

Colchester Borough Local Plan 2017 – 2033 – Section 2 Examination

MAIN MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

Further statement in respect of questions requiring further answers

Main Matter 1

- **Does the policies map correctly illustrate geographically the application of policies in CLP Sect 2?**

I would state that the maps as detailed in the 'Policies Maps' section of the Council's document dated June 2017 fail to detail the section of the Borough relating to Lexden. See previous representation ID 6178. The area of Lexden west of the former Essex County Hospital, (map TC 1-4) and to the east of Stanway (map WC 1-5) is omitted from the maps.

In the current form the plan fails in regard of this matter 1. The plan attached shows the area that should be included.

- **Is CLP Section 2 consistent with the NPPF in all other respects? Or if not, what is the justification for any inconsistency?**

Previous rep ID's 6177, 6180, 6181 – Why is the Council persistently inconsistent in their application of planning policy in respect of the NPPF. In particular, the presumption in favour of sustainable residential development.

The Council has approved the residential development of sites in ;Irvine Road a former 'green' allotment site (now developed) ,land adj 37 Oaks Drive (formally dismissed at appeal- now developed), 1 Sussex Road (one unit town cramming)

The site detailed in previous representations land at 3 Highfield Drive is a residential site of no notation, outside the conservation area, no special character or features. The Council continue to frustrate development on unjustified and insignificant grounds (loss of a green corner and airiness)contrary to the guidance set out in the NPPF. Why are the Council and the Inspectorate inconsistent in decision making when in this case there is no sound objective planning justification. ?

- **Do the policies in CLP Section 2 provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?**

The policy maps in the draft plan are lacking in detail regarding policy zoning. Also policies such as SP1 are vague in regard to presumption in favour of sustainable development unless '*material considerations*' indicate otherwise. Why are there no examples/ detail of what constitutes a 'material consideration' ? .In its current form the policy allows subjective decision making by ; planning officers, members and inspectors. Policies and land designations should be clear and not incite inconsistency.

The draft plan currently fails to give any clarity to decision makers particularly in regard to housing development.

Marguerite Haddrell BSc (Hons) MRTPI
29/3/21

Site (Land adjacent 3 Highfield Drive,Lexden Road,Colchester).The Council did not give it a blue number in Call for sites 2015 !

