016 to 8 September 2016 so that technical stakeholders, businesses, developers and landowners, community representatives and members of the public could comment on the draft policies and the policies maps. The draft Local Plan was supported with Sustainability Appraisals and these have also been out to public consultation, Part 1: 8 August to 19 September 2016 and Part 2: 28 August to 10 October 2016.

The representations received vary from suggested amendments to wording, through to full support of policies or full objections to policies. Representations also included proposals for additional sites for housing and/or employment growth or updates to sites already part of Tendring District Council's Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment document.

Any proposed changes to the Preferred Options Local Plan to create the Submission version of the Local Plan will be presented to another meeting of this Committee.

The comments and changes put forward as representations address Part 1 and Part 2 of the Preferred Options Local Plan and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal. This report provides a summary of those representations. The representations can be viewed on the Council's website.

On 21 January 2016 this Committee approved the following resolution:

That the Local Plan Committee:

- b) approves that the range of Objectively Assessed Needs for Tendring District Council is 500-600 dwellings per annum; that the mid-point of 550 dwellings per annum is used as the

Council's provisional housing target for the Local Plan and that officers consider options up to 600 dwellings per annum as the Local Plan refines through its next consultation stage and new data is assessed;

On 9 June 2016, this Committee approved the locations for the supply of the Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) of 550 homes each and the location for the supply of the additional potential needs of up to 600 homes each year for public consultation.

On 27 September 2016, this Committee was informed that the Office for National Statistics had published new population projections and the Government had used those to create new household projections. Committee was informed 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 and that, if available, this would be presented to the meeting of the Local Plan Committee in November 2016.

Whilst the (OAN) report update has not been finalised at the time of writing this Committee report, it has been confirmed by Peter Brett Associates that Tendring can proceed on the basis of the lower of the range of housing requirements, at 550 homes each year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Plan Committee:

- 1) Notes that the consultation responses for Part 1 of the Preferred Options will be jointly collated by Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils to jointly consider whether any necessary changes are to be proposed, which will be presented to the next meeting of this Committee;**
- 2) agrees that if the final report, expected in November 2016, from Peter Brett Associates on Tendring District Council's Objectively Assessed Needs confirms 550 homes each year as the Council's annualised housing requirement, the Head of Planning Services is authorised to proceed with Option T and not Option W in respect of allocations in Weeley in the draft Pre-Submission Local Plan;**
- 3) notes that the representations received in response to the consultation on Part 2 of the Preferred Options Draft Local Plan will be considered by the Head of Planning and any minor changes will be presented in the pre-submission draft to the Local Plan Committee on 19 January 2017 for consideration and approval; and**
- 4) requests that when considering the representations received, the Head of Planning Services consults the Local Plan Committee on major changes or those matters which have been highlighted by the Committee during its debate, prior to presenting the pre-submission draft at its committee on 19 January, this is to ensure that there is no further delay to the timetable.**

PART 2 – IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

DELIVERING PRIORITIES

The Local Plan helps to implement place shaping priorities in the Corporate Plan 2016-2020 for Tendring District Council through:

- Community Leadership by engagement with the community and effective partnership working with technical stakeholders, developers and other interested parties;
- Health and Housing through policies that promote healthier lifestyles, a quality living environment, local regeneration and council house building; and
- Employment and Enjoyment through policies to support business growth and skill development and the protection and promotion of the natural and built environments.

The Local Plan is a project in the 2016-2020 Corporate Plan and is on target at the time of writing this report. A decision to support the recommendations in this report will demonstrate progress in the delivery of the Local Plan.

RESOURCES AND RISK

Resources: The Local Plan Committee's recommendation to Council, in consultation with Cabinet and subsequent approval by Full Council of the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Document enabled the Council's Planning Policy Team to carry out public consultation with our local communities and liaise formally with partner organisations and infrastructure providers. The costs involved in this work are met through the agreed 'LDF Budget'.

Risks: Growth options proposed and certain policies in the consultation documents have led to some objections and some support. A future meeting of this Committee will consider changes to the policies and policies maps; today's meeting can provide a steer on those changes. If the Local Plan is amended in response to objections, it will still need to meet the tests of soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in order for the Local Plan to be adopted.

Braintree District Council and Colchester Borough Council, like Tendring, are also in the process of preparing new Local Plans to guide future development. Through a Memorandum of Cooperation, the local authorities have agreed to cooperate on strategic planning matters of cross-boundary significance, including Part 1 of this Local Plan.

The risk of not agreeing a Local Plan that will deliver sufficient housing to meet objectively assessed needs would be that it would be rejected by the Planning Inspector as being unsound, thus leaving the district vulnerable to unwanted development.

LEGAL

The planning legislation and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places Local Plans at the heart of the planning system, so it is essential that they are in place and kept up to date.

The NPPF expects Local Plans to set out a vision and a framework for the future development of the area, addressing the needs and opportunities in relation to housing, the economy, community facilities and infrastructure, as well as a basis for safeguarding the environment. They are a critical tool in guiding decisions about individual development proposals (Planning Guidance Paragraph 001 Reference ID: 12-001-20140306).

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) state that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the 'development plan' unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory 'development plan' for Tendring, as it stands is the 2007 Adopted Local Plan. However, the policies and proposals in the Adopted Local Plan are increasingly out of date and cannot be afforded full weight. The NPPF states permissions should be granted in such circumstances in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impact outweighs the benefits or other policies indicate otherwise. It is therefore essential to progress the emerging Local Plan through the stages of the plan making process and ensure it meets the requirements of national planning policy so it can become the new statutory development plan and be relied upon by the Council acting as the Local Planning Authority.

Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, places a legal duty upon local authorities and other public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation, this is known as the 'Duty to Cooperate' on strategic matters of cross-boundary significance, which includes housing supply. Before a Planning Inspector can begin the process of examining a Local Plan, they need to be satisfied, with the Council's evidence, that the local authority has demonstrated it has done everything it can to ensure effective cooperation with neighbouring authorities and other partner organisations and has sought to resolve, as far as is possible, any cross-boundary planning issues.

Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a local planning authority to carry out a sustainability appraisal of each of the proposals in a Local Plan during its preparation. More generally, section 39 of the Act requires that the authority preparing a Local Plan must do so "with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development".

Sustainability appraisals incorporate the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (commonly referred to as the 'Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations'), which implement the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC (the 'Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive') on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. Sustainability appraisal ensures that potential environmental effects are given full consideration alongside social and economic issues.

Part 1 and Part 2 of the Local Plan have been published for consultation pursuant to Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Local Plan is

subject to a statutory six-week public consultation period and the Sustainability Appraisals five weeks; however, the consultations were extended to eight and six weeks respectively to accommodate additional time for anyone taking summer holidays.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Area or Ward affected: All wards.

Consultation/Public Engagement: The Local Plan is subject to a statutory six weeks public consultation period and the Sustainability Appraisals five weeks; however, the consultations were extended to eight and six weeks respectively to accommodate additional time for anyone taking summer holidays.

PART 3 – SUPPORTING INFORMATION

CURRENT POSITION AND BACKGROUND

Tendring District Council consulted on three documents over the Summer of 2016: the Preferred Options Local Plan; the Sustainability Appraisal of the strategic policies of the Local Plan, (known as Part 1); and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Tendring District specific policies, (known as Part 2).

The Preferred Options stage of plan making, (otherwise known as Regulation 18), enables the Council to test its preferred strategy through consultation with the public, community representatives, technical stakeholders, businesses, landowners and developers.

The representations received should then be considered by the Council to identify any changes it wishes to make to the Local Plan before submitting it to government. The purpose of making any changes would be to ensure that the Local Plans policies are compliant with legislation and to resolve, where possible, objections to the Plan.

Following the closure of the consultation on the above documents, new population and household projection data has been published. This is relevant to the Council's evidence base. Initial assessment of this data by the Council's consultants indicates that it may be sufficient to make provision for 550 homes for each year of the Local plan. If confirmed, there will be an opportunity to reduce the site allocations consulted upon in the Preferred Options draft of the Local Plan.

Over 90% of the objections from members of the public concerned Weeley; whilst many accepted the need for some growth, the public considered the option for a higher level of homes in Weeley to be disproportionate growth. A report to the April 2016 Local Plan Committee agreed for consultation allocations of land for 1400 new homes in Weeley to help meet that need for 600 new dwellings per year in the district and allocations of land for only 304 to help to meet the need for 550 new dwellings per year.

CURRENT POSITION

Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN)

On 21 January 2016 this committee approved the following resolution:

That the Local Plan Committee:

b) approves that the range of Objectively Assessed Needs for Tendring District Council is 500-600 dwellings per annum; that the mid-point of 550 dwellings per annum is used as the Council's provisional housing target for the Local Plan and that officers consider options up to 600 dwellings per annum as the Local Plan refines through its next consultation stage and new data is assessed;

On 9 June 2016, this Committee approved the locations for the supply of the Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) of 550 homes each year and the location for the supply of the additional potential needs of up to 600 homes each year for public consultation.

On 27 September 2016, the Council was informed that the Office for National Statistics had published new population projections and that the Government had used those to create new household projections. The Council's evidence needs to be updated to reflect the data and Peter Brett Associates has been appointed to advise the Council on any changes to Tendring's housing requirements. If available, this will be presented to the meeting of the Local Plan Committee in November 2016.

Whilst the (OAN) report has not been finalised, at the time of writing this Committee report, Peter Brett Associates has indicated that the mid point of the range of housing requirements, at 550 homes each year is likely to be sufficient to meet the district's objectively assessed housing needs.

At the April 12, 2016 meeting of this Committee, tables presenting housing requirements, current supply and preferred options for the remaining supply of housing to meet the OAN at 550 homes each year and at 600 homes each year were approved.

Weeley had received significant interest from landowners and developers before and during the Issues and Options consultation (1 September 2015 – 13 October 2015). The communities of Weeley parish also scored highly within the settlement hierarchy given the settlements location in close proximity to the strategic road network and rail station. Together the availability of land and the sustainability of the location, two key elements of producing a sound Local Plan, resulted in public consultation on two ranges for new homes in Weeley.

At 550 homes each year 'option T' (TDC Offices 24 and Weeley South of Thorpe Road 280 - 304 homes) was approved for public consultation.

At 600 homes each year option 'W' (TDC Offices 24, Weeley south of Thorpe Road 280,

Weeley north of Thorpe Road 307 and South of Tendring Park Services 800 - 1411 homes) was approved for public consultation.

Given the advice received from Peter Brett Associates, this Committee is requested to authorise officers to move forward with option T and remove Weeley north of Thorpe Road (307 homes) and South of Tendring Park Services (800 homes) if the final report from Peter Brett Associates confirms 550 homes each year as Tendring District Council's annualised housing requirement.

The evidence base, in particular the number of extant planning permissions and the delivery of houses, will continue to develop. This will be reported to the Local Plan Committee at future meetings.

BACKGROUND

This section provides a summary of the representations received in the following order:

Local Plan Preferred Options Representations

- Technical Stakeholders
- Businesses, Landowners and Developers
- Community Representatives
- Members of the Public

Sustainability Appraisal of Part 1 Representations

Sustainability Appraisal of Part 2 Representations

Each of the Local Plan representations summaries are supported by appendices which provide a fuller account of the representations. The representations are available in full on the Council's website.

Representations have been made via the Council's on-line portal, email and in writing. While every effort has been made to include all representations in this report, if any have been overlooked to date in processing, these will be reported to the next meeting of the Local Plan Committee.

Summary of the Local Plan Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Responses

Tendring District Council carried out three public consultations over the summer: the Preferred Options Local Plan, the Sustainability Appraisal of Part 1 of that plan and the Sustainability Appraisal of Part 2 of that plan.

Below are summaries of the representations made on the above documents. A fuller summary of the representations are attached as appendices and the representations in full may be viewed on the Council's website.

Technical Stakeholders Representations

Representations have been received from sixteen Technical Stakeholders. Significantly, Essex County Council and Colchester Borough Council, whose support is important in demonstrating that the Council has fulfilled its 'duty to co-operate,' have both supported Tendring District Council's approach and the content of the Preferred Options Local Plan.

Suggestions have been submitted to improve policy wording, for filling evidence gaps and guidance on helping to ensure the Local Plan is sound and compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework. A fuller summary of these are available in Appendix 2 and the full representations may be viewed on the council's website.

Summary of Technical Stakeholders Representations

Anglian Water has assessed the proposed allocations in the Local Plan and provides advice on what measures will be needed for each development to accommodate foul water. Braintree District Council supports the Local Plan and the housing range tested in the preferred options. The British Naturalists' Association considers that the removal of parts of the Coastal Protection Belt has been severe and requests this local designation is reconsidered. Chelmsford City Council supports the Local Plan but request that the proposed northeast Chelmsford bypass is added to part 1 of the Local Plan.

Colchester Borough Council supports the Local Plan, but suggests it should not have included an Ordnance Survey map of the area of search for the east Colchester / west Tendring garden community. The Borough Council also considers that the indicative link road for the A120 /A133 should not have been put the Local Plan and nor should the Local Plan have cross-referenced the garden community in Part 2. Committee is asked to note that Tendring officers disagree and consider that having the area of search and an indicative link road assisted the consultation process. The Colchester Natural History Society would like to see a 1.5 km buffer from Salary Brook towards Elmstead Market. Committee is asked to note that this would impact on the amount of development that could be accommodated in the Colchester Borough within the area of search for the garden community.

The Environment Agency makes some policy improvement suggestions and notes that the next version of the Local Plan needs to be accompanied by a Habitats Regulation Assessment and a sequential test for flood risks on the sites being identified for development and the proposed Regeneration Areas. Essex County Council supports both parts 1 and 2 of the Local Plan. The County Council supports the identification of a potential A120 / A133 link road and provides detailed information on the school requirements for the preferred housing and mixed-use allocations. The County Council also provides a range of policy improvement suggestions. Committee is asked to note that a Habitats Regulation Assessment and sequential tests have been commissioned to inform the pre-submission version of the Local Plan and that the policy suggestions by the Environment Agency and Essex County Council will be considered by officers

with any proposed major changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Highways England welcomes the strategic approach made by the Local Plan and supports the proposed A120 and A133 link road, stating that a junction would need to be grade separated rather than a roundabout to ensure less impact on A120 movements and that a business case for the road needs to be developed and led by Essex County Council. Highways England states more emphasis needs to be placed on public transport. They also state that the developments proposed in the preferred options would not have a severe impact on the A120 except in the case of Gt Bentley. Committee is asked to note that the policy suggestions by Highways England will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Historic England will submit its comments on the Local Plan before the January 2017 meeting of this committee. Royal Mail asks that the Local Plan employment policies protect its distribution centre assets, especially where new communities may be built in their vicinity. The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds makes some policy word change suggestions and an addition of Walton Mere to Table D1. The Theatres Trust requests the removal of the word 'viability' from the community facilities policy. Committee is asked to note that any policy suggestions from the organisations in this paragraph will be considered by officers any proposed major changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Natural England requests an objective should be added to Part 1 of the Local Plan to cover landscape and climate change. The agency also suggests a number of policy wording improvements. Network Rail makes specific comments on pedestrian and farm level crossings and the potential need to remove them to facilitate safety. The National Health Service, North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group have assessed each of the proposed allocations and suggested ways in which the developments will improve health services. The focus is on new or expanded health centres across the district providing a wider range of services than currently available locally. Committee is asked to note that the policy suggestions and infrastructure requirements will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Businesses, Developers and Landowners Representations

The representations received from Businesses, Landowners and Developers in regard to the Part 1 and Part 2 Local Plans mainly promote new housing/mixed-use sites (including some sites which have previously been promoted but were not included in the Preferred Options Consultation Document). There are also representations that request changes to housing/mixed-use sites which have been included as proposed allocations. Other representations focus on changes to settlement boundaries, particularly in regard to some Smaller Rural Settlements and for settlements which are currently excluded from the settlement boundary policy due to their very rural nature. 75 representations have been received for sites and 12 have been received with general comments from businesses, developers and landowners. Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to

this committee at a future meeting.

Summary of Businesses, Developers and Landowners Representations

Clacton-on-Sea, as the main Strategic Urban Settlement in the district, has received broad support from landowners and developers in regard to the proposed strategic housing/mixed-use allocations. Additional land is also being promoted for a strategic housing/mixed-use development off Sladbury's Lane.

A proposed new strategic housing allocation has been submitted for land at Little Oakley, Smaller Rural Settlement/Ramsey, which relates to the Harwich and Dovercourt, Strategic Urban Settlement and includes a proposed western by-pass.

Weeley has received support from three major landowners and developers in regard to the proposed Expanded Settlement for strategic housing/mixed-use allocations.

Gt Bentley and Elmstead Market are the Rural Service Centres which are the main focus for landowner and developer representations for further housing allocations.

The areas being promoted for new or revised housing/mixed-use are as follows:

- Alresford
- Ardleigh
- Brightlingsea
- Clacton
- Elmstead Market
- Frating
- Gt Bentley (including Aingers Green)
- Gt Bromley (including Balls Green)
- Gt Holland
- Gt Oakley (including Stones Green)
- Harwich & Dovercourt
- Jaywick
- Kirby Cross
- Kirby-le-Soken
- Little Clacton
- Little Oakley
- Mistley
- Ramsey
- St Osyth (including Chisbon/St Osyth Heath)
- Tendring (including Tendring Green and Tendring Heath)
- Thorpe-le-Soken
- Thorrington
- Walton
- Weeley
- Weeley Heath

Appendices 2 and 3 contain brief summaries of the Part 1 and Part 2 Local Plan representations, listing the scheme, the main policy issues and an indication of the number of dwellings being promoted (if stated in the submission). Where a submitted site was not included in the Preferred

Options Local Plan, this is noted as (N). Some of the 'new' sites have been submitted previously and considered under earlier stages of the plan process.

The summaries do not refer to associated open space/Green Infrastructure at this stage, although this will be required to support strategic housing and mixed use developments.

Committee is at present asked to note that the representations will be assessed by officers with any proposed major changes formally presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Community Representatives Representations

The range of responses from the community representatives, which include Councillors, Town and Parish Councils and residents' groups amongst others, is one of the most diverse of those received. Of the 37 representations received, a number recommend that the plan be adopted as soon as possible, where others raise significant levels of objection, even stating that the Plan is unsound.

A summary of these representations can be found below. The individual summarised representations can be found in Appendix 4. The representations in full can be viewed on the council's website. Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers of Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils' for Part 1 of the Local Plan and Tendring only for Part 2 of the Local Plan; with any major proposed changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Summary of Community Representations Part 1 – North Essex

Councillors: Councillors Julie and Tim Young are concerned to see Tendring building on the Colchester border. The Councillors also wish to see a 1.5km green gap and recommend that any development should catalyse A120 and A133 improvements. They consider health and education should be expanded for both proposed and existing residents and support is given to the expansion of the University of Essex.

Elmstead Parish Council: Expresses concern in regards to the proposed east Colchester / west Tendring garden community: including, impact on the natural environment; public open space; the strategic green gap designation; noise and traffic pollution and worsening public transport services.

Frinton and Walton Town Council: provide suggestions on policy wording improvements (see Appendix 4).

Other Organisations: The Wivenhoe Society raises concerns over the ambitious housing targets set by Colchester Borough Council. They also suggest the west Tendring development is delayed until the end of the plan period by which time experience of developing garden cities would be gained. In addition, the Society suggests that Weeley could accommodate more growth than what is proposed in the Plan. The University of Essex supports the 'garden city' concept and wishes to grow the University on land within Tendring's boundary.

Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to this committee on January 19, 2017.

Summary of Community Representations Part 2 - Tendring

Councillors: Councillors Julie and Tim Young have made a number of comments in regard to the proposed development at Weeley. These concerns include traffic generation, impact on infrastructure and the impact on the character of the village.

A number of requests have been made to amend the Settlement Development Boundary of some settlements and some other mapping changes are suggested by Councillors.

Town and Parish Councils and Residents Groups: Weeley based Councils and residents' groups have varying concerns over the proposed developments at Weeley. The way in which Weeley was identified as an 'expanded settlement' and the amount of growth proposed.

Other Weeley area concerns, included the impact on healthcare, education, highway capacity, loss of agricultural land and the character of the village.

Elsewhere in the district, concern is also expressed in regards to general highway capacity, healthcare and education provision. Suggestion is made that greater weight should be given to rail travel and trackside infrastructure. A number of Parish and Town Councils make the point that infrastructure should be delivered before development commences.

The current car parking capacity and that being exasperated by new developments was mentioned as being a concern within the District's larger towns. The lack of affordable housing throughout the district was also flagged up through representations. The level of development outside of the Tendring district was also seen to potentially have a detrimental impact.

The loss of open countryside and the removal of the Green Gap designation were noted as concerns for some Parish and Town Councils. The impact of flooding and surface water drainage was also raised as potential negative impacts of proposed developments.

Some Councils lean support to both the Weeley and west Tendring developments.

A number of Town and Parish Councils had concerns over the development of specific sites within their area and requested detailed mapping changes. Numerous wording changes to policies and the supporting text are also suggested.

A number of organisations promoted access to the countryside, including bridleways, footpath and public open space.

Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to a future meeting of this Committee.

Members of the Public Representations

Representations have been received from 204 individual members of public. The number of comments within each representation is between 1-80 comments. The majority (1670 out of 2234) of comments are centred on the growth proposed for Weeley. Other representations express concerns regarding development near Elmstead Market for the new Garden Community in West Tendring (375). While the remainder relate to a broad range of places and sites throughout the District (189).

The representations have been broken down into the recurrent themes expressed by members of the public. These topics range from education to economy and from health and wellbeing to transport and congestion.

A summary of these representations can be found below. A fuller summary of the representations can be found in Appendix 5. The representations in full can be viewed on the council's website. Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers of Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils' for Part 1 of the Local Plan and Tendring only for Part 2 of the Local Plan; with any proposed major changes presented to a future meeting of this committee.

Summary of the Members of the Public representations for the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation – 2016 – Part 1 – North Essex

The largest concern within the representations from Members of the Public regarding the new garden community in east Colchester / west Tendring is transport and congestion. This accounts for 8% of comments received across the district.

Members of the public have also shown concern over erosion of the green gap and diminishing healthcare provision accounting for 6% each.

Schools; loss of green space; over development and loss of rural environment account for 5% each.

4% of comments address wildlife/agriculture/habitats. Whilst employment/economy and loss of agricultural land account for 2% each.

Infrastructure; Flooding; Sewerage; Parking; Property Values; New Railway Station; Police & Crime; Crematorium; Affordable Housing; and Social issues in total account for 7% of the correspondence received by the Council.

Representations on the individual policies received 45% of the correspondence.

Summary of the Members of the Public representations for the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation – 2016 – Part 2 (excluding comments on Weeley).

The majority of comments are centred on the growth proposed for Weeley. Other representations express concerns regarding development near Elmstead Market for the new Garden Community in West Tendring. While the remainder relate to a broad range of places and sites throughout the District.

The representations have been broken down into the recurrent themes expressed by members of the public. These topics range from education to economy and from health and wellbeing to transport and congestion.

Although the vast majority of responses from members of the public refer to the proposed development at Weeley, there are a substantial amount of responses which refer to other topics and sites (around 10% of the total correspondence from members of the public). The percentages expressed below are percentages of this 10%.

The most common theme throughout the correspondence is the potential for loss of the rural

environment and village history. This accounts for around 15% of the correspondence.

In regards to health and wellbeing, members of the public are concerned about GP surgeries being overwhelmed by new residents in the area. This accounts for 14% of the correspondence received.

The correspondence also suggests a concern over the increasing levels of traffic congestion in the proposal areas and the added vehicles on the road as a result of the proposed developments. This accounts for 12% of the correspondence received.

12% of correspondence addresses concerns over loss of agriculture, wildlife and conservation more generally. The members of the public are concerned about local habitats being destroyed causing less wildlife.

Members of the public have also expressed concern regarding school overcrowding - suggesting schools are or will be at or over capacity. This was raised in 10% of correspondence.

Members of the public recognise that Tendring being a coastal district, parts of the district are at high risk of flooding through coastal flooding and with the increase in houses, the members of the public are concerned that there will be more surface water flooding due to the increased levels of buildings and roads in the District. This constitutes 9% of the correspondence.

19% of the correspondence addresses concerns over: employment; over development; economy; and air quality or pollution. The general concerns encompassed by this are that there will be over populations of the area leading to a lower quality of life for all of the current residents who submitted objections to the plan.

Summary of the Members of the Public representations for the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation – 2016 – Part 2 (Weeley).

The majority of the correspondence which the Council received in this consultation was from members of the public. Within this section of correspondence, the overwhelming proportion of representations had regard to Weeley (around 90% of all members of the public referred to Weeley).

Within the representations, there are a broad and diverse range of themes. The most recurrent theme was the potential for transport and congestion in and around Weeley. Many members of the public believe that the roads in the area are already at capacity, especially at peak hours. Transport and congestion accounts for around 15% of the total correspondence from members of the public.

The second most recurrent theme was over development and loss of village identity. Members of the public consider that Weeley could not withstand as many houses as proposed by the higher level of Objectively Assessed Needs. This accounts for 13% of Weeley correspondence.

The next most common themes are: sewerage, drainage and flooding; health and wellbeing; and designations on the Weeley local map C30.

In regards to health and wellbeing, members of the public are concerned about GP surgeries being overwhelmed by new residents in the area. Finally, the objections to the Weeley map (C30) are generally in regards to members of the public disagreeing with the suggested allocations. These

three issues combined account for around 30% of the total members of the public's responses regarding Weeley.

Other representations that have been received include matters of: economy; schools; employment; loss of rural environment and village history; air quality and pollution; wildlife; agriculture and conservation. This accounts for around 42% of the total members of the public's responses. All of these themes centre on overcrowding and overpopulation. Further to this, representations express that the effect that the extra people in (and moving through) the area will be a negative action. This will manifest itself in poorer air quality, as well as local habitats being destroyed causing less wildlife. The concerns surrounding the economy, schools and employment are concerns that the current inhabitants will not receive the same level of support and enjoy the same quality of life as they currently have.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Representations

Summary of the Consultation Responses on the Sustainability Appraisal of North Essex Authorities – Common Strategic Part 1

During the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation, the corresponding Sustainability Appraisals of Part 1 and 2 were also published for consultation. The responses received for Part 1 are summarised below:

Technical Stakeholders

None received

Businesses, Landowners and Developers

Gladman Developments Limited: Support is given to Tendring, Colchester and Braintree working together. Questions are raised in regard to the deliverability of housing sites in comparison to the Council's Objectively Assessed Needs requirement. Gladman suggests the District's aging population must be considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. The Council is reminded that, when looking at future developments, consideration should be given as to how they will expand after the plan period. Committee is asked to note that sites are considered beyond the current Local Plan period.

Community Representatives

Councillors Julie and Tim Young are concerned to see Tendring building on the Colchester border. The Councillors also wish to see a 1.5km green gap and recommend that any development should catalyse A120 and A133 improvements. They consider health and education should be expanded for both proposed and existing residents and support is given to the expansion of the University of Essex.

Elmstead Market Parish Council: concerns are made in regard to the loss of 'best and most versatile agricultural land'. It is also stated that residents of Crockleford Heath and Mount Pleasant would be adversely affected by the proposed development contrary to the information within the Sustainability Appraisal.

Members of the Public

A request is made to include the Stour and Orwell estuary within the 'biodiversity' section of the Sustainability Appraisal. Concerns are also raised in regard to the level of development proposed for Harwich and Dovercourt. In particular, impact on traffic and the highway network.

Concerns are raised in regard to the loss of Grade 1 'best and most versatile agricultural land'. In addition, concerns regarding the loss of residential amenity especially at Crockleford Heath and Mount Pleasant are highlighted.

A request is made for the Council to consider Compulsory Purchase of land for development and use of brown field sites. A preference is given to wave and tidal energy over wind energy. A request is also made that developers are taxed to allow for affordable housing.

A suggestion is made to build a new town by the A12.

Committee is asked to note that the representations on the Sustainability Appraisal will be considered by Officers and our Sustainability Appraisal consultants and any proposed major changes will be reported to a future meeting of this committee.

Summary of the Consultation Responses of Sustainability Appraisal of Part 2

Technical Stakeholders

None received

Businesses, Landowners and Developers

Gladman Developments Limited: Welcomes that the North Essex Authorities are working together to prepare a strategic plan. In addition, recognises that Maldon is part of the same Housing Market Area but may be unable to align at this time. (note to Committee – Maldon is not part of Tendring's Housing Market Area – this may be referring to Chelmsford).

The Plan is too rigid and does not give the Council opportunity to react to changes that may arise. LP1 is not specific enough to ensure robust and transparent assessment. The scoring system in LP1 does not seem to be realistic with 600 houses creating a '+' and over 600 houses causing a '-' in housing regeneration.

PPL6 and SP2 are so rigid, they may cause some houses to not be built and therefore the Council may not reach its 5 years housing supply.

Important that settlements (such as Alresford, Little Clacton or Ardleigh) are assessed and meaningful growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability.

Gladman is prepared to deliver 118 dwellings on the site of Wick Lane, Ardleigh within the next 5 years.

Strutt and Parker LLP: Weeley Garden Village (land south of Tendring Park Services) would perform well against the SA objectives. Garden village would ensure the provision of a mix of well-designed housing types, including both market and affordable housing to support existing and growing population.

SA2 and SA3 - Weeley has good transport links and can offer sustainable employment to the

surrounding areas due to its connectivity to the road and rail network. More houses and residents will give a significant and positive impact to the local economy.

SA4 – the mix of housing and workspace ensures there is minimal impact on the local highways and road network as people can live within walking distance of their place of work.

SA5 – Weeley could accommodate 8ha of new employment land; a 1 form new primary school; a new GP surgery/medical centre; a new neighbourhood centre including shops, services and community uses; 7 ha of new public open space.

The site can deliver: a new primary school; GP surgery/medical centre; neighbourhood centre; and public open space; as well as housing.

SA6 – the provision of homes to meet the housing need for the district would be alleviated by Weeley providing the houses. By not overcrowding the higher population density areas, the character of the district will be maintained.

SA7 – the infrastructure and the village are well suited and situated to accommodate the proposed growth.

SA8 – the scale of Weeley Garden Village is suitable for a comprehensive and sustainable drainage system to be integrated. This would reduce the current risk of flooding in the village. Being a Flood Zone 1 would ensure that more flooding prone areas are not being overcrowded. The NPPF states that plans have to be deliverable and the proposed Weeley growth is deliverable.

Community Representatives

None received

Members of the Public

Carol Bannister: Feels she was misled in regards to the purpose of the appraisal. She thought it was aiming to inform on sites that were put forward by developers and landowners. The appraisal should have also have been as objective as possible. Yet Essex County Council remains a key consultee and the document was written by Tendring District Council and analysed by Essex County Council, resulting in the document almost solely being looked at 'in-house'.

Employment site options for Weeley are 'set in stone' and so building in Weeley would destroy the vibrant community. Transport links in Weeley are not good enough. The pedestrian areas (e.g. paths) are sometimes dangerous. Not enough primary school spaces.

She is concerned about the methods used to produce this so-called Sustainability Appraisal. Building in Weeley would annihilate the village community and rural environment.

Ms A V Barnes: Objects to the Plan in its entirety in regard to Weeley. The water table as it currently is would mean any new development would cause flooding to the existing houses of the village. Weeley is not sustainable if it is developed as agriculture and holiday trade are the key areas of its sustainability which development would destroy.

J M Meredith: Too many houses planned and not enough schools, medical practices etc. Sites such as Barnards are being closed yet the Council recommends the Mercedes building to be an

employment site which is next to the Stour and Orwell Special Protection Area. The community is losing schools and open space yet with more and more housing being put in, schools and housing are what the community need. There is a lack of balance.

HA4 offers the football club car park as housing yet without the car park, the football club is not viable.

The Preferred Options Public Consultation Exercise

The consultation period started on Thursday 14 July and ran until Thursday 8 September, during this time officers held 9 public exhibitions across the district. In all, 815 people attended these exhibitions.

As part of the Preferred Options process the Council leafleted every household across the district (and parts of Babergh and Colchester to meet the Duty to Co-operate) to make the residents (and others) aware of the forthcoming consultation events. Some of these leaflets arrived after the first two exhibitions so an additional event was held in Walton-on-the-Naze to cover that part of the district, whilst Clacton already had a second event planned. Officers also wrote to residents of properties adjacent to sites where large scale development was proposed and erected signs with maps to draw attention to the locations for proposed growth.

Date	Venue	No. of attendees
Monday 18 July	Clacton Town Hall, Clacton	15
Wednesday 20 July	Baker Hall, Kirby Cross	16
Wednesday 3 August	Council Chamber, Weeley	125
Thursday 4 August	Columbine Centre, Walton	79
Saturday 13 August	Tendring Enterprise Studio, Clacton	70
Tuesday 16 August	Central Church, Dovercourt	60
Friday 19 August	Council Chamber, Weeley	150
Monday 22 August	Venture Centre, Lawford	100
Tuesday 30 August	Community Centre, Elmstead	200

Within the exhibitions, members of the public were asked to give their comments on the Preferred Options consultation document. Whilst official representations could only be submitted via Objective on the Council's website, on a representation form or by post/email, members of the public were also given the opportunity to submit informal comments at the exhibitions.

The public were invited to write their thoughts on 'post it' notes provided at the exhibitions. These are attached as Appendix 6.

Next Steps

Detailed consideration will be given to the comments made through the recent Preferred Options consultation. Where officers consider that these comments should result in minor changes to the Plan, these will be incorporated into the Plan and reported to the Local Plan Committee on 19 January 2017. If officers identify the need for major changes to policies or allocations, these will be reported to the Local Plan Committee for consideration prior to January 2017. This early consideration will allow production of the Local Plan to proceed according to the agreed timetable.

Consultation responses relating to Part 1 of the Preferred Options will be jointly collated by Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils and will be reported back the committees in the respective councils..

APPENDIX 1 - Representations on the Preferred Options Local Plan – Part 1 North Essex and Part 2 Tendring - Technical Stakeholders

Representations on the Preferred Options Local Plan – Part 1 and Part 2 - Technical Stakeholders

Anglian Water (AW)

AW has assessed each of the housing and employment sites and no objections have been made. AW provides an overall Red/Amber/Green rating for all sites and classifies every site as Amber. However, some sites have a Red flag for water recycling capacity, which means these will need to be improved. The additional capacity needed will inform AW's 2020-2025 business plan. AW indicates that the Clacton, Holland, Manningtree and Jaywick water recycling centres would need to be improved and that the phasing of the growth from TDC's allocations should reflect the timing of such improvements. TDC's proposed phasing relies on existing consents in the early years of Local Plan and therefore is compliant with AW's advice.

AW advises that their preferred method for surface water disposal is through Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). TDC's Local Plan is compliant with this advice.

AW requires all new development to connect to the foul water network. AW has assessed where improvements will need to be made to the foul water network and will offer pre-planning to each developer on any requirements for network upgrades.

In relation to the Colchester Fringe, AW advises upgrades will be required and they would welcome early engagement to aid the planning of the garden community.

Braintree District Council (BDC)

BDC welcomes the positive approach to strategic working being undertaken by TDC within the north Essex area. BDC also supports the approach taken on the 550 and 600 homes each year scenarios employed by TDC in the Preferred Options Local Plan consultation.

British Naturalists' Association

Considers that the review of the Coastal Protection Belt has been too severe and identifies areas where it considers the belt should be reinstated.

Chelmsford City Council

Supports Part 1 and Part 2 of the Local Plan and requests that the northeast Chelmsford bypass is added to Part 1 of the Local Plan.

Colchester Borough Council (CBC)

CBC formally objected to the previous Submission version of Local Plan for Tendring District

Council based on the scale and distribution of the proposed growth. CBC does however support both Part 1 and Part 2 of the current Preferred Options Local Plan. CBC has suggested some areas for change.

- i. That the area of search for the Colchester Fringe should not be shown on an ordnance survey based map and that the indicative A120/A133 link road should not be shown.
- ii. That references to the Colchester Fringe should not be made in Part 2 of the Local Plan.
- iii. That the Submission version of the Local Plan does not include a range of housing targets i.e. 550-600 but sets a definitive target.
- iv. CBC supports the phasing and delivery schedule of the housing supply.
- v. CBC suggests further joint evidence may be required on affordable housing targets as they differ for CBC and TDC's Local Plans.
- vi. CBC supports the potential link road from the A120 to the A133 but considers Policy CP2 should make more reference to public transport including rapid transit and park and ride.
- vii. CBC welcomes our approach to rail and suggests we seek to enhance access to stations as part of development proposals.
- viii. CBC suggests any development proposals for the Ardleigh Crown area should not conflict with CBC's Green Orbital route. The Local Plan does not contain any proposals for the Ardleigh Crown area.

Colchester Natural History Society

Would prefer no development east of Colchester in the vicinity of Salary Brook but if development does take place – the Society gives a preference for it to be 1.5 km away from the brook. The Society provides a list of invertebrates, birds, plants and moths in the area.

Environment Agency (EA)

EA are very supportive of the Garden Communities policies and provide comments for some minor improvements. They suggest more emphasis should be placed on blue infrastructure, that flood risk issues are added to PP10 (Camping and Touring Caravans), strengthening policy on flood issues within PP11 (Holiday Parks), and suggested improvements to PPL1 (Development and Flood Risks), PPL 4 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) and PPL 5 (Water Conservation, Drainage and Sewerage).

EA wish to see the sequential (and potentially exceptions) test carried out for the Local Plan allocations with reference to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

EA points out that Policy PP14 (Priority Areas for Regeneration) will specifically require the sequential and exceptions test. They also point out that regeneration will reduce the deprivation index – meaning less priority for EA funding. Similarly, they point out any new development post

2012 cannot be included in calculations for flood defence grant aid from EA. More positively, EA offer to work with TDC to produce a guide for small plot or plot level rebuilds to support Flood Risk Assessments for planning applications.

Essex County Council (ECC)

ECC formally objected to the previous Submission version of Local Plan for Tendring District Council based on the scale and distribution of the proposed growth. ECC however, does support both Part 1 and Part 2 of the current Preferred Options Local Plan. ECC has suggested some areas for change and requirements for infrastructure to support the proposed growth.

Part 1

- i. Minor alterations to wording in Part 1 policies.
- ii. Seeks a link road between the A120 and A133 for the east of Colchester garden community.
- iii. Seeks two – two form primary schools and one - four form secondary school, plus early years provision for the east of Colchester garden community.
- iv. Supports our references to SuDS and encourages multi use green space for recreation and wildlife.
- v. Supports community facilities and long terms stewardship policies.

Part 2

- i. Recommends the introduction at Part 2 moves to before Part 1.
- ii. Provides additional text regarding the Essex Minerals Local Plan and the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan.
- iii. Recommends minor changes to the Vision and Objectives such as changing 'health care' to 'health' in order to capture the wider health agenda.
- iv. Add 'Climate Change' to HP3 (Green Infrastructure).
- v. Recommends some site-specific policies for the larger allocations.
- vi. Requires the following in regards to education for the proposed allocations:
 - a. Clacton-on-Sea: Two – two-form entry primary schools. Re-opening Bishops Park College or expanding secondary schools in the Clacton/Frinton area. One 30-place nursery co-located with a new primary school.
 - b. Harwich and Dovercourt: Expansion of one or more primary schools. Use of existing surplus in secondary accommodation.
 - c. Frinton, Walton and Kirby: Expansion of one or more primary schools. Re-opening Bishops Park College or expanding secondary schools in the Clacton/Frinton area

(including consented growth). One 30-place nursery co-located with a new primary school.

- d. Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley: Expansion of one or more primary schools and 1-2 additional forms of entry for Manningtree High School (including consented growth). One 30-place nursery co-located with a new primary school.
- e. Brightlingsea some expansion of primary and secondary places may be required. One 30-place nursery co-located with existing primary school.
- f. Weeley: For Scenario 1 (304 homes) expansion of St Andrew's Church of England Primary School, use of existing catchment capacity at Tendring Technology College – Thorpe (note this may reduce places for non-catchment areas). For Scenario 2 (1,411 homes) 1 – two form entry primary school. The secondary school provision is more complex for years 7-9; this could be accommodated through Tendring Technology Campus (Thorpe). Years 10 and 11 would need to be accommodated by the Frinton campus or years 7-11 could be accommodated by the reopening of Bishops Park Technology College or the expansion of secondary schools in Frinton/Clacton. One 30-place nursery co-located with a new primary school.
- g. Rural Service Centres: Expansion of existing primary schools – though it is pointed out Elmstead and Thorpe-Le-Soken have limited scope for expansion.

- vii. Minor policy change suggestions to Living Places Policies 2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10
- viii. Support to Living Places Policy 11 (HMO)
- ix. Minor policy change suggestions to Prosperous Places Policies 6,7,8,11,12 and 14. Specific request to discuss Oakwood and Crusader Business Parks in relation to the emerging Minerals Local Plan.
- x. Minor policy change suggestions to Protected Places Policies 1,2,4,5,7 and 11. Suggest TDC updates its 'Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2009)'.
- xi. Minor policy change suggestions to Connected Places Policies 1 and 2.
- xii. Suggests a new policy covering developer contributions and provides an example.
- xiii. Provides additions to the Glossary of Terms.
- xiv. Heritage Assets – suggests text is updated to reflect the 2015 'Protected Lanes' review (nine lanes for protection).
- xv. Add 'London' to references to Stansted Airport.

Highways England (HE)

HE supports the approach made to transport in the Local Plan. HE wishes to support the Local

Plan to deliver its growth and highlights key strategic projects as:

- A120 Braintree to Marks Tey, long term (dualling) – led by ECC to determine options for a new A120 route between Braintree and the A12.
- A12 widening between J19 and J25.
- Highway modelling of the effect of three Local Plans; Braintree, Colchester and Tendring, including a 'Rapid Transit Study' for East Colchester/West Tendring.
- The A12/A120 route based strategy as published by the Highways Agency in March 2013 and revised strategies that are being prepared for delivery post 2020.
- Supporting the case for improved rail connections to Essex and beyond.

HE considers that increased emphasis should be put on the public transport, walking and cycling, including access to rail stations.

Specifically, for Tendring HE advises:

Growth proposed at Clacton-on-Sea, Frinton and Walton, Harwich, Manningtree, Thorpe-Le-Soken and Weeley is unlikely to have severe impact on the A120. Growth at Gt Bentley may have adverse impact on the A120 and that this should be assessed. For the Colchester Fringe, HE advises a business case be developed for the link road and a new junction on the A120. HE advises that an upgraded junction would have less impact on the A120 than a roundabout.

Historic England

Historic England will provide any representations in time to be taken account of, for the January meeting of this Committee.

Royal Mail (RM)

RM advises that for every 500 new homes a new postal round needs to be created. For RM this means that they need to consider the expansion of assets to accommodate the growth. RM has sites in Clacton-on-Sea, Wivenhoe, Brightlingsea, Frinton-on-Sea, Harwich and Manningtree. RM is satisfied that Policy PP6 (employment Sites) will protect assets within designated areas but is concerned regarding sites not protected under the current Local Plan employment policies. Here RM considers any proposals for growth from housing or retail should attenuate the noise from RM assets and not seek removal of the RM assets.

RM supports Policy CM2 (Improving the Transport Network)

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

The RSPB suggests that a number of policies should remove 'or' and 'and/or' to make them consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. They also recommend improvements to the vision and objectives in relation biodiversity and request that Walton Mere is added to Table

D1. The RSPB wishes to review the Habitats Regulation Assessment. This Assessment is made on the submission version of the Local Plan and Land Use Consultants have been appointed to produce the HRA.

The Theatres Trust

Suggests changes to Policy HP2 including the removal of the word 'viability'.

Natural England (NE)

NE suggests an objective should be added to part 1 of the Local Plan to cover landscape and climate change. A number of comments have been made on policies throughout the Local Plan in relation to paragraph ordering, additions and wording changes. NE would like to assist TDC with the Habitats Regulation Assessment.

Network Rail (NR)

NR welcomes support in removing any potentially dangerous level crossings and makes specific reference to level crossings which may be affected by the Local Plan proposed allocations:

Oakwood – the Giles User Worked Crossing (UWC) and Giles Footpath Crossing. NR considers that the change of use would mean the Giles UWC could be removed, as it would no longer be required. NR flag the need for early engagement on mitigation for the Giles Footpath Crossing, given the likely increase in usage.

Colchester Fringe – operational rail infrastructure is within the broad area of search and as such, impacts must be assessed in mixed use allocated in the vicinity.

Great Bentley – NR comment on the need to engage with them on impacts to footpaths on Gt Bentley Footpath and Lords Level Crossing.

Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley – NR requests to be engaged in any discussion regarding road improvement in the vicinity of the CCTV Level Crossing east of Manningtree Station.

Weeley – NR wishes to be engaged in discussion on the future of the Church Lane Footpath Crossing and potential station improvements that may be required of the proposed Weeley allocations.

National Health Service – North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)

The CCG notes that there are 15 GP Practices, 4 branch surgeries, 34 pharmacies, 15 dental surgeries, 17 opticians and 2 community hospitals in Tendring District Council's administrative area. The CCG considers that the growth in employment and housing will require a growth in GP practices. The CCG alongside NHS England has commenced work on assessing the optimal space requirements for a full range of services to be delivered within the community. The CCG suggests that the Local Plan makes it clear that developments will be subject to financial contributions to the CCG/NHS but to not be specific in regards to what actually needs to be delivered or specific timeframes as this should be discussed at Planning Applications stage in light

of the CCG's 'Five Year Forward View', 'Strategic Estates and Primary Care Strategy' and 'Sustainability Transformation Plans'. However, to provide information to support the Local Plans Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the CCG has provided the expected requirements and their anticipated costs for potential developments in the Tendring District. This includes new Health Centre(s) for the Colchester Fringe, Weeley, Elmstead and Gt Bentley areas and a new Health Centre for the west Clacton area, with enhanced facilities at Oakwood Park, Harwich, Brightlingsea, Alresford, Little Clacton, Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley and Thorpe-Le-Soken. In addition, the recent consents in the Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross areas have provided almost a million pounds towards a new Health Centre in this area.

The CCG has also provided suggestions for improvements to the Part 1 Local Plan policies in relation to health and the Healthy Places chapter in Part 2 of the Local Plan.

APPENDIX 2 – Businesses, Landowners and Developers – Part 1 Local Plan

BUSINESSES, LANDOWNERS AND DEVELOPERS – Part 1 Local Plan

Richard & Ronald Allwright and Peter Bray (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Policy SP1 – support

Policy SP2 – object – will not deliver enough housing to meet OAHN (Objectively Assessed Housing Need)

The Burghes Estate (Agent Berrys)

Policy SP2 – support – Plan should identify land for >11,000 dwellings to ensure delivery

Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Policy SP2 – object - plan unsound – not effective or consistent with national policy re. meeting OAHN

Sites not identified for delivery in short-term.

David Foster (Agent Boyer)

Policy SP3 – vary – sites previously allocated but not delivered should be carefully considered

Policy SP5 – vary – give support to innovative and unique schemes

Gladman Developments Ltd.

Vision - support

Policy SP3 – object to criterion (b) – contrary to NPPF

Policy SP4 – object – recognise need but requirements for necessary new infrastructure and facilities not assessed?

Policy SP6 - support 3 new garden communities approach

Policy SP7 - object - fundamentally flawed and in conflict with NPPF

Policy SP9 – support but delivery trajectory must be realistic – smaller and medium sized sites needed early in plan period.

Hills Building Group (Agent Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd)

Policy SP8 – vary - no objection in principle but concerns over assumptions regarding deliverability.

Knight Developments Ltd (Agent Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd)

Policy SP8 – vary - no objection in principle but concerns over assumptions regarding deliverability.

Mr Tim Martin (Agent MatPlan Ltd)

Policy SP2 – object/vary - revise table in Part 2 LP1 to be consistent

Policy SP7 – object/vary - object as drafted until comprehensive information and delivery arrangements available

Policy SP8 – object/vary - object as drafted until comprehensive information and delivery arrangements available

Delivery Arrangements – object/vary - comments as in SP7 & SP8.

Persimmon Homes

Policy SP2 – need to be mindful of wider HMA which includes Greater London Authority (constraints exist within London itself and Metropolitan Green Belt areas/Authorities)

Policy SP4 – timing of delivery of new infrastructure unclear

Policy SP6 – object – evidence base not robust re. delivery

Policy SP7 - object – uncertainty re. amount, location and delivery – implications for OAN

Policy SP8 – Boundaries should be defined in LP –realistic delivery trajectory should be included.

Rosegrade (Agent Holmes & Hills LLP)

Vision – object

Policy SP2 – object

Policy SP6 – object

Sammi Developments Ltd (Agent Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd)

Policy SP8 – vary - no objection in principle but concerns over assumptions regarding deliverability.

St Monica's Trust (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Policy SP2 – object – plan unsound - not effective or consistent with national policy re. meeting OAN

Policy SP6 – Additional development should be distributed throughout settlement hierarchy – concerns over Weeley Expanded Settlement and Windfall approach.

Taylor Wimpey (Agent Woolf Bond Planning)

Policy SP2 – object – plan should identify enough deliverable sites to help deliver 12,000 dwellings.

Policy SP3 – object – support employment allocation at Weeley but should be part of mixed-use scheme to include: housing; community facilities; local centre; land for primary school; and public open space.

Tendring Farms Ltd (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Policy SP6 – sound relation to Part 2 Policy SPL1 re. Mistley, Manningtree & Lawford.

University of Essex

Policy SP4 – support

Policy S7 – support - The University broadly supports the 'garden city' concept; this needs early completion of key road between A120 and the A133.

Mr George Wright (Agent Hills Building Group)

Policy SP8 – vary - no objection in principle but concerns over assumptions regarding deliverability.

APPENDIX 3 - Businesses, Landowners and Developers – Part 2 Local Plan

BUSINESSES, LANDOWNERS AND DEVELOPERS – Part 2 Local Plan

Sites being promoted for new housing or mixed-use including housing

Alresford

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Seeking increased housing provision in Rural Service Centres.

Include land north of Cockaynes Lane for housing (N).

Ardleigh

Promoter – Mr D Brasted (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land at Old Ipswich Road within Colchester Fringe – Local Map 12 (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land east of Turnpike Close for housing (N), or employment

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land north of Old Ipswich Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Gladman Developments Ltd.

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, SPL3, HP1, LP1, LP2, LP4, LP5, LP10, PP12, PPL3, PPL6, PPL8 and PPL10

'Site-specific' – SPL2 - Local Map 9

Include land north of Wick Lane/Colchester Road for housing - up to 118No. dwellings (N).

Promoter – Harris Plumpton Trust (Agent Evolution Planning)

Submission – object to Policies SPL1 and SPL2

'Site-specific' – 4No. sites proposed for housing:

Land between Wick Lane, Colchester Road and Dead Lane – up to 30 units (N).

Land south of Colchester Road – up to 20 units (N).

Land south of Aveline Road (N).

Land south of Harwich Road (N).

Promoter – Mr Brian Stapleton

Submission – Land adjacent to the cemetery with access to Harwich Road in the Southeast corner, could accommodate up to 15 more houses.

Promoter – Mr R Steward (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north east of Ardleigh Road for housing – 5No. units (N).

Brightlingsea

Promoter – J S Blyth & Sons Ltd (Agent Honace)

Submission – Propose mixed-use allocation land north of Robinson Road

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Local Map 9

Include land north of Samson's Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Hopkins Homes Ltd

Submission – Brightlingsea should be elevated above Rural Heartland.

'Dwelling stock' should be changed to 'new homes'. The words 'short fall' at the start indicate a failure from the outset. LP1 fails to deliver a minimum requirement. The policy should delete 100homes for Brightlingsea and replace it with 120.

Promoter – Tim Snow Architects

Submission – We would like to see a variation of the settlement boundary at the end of Batemans Road (formerly Ideal Nurseries Site). The site could be accessed from Talbot Road and Thorrington Road as well as Batemans Lane.

Clacton

Promoter – Mr K Acres

Submission – Crossways Garden Centre, Thorpe Road Little Clacton for development.

Promoter – Richard & Ronald Allwright and Peter Bray (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, SPL2, LP1, LP7 and PPL6

'Site-specific' - Local Map 10 Part A in respect of proposed mixed-use and housing allocations and Local Wildlife Site ref. Te92.

Include land south of Centenary Way, Clacton for housing (N).

Promoter – Bloor Homes (Agent Barton Willmore)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, LP1, LP5 and PPL6

Submission – Include land north of Rush Green Road/east of Jaywick Lane for housing. General support for growth but object to housing supply, including affordable housing and Green Gap policies.

Promoter – Brown & Meek (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2, HP4 and PPL6 - object

Include land south of Rush Green Road for housing – 60No. units (N).

Promoter – ECC (Agent Bidwells)

Submission – The following policies are supported:

LP2 Housing Choice

LP10 Care and Assisted Living

Specific representation made in regard to Coppins Court – "... the Local Plan must specifically allocate the site for C2 use, rather than simply for a general residential allocation"

Promoter – Robert Giles

Submission – support mixed-use allocation east of Thorpe Road to include approx. 288No. dwellings

Promoter – Land Logic Ltd. (Agent MatPlan Ltd.)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies LP1 and PPL6

'Site-specific' - Policies SPL2 and Local Maps 10, 11 and 24 in respect of proposed mixed-use and housing allocations.

Land south of London Road, Clacton is being promoted for approximately 230No. dwellings (N).

Promoter – Messrs Lord & Hunt (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land west of Earls Hall Drive for housing – 30No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – Merchant Projects Ltd. (Agent Artisan)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policy SPL1

'Site-specific' - Land at Foot's Farm, south of Centenary Way, Clacton is being promoted for approximately 120No. dwellings (Local Map 11) (N).

Promoter – Mr R O'Dell (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - support

Include land west of Earls Hall Drive/north of St John's Road for housing – 70No.dwellings net (N).

Promoter – Persimmon Homes

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, SPL3, HP1-4, LP1, LP2, LP3, LP4, LP5, PP3, CP1 CP2 and PPL11

'Site-specific' - Policy SPL2 and Local Map 10

Include land west of Jaywick Lane/south of St John's Road for mixed-use including approx. 1,145 dwellings, primary school, GP surgery/medical centre and neighbourhood centre.

Promoter – Sammi Developments Ltd (Agent Phase 2)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Policies SPL2 and Local Map 11

Include land west of Sladbury's Lane/south of Burr's Road for mixed-use (N).

Promoter – Scott Properties (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Support allocation of land east of Thorpe Road/south of Holland Road ('Oakwood Park') for mixed-use including 1000No. dwellings, education, health, care and retail.

Promoter – Silverton Aggregates (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy PP6 - object

Include land north-west of Oxford Road for housing (not employment)

Promoter – Tim Snow Architects

Submission – We support the allocation of housing to the north of Centenary Way.

Promoter – St Monica's Trust (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies LP1 and PPL6

'Site-specific' - Local Map 10

Land west of Cherry Tree Avenue, Clacton is being promoted for housing (N).

Promoter – TDC – Mr Ian Taylor

Submission – Extend settlement boundary to include The Esplanade Holland on Sea up to the Gunfleet Boating Club

Promoter – Mr & Mrs Wild (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - support

Include land west of Little Clacton Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr T Wild, Greenwich Hospital Trust & Mr P Smith (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2, LP1, LP2 and CP2 - support

Include land west of London Road (Hartley Gardens) for housing up to 2,500 units.

Elmstead Market

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Increase housing provision in Rural Service Centres

Include land west of School Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Concerns re. SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land north of Clacton Road for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Concerns re. SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land of south Clacton Road for housing (2No. sites) - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Concerns re. SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land east of School Road for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Concerns re. SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land east of Tye Road for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Knight Developments Ltd (Agent Phase 2)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, LP1 and Local Map 13

'Site-specific' - Include land west of Church Road for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Wivenhoe Park Estates (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Include land to western boundary of village for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Frating

Promoter – Colchester Gospel Hall Trust

Submission – We welcome: the provision of places of worship, whether they are newly built or conversions; provision for burial sites; extension of Frating settlement boundary to include the gospel hall in Colchester Road.

Gt Bentley (including Aingers Green)

Promoter – City & Country (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land west of Plough Road for housing (N).

Promoter – City & Country (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land north of Thorrington Road for housing – up to 90No. dwellings (N).

Promoter – City & Country (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land south of Thorrington Road for housing – up to 60No. dwellings (N).

Promoter – Gibbon Farms (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include Aingers Green as a 'Smaller Rural Settlement'

Include land west of Plough Road for housing (2No. sites) (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include Aingers Green as a 'Smaller Rural Settlement' – Policy SPL1

Include land west of St Mary's Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr & Mrs Strutt (Agent Pomery Planning Consultants)

Submission – Include land north of The Green for housing (N).

Promoter – Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP (Agent Star Planning & Development)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Local Map 16

Include land west of Heckford's Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr George Wright (Agent Hills Building Group)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Local Map 16

Include land east of Heckford's Road for housing (N).

Gt Bromley – (including Balls Green)

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land east of Frating Road for housing (N).

Gt Holland

Promoter – Ms H Hill (Agent Robinson & Hall)
Policy SPL2 - object
Include land south of Hamilton Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Ms H Hill (Agent Robinson & Hall)
Policy SPL2 and PPL6 - object
Include land north of Little Clacton Road for housing (N).

Gt Oakley (including Stones Green)

Promoter – Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance (Agent Strutt & Parker)
Submission – representations comprise:
Policies SPL2 and LP1
'Site-specific' – Include land south-west of Beaumont Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance (Agent Strutt & Parker)
Submission – representations comprise:
Policies SPL2 and LP1
'Site-specific' – Include land south-west of Wix Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Cooper Bros. (Gt Oakley Ltd) (Agent Robinson & Hall)
Policy SPL2 - object
Include land north of Stones Green Road for housing – 6No. units (N).

Harwich & Dovercourt

Promoter – Cadena AM Ltd
Submission – supports the Local Plan. Land at Greenfields Farm, Dovercourt would create 164 dwellings for the housing allocation. 819 dwellings within the plan period for the Harwich & Dovercourt area would also be achievable.

Promoter – Elm Farm Country Park Limited and Elm Farm Caravan Park Limited
Submission – Fully support proposed growth at Elm Farm.

Promoter – Paul Hales
Submission – Support Policy LP3 and the proposed site at Low Road, Dovercourt.

Promoter – Harding Estates (East Anglia) Ltd (Agent Peter Brett Assoc.)
Submission – Comments on Policies PP1, PP2, PP4 and PP7 – ref. PP 14/01431/OUT - Include land at Pond Hall Farm for mixed use – employment, retail, leisure and residential (Local Map 20). Specific policy requested.

Jaywick

Promoter – B D & I R Rendell
Submission – object to land opposite No. 27 – 45 Garden Road not being included for development

Kirby Cross

Promoter – The Burghes Estate (Agent Berrys)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies PPL6 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Local Map 15

The site at Turpins Farm can accommodate 210No. dwellings. In addition to the 240No. dwellings at Hallstead Road this results in an 'over-supply' of 74No. dwellings. The contribution to growth from F, W & KC should be increased by at least a further 350No. dwellings.

Promoter – The Land and Planning Company

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Local Map 15

Include land south of Thorpe Road for housing (up to 50No. units) (N).

Promoter – Mr R Sawyer (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north of Thorpe Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP (Agent Star Planning & Development)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2, PPL6 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Local Map 15

Include land east of Halstead Road for housing (N).

NB re. App. Ref: 15/01234/OUT – Up to 240 dwellings with a community hub including either a 40-bed space care home (Class C2) or a healthcare facility (Class D1) – refused – Appeal allowed

Kirby-le-Soken

Promoter – Pomery Planning Consultants

Submission – Support the alteration to the settlement boundary to include the end of Chartfield Drive. The inclusion of this modest site will allow some sustainable and appropriate growth in this settlement (Local Map 21).

Lawford

Promoter – Affinity Water (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policies SPL2 and PPL6 - object

Include land east of Colchester Road (north of Long Road/west of Trinity Road) for housing (N).

Promoter – The Pattle Will Trust (Agent Hawkspur)

Policies SPL1, SPL2 and LP1 - object

Include land north of Grange Road for housing – up to 30No.units

Little Clacton

Promoter – Mr N Barrington-Fuller (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north-east of Connaught Road for housing – 8No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – Mr N Barrington-Fuller & Mr Lee (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north of Batemans Road/south-west of Weeley Road for housing – up to 50No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – Britton Developments (Agent – Martin Robeson Planning Practice)

Submission – Include land north of Centenary Way for housing (Local Map 24) (N).

Promoter – Chase New Homes

Submission – Local Map 24 - amend proposed Settlement Boundary to south-west of Weeley Road to extend ribbon development to allow new housing (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land east of The Street for housing (11No. units) (N).

Promoter – Gladman Developments Ltd.

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, SPL3, HP1, LP1, LP2, LP4, LP5, LP10, PP12, PPL3, PPL6, PPL8 and PPL10

'Site-specific' - SPL2 - Local Map 9

Include land east of Amerells Road for housing - up to 115No. dwellings (N).

Little Oakley

Promoter – Foulton Hall Farms (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land southeast of Harwich Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Landfast Ltd (Agent Edward Gittins & Assoc.)

Submission – Include land at Little Oakley for housing, to include a link road/Dovercourt Western Bypass – approx. 400No. units total (N).

NB Part of land includes site of App. Ref: 15/00964/OUT – 71 dwellings – refused – Appeal dismissed

Also see Ramsey below as site area includes land in Ramsey Parish

Mistley

Promoter – Anglia Malting (Holdings) Ltd (Agent VRG Planning)

Submission – Include Edme site as regeneration area, allocate for mixed-use including housing, remove employment safeguarding and prioritise brownfield (N).

Promoter – Mr R Brooks (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 and PPL6 - object

Include land west of Trinity Road for housing (N).

Promoter – David Foster (Agent Boyer)

Submission – Include land to east of Mistley Port for housing (N).

Promoter – Tendring Farms Ltd (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Supports the Plan re. growth - Mistley, Manningtree & Lawford sustainable settlement/s

Concern over other aspects of Plan soundness – Policy LP1, LP3 and SPL1

Include land south of Long Road, west of Clacton Road for housing (N).
NB App. Ref: 15/00761/OUT - Up to 300 dwellings and up to 2 hectares of employment land (A2/A3/B1/D1 uses) – Approved

Promoter – Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP (Agent Star Planning & Development)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Local Map 27B

Include land east of Harwich Road for housing – fully support proposed allocation (ref. also PP Ref. 15/01520/OUT – up to 135No. dwellings). However, object to extent of allocation. Request amend settlement boundary to accommodate minimum 180No. dwellings (N).

Ramsey

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land and south of Church Hill, Ramsey for housing – approx. 71No. dwellings (N).

NB App. Ref: 15/00964/OUT – 71 dwellings – refused – Appeal dismissed

Promoter – Landfast Ltd (Agent Edward Gittins & Assoc.)

Submission – Include land south of Church Hill, Ramsey for housing, to include a link road/Dovercourt Western Bypass – approx. 400No. dwellings total (N).

NB Part of land includes site of App. Ref: 15/00964/OUT – 71 dwellings – refused – Appeal dismissed

Also see Little Oakley above as site area includes land in Little Oakley Parish

Promoter – Nigel Neal and associate land owners

Submission – Amend proposed Settlement Boundary as in 2012 Draft Plan

St Osyth (including Chisbon/St Osyth Heath)

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include Chisbon Heath as a ‘Smaller Rural Settlement’ – Policy SPL1

Include land north of Heath Road for housing (N).

Tendring (including Tendring Green and Tendring Heath)

Promoter – Mr T Blake (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land northeast of Heath Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ – Include land west of Heath Road (The Old Chapel) for housing (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land south-west of Heath Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Ms S Harrison Osborne (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land north-west of Heath Road for housing – max. 5No. units (N).

Thorpe-le-Soken

Promoter – The Lifehouse (Agent Ideas in Place)

Submission – Include land south of Frinton Road/east of Station Road for housing, business and leisure uses – 200No. dwellings, 42No. Independent Living units, 50No. Attended care units, 50No. Luxury holiday units, and 600sqm business space (N).

Promoter – Rosegrade Ltd (Agent Homes & Hills)

Submission – Include land west of Station Road for housing (approx. 25No. units) (N).

Promoter – Scott Properties (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Support proposed allocation (100No. dwellings)

Promoter – Tim Snow Architects

Submission – 30 ha of land to the north of Thorpe Park Lane, and west of Frinton Road. The site is called Rose Farm Quarry. The site would be perfect for the Life House Spa Hotel.

Promoter – Mr M Stobbs (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land west of Golden Lane for housing – max. 3No. units (N).

Thorrington

Promoter – Mr J P Phelan (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land northeast of Heath Road for housing (max. 6No. units) – Local Map 32 (N).

Promoter – St John's College, Cambridge (Agent Savills Planning)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site specific' - Include land west of Church Road for housing (approx. 50No. dwellings)

'Site specific' - Include land east of Station Road/north of Clacton Road for housing (approx. 60No. dwellings)

Walton

Promoter – owners (Agent Collins & Coward)

Submission – include 2 sites adjoining Walton Mere for housing (approx.20 No. dwellings each) (N).

Weeley

Promoter – Andrew Bacon (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Representations received in regard to:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' – Weeley Garden Village (Local Map 33).

Concept of Expanded/Garden Village supported including site-specific land south of Colchester Road between Weeley and Little Clacton by-passes. Approx.1000No.dwellings, primary school, neighbourhood centre, and GP surgery/medical centre.

Promoter – Rose Builders (Agent Mr Brian Morgan)
Submission – Representations received in regard to:
Policy LP1 and PP3

‘Site-specific’ – Expanded Settlement (Local Map 33).

Concept of Expanded/Garden Village supported including site-specific land south of Thorpe Road. 550No. dwellings and associated community infrastructure – option for possible primary school, Parish Council Office, retail, ‘start up’ offices and GP medical centre. Support space south of Thorpe Road; perfectly placed for development. A chance for Weeley to become a nucleated settlement. The centre should be in the traditional centre of the village with access for pedestrians and cyclists.

Promoter – Mr G Swinscoe (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north of Thorpe Road for housing – 30No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (Agent Woolf Bond Planning)

Submission – Representations received in regard to:

Policies SP2 and supporting text, SP3 and supporting text and LP1.

‘Site-specific’ – Expanded Settlement (Local Map 33).

Include land (20ha) north of Colchester Road for mixed use – 380No. dwellings, site for employment (approx. 3ha) - B1/B2 business space, 1,500sqm local centre and medical centre (approx. 0.5ha), land for a primary school and play/recreation facilities. Proposed Plan allocation for employment land is supported but this should be part of a mixed-use scheme.

Weeley Heath

Promoter – Britton Developments (Agent Martin Robeson Planning Practice)

Submission – Include land north-east of Clacton Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr Tom Doran (Agent - GVA Grimley)

Submission – Local Map 30 - amend proposed Settlement Boundary to south of railway line and allocate for the following mixed uses:

- housing
- holiday caravan park expansion
- residential caravan park
- possible community/leisure facility - if enough park homes and holiday caravans (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land south-east of Mill Lane for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr J Green, Mrs V Wright & Mr N Barrington-Fuller (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 – object

Policy LP7 - support

Include land south west of Clacton Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Kays Properties (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land west of Clacton Road for housing – 120No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – St Osyth Beach Estate Ltd (Agent Boyer Planning)

Policies SPL1, LP1 and Local Maps 33 and 34 - object

Objectives and Policies PP8 and PP10 – support

Submission – Include 3No. sites for housing at::

Land east of Rectory Road

Land west of Bentley Road

Land east of Rectory Road/south of Mill Lane

Representations which concern existing and proposed employment-related sites including tourism:

- One representation has been received in regard to retail and leisure facilities at Clacton Factory Outlet Centre:

Kames Capital (acting for AEGON UK Property Fund Ltd) (Agent RPS CgMs)

Representation – Object to Policy PP2, amend Policy PP6

District retail need should be met partly through re-designation of Clacton Factory Shopping Village as an identified 'District Centre'. Required for a 'sound' Local Plan.

- One representation has been received in regard to employment land allocation at EDME Maltings, Mistley.

Promoter – Anglia Malting (Holdings) Ltd (Agent VRG Planning)

Submission – Include Edme site as a regeneration area, allocate for mixed-use (residential-led) and remove employment safeguarding.

- One representation has been received in regard to employment land allocation at Bramble Island, Gt Oakley

Promoter – EPC-United Kingdom PLC (Agent Leith Planning Ltd)

Object – no reference to Bramble Island site, nature of operation (hazardous substance) or biodiversity value of land.

- Two representations have been received in regard to employment land allocation at Mistley Port.

Promoter – David Foster (Agent Boyer)

Submission – Object to allocation of land to east of Mistley Port as employment site – contrary to NPPF para.22 and not under control of Mistley Port. No evidence that expansion of Mistley Port is viable.

Policies SPL3, LP2, PP7 and PP8

Promoter – TW Logistics Ltd.

Submission – Object to protection of Mistley Port as a general employment site. Site-specific marine/port designation is required. Also, for allocation of land for port expansion.

Further comments re. Edme Maltings and Crisp Maltings - not identified as employment sites.

Policies PP6, PP7 and Local Map 27.

- One representation has been received in regard to employment land allocation at Carless Refinery, Parkeston.

Promoter – Halterman Carless (Agent Keningtons)

Submission – Include land west of the refinery for employment expansion and remove land proposed for expansion to north (as owned by Network Rail).

- One representation has been received which includes employment and mixed uses at the Lifehouse, Thorpe-le-Soken.

Promoter – The Lifehouse (Agent Ideas in Place)

Submission – Include land south of Frinton Road/east of Station Road for business and leisure uses (and housing) – 600sqm business space, 50No. Attended care units, 50No. Luxury holiday units and 42No. Independent living units (and 200No. dwellings).

- One representation has been received in regard to tourism, retail and community/leisure facilities at Low Road, Dovercourt

Promoter – Onslow Holdings Ltd (Agent Marlborough & Co)

Submission – Include land south of Low Road for “chalet style” mobile home park, family tavern, fast food restaurant and mini market/post office/pharmacy

- One representation has been received in regard to employment/tourism at Titchmarsh Marina and Walton Mere, Walton

Promoter – owners (Agent Collins & Coward)

Submission – include specific policy references to support

- One representation has been received in regard to employment/tourism at Hutleys Caravan Park, St Osyth

Promoter – St Osyth Beach Estate Ltd (Agent Boyer)

Submission – support for Objective 10 and tourism

- One representation has been received in regard to tourism at land north of Robinson Road, Brightlingsea

Promoter – J S Blyth & Sons Ltd (Agent Honace)

Submission – Propose mixed-use allocation to include holiday lodges

General Representations

Bourne Leisure Ltd (Agent Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners)

Representations comprise Vision & Objectives, Policies PP8, PP11, PPL1, PPL2 and PPL4.
Support for tourism and protecting environment

The Burghes Estate (Agent Berrys)

Amend settlement boundary between Frinton/Walton/Kirby Cross and Kirby-le-Soken . Policies SPL1, SPL2, LP1, PPL6 and Local Map 15. Frinton/Walton/Kirby Cross should have at least a further 350 dwellings.

Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Site selection and distribution. Representation – Development boundaries of Smaller Rural Settlements should be increased or made more flexible.

Hopkins Homes Ltd

There may be viability constraints associated with the 30% provision which would require greater flexibility. The third paragraph of the policy does not comply with the CIL Regulations or with Central Government Policy in that it suggests that there may be a lower percentage plus an unspecified pooled payment towards generally constructing affordable dwellings. The Council routinely asks for Gifted Affordable Council Houses and it would appear that there is a standard approach for such requests. The policy should be amended to state whether Gifted Council Houses are the proposals which "involve the provision of alternative forms of affordable housing" and be clear about what is required. Overall, the Policy does not appear to be consistent with national policy. It may lead to restrictions on the delivery of housing.

LP 7 does not accord with National Policy. The policy is vague, as is LP3.

Need to show a scenario of upper and lower housing estimates which includes more than just a variation in Weeley.

Full look at housing needs and wide range in the mix development to ensure all needs are catered for.

Kentucky Fried Chicken

Targeting Class A5 establishments is futile as even Class A1 shops sell foods which are high in fats, sugars and salts. There is no academic evidence to suggest proximity to fast food restaurants and obesity are linked

Merchant Projects Ltd

Land situated north east urban fringe of Clacton (Land of Centenary Way, C015 4UD) comprising of 5.43 ha capable of delivering 120 dwellings. 550 dwellings per annum appears to be a reasonable number but should be kept under review. It is our view that the plan should be more flexible to allow changes as the Local Plan does not seem sure in itself. Extra allocations should be made to ensure housing demands are met.

SP6, SP7, SP8 and SPL1 contradict themselves. They state the majority of housing growth will be within or adjoining to existing settlements, yet the Garden Communities project is a separate city and contradicts this.

We believe the council is too reliant on the success of the garden community. No viability model or assessment applied to the garden communities to see if it would be possible to build within the allotted time frame.

The plan is currently inflexible and therefore vulnerable to changes. Unrealistic delivery rates have been applied and the building works are centred on a few particular areas, which could result in nothing being achieved if these plans were to fail.

SP2 is too inflexible and should allow other sites the opportunity to expand. Centenary Way (CO15 4UD) is a good example.

We strongly suggest the land at Centenary Way (CO15 4UD) should be reconsidered for further development.

Mersea Homes

Propose a cross-boundary University Growth Area (UGA). Open ended framework is more flexible - can make changes during the build as well as add on after the build.

NEEB Holdings

We support the Council's stance on the provision of a safe and efficient transport network. New roundabout to be created west of Little Bentley.

We support the housing provision of 550 per annum as a minimum. We understand the importance of brownfield sites but it must be kept in mind that due to contamination, some of these sites are not possible to build on or have lengthy delays. Therefore, greenfield sites should also be bore in mind.

Fully support the upgrade of the A120 due to its importance to the economy of Tendring. Desire better services for drivers and passengers. The creation of a roundabout west of Little Bentley. This would create a convenient stopping point between Colchester and Harwich.

Supporting the proposed hierarchy but wish to stress the importance of development outside of defined settlement boundaries.

It is important to keep settlement boundaries flexible to align with changing economic and community views.

We support the plan and see many good things throughout.

Pommery Planning Consultants

Generally, support the proposed document. The illustrated settlement boundary for Great Bentley does not include all of the land that has been approved to be built on (16/00133/OUT). Furthermore, there is an approved cluster of houses that remain outside the settlement boundary. Is this a drafting error? If both of these areas are included into the settlement boundary, there would be an illogical gap between the current settlement boundary and the amended area. Therefore, the settlement boundary should be included to make one unified settlement area.

Mr C Richardson (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land south of Heath Road, Tendring Heath for redevelopment.(cease use as haulage yard)

Martin Robeson (MRPP)

Objects to PPL6, supports Policy SP1, concerns re. Policies PP1, PP7 and PP14 comments re. Objectives 2 & 3, Policies HP1, HP4, LP1, LP5.

Stephen Rose (Rose)

Development boundaries of Smaller Rural Settlements should be increased or made more flexible.

Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (Agent Indigo Planning)

Submission – Policy PP4 - local retail impact assessment threshold outside of Clacton and Frinton should increase from 250 sq.m. to 750 sq.m.

Tim Snow Architects

The current plan fits with the current model of a sustainable approach but these can be susceptible to change and therefore there should be an element of flexibility in the Local Plan to accommodate for this.

St Helena Hospice

Build a retirement village. Accommodation for the frail and old. Everything contained within the village (pharmacy, health centre etc.). Would need good transport links into the surrounding towns of Harwich, Colchester and Clacton.

The village would employ a significant number of people through carers, shop assistants, health care professionals etc.

University of Essex

The University supports Policies HP4, PP12, CP1 and CP2.

The University also supports the notion of improving sustainable transport and accessibility measures. The University broadly supports the 'garden city' concept; this needs early completion of key road between A120 and the A133.

An area to the east of the University campus and B1028 is recommended for the future expansion of the University and its activities. This allocation is not, however, reflected in the draft Tendring District Local Plan.

The University recommends that infrastructure should come before the expansion of settlements.

Various (unnamed) clients (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy PP6 – object – ambiguous and unreasonable as written.

APPENDIX 4 - Community Representations

Consultation responses on behalf of Community Groups and Representatives – Part 1

Councillors

Councillor Julie Young – (Colchester Borough Councillor)

Essentially, Councillor Young objects to the garden city (west Tendring) development.

Councillor Tim Young – (Colchester Borough Councillor)

The Councillor is concerned to see Tendring building on the Colchester border. Councillor Young also wishes to see a 1.5km green gap. It is recommended that any development should catalyse A120 and A133 improvements. Health and education should be expanded. Support is given to the expansion of the University of Essex.

Town and Parish Councils and Residents Groups

Elmstead Market Parish Council

The Parish Council's concerns are around the proposed Colchester East/Tendring West Garden Development. Concerns are raised in regard to the eroding green gap between Colchester and Elmstead Market. The level and proximity of new development will affect the rural character and appearance of Elmstead.

Concerns also exist over the loss of open spaces, habitat, appearance and beauty of local countryside. It is stated there is regular severe congestion beyond the B1028 junction.

Other concerns the Parish Council would like addressed before the next consultation include increasing pollution and noise due to increased traffic flow through Elmstead Market. The Parish Council also raised concern over timing of development.

Frinton and Walton Town Council

SP2 – vary overstating housing needs. Change wording to “Each Authority will have a robust review mechanism of these numbers to deal with circumstances where under or over achievement is significantly affected by issues outside its control”.

SP4 – vary 7th bullet point should read “and expanded settlements” after the words ‘urban areas’.

SP5 – vary take ‘where appropriate’ out at the end of the 1st paragraph and finish the paragraph as “...design codes for large and strategic scale developments” to improve future developments.

SP6 – vary second paragraph, second line, replace “to avoid” with “there is no”.

Little Oakley Parish Council

Concerns regarding infrastructure in particular worsening bus service throughout District. Adequate parking spaces required for each development – one or two per house often not enough.

Other Organisations

University of Essex

The University broadly supports the 'garden city' concept; this needs early completion of key road between A120 and the A133.

An area to the east of the University campus and B1028 is recommended for the future expansion of the University and its activities. This allocation is not, however, reflected in the draft Tendring District Local Plan, which indicates a lack of coordination between the Councils. The University seeks further clarification.

The University recommends that infrastructure should come before the expansion of settlements.

The Wivenhoe Society

Wivenhoe Society suggests that the target of 920 annual builds for Colchester should be reduced to recognise that Colchester has already provided more houses proportionately than others in the country and region.

The primary concern of Wivenhoe residents is the impact of the garden settlement on the A133, road infrastructure and routes into Colchester. The A133 is already severely congested at peak times. A route connecting the A133 to the A120 could provide some alleviation.

The Wivenhoe Society states that traditionally new garden cities were developed from small settlements where there are existing facilities to serve initial development stages – this would not be the case for East Colchester / West Tendring.

The new development would effectively be an expansion of Colchester. There is no existing infrastructure on the site north of the A133.

Residents are concerned about timing or provision of health facilities and schools in terms of possible adverse impacts of facilities in the early years before a critical mass of housing is built. Provision of a country park is welcomed as are indoor leisure facilities.

The Society states that in the Sustainability Appraisal the impact on agricultural land is masked by the assessment of other impacts and has therefore been given an amber rating.

The Society suggests that Weeley could possibly be expanded. This would require less transport fixes, the impact on heritage sites and wildlife would be no greater and this could help the economy of Clacton.

A second strategy would be, to put the east Colchester / west Tendring on hold until 2033, by which time experience of developing garden cities would be gained. Wivenhoe Society suggests that the development at Marks Tey should be put in place at a faster rate to allow the infrastructure

to support the new development to be put in place at an earlier date. Tendring could increase its allocation for Weeley and possibly expand some of the other settlements served by the rail line.

Consultation responses on behalf of Community Groups and Representatives – Part 2 Councillors

Councillor Rosemary Heaney

Councillor Heaney objects to Tendring Central development which was previously proposed for residential development in the Issues and Options paper.

Councillor Daniel Land

Considers, his area has to take a proportion of growth but that the distribution of housing in Weeley is too high. There is a lack of shops and services in the area and the level of development proposed would lead to detrimental visual amenity. Transport issues are also highlighted with a knock-on effect to neighbouring villages. The village will lose its identity and residents human rights are being decreased.

He considers house building in the District has not achieved that proposed in the emerging plan and he believes that this will not change. The Councillor considers that Weeley should be revisited as a proposal in this plan and other more suitable areas should be considered.

Town and Parish Councils and Residents Groups

Alresford Parish Council

The Parish is concerned over the road capacity and employment prospects within the District.

Brightlingsea Town Council

The Town Council recommends that the Coastal Protection Belt to the west of the settlement be extended north to include Wicks Wood and Lodge Wood to the All Saints Conservation area.

It is recommended that the Western Promenade is included as Safeguarded Local Green Space. The Town Council would like to see car parks designated on the proposals maps.

Frating Parish Council

Generally, supports the Local Plan as it will mean the District Council will have control over planning rather than landowners and developers.

The Parish understands that some sections of the plan will be met with strong resistance but the areas we have chosen for extensive development are suitable.

Infrastructure must be built before the houses though. The Parish is pleased to see 'Tendring Central' has been stopped.

Frinton and Walton Town Council and Frinton Residents Association

SPL1 - Vary if Weeley is to be an expanded settlement.

Reason: Recognition of the state, size and suitability of the B1033 must be addressed eastwards.

SPL3 - Vary Part B, point a); add following words after "Highway Network". *"as existing before the development"*.

3.1 Vision for Tendring - Vary Frinton-on-Sea to be designated a *Town by the Sea*.

Rural Heartland - Vary Change opening sentence after Brightlingsea to read *" , the expanded settlement Weeley along with some of the larger villages will have seen some significant levels of new housing"*

HP1 - Vary a) Add *"The Clacton and Harwich (Fryatt) Hospitals, the existing and proposed Medical Centre are maintained and expanded to meet the needs of the expanding population."*

Reason: To safeguard, maintain and improve our existing and future Health Facilities.

HP3 - Vary Add at end of first paragraph: *"which includes green gaps and green wedges."*

Reason: To strengthen the Policy.

LP3 - Vary at end of first paragraph insert after "regard to" *"and will be in line with"*.

b) Add to end of first sentence *"but each development must have significantly higher average achievement."*

d) Finish sentence after the word *"development"* with: *"to sustain and improve that of the immediate area"*. Insert new item g) *"That all large developments must have highways, raised curbs and footpaths built to a standard that can be adopted by the Essex County Council."*

Reason: To improve our future housing stock. Insert new item h) *"Housing mix should recognise and reflect the age Demographics of the District, with priority given to increasing the housing stock of bungalows"*.

Reason: To ensure housing stock is appropriate to local needs.

LP5 - Vary in the 3rd paragraph, penultimate and final lines. *Remove the bracketed text after council housing.*

Reason: So that Council, Social and affordable housing is equally distributed.

LP6 - Vary section headed The Content of Schemes: Keep 1st sentence *"A proposal shall cater for local needs."* remove rest of paragraph section headed Secure arrangements, point c: Remove *"over a wider geographically area"* substitute *"within the Tendring District"*.

Reason: To avoid doubt and strengthen Policy.

LP7 - Vary incorporate point c. in the 2nd paragraph after "*existing dwelling*" on the 3rd line, starting "*or involving ...*" Remaining points a. and b. should have an "*or,*" between them.

LP10 - Vary Create two new use classes (It can be done!) These clauses to be used in paragraph three and four as appropriate *C2b = same as C2 without hospitals, Nursing Homes and extra-care homes for Mental disability.*

Reason This is to apply to new build and Conversions INSIDE settlement limit boundaries. *C2c = Hospitals, Nursing Homes, extra-care Homes and secure Residential Institutions for Mental disability. This to apply for new developments and conversions at least 400m from settlement boundaries.*

Reason So that authorities and staff can deal fully with the patient needs.

Objective 2 Remove Offshore Renewable Energy. Add Tourism, SME's.

Reason We have not been able to attract any interest and the contracts for further offshore wind farms have gone elsewhere.

PP1 - Vary remove Walton-on-the-Naze.

Reason Not true Aldi is coming to Town!

PP3 - Vary Start paragraph 6.36 with the following replacement sentence: "There are other small parades of shops across the town and rural areas that are of neighbourhood significance but do not meet the definition of a centre....."

In the preamble to PP5, the quoted definitions from the NPPF for "Primary Shopping Frontage" and "Secondary Shopping Frontage" are wrong. It would seem Officer comment or interpretation may have been added.

PP5 - Vary add point g; *Any change of use will be considered against the aims of this policy.*

Reason: To protect the reduction of A1 usage and to maintain the integrity of our High Streets.

6.5 Delivering Economic Prosperity.

2nd paragraph (6.55) add after A137, B1033

Reason 15%+ of the TDC population live to the East of Weeley. 3rd Paragraph (6.56) 3rd line, remove have replace with choose thus reading "*choose to Commute*". Where is the necessary emphasis on Leisure and Tourism in the Delivering Economic Prosperity pre-amble.

PP6 - Vary The Policy for use of redundant Farm Buildings needs re-wording.

Reason Possibly too prescriptive and conflicting with the aim of regenerating Rural economies thus not achieving its objective.

PP7 - Vary? No comment on proposed allocations but perhaps consider Walton Mere to be added

as this is on the Policy Map as a Priority area for Regeneration.

PP9 - Vary Remove the whole policy and re think.

Reason This policy will limit development and/or conversions to Hotels, and will possibly encourage more hostel style properties. The free economy must be allowed to function unhindered. We cannot straight jacket businesses. If we do, the professional small Hoteliers will go elsewhere. Large Hoteliers will still develop, produce mediocre buildings and services, and we will lose the character encouraged by smaller concerns.

PP10 - Vary Add Recreational Vehicle Parks.

Reason There is great need for specific places for overnight parking for RVs.

PP11 - Vary We support this but would ask officers to strengthen the last three paragraphs wherever possible.

PP12 - Vary in objective 2 of "Prosperous Places" we suggested Removing Renewable energy and inserting Tourism and SME's. The first paragraph of this policy should therefore include reference to these industry training/skill requirements. Add to the end of last paragraph the words: "and prioritise employment of local people".

Reason to ensure "improving Education and skills" reflects our needs.

PP13 - Vary in point c. change "essential" to "key".

Reason Is there another Policy that will allow for individual dwellings of significance to be created from redundant farm buildings?

PP14 - Support Add after Community safety and accessibility, "The B1033 is key to Walton development"

7 Protected Places in first bullet point of pre-amble, change completely to: "*minimising the risk to human life, property and countryside from flooding and coastal erosion.*"

PPL1 - Vary Remove the Exception test paragraph and then add this sentence to The Sequential Test. "*Any allocated sites in flood risk zones 2 and 3 should be removed from policy and local maps.*"

PPL3 - Vary Take out the word "*native*" from bullet point d. add bullet point f. "*green gaps and green wedges*" Add this sentence after point f.: "*Any proposed works on the above will be require a specific Planning application.*"

Reason will strengthen policy.

PPL5 - Vary The word "should" appears three times in the first two Paragraphs. These to be changed to "must".

Reason will strengthen policy.

PPL6 - Vary the word “AND” should also appear between a. and b.

Reason will strengthen policy.

PPL7 - Vary remove the words “*desk-based*” from first paragraph.

PPL8 - Object We believe the old policy should be incorporated instead of this one. Replace with the whole of policy EN17

Reason will strengthen policy and EN17 has been shown to work

PPL12 - Object We believe the old policies should be used. Replace this policy with the whole of FW5 and FW6, including the pre-amble from the 2007 plan which adds strength.

Reason Is a stronger policy with more conditions and has been shown to work.

8.2 Improving Transport network: Penultimate paragraph (8.20) *add the B1033.*

Reason 15% of population of TDC live to the East of Weeley and need better infrastructure.

CP2 - Vary in the third bullet point, full stop after permission and remove rest of paragraph. Now reads: “Proposals that would have adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission.”

Reason This will allow infrastructure to be driven by a County and District Strategic Plan and not be driven by developers’ specific applications.

8.3 Improving the telecommunications network 3rd paragraph (8.24) add after “*coverage*” within the bracket, “*plus any new technologies that will occur in the lifetime of this plan*”

9 Delivering Infrastructure Three times in the table showing ECC, Public Utilities etc. and Health Authorities the word “*liaising*” is used in our view inappropriately. Replace with the word “agree”.

Reason: Liaising ends up as lip service. This plan must be robust and serve the needs, demands and wants of the population of Tendring. Add CQC as a consultee for health and care provisions.

10. Monitoring and Review

Sentence before bullet points: after the word “monitored” add “*and reviewed*”

Reason: We see where monitoring will take place but not review.

Appendix C - Local Maps The detail cannot be fully checked on the maps for our Town area as the scale and thickness of lines can be confusing. The quality of local maps must be up to the standard set by the 2007 local maps.

Great Bentley Parish Council

The Preferred Options Consultation Document Section C, Local Maps, page 200, shows a map of Great Bentley. The Parish Council's new allotments site located to the south of the Plough Road Industrial Centre is not shown and is outside the proposed village boundary. The Parish require that this is amended.

Great Bromley Parish Council

The Parish Council was broadly very supportive of the Preferred Options Document and only noted a couple of typographical errors to be addressed.

Harwich Town Council

The Town Council raised concern over the loss of parking at the Harwich Football Ground site, should this be carried forward for residential development.

The Town Council also consider that any development at the Mayflower School would be unacceptable.

Support is given to the Harwich School who intend to deliver sixth form facilities on their site.

The Town Council continues to support development at Horsley Cross for employment uses. The infrastructure provision in Harwich is noted as needing an upgrade. It is considered that the existing community, leisure and sports facilities are already at capacity. Similarly, car parks, public transport facilities and improvements to the A120 are all required.

The Town Council also have concerns over the provision for healthcare and education in the area.

Kirby-le-Soken Parish Council

The Parish Council submitted their draft Parish Plan and Village Design Statement. They require that this plan is adopted by the District Council as part of the Development Plan.

Lawford Parish Council

The Parish Council confirms their status within the Preferred Options Document as a Smaller Urban Settlement.

Concerns were raised that an increase in house prices forces young people out of the local housing market. The level of affordable housing and the need to keep families in the same area was also questioned.

Concerns raised over the number of speculative applications which have been approved in this area.

The Preferred Options Local Plan states that the area could accommodate 520 dwellings, yet the area has planning approvals for 935 homes. A note should be made of these approvals and no further applications should be approved.

Concerns were raised in regard to development at Brantham and East Bergholt. Concerns also raised over traffic and GPs with regard to the out-of-district development. It is stated that there are no sixth form places at the Manningtree Academy. A requirement to build sixth form facilities is promoted by the Parish Council.

Requirement to mention the GP surgery at Ardleigh. Solar panels on new homes should be promoted. Solar farms should directly benefit the settlements they impact.

A request is made to lower the threshold of housing on any site where contributions toward open space are sought. The Parish Council requires that Policy LP2 is amended to allow for full details of dwelling size, type and tenure to be seen at outline application stage.

Concerns are raised with regard to the vulnerable nature of an ever-growing elderly population and the opportunistic crime that this may allow. A requirement is made for new residential development to incorporate new retail premises.

Concerns are raised in regard to traffic and lack of capacity at railway stations in the area. A requirement that the plan should state what particular measures will be supporting and what dialogue will take place with the responsible authorities. A requirement is also made to engage with the Haven Gateway and Heart of Essex Strategic Transport board.

General support is given to both the Crockleford Garden Village and Weeley expanded village developments. Some concerns were made from residents of Tendring village to the Weeley proposals. Amidst these is the suggestion that Crow Lane is designated as a protected lane.

A system of 'post occupancy review' is recommended.

Little Bentley Parish Council

It is recommended that the Plan puts in place provisions to upgrade current infrastructure (particularly road and rail) before sustained development. The Parish also requests the expansion of the village envelopes to expand villages slightly.

Little Clacton Parish Council

Numbers of dwellings are flawed, the Parish urges TDC to reconsider a more even distribution especially to the northern A120 / A133. Planned distribution towards Clacton unworkable as infrastructure not in place.

A120 / A133 offers the best option for residential and business. Better use of disused brownfield sites will take traffic away from villages.

The Parish feels the area proposed as an extension of Oakwood Park needs to have green wedge in the way of a Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) as this would accommodate the displacement of wildlife. Suggest northern boundary of this area be a green zone.

Policy LP6 is too ambiguous, not robust enough to protect rural exception sites. No safeguard in

LP6 to protect rural exception sites. The 50 dwellings maximum must be added.

The Parish argues that the District Council reinstate safeguards from Policy SD3 into Plan, to protect rural exemption sites.

Within Little Clacton map, area of Engaines School is not shown as protected Public Open.

The Parish also objects to land west of Thorpe Road, Dalau site being proposed as employment zone as this area is green gap.

Little Oakley Parish Council

Concerns raised regarding employment and in particular that the housing allocated for Harwich would not deliver employment. Concerns regarding healthcare provision especially at Clacton and Harwich hospitals which are under-utilised.

The density and levels of parking at new developments was questioned. A requirement of tradespeople and visitor parking at new developments was put forward. A request is made that affordable housing is set aside for local people.

A proposal for a new marina in Harwich is put forward. Concerns regarding drainage and surface water flooding are raised.

Mixed views are given in regard to renewable energy, a subsection made to incorporate solar panels into new build properties. A four-way junction at Gt Bentley was suggested.

Manningtree Town Council

The Town Council repeatedly questions the amount of school spaces and state that schools are currently at capacity. There is no positive impact for the new train station. A station at Brantham (Suffolk) would be better situated. It is stated that there is too much congestion within the plan, especially in regards to the train station. The Town Council supports the Authority's approach to green spaces.

Mistley Parish Council

The Parish makes the comment that Mistley Place Park and the surrounding areas are Protected Open Space and Strategic Green Gap within the 2007 adopted Local Plan and should remain as such. Infrastructure improvements are also required to support any new development.

The Parish suggests the amalgamation of policies LP3 and LP4. It is also recommended that housing density should only be higher on ex-industrial sites in order to protect wildlife. The Plan should do more to encourage doctors to set up practices in the District. Support is given to the concept of 'local housing for local people'.

Primary shopping areas need to be protected from being turned into housing – especially public houses, so PP5 policy on Town Centre Uses needs to be strengthened to reflect this.

The A137 railway crossing and underpass is an issue. This is often used when the A12 is closed after an accident.

Ramsey and Parkeston Parish Council

The Parish Council requests all development sites to be listed.

The Council request that St Michael's Church (Local Map 20 – Harwich and Dovercourt) is listed within the Heritage Assets within the Draft Local Plan. The Council would also like to see the site at Mayes Lane Ramsey (dismissed at appeal) to be indicated as an area of Safeguarded Local Green Spaces. Also the Parish requires that the proposed Linear Park sited north of the A120 is reinstated.

Ramsey and Parkeston Parish Council supports land West of Mayes Lane being removed from the Draft Local Plan. They also would like to request that land South of Ramsey Road, Ramsey is removed from the Local Plan due to sustainability issues, water mains, flooding, electricity and pressure on schools.

St Osyth Parish Council

In principle, support is given to the Preferred Options document.

Thorpe-le-Soken Parish Council

Concerns regarding a planning application for 350 residential units at Thorpe Hall and the detriment to the Historic Garden as a result are raised.

Thorrington Parish Council

The Parish council has no specific concerns with the Local Plan.

Weeley Parish Council

Weeley Parish Council objects to all housing and mixed use allocations within the Preferred Options Local Plan. It is stated that Weeley and Weeley Heath should be considered as a single settlement.

Concerns are raised that there has not been an objective assessment of Weeley's suitability for significant additional growth. The settlement of Weeley does not feature significantly in the Preferred Options Document and little consideration is given to the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Concerns with regards to infrastructure in Weeley including; GP surgeries and healthcare are of concern in the area. Education is also highlighted as a concern as there is no secondary school in the area. Poor public transport links and little employment opportunities are highlighted in the village.

Also the lack of skills in Weeley means that employment opportunities are further curtailed. Concerns are also raised in relation to the difference in housing numbers at Weeley when

considering the upper and lower OAN.

The Parish states that the settlement boundary between Little Clacton and Weeley is confusing. The Parish also considers that more services in Weeley will not help it and that the loss of identity will still take place. It has requested that the plan specifically states the vision for Weeley.

Weeley Residents Association

The Residents Association states that the Preferred Options Document as drafted is unsound. The Plan is not positively prepared and does not put forward a strategy that would meet objectively assessed needs. The Plan is considered to be unjustified as alternative options were not considered and the Sustainability Appraisal was prepared after the Preferred Options Document. It is also considered that the Preferred Options Document is not effective as it does not demonstrate how it will be deliverable over its lifetime. It is also claimed that the document is incompatible with national planning guidance as it does not promote sustainable development.

Concerns are raised that the spatial strategy for the Part 1 and Part 2 Plans are incompatible. Questions are raised as to the soundness underpinning the Settlement Hierarchy.

The 'uplift' in dwelling numbers at Weeley is questioned and the unique nature for this 'uplift' at Weeley alone is queried. It is considered that this is not a sustainable pattern for development. It is also claimed that the Council has not satisfied its Duty to Co-operate.

Concerns are raised in relation to inconsistencies within the Settlement Hierarchy. It is questioned if Strategic Environmental Assessment will still be required post BREXIT.

Weeley has poor transport connections A133/A120 gridlocked at both peak times and holiday season. B1441 Weeley By Pass / B1033 Colchester Road / Thorpe Road is already congested, irresponsible to propose large scale developments in these areas. It would be unsafe to formulate local plan based on erroneous statistics from recent 'assessments' and 'surveys' where irrelevant, inaccurate and incomplete data was recorded. An increase in traffic numbers would reach an unmanageable level. Congestion impacts quality of life and environmental problems, workers have problems accessing labour markets and employment.

Tourism - Local villages and coastal areas need routes to get access anywhere inland, small feeder roads are not designed to accommodate huge traffic volumes. It is also stated that Weeley railway station is very small with poor facilities.

The Association states that the proposed plan will be detrimental and compromise local agricultural employment. Poor infrastructure could impact the economy, it is stated. The emerging policy should support growth, not turn agricultural land into building sites.

The Plan would disregard and override 'loss of valued community facilities and services' aspirations (contrary to NPPF document). Lack of proposed space per site would result in over expansion of the village. Rural landscape would change beyond recognition causing irreversible and overriding harm to the environment. It is also stated that the NHS has limited facilities at present. Weeley currently has no GP surgery or pharmacy in the immediate area. Green spaces

that already exist will soon be built over with no room for any future replication.

Buildings, road surfaces and other hard surfaces would be detrimental to a 'wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits' it is stated. (required by NPPF)

Building proposed up to holiday park boundaries which may influence holidaymakers deciding where to take their holidays. Concerns are also raised in regard to existing local sewerage problems.

Suggestion is made that Weeley is left as a village with just its currently accepted planned local expansion. Whole proposed development could be relocated to Horsley Cross.

Wix Parish Council

Concerns are raised that Policy HG1 contradicts Objective 6 of the Preferred Options Document. The Parish Council welcomes the reference to public houses in paragraph 4.17.

Concerns are raised that an approved application will offend the draft Backland policy contained within the emerging Preferred Options Document.

The Parish Council suggests a cycle and footpath should be delivered along the A120 from Parkeston to the Hare Green junction on the A120.

Concerns are also raised in relation to the lack of adequate infrastructure in the smaller villages including drainage and surface water flooding. The capacity of the highway network is also a concern for the Parish Council.

Wrabness Parish Council

The Parish supports inclusion of Rectory Road playing field as green space. However, the Parish objects to the designation of railway cutting to the north of Station Road.

A request is made for 0.2 ha of land immediately west of Wrabness. Village hall is mapped as proposed Safeguarded Green Space. Similarly, a request is made for the Station Masters Garden area at Station Road should be safeguarded as Local Green Space. The Parish strongly recommends the designation of Wrabness Station Yard as a local wildlife site be reviewed.

Other Organisations

British Horse Society

Repeatedly asks for more bridleways; better access and networks between bridleways and infrastructure, including to the coast; and new infrastructure that is available and accessible for all rather than just cyclists and pedestrians.

Other comments include: making green grid/infrastructure public; equestrian supportive tourism; equestrian access to coastal path.

CAUSE

CAUSE has put forward a transit-oriented development proposal called 'Metro Plan for Colchester and Tendring'. It is based around the under-utilised public transport spine of the Colchester - Clacton railway. CAUSE believes that more emphasis should be given to the excellent public transport linkages offered by the Colchester-Clacton rail line. CAUSE's Metro Plan enables the priority areas of Clacton and Walton-on-the-Naze to connect by a 4 hourly metro train service.

Colchester Institute

The Institute are fully supportive in their four comments made.

Essex Bridleways Association

The association repeatedly asks for: more bridleways; better access and networks between bridleways and infrastructure; and new infrastructure that is available and accessible for all rather than just cyclists and pedestrians.

Other comments include: making green grid/infrastructure public; equestrian supportive tourism; and the future maintenance of infrastructure to be set aside by the developers.

Frinton and Walton Heritage Trust

The Heritage Trust particularly supports the continuation of the Avenues Special Character Area policy.

Questions are also raised around the AON and the Peter Brett report. Moreover, the level of growth proposed is not supported by infrastructure.

The Harwich Society

Supports policies PPL7, PPL8 and PPL9 and states that it is essential that conservation continues to be promoted positively in the Local Plan.

The Society has concerns over infrastructure and suggests that the demand for infrastructure needs to be assessed and not left until the planning application stage.

Objections are raised to Policies HP1, HP2, CP2, PP5 and Section 9 - Delivering Infrastructure.

Ontrack

Ontrack highlights the importance of the use of land along rail corridors and parcels of land which are undeveloped by stations or railway facilities. This land should be kept clear of development to encourage the expansion of existing stations such as Thorpe Le Soken or Walton. Also, the possibility of the reinstatement of a second track at Harwich Town is suggested. Potentially new stations at Gorse Lane, Great Clacton and the potential reopening of Brightlingsea station are all suggested.

APPENDIX 5 – Members of the Public

Members of the Public – Part 1 – North Essex

1. Should not build in Weeley, should build on Colchester Fringe
2. Map C8 is not clear and therefore the people of Elmstead Market cannot fully appreciate the impact of the garden community. No mention of improved A133 through Clinghoe Hill where there will be added congestion on a strained route already.
3. Members of the Public wish to live in Elmstead as a village, not a town like Colchester which they fear it will become.
4. “Large estates of affordable housing will encourage more unemployed people to come and live in the Tendring area and this could lead to an increase in crime”
5. 9000 new homes will not make anyone happier or healthier. Increased traffic problems. Communities are being sacrificed in a relentless quest to concrete over what is left of our beautiful countryside
6. Our school and doctor and hospital cannot cope. Let’s have a new hospital instead. Inhabitants want to be Elmstead, not Colchester
7. Inhabitants are very unhappy with the eroding of the green gap. Exhibitions need to be improved with more guidance for members of the public. No timescales given for building tranches.
8. General objection to building in Tendring due to too many people entering the country and draining resources.
9. The MOD land that has been released South of Colchester should be used rather than allowing Colchester to build in Tendring.
10. The building sites proposed are too close to Elmstead. People are not getting what they expected to be getting from their house due to the surroundings. Council taxes will be higher, more police will be needed along with street lighting, waste disposal, sewerage, etc.
11. Alresford is considered sustainable due to the infrastructure yet the service frequency is so limited it is unreasonable to ask this of the area. Fears over when the infrastructure will be put in, before or after the houses are there? There are not enough bungalows for the elderly. Many do not want a large house yet cannot find suitable accommodation. Roads are not built at suitable times to alleviate traffic from houses. Train network needs upgrading
12. Any new homes heading away from Salary Brook should be over the hill so they are out of sight. Any land east of Colchester would be unpleasant and create an unmanageable sprawl. Local and national policy should seek to enhance or preserve rural environments. If building has to happen east of Colchester, Salary Brook should have a 1.5 km green belt

around it to preserve its beauty. (repeated)

13. Concerns over most houses being on greenfield rather than brownfield. Far too much over development and potential for rural villages just turning into a conurbation.
14. As Tendring District Council has not met housing needs for years, there obviously is not enough demand for houses. Colchester will reap all the benefits of commerce etc. If the area becomes part of Colchester, they will get the tax benefits of the new houses. The garden community would result in a loss of the best and most versatile farm land. There is silica sand in this area. The only such area in the whole of Essex. Development around Crockleford Heath would destroy the rural landscape and culture.
15. A notation of what infrastructure should be considered for the process of the plan. Does the council have the support of NHS England and Highways?
16. Inhabitants went to an exhibition in Jaywick Lane and the members of Tendring District Council who were there seemed thoroughly unprepared. No Councillors were at these meetings. Any plans for Clacton hospital? Is it going to close?
17. The road outside Elmstead is fast and dangerous. Adding more houses will make it worse. Additional safety measures must be put in place.
18. Area between Colchester and Salary Brook is of particular attraction to wildlife and local population. Building on Colchester Fringe will exacerbate its problems. The overall plan is not ambitious enough. It does not make significant impacts in deprived areas. It is a compromise plan.
19. The plan is an obvious attempt to destroy Salary Brook Valley. There are fields behind the valley which would be better suited to houses.
20. Nothing is planned for Clacton. Where will Tendring District Council put the criminals? Less police too.
21. Climate change means building on arable GB is stupid. Communities are being disrupted. This should be questioned.
22. Jobs should be top of the list. Followed by schools, roads, transport and doctors. Tendring is a selection of villages. By building 11,000 homes, they will be towns. These settlements will be in chaos.
23. The government only cares about the rich counties. Roads are very poor.
24. Only the builders and wealthy will benefit from this.
25. Put in place broadband that Local Government agreement insists on.
26. Colchester is an ancient town and inhabitants should not change it.
27. It is suggested that as Elmstead Market is a dispersed settlement infilling could ruin the

character of the village and estate development would overwhelm it. It is suggested that the protection of Elmstead Market's visual, historical and archaeological qualities should be supported.

Members of the Public – Comments specific to Weeley

1. There would be a destruction of green space including habitats. Weeley needs to stay as a village. The rural landscape would be irreversibly ruined.
2. There will be huge amounts of car pollution due to the extra 3000 cars. Added traffic and congestion. Frequency of bus and rail services is limited. Building in Weeley contradicts SP1, SP 4, SP 5 and SP 6.
3. The new settlement is not far enough away to be considered a free standing settlement.
4. Fears of overdevelopment beyond sense. Tendring District Council must create a sensible and more acceptable plan.
5. Is there any point in the SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) as this is required by EU law yet we are not to remain in the EU? Same idea for the Habitats Regulation Assessment. EU has lied to us for years and therefore anything Tendring District Council acts on, regarding what the EU have said, would be flawed and based on fiction. Weeley station is not good enough to cope with commuters and train travellers. Weeley does not have a doctor's surgery or pharmacy. Tourism will suffer in the region. Caravan/holiday parks are the sole income for many parts of the district and these plans will hamper this. Local sewerage problems are already unmanageable and unhealthy. It already seeps up into gardens and fields.
6. Roads and hospitals need improvement.
7. Effect on local schools, roads and infrastructure will be huge. They need improvement.
8. This is too many houses for the need in Weeley, a farming and tourist area. From one member of the public's research, the levels of unemployment in Tendring were around 8% (double the average for Essex). 20% of children live in poverty and 20% of citizens live in seriously deprived areas.
9. 800-1100 does not constitute a new garden settlement, especially as it is attached to a currently formed and established settlement. A garden village is 1500-10,000 new homes that is not attached to an existing settlement.
10. Air quality will be diminished causing a drop in health of locals.
11. Conflicting numbers in regards to how much new construction is marked as employment sites. SP 3 says 40 ha. PP 7 says 63.28 ha. 10 ha of this would be based in Weeley and this is unacceptable to the residents of Weeley. Extending the village boundary would destroy the village and the local habitats. The plans for Weeley are not within the spirit of the NPPF.

Road improvements proposed would not even alleviate the traffic problems in their current situation. The plan repeatedly contradicts itself. The building works for the new garden community in west Tendring appear disproportionately small compared with Weeley. The building does not contribute or enhance Weeley nature, built or historic environment. St Andrew's church would lose its setting. People who do not live in the village do not have the right to change its nature and identity against the vast majority of inhabitants wishes. Large scale development will increase the already high risk of flooding in Weeley.

12. Plan is ambiguous and aimed at the whims of developers and Westminster not local residents. Houses being built are substandard as the Council has reduced the minimum size of a house.
13. Weeley Heath and Weeley village are one entity, not two.
14. What will happen to the 4000-year-old stone circle just north of Weeley?
15. Better option than Weeley would be: 2 Barnfields, 1 Barnfields and The Tudors. Better connections here with road and rail. Aesthetically, the best option in the area too.
16. Tendring should consider reintroducing prefabricated housing.
17. Why build houses at the end of the country and the end of the train line?
18. Objects to the Hartley Gardens as this would be overdevelopment, believes that infrastructure will be inadequate and will be unfair on local residents. Suggests Weeley is a better option, or development along the A120.

Members of the Public – Part 2 – Tendring – Comments not specific to Weeley

1. The majority of jobs within Tendring only pay the minimum wage and this will surely have an impact on the type and price of houses that are required for those employed in Tendring.
2. Concerns about GPs surgeries in Holland on Sea and Clacton and recruitment of GPs
3. Concerns expressed about affordable housing and how wage increases will be achieved
4. It is noted that in the Local Plan there is no development area marked for Sladbury's Lane.
5. Mayes Lane, Church Hill Old HAD5 appeal site, requests that this site be deleted from the 'PPL6 Strategic green gap policy' as currently shown on the policy map for Harwich and Dovercourt (including Parkeston and part of Ramsey).
6. The Local Plan needs to take into account what is happening in Suffolk, i.e. Brantham, East Bergholt as large developments in the south Suffolk will increase local traffic through to Lawford via A137. New developments in Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley need to take into account this increase in traffic.
7. SPL3 - Vision good but need people in place to make it happen. Building houses does not

create sustainable employment. Bathside Bay is only suitable as a Marina. More tip sites and recycling required. Affordable housing should only be available for local people. Drainage and sewerage inadequate. Add 4-way junction at Gt Bromley A133/A120. Need infrastructure in place. Harwich desperately needs a tourism vision, not a port or windfarms. A bridge from Harwich to Felixstowe.

8. A more proactive approach to employment and commercial activity is required especially in the Harwich area. More parking spaces per house needed. At least 2 hours free parking should be provided in car parks or on street to enable retailers to compete with out of town retailers. Development needs to be proportional to area. Improvements to A120. Pleased that Little Oakley is now classed as a rural settlement.
9. Better use needs to be made of the Harwich and Colchester hospitals.
10. No jobs to support large developments.
11. Supportive of Local Plan's strong protection of heritage of coast, estuaries, countryside and buildings. Supports the Local Plan in its recognition of the District's ecological assets being key to its attractiveness and tourist economy. To maintain the heritage requires funding and there needs to be a masterplan budget to accompany the Local Plan. Supports the proposed regeneration of Walton as well as the 30% affordable housing but is concerned about the Council's ability to achieve a quality outcome and control/regulate developers designs. The block development of the care home and planned destruction of the natural sloping landscape and its impact on the protected nature reserve at the former Martello Caravan site is alarming. It requires skilled teams of planners, urban designers and architects within the planning office. The formation of planning teams from across districts and counties might be an effective way to increase expertise, particularly regarding design quality. Need for clear planning directives, with self-certification becoming more common it would be more acceptable if published standards set the requirements for space allocation for storage, water capture and grey water recycling, etc. To achieve the 20-year Plan, TDC needs construction companies with local expertise well-schooled in contemporary technologies and construction techniques. Concern expressed regarding construction in vulnerable flood areas, detail is needed on preventative action. Suggests co-operation with other coastal authorities to enhance expertise and best practice must be developed. Suggests development sites should be open to competition to achieve the best design proposals. Concerned as to whether the Local Plan represents sufficient vision of the future in 20 years. Suggests that getting the infrastructure in place is a priority. Suggests the Plan does not adequately address sustainability and resilience to withstand impacts such as another sea surge, severe water shortage or power disruption. The Plan is positive and inspirational but should review negative impacts too and be prepared for the 'what-if' scenarios.
12. Suggests an extension of the settlement development boundary of Alresford as an alternative site for future development.

13. Requests that 82 houses are not build on Michaelstowe, in Ramsey.
14. Suggests amendment to the development boundary for Straight Road, Bradfield.
15. Suggests amendment to the plan for Bradfield regarding access to Bradfield foreshore.
16. Concern expressed about the inclusion of Bradfield Village Hall within the development area.
17. It is suggested that once the mineral extractions end at Crown Quarry, adjacent to Ardleigh Reservoir, the land bordering this area should be dedicated to the enjoyment of the public. Recognises that the Crown Quarry land is within the area designated as requiring protection from pollution of the water table but given the huge potential of the environmental benefits that will accrue, suggests that these should be recognised in the Preferred Options and that the area in question should be given 'green' space status. Suggests caution be exercised in permitting any further development of land to the east of Old Ipswich Road, Ardleigh.
18. Concern that there is nothing in the Local Plan that seriously addresses the lack of strategic road access to Manningtree and the North West Tendring villages, despite extensive developments that have been permitted in recent years. Problems are exacerbated when traffic is diverted during closures of the A12. Significant heavy traffic from Mistley Port and nearby industries in Lawford. Suggests that easing small vehicle flow through Manningtree station underpass with traffic lights is more likely to compound the problem. Concern that the roads towards the A12 and Ipswich are inadequate with the increasing volume of traffic. Similar concerns expressed about the main road through Manningtree through Ardleigh to Colchester. Concern regarding the significant traffic flow along Wick Lane, Ardleigh, a protected lane, to A12. Suggests a connection to the A120 at Ardleigh.
19. Strongly requests that the Policies Map and Local Maps are varied so that the land currently classified as Coastal Protection belt surrounding Brightlingsea continues to be included within the new Local Plan. Of particular concern is the proposed removal of the coast protection belt adjacent to the ancient woodlands of Lodge Wood and Wicks Wood, near the Manor Housing Estate and requests that this is included to help protect the character and visual amenity of the rural landscape. Suggests amendment of the Brightlingsea map to indicate Classified Ancient Woodlands and Local wildlife site of Wicks Wood and Lodge Wood. Suggests Policy PPL4 should be worded more strongly to take into account adjoining land that surrounds special protection areas and sites of special scientific interest including the protection of ancient woodlands, where building on adjacent land would cause adverse impact.
20. Suggests local people should decide the locations for developments and what growth is needed for their villages. Concern regarding potential bullying of villages, abuse of existing villages/towns, loss of identity of the area, loss of agricultural land. Suggests that children should be encouraged to look after the elderly. Comments that town centres are only active during the tourist season. Suggests that existing employment sites would be affected by proposed employment sites and that employment allocations should have been addressed a

long time ago. Comments that it has become easier and cheaper to buy online and that this is preferred by many people to the hassle of going to a shop. Suggests the rural economy should be decided by the locals. Suggest that tourist destinations such as Beth Chatto gardens should be protected and recognised. Asks whether it is wise to have hotels which will only be used during holiday periods and not very active at other times. Suggests education should be available and affordable to all, not just those on benefits. Suggests consideration should be given to the impact on flora and fauna and natural habitats should be respected that loss of green space and habitat is a serious issue. Suggests sustainable transport and accessibility and improving the transport network should have been tackled a long time ago. Comments that the cost of public transport is too high, that some people are housebound but may wish to comment, many people believe they are not being listened to because problems have existed for year and are only now taking an interest, e.g. people who cannot get out of their own drives due to heavy traffic need to be reassured that their problems are taken seriously. Suggests building a new town along the A12 instead. Suggests the reduced bus service through village could limit opportunities for residents of the new development. Comments about the submission document: The amount of information is huge, suggests separate sections to make it easier for people to understand and comment. Those unable to read the document should have been given the chance to comment too. Maps were not clear and the information not easy to understand.

21. Suggests that TDC is intent on destroying all of the small villages instead of invigorating the coastal areas. Suggests over development of small villages, i.e. Elmstead and Alresford. More green areas needed, not concreting over large areas of farmland and woods. Suggests small developments, not large estates and encouraging retail development in towns not in the countryside. Supports most of the Protected Places policies. Suggests that joining the A120 with the A133 would add to the existing congestion at Greenstead roundabout. Concerned that the problems with sewerage will get worse.
22. Suggests that there is not enough provision of facilities (healthy places) now; that it will encourage people to move to the area from London.
23. Suggests that there should be a greater emphasis on the opinions of Town and Parish Councils and to involve the community more. Concern that we will need to produce more food in future; suggests reducing the flow of housing and planning strategically according to a revised need; provide more compact units per build; place affordable housing strategically, i.e. closer to town and employment. Supports PPL1 and 2 but with wider consultation. Comments re PP10 to allowing only one application on any given site and a comprehensive description – local decisions become paramount. Regarding renewable energy generation, suggests preventing these where there is a risk of local objection and environmental hazard.
24. Concerned at loss of open spaces, particularly school playing fields. Suggests that further developments in Tendring at the levels proposed will overload the infrastructure and provision of services, education and healthcare. Suggests that in Appendix D Elmstead Market Churchyard should not be included, or the verges to Church Road, Elmstead Market

and Strawberry Grove.

25. Questions the suitability of putting developments where they will have a massive detrimental impact on existing infrastructure, existing population and their services. Suggests carrying out environmental assessments in all proposed areas and commitments being made to retain green spaces between rural areas that could be for ramblers, etc. Suggests room needs to be made for nature, or it will be lost. Suggests planning and developing alongside existing roads spread out around Tendring; to designate and develop our proportion of the 1.8m empty homes in the UK, which would release greenfield and agricultural land from development. Suggests concentrating on the service sectors, enlarge hospitals to meet new requirements, assisted living accommodation, holiday parks, water sports, marina, casino, build smaller less costly retirement accommodation that can also be used for first time buyers and young families.
26. Suggests vision is good but people need to be in place to make it happen and that building houses does not create sustainable employment. Also suggests that Bathside Bay is only suitable as a marina. Regarding HP1, comments that there are already not enough services. Suggests Harwich & Clacton hospitals need to be utilised and more tip sites and recycling needed; parking facilities for number of population/visitors/tradesmen. Comments that 'care' needs to mean 'care' – care homes do not supply 'care'. Supports PPL1, PPL2, PPL3 & PPL4 but comments that drainage and sewerage are currently inadequate. States that any development should be proportional/sensible. Suggests improvements to A120 including making A120/A133 junction 4-way to enable joining the A133 from Harwich which would reduce HGVs using B1414. Supportive of Little Oakley being classed as a rural settlement.
27. Suggests a more proactive approach to employment and commercial activity is required especially in the Harwich area; that health and wellbeing this will be one of the difficult areas to achieve and that better use of the Fryatt and Clacton hospitals should be on the agenda. Suggests more parking spaces need to be provided per house, so street parking is available for delivery and service trade vehicles and that affordable housing should be for residents who have lived in Tendring for at least 3 years. Comments that drainage and sewerage is inadequate in some areas already, that plans need to be robust for new developments and that they need to be proportional to the area. Suggests that a 4-way junction at Gt Bromley A133/A120 is needed and that infrastructure needs to be in place; doctors, roads, parking, business investment; that local hospitals need to be utilised and that Harwich needs a tourism vision not a port or windfarm. A bridge from Harwich to Felixstowe is also suggested.
28. Commented that notification for the exhibition dates arrived late, that the plans exhibited were printed too small to view them properly. Object to the building of the new estate next to Constable Avenue, Clacton as this will cause loss of quiet enjoyment of their property, general noise of the estate, inadequate provision of doctors, lack of policing and concerns about anti-social behaviour. Suggests that surrounding roads need to be widened and

properly maintained, that drainage and utilities need to be capable of withstanding the new estate; concern expressed about loss of agricultural land; lack of funding for the hospital; a need for dentists/chiropractic. Asks whether there will be a green space between their property boundary and the estate, e.g. for wildlife. Expresses concern about the jobs available, and concern about whether the Council can afford to pay benefits if there is no work available.

29. Objects to the Hartley Gardens as this would be overdevelopment, believes that infrastructure will be inadequate and will be unfair on local residents. Suggests Weeley is a better option, or development along the A120. Concern also about the loss of green gap between Clacton and Little Clacton.

30. Concern expressed about the removal of the Coastal Protection Belt at Brightlingsea.

31. Concerned about the erosion of the green gap between Clacton and Little Clacton, particularly along Centenary Way. Suggests that Little Clacton can accommodate new housing by that any development should be in the centre of the village. Recommends that land west of The Street, Little Clacton.

32. Concerned that the Tendring peninsula is in danger of being swamped by high new developments, destroying villages and associated communities. States that villages are an important and vital part of the community and British lifestyle and heritage. Many people cannot tolerate the prospect of living in built up areas which is why they move to villages. Is concerned that the existing infrastructure cannot withstand the proposed plan; that roads are extremely congested at certain times; the size of the proposed developments. Concern also expressed about loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitat, lack of employment opportunities, health services already in crisis, oversubscribed educational provision, loss of agricultural land, green spaces, bridleways and footpaths.

33. Does not oppose growth, however believes that the values and character of a village should be retained whilst embracing growth. Wants communities to become stronger and prosperous without detriment to the character of a village, i.e. retaining the green spaces. Believes that urban areas of Clacton and Harwich need to be expanded to bring improvement, at the moment they are run down and neglected. Suggests taking advantage of brownfield areas which will not only meet the demands but also regenerate the areas.

34. Concerned at the loss of green space and peaceful environment, lack of employment and encouraging people to move into the area from London.

35. Concern expressed about provision of infrastructure, surgeries, schools, roads, drainage and lack of employment opportunities.

36. Concerned about the effect of the large development proposed to the west of the bypass between Progress Road and Brook Retail Park and the increased level of traffic that will be created along Little Clacton Road. Seeks reassurance that a new road would be built to

mitigate this.

37. Concerned that their garden has been classified in one part safeguarded local green space and in another strategic green space and that this needs to be corrected.
38. Object to the development at Rouses Lane, St John's Road, Clacton as this will devalue property and wildlife will be lost, that the traffic network is not sustainable, sewers. Comments that there are no GPs surgeries, no jobs and that it will have a large impact on Tendring.
39. Suggests green areas need protecting. Concern that school places are running out.
40. Concerned that the proposed number of houses at Hartley gardens will not bring long term prosperity to Clacton and could lead to housing market saturation in view of the proposals for the west and north of the town.
41. Concern regarding traffic congestion at Frating roundabout, through Thorpe and Kirby Cross.
42. Commented that the maps are poorly defined and no mention of changes to the Brightlingsea Coastal Protection belt in the text and that there was no public meeting for Brightlingsea.
43. Resident pleased their property had been removed from the village envelope for future building options in Little Clacton.
44. Concerned at the timing of the delivery of the leaflet advising the exhibition dates and locations.
45. Hopes that the new plan has not come too late to stop the proposed Willow Farm Development. Concerned about the disruption and chaos caused if the development goes ahead.
46. Instead of creating more housing, we should be improving the facilities for our current residents. Concerned that village (Little Oakley) may become more like a town. Housing needs to be affordable for their generation.
47. Request a change be made to correct a minor cartographic error on a specific site in Station Road, Kirby.
48. Suggests PPL3 and PPL4 to protect both the rural landscape and biodiversity and geodiversity should be worded more strongly to take into account adjoining land which surrounds areas and sites of special scientific interest, including the protection of ancient woodlands, where development of adjacent land would cause an adverse impact.
49. Concern about the plans for 100's of houses in Kirby Cross and the surrounding areas. Do not think it appropriate to destroy the village and their way of life with mass housing. Have already lost the police station and coastguards, the libraries are part-time and the street

lights are switched off at midnight. If they had wanted to live in an overcrowded, noise polluted environment they would have chosen somewhere else to live.

50. Commented that the presentation of the Local Plan at Elmstead was very informative and well presented. Concerned about traffic and the number of parking spaces allocated to properties.
51. Advises that skylarks live and breed in the fields opposite Morrison's Supermarket and are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. They are classified in the UK as a Red List species under the Birds of Conservation Concern review and as a priority species in the Biodiversity Action Plan.
52. Objects to the removal of green belt adjacent to north of Sackets Grove Caravan Park and the west of Jaywick Lane, known as Rouses Farm. In the 2012 draft plan a green belt between the proposed settlement development southern boundary and Sackets Grove Caravan Park had been incorporated as an amenity for both sites, and a distinct separation between both sites, in the latest plan this green belt has been removed taking away the amenity desirable for both sites. Secondly the green belt in the previous plan west of Jaywick Lane corresponded directly with the green belt east of Jaywick lane and was seen as a corridor for wildlife.
53. Supports the sites selected and outline in the plan as the most suitable locations for additional housing in the area.
54. States that the vast majority of residents in the district don't want more housing.
55. Suggests that the object of a consultation is to consider the views and aspirations of local residents and that you cannot empower local people if you bore them with terms like overarching roles. Also suggests the district plan meets very few infrastructure requirements and is unacceptable without all parties working together and considering the effect that these developments will have, accumulatively on the village of Thorpe. Comments that the previous plan and current proposals are much the same. That most young families in the area are on minimum wage and unable to save for a deposit and handicapped by rising prices. That the combination of developments in the Tendring area will adversely affect resident's free movements and ability to shop in the village of Thorpe. States that business will continue to close, that the turnover of shops in recent years has been unacceptable. Refers to the inadequate sewerage system and lists a number of highway issues stating that they will impact upon the schools and local facilities. Suggests that the proposals do not consider or provide any safeguards for the most affected village of Thorpe from developments in the golden triangle of Harwich, Walton/Frinton and Clacton. Suggests that the lack of a bypass will impact heavily on health and wellbeing, as well as future tourism. Comments re Hierarchies of Centres, stating centres have been defined for Clacton, Dovercourt, Harwich, Frinton, Walton and one assumes Kirby and asks what is the pivotal point between the centres? How does one traverse between them? Could it be at Thorpe Memorial? States that Thorpe is being classified as a rural centre and that the plan talks of

protecting it, how can that be when policies are being put in place that you know will deliberately destroy the village. Suggests having a level playing field and that the same consideration as Frinton, Walton and Kirby. Suggests that a one off levy be placed on every private and commercial development to contribute towards the damage to the village.

56. Commented that at the Jaywick exhibition maps and plans were difficult to decipher and Tendring employees were not able to answer questions being asked regarding provision of doctor's, etc., with tempers becoming frayed. Several people left unhappy. Help was not forthcoming in understanding the implication of the new plans, it was also noticeable that there were no Councillors present. Did not find the representation form easy to understand.

57. Suggests that the settlement boundary for Little Clacton be extended along Tan Lane to incorporate Crackstakes Farm.

58. Suggests access roads must be addressed, possibly a bypass to avoid all excess and heavy traffic before further housing is commenced. No objections to proposals in Policies HP1-4, as long as Council can prove it will deliver what's promised. Also suggests the numbers don't stack up, totals add to 11,000 not 10,000. Questions exactly how many properties will TDC start with and how does it all add up, i.e. 10149 dwellings over 17 years. TDC must demonstrate that these proposals are sustainable given that jobs/transport and community services are always limited. Asks how will the Council be seen to ensure that a fair and accurate carrying out of these requirements takes place. Will it be transparent? (LP1-6). Regarding Policy PP1, asks if this is in addition to the new retail outlets already happening in the area. Walton, Clacton, Manningtree, what about empty shops, Frinton, Walton, etc. Suggests Thorpe requires a car park. Comments that no mention is made of Thorpe Hall gardens, woods and surrounding fields under Heritage Assets. States that it is vital that any reports undertaken regarding wildlife/heritage sites, tree protection, bats, newts, owls, slow worms, is carefully considered in order not to upset the natural balance and that Historic England is kept informed.

59. Questions how any self-build plots will be allocated – companies or individuals. Suggests that indoor leisure activities should be introduced, museums and activities to occupy tourists in bad weather, i.e. art centres, pottery.

60. With regards to SPL1, comments not in Brightlingsea with only one twisting road as access.

61. Regarding policies LP1, LP5, LP8 & LP9, asks whether houses are actually needed, seeks clarification regarding back land and states that the rural economy has changed and making special provision for a minority exposes them to more difficulty. Suggests no more houses first to justify supermarkets. Asks if this means a transport service for all. States that wildlife corridors are important to prevent inbreeding and extinction of wildlife, and that planning permission should be required for pond in-filling and watercourse bank management. Comments also made on varying the siting of phone masts.

APPENDIX 6 – ‘post it notes’ Comments from Exhibition Attendees

The list below gives Members an understanding of the issues raised by the public at the exhibitions.

Comments received on “post it notes” at the 9 Public Exhibitions

- LP7 Suggested Policy fails to address the individual aspirational requirements
- Policy would result in effectively increase village development limits by 1.2km all around the village
- Would allow plot land style development
- Would destroy open character of countryside around village
- There is no provision for improving road network
- Existing access points via Colchester or Ipswich are unsuitable
- Direct access from A12/120 to support future development
- Poor access to this area additional rail services
- Drainage and sewage can't cope now
- Crow Lane very narrow for increased traffic
- Would not infilling up to the bye pass first be preferable? near the station and nearer Main Road
- Concern for Great Bentley and nearby areas especially Weeley –A vast Plan of housing
- Improve roads and repair potholes
- How many lorries are going to use Tendring Village and Crow Lane and Crown Lane?
- All I can see is rhetoric and subjective comments from the Council no facts and figures
- Infrastructure will not cope, it can't cope with high unemployment, lack of leisure facilities, sewage, and drainage is already at capacity
- Absolutely crazy, these plans are built on fantasy figures. Where we can cycle and walk everywhere and are well resourced for doctors, schools, police etc.
- If these plans go ahead it will kill off the wonderful Weeley Village life we enjoy-shame on you TDC
- Regulate cost effective train travel

- No infrastructure, roads, rail (Weeley closed on Sunday), doctors, school places
- No local jobs
- More Housing – Not affordable collapse of services Transport gridlock
- Weeley Village will be destroyed with knock on effect on Tendring - Roads are already gridlocked, local lanes are not safe for increased traffic
- Consider water table drainage etc.
- The obvious disadvantage to the Local Plan is lack of infrastructure with road links, medical facilities, education provision and lack of employment local opportunities
- A bye-pass to Frinton and Walton is a must before mass housing comes to Weeley
- Safe cycle paths in the area
- Infrastructure- doctors, Transport, schools and community facilities should be decided before further housing is discussed
- The proposals for massive development in Weeley will annihilate this lovely village and have a knock on effect for its neighbouring villages.
- The plans are against the wishes of the Weeley residents and the quoted numbers will not be meeting a local need
- Much needed farmland will be lost
- Infrastructure will not cope and Weeley's rural identity will be destroyed forever
- When will TDC and Essex Highways do "joined up writing!" I am not against new housing but roads/infrastructure should come first
- The roads can't cope now
- As for drainage there is no evidence of any maintenance/cleaning
- The Weeley development will totally swamp what already exists there and make it totally unrecognisable.
- What provision for employment, medical services, schools etc.?
- Has anybody had an intelligent thought about this proposal?
- Policy should allow for landmark (future listed) development in countryside
- Aspirational self-build and lifestyle choice should be recognised

- Control could be based on land area/%build links
- Give us doctors, hospitals and work -the infrastructure first not lots of houses and no work
- Colchester, Ipswich, London for work
- Not all Clacton-no work, no doctors, schools etc. (already have major stress on demand)
- Each village should take housing especially Elmstead Market, Lt Bromley, Gt Bromley, Wix, Wrabness as near good roads for access
- A community grows from within, forcing houses everywhere will only anger the residents and create more problems than it solves
- Too much intensive redevelopment in one spot will affect existing house prices detrimentally
- Need improved infrastructure, amenities, Doctors, jobs etc., before taking more people in
- What about better road infrastructure? The number of additional housing units in Clacton will give significant extra traffic.
- Cant keep building and building on farm land/green land we will have no green spaces left....is it all belonging to the same person
- Bockings Elm-1700 houses = 4000 more people. Sewage, water, the roads can't take the traffic. We are promised Doctors but it doesn't happen
- Keep Clacton hospital open!
- Have you thought about the elderly retired people with respiratory problems and what sort of provisions there are for the transport of those people to get to hospital? Also with all the pollution with cement and brick dust they will travel in the air causing more health problems.
- All very well building new houses but there are not enough jobs, shops, facilities to support this and infrastructure of roads not good enough to cope
- What about repairing awful state of Constable Avenue Road
- Residents are not listened to –Councillors have forgotten whose interest they should be representing
- Would query the value of some “Green Gaps” – due to the fact they are obscured from view, due to historical extensive foliage and are therefore only visible via an aerial view
- Where is the hospital, new schools, doctor's surgeries and new transport routes to cope with new residents?
- How are there going to be new jobs when most of this area is seasonal?

- Why are our green areas being taken?
- No doctors want to come here
- There is no work here so the traffic up to London will be horrendous with longer queues than now on the Weeley by-pass
- Before housing we need infrastructure, roads, schools, doctors and work for local people
- Less dependence on private cars. More proper employment, Full Police presence -on the beat not cars
- Concern that people commuting to London will shop there, train service not brilliant
- Who will the houses be for? feel we should develop Clacton as tourist area
- Police visible on the streets
- Another doctor's surgery would be nice
- Why is development being concentrated in one half of the district because most of the Councillors live in the other half and don't want it where they live
- Disgraceful - thousand years of history wiped out with Mistley and Lawford being merged to form a "Greater Manningtree"
- Railway crossing at Manningtree Station
- Parking needs to be addressed before more development goes ahead
- Must keep Green Areas between villages and try harder when it goes to appeal
- Please do something to improve the A137 where it goes underneath the railway line at Manningtree station, its getting worse
- Already 1 million empty houses in the Country. No jobs to support development
- Housing is needed for local people on low incomes, not London overspill
- There is not the infrastructure, services or employment required to validate this plan
- An utterly meaningless exercise as the local population's views are being ignored.
- Maps are meaningless and don't inform
- Railway/tunnel at bottom of Cox's Hill needs to be sorted
- When will Mistley Quay owners be made to improve the area? The unsightly fence,

rusty oil drums, broken foot paths derelict buildings etc.

- Traffic lights at Manningtree station – may make it safer there but many local people all dispute that they will improve the flow of traffic. Would it be possible to have a trial time with temporary traffic lights to monitor the effect, this may confirm or otherwise and perhaps save money?
- Mistley Manningtree Lawford and Brantham all CO11 post code we all need better roads and improved shopping
- TDC will still pass housing development as they wont pay for a Public Inquiry-too costly
- Sewage treatment works at Manningtree not able to cope with 1,000 more dwellings. Roads, school's surgeries inadequate.
- There cannot be new builds at the proposed levels unless there are better health services. Colchester hospital cannot cope, what is Tendring going to do about that – push for new hospital- make better use of existing facilities at Clacton and Harwich.
- Your” Sustainable Places” sheet is just pie in the sky
- Manningtree High Street is slowly dying –need more diverse shops
- Please sort out infrastructure and amenities before building more large ugly houses for commuters
- Wignall Street, Harwich Road Lawford totally inadequate for increased traffic
- Bromley Road is quite narrow and leads to Car Park will add to congestion. A footpath presently leads from the school to Dead Lane which is very rural. Several hundred homes in your “Preferred Options” will make life unbearable for new comers as well. Infrastructure is inadequate. The trees are protected
- Green Wedge north of Long Road Lawford must be retained for recreational use – parkland
- Condition of new build should be that infrastructure should be in place before building houses begins, bungalows for older people should be included so families can stay close by this would free up other houses for growing families
- Keep green areas around villages so they remain ad villages
- The bridge under the railway struggles to cope with the traffic on normal days but problems on the A12 can cause queues up to Garden City
- Are the units on the industrial estate in Manningtree fully used or could the space be better used?

- Speed limits are never adhered to this needs urgent attention
- Maps to Small
- Railway crossing needs underpass
- What will happen to my kittens hunting grounds and prey? (from BW aged 7)
- Infrastructure needs attention first plus the railway bridge - do these firsts
- Every new house will have at least 2 cars attached to it. Where is the room for all this extra traffic?
- Can the industrial waste land and derelict/unused units in Manningtree be developed for an indoor swimming pool for use by schools and public?
- The railway underpass needs addressing before more houses are built. Can it be widened and go deeper to allow two-way traffic?
- There are large numbers of existing empty houses' that need to be re-generated before any new houses are built
- Not even one more house should be built in Manningtree, Lawford, Mistley, Bromley etc. area or on north side of river Stour until highway bottleneck at Manningtree railway station is resolved. This should be a national priority and left to local authorities
- Colchester to Elmstead – Infrastructure needed before development e.g. crossings, schools, fibre broadband
- Plans should be bigger –better for seeing what you are planning
- Was any research done into whether local infrastructure could support the disastrously planned housing estate in the middle of arable land on the corner of Heath Road/Rigby Avenue? One dentist practice one doctor's surgery in Manningtree and Roads that are little more than country lanes, not to mention lack of schools. This decision was whooshed through a Tendring Council Meeting, with a faulty sound system, no Chairman. Nobody could hear what was being said and the plan went ahead apparently unopposed. Please tell us exactly how these developments are meant to be sustained. Just plonk them anywhere and hope for the best seems to be the order of the day. We are not "Nimbys" just deeply concerned what is happening to our much loved "countryside and villages
- Parks, footpaths and cycle paths to thread through strategic routes and encourage less car use
- The issue is not the provision of doctor's surgeries but whether the existing surgeries will expand to staff them. Unfortunately, that is not within the gift of the Local Plan but it should be worded so that pressure to provide the staff is able to be applied

- One of the reasons people are moving here and creating a demand for houses is that they can't afford to live in large cities such as London however if this carries on, what are, at the moment villages, will eventually become large over populated and expensive as some of the main cities SW aged 12
- Harwich/Dovercourt Roads, Doctors (never fully operational) doctor's appointment need to be made weeks in advance –then hour wait. Why do we need more houses and people when we can't service the current population? Also dilapidated sites which have become a total eyesore
- A137 station bridge/roundabout problem should have been sorted before building so many houses in Lawford
- Why not a public green space (garden? park?) on old factories site near Manningtree Co-Op (was to have been a Tesco)
- Please take account of existing available sewerage capacity when sanctioning more dwellings houses and flats. At Holland Road, Frinton we regularly suffer raw sewage on our lawns as the local brook overflows when heavy rain occurs
- How about dwelling the A120 at Horsley Cross and building there instead?
- Again bridge under railway has to be an early priority. Aspirations ambitious but based on certain assumptions that may prove wrong. Experience needs to be considered – empty units on Manningtree Commercial site, failure of Clacton Retail Village
- Ardleigh: More doctor's surgeries and more bungalows for Ardleigh residents
- I went to a workshop at a Friends of the Earth Conference about 4-5 years ago first before the Local Plan idea was going to be passed and what we were told was a lot more detailed than what you have put in this exhibition. e.g. people in a village getting together and discussing and planning their particular area. This is all very vague and is like vague vision for what should happen, whereas my understanding years ago was for something a lot more detailed
- Developers are cashing in while pleading poverty when it comes to infrastructure to service new housing
- Farmland should be sold at farmland prices for new homes.... that might then be affordable
- Please if we have to have more housing more imaginative and affordable than the development now going on Cox's Hill - elitist!
- With this massive increase in population in a small community (representing an enormous percentage) Where is our policing? We are already suffering with Mistley Station crossing and being told by officers "well you're insured aren't you?"

- A137 rail crossing needs emphasizing in section 8.21 Transport Network as the A137 is the A12's diversionary route if blocked. We need traffic lights now and commitment to widen the underpass during the term of this Local Plan
- Can the Council please get an idea/plan about how the already cramped local area/people will be effected/squashed before they get bullied into putting 350 more homes on such a small area. GL aged 14
- If these houses are going to be built, the roads will be full and there is no room to expand/add to coincide with the influx. GL aged 14
- If local people are going to be told that houses are going to be built, at least give them an opportunity at court or something of that importance to speak out against it. TDC have not done this because they are too scared of being bullied and sued. GL aged 14
- By doing this you are also bullying local people out of their homes because the views of the community are they don't want to live in such a cramped area -so move. "Good Job" GL aged 14
- By looking at the boards, all views are negative. TDC will you listen to this and do something or will you let yourselves be bullied.....again! Let people vote and you will be able to see the community's thoughts. GL aged 14
- So the best of land (if any) to build on that looks the worst at the moment (Mistley Place Park) gets withdrawn? Come on people, get your act together. GL aged 14
- Why are there no plans of houses to show? If your going to kill our land, at least have the decency to show us the abomination that will replace it!! GL aged 14
- Well done TDC for single handedly killing the local area. GL aged 14
- Do a community vote to gain support for a re-consideration. We live in a democracy but at the moment people are not being listened to. VOTE. GL aged 14
- Sports and Recreation –Provision of safe cycling routes needed in Manningtree/Ardleigh/Bromley /Bradfield areas. Provision of swimming pool in Manningtree area – nearest is 10 miles away with no direct public transport access
- Why isn't there any information about the outline details regarding access, percentages numbers of housing, other units, services etc. for the 300 plus houses off Long Road. Not good enough –completely let down by TDC
- Many new developments seem to be for wealthy people only 4-6 bed properties and not for young people or down sizers. you must address the lack of small properties
- TDC must make the Local Plan sort out Manningtree Station bridge issue e.g. car park on

north side

- Improvements required on A137 at Station we cannot sustain current traffic situation
- Railway Bridge needs an underpass. Commuter parking on roads needs stopping and enforcing (as per Lawford Dale). How can the proposed development be sustained the existing infrastructure and roads?
- Increase every village envelope in the whole district allowing a few dwellings in each village thereby adding to the “life” of Villages and avoiding large scale housing estates
- At present there are virtually no cycle paths in the area. Please address this, particularly when making any improvements to the A137 railway tunnel`
- Speaking to representatives today, I feel sorry, TDC has given no answers that actually answer people’s questions about the import issues
- With all the extra houses in this area plus around Colchester, how is the hospital going to cope with so many extra people? It is already struggling to manage
- It is vital that there are no more housing developments eroding the boundaries between Mistley, Manningtree and Lawford. It is good to see “Strategic Green Gaps” in the TDC Plan but will this stop speculative housing development applications
- This philosophy is fine but there is no reference to the A137 and especially the level crossing bottleneck in Manningtree. What is being done to work with Babergh DC to tackle this. A new car park on the Suffolk side would help the increased commuters
- Need more social and affordable homes. Stop allowing developers to get away with delivering their agreed quotas. Manningtree and surrounding areas are becoming areas for the rich commuters – what about the locals?
- Why are still waiting for the duelling of A120 Colchester to Harwich?
- Long road is already very difficult to cross at certain times. With further 660 families living off Long Road this problem will only get worse
- Housing densities need sorting so that off road parking is promoted. Mistley, Manningtree and Lawford is semi-rural in nature and densities need to reflect this. Only on former industrial estates e.g. Maltings would one expect higher densities
- You need to make LP1 available disabled/ability bungalow development percentage in each Village/town so people can stay with their communities
- One person’s vision is far from the reality of what the people of Manningtree need/want or have asked for! One house becomes a village to a town to a city to over population. The excuse that more houses need to be built. Approved local need for roads with adequate

acres for all

- Demand for so many housing will become unsustainable with major new Network Rail with substantial financial contributions for developers
- Please be aware that Councils and Government are here to serve the people. The general feeling locally is that views are not listened to and everything is already fixed
- Journey time into London via rail from Walton/Frinton and Clacton needs to be improved if you seriously want to attract commuters. My colleague gets into London quicker from Exeter than I do from Frinton
- Green areas between and within villages need to be retained. Much needed agricultural land must be protected to feed future generations. The rural roads are already congested during rush hour times now they will not cope with the amount of future traffic particularly the B1414
- Infrastructure and car parking at Manningtree station are already inadequate Monday – Friday. Wignall Street and Harwich Road Lawford too narrow for existing traffic. Cycling should be promoted but, is dangerous on existing roads
- We have been here 10 years and have been told several times that rail services would improve. One train per hour is insufficient and they need to run later as so the buses so that people can get home from Clacton/London etc.
- May I suggest you visit Canvey Island like us they have one road in/out, or visit other authorities to see what they are offering their rate payers - INFRASTRUCTURE
- Water supply demand? Capacity of sewers?, Sewage treatment , Major infrastructure requests
- The local map is possibly misleading local people as the map does not highlight significant developments not yet built or under appeal e.g. 217 flats at Martello, Walton, 240 at Kirby plus care homes on each site
- I think your looking through rose tinted glasses
- You're not actually interested are you?
- Why is that some of these new estates have no social housing allocations? Giles Watling states you take the money and its a lot
- Moved here from large town and traffic congestion don't want it to follow here. That's why we live here. We need a general hospital now without more houses
- New schools before housing. Better roads, bypass Thorpe. Cheaper rail fares. Doctors before health clinic

- Thorpe-le-Soken roads get gridlocked now
- What about infrastructure for houses?
- Healthy Places? Too many houses, too many cars, too much pollution
- Road in out of Walton Road/Frinton Road nightmare for people already living their traffic flows day and night. No hospital, no social housing for local people already paying for services. Consider local people before holiday makers as we tend to take a back seat when they are in town.
- No infrastructure in place to drains, roads schools, doctors, transport-virtually none existent in the evenings. No lighting, although people still mobile, nurses/carers/police/fire/ambulance/lifeboat who are all serving their community, also people who keep lights in their properties because they do not feel safe. Would this be rectified in the new housing plan.
- I really don't want to look at 240 houses instead of a green field
- I don't agree with building on Station yard car park Walton-on-the Naze
- Housing to meet requirements. How about down-sizing, more bungalows in good areas
- Schools and doctors need to come first not after the houses are built
- Developer should not be allowed to ride rough shod over council plans
- We need the infrastructure schools, roads, dentist, G. P's - not all these new houses
- How do you propose to attract business into Walton town Centre? We need butchers, greengrocers – not another fast food outlet or charity/second hand shop
- Infrastructure before Housing surely?
- Government needs to realise that building houses without infrastructure is a recipe for disaster and this area has virtually reached that point.
- Clacton is rapidly becoming a no go area. Drugs fights more people from London.
- If building surgeries get doctors to put in there. At the moment you can't get appointments.
- Check summer traffic, build shops, surgeries, dentist etc. before houses. Where will people work?
- How many builders are charged the Infrastructure Levy? Like other Local Authorities are doing? Common sense is needed infrastructure before houses, put locals needs first and why is Alresford not having any housing?