

It is very difficult to respond to a document which is general prose rather than specific policies / commitments, and which for most of the time is describing matters outside CBC's control.

p.23 There is no comment on *why* 82% of work trips from Tendring are by car even though a large % of them are to central Colchester (*viz*, the failure by DfT / ECC / TOCs / CBC / TDC to actually DO anything to provide an improved - usable - affordable local train service).

pp. 46-47:

CBC presumably *already* has a policy of supporting greater priority for bus operation? But the real-world actions of CBC officers and NEPP officers (who appear to also actually be CBC officers?) are totally *non-supportive*, as has been revealed by the recent applications for bus passing places in Wivenhoe, which produced repeated statements from Matthew Young and NEPP (and indeed ECC) officers that their policy is that they will not permit even a very small reduction of parking spaces unless all the nearby residents express *active enthusiasm* for the reduction (!), even in cases where the local Neighbourhood Plan survey has removed heavy overall resident support for passing places. It appears therefore that CBC needs to 'get its act together' on this front! [Emails can be copied to you].

The para beginning 'On the east.....' is too non-specific to be usefully commented on – it appears ?? to be referring to Hythe Station as a bus-rail transport changing point ? for people going from the new developments north of the Uni to places *beyond* Colchester? And buses using the busway alongside the railway [as included in the LDF documents] as their route from the new development to central Colchester (via Hythe Station Rd)?

It is not stated why it is thought a good thing that these proposed new (presumably commercial) bus routes should be made unviable by being forced into competition with a subsidised P&R operation. Possibly the para is just written on a sort of naïve basis that 'the more transport you have the better it must be', as if financial viability didn't matter!

Any attempt to damage the Wivenhoe bus services, and the Tendring rail services into Colchester Town, by introducing a competing subsidised P&R facility available to motorists only, will of course be opposed at subsequent stages of the Local Plan process, as it was in 2010. [By that time, though, the failure of Cuckoo Farm will probably have put ECC off Colchester P&Rs altogether].

p.46 bottom – although of minor importance, there is a self-contradictory para, which firstly claims that 'much' of the public transport (means buses?) to the 'villages' is supported by public subsidy (which is certainly not true in terms of the *numbers of passengers* involved), followed by the statement that this means that the services are 'subject to changes by the operator' - which of course is *not* the case in respect of supported services.

p.47 spelling of Clingoe Hill.