

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation (22 June to 10 August 2020) - Schedule of Responses

62 Respondents and 143 Comments

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Essex County Council	Comment	Introduction	<p>The following comments on the Plan relate to ECC’s role as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.</p> <p><u>General</u> For information purposes only, it is noted that minerals and waste developments are defined as a ‘County Matter’ in the Town and Country Planning (Prescription of County Matters) (England) Regulations 2003 and are therefore outside of the remit of the Plan. As such, where the Plan refers to ‘development’, this does not apply to development relating to minerals and waste matters.</p> <p><u>Section 3 - Introduction</u> This section aims to set out the Development Plan for Tiptree Parish. The description of the Development Plan presented in Section 3 omits both the Essex Minerals Local Plan 2014 and the Essex and Southend-On-Sea Waste Local Plan 2017. The Plan and any applications being determined within Tiptree Parish will need to be in conformity with these Development Plan documents. There is a requirement to accurately set out the Development Plan within the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan. The following wording is suggested to ensure that the Development Plan is accurately portrayed:</p> <p><i>“County Plan Policy”</i></p> <p><i>Essex County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority for Tiptree Parish. The Development Plan for Tiptree Parish also includes the following documents:</i></p> <p><i>The Essex Minerals Local Plan (2014)</i></p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p><i>The Essex Minerals Local Plan (MLP) identifies sites and locations for mineral development within Essex up to 2029 and introduces policies to manage this type of development. There are no mineral extraction sites or other forms of mineral infrastructure either currently operating or allocated within the parish. However, there are deposits of sand and gravel within the parish which are subject to a Minerals Safeguarding policy within the Minerals Local Plan. Regard should be had to the requirements of Policy S8 of the MLP when 5ha or more of a proposed development falls within a Minerals Safeguarding Area.</i></p> <p><i>Essex and Southend-On-Sea Waste Local Plan 2017</i> <i>The Essex and Southend-On-Sea Waste Local Plan (WLP) sets out how Essex and Southend-On-Sea aim to manage waste up to 2032 and introduces policies to guide waste management. It seeks to deal with waste more sustainably by guiding the development of waste management facilities, encouraging recycling and reducing reliance on landfill.</i></p>
Essex County Council	Comment	Introduction	<p>ECC in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) provides the following comments that reiterate comments made on the Regulation 14 Plan. The Plan contains limited information about flood risk. The LLFA recommend the inclusion of the following wording in the Plan.</p> <p><i>In order to help manage downstream flood risk, any new development within the Plan area should be directed away from areas of existing flood risk where possible. New development within the plan area must ensure that surface water runoff rates are not increased beyond existing rates. Historically some surface water flooding has occurred towards the north of the village in close proximity to the Elms Farm allocation. Site investigations have shown that the watercourse to the southwest of the site has limited capacity. Any development in this area should consider improvement works as part of the development.</i></p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p><i>All development within the plan area should use Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage rainfall runoff from the site. These techniques should encompass the four pillars of SuDS, addressing water quantity, water quality, biodiversity and amenity. In order to achieve these results, the use of above ground SuDS should be promoted. Where possible these features should be multifunctional, not only providing flood risk mitigation but also enhancing green infrastructure within the plan area.</i></p> <p><i>All drainage strategies for major development within the plan area should be based on the Essex Sustainable Drainage Design Guide. It is recommended that developers engage in pre-applications discussions with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) to ensure that any recommendations can be incorporated into site design as early into the planning process as possible. While the LLFA is not currently a statutory consultee on minor application it is still recommended that the principles of the Essex SuDs Design Guide are implemented on smaller sites to ensure that the cumulative effect of multiple smaller developments does not have a significant increase downstream flood risk.</i></p> <p><i>Although not directly linked with the planning process it should be ensured that any new development within the Plan area complies with the Land Drainage Act and an application is made to the LLFA for ordinary water consent before making any changes to existing ordinary watercourses.'</i></p>
Essex County Council	Comment	Introduction	<p><u>Renewables</u> The NPPF recognises all communities have a responsibility to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources and supports community-led initiatives. The Plan could mention renewable energy technology for domestic and commercial developments. Useful documents and guidance include:</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Carbon Neighbourhood Planning guidebook updated January 2018 produced by the Centre for Sustainable Energy https://www.cse.org.uk/downloads/reports-and-publications/policy/community-energy/energy-advice/planning/renewables/low-carbon-neighbourhood-planning-guidebook.pdf • Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy – Department of communities and Local Government – https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/225689/Planning_Practice_Guidance_for_Renewable_and_Low_Carbon_Energy.pdf <p><u>Energy Efficiency</u> The Plan could include a supportive statement to improve energy efficiency to existing and new builds. Whilst energy efficiency targets are set nationally in Building Regulations, there are opportunities for neighbourhood plans to influence new development, through policies requiring developers to demonstrate how they've followed the 'energy hierarchy' in reducing energy demand before implementing renewable energy, or make the most of solar gain and passive cooling through the orientation, layout and design of the development.</p> <p>Smart energy tools and storage devices are beginning to emerge which help to manage energy within the home and within the local network to make better use of the energy we produce and use. These tools have potential to reduce the amount of energy used in homes or businesses and reduce fuel bills.</p>
Forestry Commission	Comment	Introduction	Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission, unfortunately we do not have the resources to respond to Neighbourhood plans. If you have ancient woodland within your boundary to consider, the Forestry Commission has prepared joint standing advice with Natural England on

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>ancient woodland and veteran trees which we refer you to in the first instance. This advice is a material consideration for planning decisions across England. Ancient woodlands are irreplaceable, they have great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed. This applies equally to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS).</p> <p>It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland, unless “there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists” (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 175).</p> <p>The Standing Advice explains the definition of ancient woodland, its importance, ways to identify it and the policies that relevant to it. It also provides advice on how to protect ancient woodland when dealing with planning applications that may affect ancient woodland. It also considers ancient wood-pasture and veteran trees. It will also provide you with links to Natural England’s Ancient Woodland Inventory assessment guides and other tools to assist you in assessing potential impacts. The assessment guides sets out a series of questions to help planners assess the impact of the proposed development on the ancient woodland.</p>
National Grid (Avison Young)	Comment	Introduction	<p>National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p>About National Grid</p> <p>National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators across England, Wales and Scotland.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.</p> <p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets:</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>National Grid provides information in relation to its assets at the website below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ <p>Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.</p> <p>Distribution Networks</p> <p>Information regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below: www.energynetworks.org.uk</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: plantprotection@cadentgas.com
Pam Welsh	Object	Introduction	<p>I received the Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation through the post.</p> <p>I have had a look through the document online as recommended and quite alarmed by the 600 houses being planned by 2033.</p> <p>I have lived in Tiptree over 18 years, in all those years I or any member of my family have never been able to get a dentist. the doctor surgery is also another difficult thing to do.</p> <p>The Traffic going past Perrywoods every day is also difficult, I have to leave my home earlier to give me extra time to get onto the A12 towards Ipswich, Having to wait at the bottom of that road turning into Feering is awful every morning, this will also get worse as they are building new houses there too.</p> <p>The road structure in and around Tiptree is already very busy, going along Maidon Road to get onto the A12 towards London is very difficult for members of my family who also have to leave the house even earlier in order to get onto the A12. If you have another 600 cars (at least) on the roads going in either direction, it's just going to be a nightmare getting around.</p> <p>Tiptree is getting very congested and I am very worried indeed. Yes, I do believe more houses are needed but the infrastructure of Tiptree is already bursting at the seams. 600!!!! well I am so shocked!! I object to the number of houses proposed.</p>
Diana Childs	Support	Introduction	I support all chapters and sections of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan for Tiptree.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Susan Lucas	Comment	Introduction	<p>I accept that 600 more homes must be built in Tiptree but resources that support the existing population are already stretched to the limit. It is imperative therefore that another Medical centre and a Dentist are provided. Roads need to be maintained to a higher standard than at present to cope with increased traffic. Traffic calming measures on main routes would extend road wear and improve safety. Public open spaces and designated wildlife sites shown on the proposal should be provided with public access and preserved for the enjoyment and mental health of the residents.</p>
Felicity Butcher	Comment	Introduction	<p>I would just like to comment.</p> <p>Are the 600 homes proposed including the proposed 275 Bloor Homes on the Maldon Road and the houses to be built on Barbrook Lane? We don't need these as they are not included in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>What about putting infrastructure in first. Re. sewers, water extra provision for electricity underground cables. Doctors and Dentists. New secondary school plus making primaries larger. Parking as there is only small private car park in the centre.</p> <p>Perhaps making Church Road one way. Lots of elderly people like myself do not feel safe when traffic comes from Tollesbury, Colchester and further afield driving through the village like idiots (as former lollipop person in Church Road who was hit on crossing, I know just how dangerous this road is).</p> <p>Also Maldon Road is horrendous for speeding and hold ups as traffic tries to turn right down Braxsted Road. Traffic forms right back to junction of Church Road!!!</p> <p>Colchester Borough Council do not seem to care about residents' feelings or objections, this used to a pleasant place to live, no longer. Are</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>we now going to be a town, no facilities two small supermarkets no policy presence.</p> <p>We have loads of new housing not being sold. Sell these before building more. 600 new properties and what is already being built averages 2000 new residents. These properties too expensive no thought to first time Tiptree residents.</p> <p>Are there provisions in place for a cinema, bowling alley etc. as people have to travel to Colchester, Braintree or Chelmsford. No buses after 7.40pm. There is going to be a gridlock in Tiptree as the new estates are all going to try to filter down the Kelvedon Road or Maldon Road.</p> <p>PS. We are also facing the poss closure of our library!!!</p>
Dennis Blaise Mannina	Support	Introduction	I agree 100% with the entire content of the 'Tiptree Village Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation'.
Natural England	Comment	Introduction	Natural England has previously commented on the Tiptree Neighbourhood plan (see letters reference 285100 dated 17th July 2019 and 298483 dated 16 December 2019) and these should be read in conjunction with this response. Please also reference Natural England's comments on the emerging North Essex Joint Strategic Plan, particularly with reference to the Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Essex Coast Recreational Avoidance and Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (Essex Coast RAMS). We additionally note that the emerging North Essex Joint Strategic Plan has been paused following communication from planning inspector, and at the time of this consultation it is unclear what direction this will take moving forward. This may subsequently cause delay with the Colchester part 2 local plan.
Jill James	Support	Introduction	We feel satisfied that the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan is an appropriate and well thought through document and we support it completely. We sincerely hope that it will be adopted as Tiptree needs to have any new

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			build very carefully controlled in order to avoid the dreadful mistakes that have been made over the years. Our village has been spoiled by random and very poorly thought through planning decisions in the past and deserves to be recognised thus.
Gloria Terranova-Streat	Comment	Introduction	Green spaces? Don't make me laugh. For 2 years residents of Tiptree fought long & hard against Gladman Land Development building on Barbrook Lane. What's the point of having a Neighbourhood Plan if agents like Gladman are going to be allowed to submit planning applications, and win appeals, thanks to the Secretary of State. We might as well not even have a Neighbourhood Plan for what it's worth. The beautiful landscape off Barbrook Lane is now going to be sodomized with 200+ houses. Absolutely disgusted.
Historic England	Comment	Introduction	Having now had a chance to review the SEA Report, as well as the R16 version of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan, I can confirm that Historic England has no further comments to make at this time.
Historic England	Comment	Introduction	We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, but do not wish to provide detailed comments at this time. We would refer you to any previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 stage, and for any further information to our detailed advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/
Ed Birkin	Support	Introduction	There is a need for more housing and the plan looks very well thought through in terms of positioning and traffic management. There are other projects being discussed such as the Bloor Homes one opposite the primary school and that would be a disaster in terms of congestion on the Maldon Road which is already overcrowded, and this should be blocked. The only downside to the plan is that there will be a big increase in traffic onto the A12 and the Braxted Park Road bridge needs widening to stop the huge traffic issues there.
Michael Robson (on	Object	Introduction	This submission has been prepared on behalf of Kler Group in response to the consultation on the Submission version of the Neighbourhood

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
behalf Kler Group)			<p>Development Plan (NDP). Kler Group has an interest in site TIP 03 – Pennsylvania Lane.</p> <p>The comments set out below comprise observations in relation to the content and assessment made, the NDP and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). These comments are provided to seek to ensure that the evidence base supporting the NP is robust and will deliver the most sustainable development for the residents of Tiptree.</p> <p>Only a Neighbourhood Plan or Order that meets each of a set of basic conditions can be put to a referendum and be made. The basic conditions are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The basic conditions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order d. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable development e. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area). f. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations. g. prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Order (or plan) and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order. <p>Conformity with the Emerging Local Plan</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>There is concern regarding the NDPs consistency with the emerging Local Plan. The emerging Local Plan identifies preferred Directions for Growth that include the western side of the settlement. The proposed allocations in the NDP are not consistent with the preferred Directions for Growth and seek to allocates sites to the north of the settlement. If the NDP is to seek an alternative approach than that set out in the emerging Local Plan, this should be addressed within the plan to provide an explanation and avoid any inconsistency.</p> <p>Alternatively, sites should be allocated to the west of the settlement to comply with the preferred Directions for Growth identified in the emerging Local Plan. The allocation of TIP03 would result in sustainable development and would not have adverse effects in biodiversity as asserted in the site assessment, see below.</p> <p>Emerging Local Plan and Reserve Sites</p> <p>In addition to the above concerns relating to the Direction of Growth for the housing numbers presently set out in the emerging Local Plan, there is concern that these are premised on the delivery of the Part 1 Local Plan and the inclusion of Garden Communities. Following the Inspector’s concerns at the examination of the Part 1 Local Plan, there is uncertainty surrounding the spatial strategy and how the housing will be delivered over the plan period.</p> <p>Due to the likelihood of the Garden Communities being withdrawn from the emerging Local Plan, it is likely that alternative sites will need to be delivered in order to meet the shortfall, including medium sized sites that can be delivered relatively quickly to ensure sufficient delivery over the plan period having regards to delays with the adoption of the plan. It is reasonable to consider that Tiptree, being the most sustainable location outside of Colchester itself, could be required to accommodate further growth. To ensure that the NDP would not be out-of-date immediately</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>following the adoption of a Local Plan which increases provision at Tiptree, it would be sensible to include Reserve Sites.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>This submission has been prepared on behalf of Kler Group in response to the Reg 16 Submission Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>The comments set out comprise observations in relation to the content and assessment made in the SEA, the NDP. Having regard to the sections above, there is concern that the NP does not meet, or there is a lack of evidence at present to demonstrate it does meet all basic conditions and deliver the most sustainable development for the residents of Tiptree.</p>
Terry Slater	Comment	Introduction	<p>Whilst I appreciate the amount of effort involved, the plan appears more aspirational than substantive in many areas. However I have two major concerns.</p> <p>1 Housing development is concentrated in one area which will mean that access to the village centre for shopping and services will in the main be by vehicle via the junction of the B1022 and B1023. This is a junction with two mini roundabouts which at best is just adequate. The additional traffic will bring problems and there are no plans to improve this junction. Scattered development around Tiptree would be better as the traffic flow into the centre would be able to use a combination of routes.</p> <p>2 There are plans to have cycle lanes, but will there be used? The ones in the Grove Road Estate are rarely used. As a resident of Tiptree for many years the number of people walking far outnumber cyclists. Most of the cyclists are young who seem to prefer pavements. On the other hand, there are many dog walkers.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>There is no provision in the plan for dog walking facilities. There should be areas to allow dogs to be exercised off lead in a secure area. For example, there is land adjacent to the Grove Road playing field that is used infrequently and could be made available for such use if the Council so desired.</p> <p>At present, dog owners drive to places like Tiptree Heath (where most people using this facility are walking dogs), local woods like Pods Wood, and Tolleshunt Knights playing field. Some even go as far as Shrub End, Danbury Lakes and Highlands Park in Chelmsford. Park Lane nature Reserve is used by many dog walkers. These journeys would not be needed if provisions were made within the plan.</p> <p>The plan should embrace the needs of as many people as possible if it is to be successful.</p>
Steve Bays	Comment	Introduction	<p>I would like to make the following comments as the previous Tiptree Neighbourhood Planning Chairman, and prior Chairman of the Parish Council.</p> <p>It was myself, as Vice Chairman of the Parish Council, and the then Parish Council Chairman Terry Slater, who set up the Neighbourhood Plan committee steering group and neighbourhood plan working party.</p> <p>After the first Public consultation, the Steering group were joined by a number of very strong personalities that had their own agenda. There is no 100% perfect plan, and a number of compromises will always need to be addressed for a plan to be acceptable to the majority.</p> <p>I would ask the inspector to satisfy him/herself on the following comments, that the Steering group have not created a Neighbourhood Plan to satisfy their own ambitions</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p><u>General Comments.</u></p> <p>It is very difficult to understand how to comment on this document online (to a layperson). Too many working Party meetings were held behind closed doors.</p> <p><u>The NHP Plan.</u></p> <p>Landowners were not consulted about the allocation of their land being designated as Nature reserve. But these sites were added to maps for wider consultation, giving the impression these were already allocated sites.</p> <p>Some Working Party Minutes and Steering Group meeting minutes have never been agreed and signed due to irregularities. Too many of the NHP meetings were held behind closed doors, without public access. (This has led to the working group attendances reducing)</p> <p>Results from the Public questionnaires have been mis-reported and distorted. Low responses have been merged with higher responses to give a false result.</p>
Michael Streat	Support	Introduction	<p>With regard to the Tiptree neighbourhood plan that is reaching the end of the consultation period I would like to say that I totally endorse the neighbourhood plan and believe it should be adopted.</p> <p>I do have to ask though what is the point as the pending plan has been totally ignored by the planning inspector and the secretary of state in allowing planning permission for 200 plus homes off Barbrook Lane. Part of the reason seems to be due to Colchester council allegedly not having a 5 year housing plan. Colchester council has not challenged this decision as far, as I am aware, so I must assume this to be true.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Colchester council has once again badly let down the residents of Tiptree.</p> <p>So, please do endorse the neighbourhood plan and maybe just for once show you actually care about anywhere other then Colchester centre</p> <p>I am including my telephone number if anyone in the planning department feels they wish to speak to me - although I am afraid to say I do not expect it.</p>
<p>Jamie Walker Chloe Hammond</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Introduction</p>	<p>I am writing with regards to the above plan.</p> <p>I have grave concerns about this plan and the future of our village of Inworth.</p> <p>I understand that due to the increase in population new properties need to be built however, I firmly believe new infrastructure needs to be developed to access the A12 instead of adding more strain to an already overly busy village road.</p> <p>Myself and my partner moved into our house in the village of Inworth 2 years ago. Our house is along the B1023 which over the past 2 years has had a significant increase in traffic. There are parts of the morning and evening where it is very difficult to sleep due to the noise. It is also becoming increasingly harder to get on and off of our drive due to the amount of traffic. As most of the properties along our part of the road are listed buildings, we are unable to modify our house to accommodate the increase of traffic and noise. Our house has been categorised as Grade II Listed due to the historical significance. An increase in pollution and potential accidents (many people speed down the B1023 and there have been accidents due to this) will therefore put our property at risk. It seems unfair that we are unable to make modifications to our property however, increases in traffic due to pollution will damage these buildings.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Currently many lorries use the B1023 to travel between the A12 and Tiptree the roads are very narrow and were not designed for these heavy-duty vehicles. Along the bends of the road two lorries on opposite sides of the road cannot drive at the same time. One lorry would have to mount the kerb to pass. There is also a risk to normal vehicles as the lorries take over more than one side of the road. When the larger lorries come past our house this makes our house shake due to the vibrations. There is a small bridge along the B1023 and I am unsure it will be able to take a long-term increase in heavy-duty lorries.</p> <p>During the lockdown period there was also a decrease in litter along the B1023 due to the decrease in traffic. By increasing the traffic there will be an increase in litter in our village.</p> <p>I understand a survey was carried out during lockdown regarding the traffic flow. During the lockdown period the traffic flow has significantly reduced as people were not travelling to and from work. The residents of the road greatly appreciated the lowering of traffic flow due to the pandemic and everyone noticed the increase in traffic and noise once restrictions were lifted. As the survey carried out is not a true reflection on the traffic flow how can this be taken into account or seriously for a potential development plan which will negatively impact our lives?!</p> <p>I am very passionate to decrease the volume of traffic down the B1023, not to increase it as are many of the residence of Inworth.</p> <p>I hope you take these matters into consideration and re-take the traffic flow survey during the hours of 5am-7pm.</p>
Vivienne Pawsey	Object	Introduction	Building approx. 650 new houses in Tiptree without building a road to A12 Is stupid Tiptree Kelvedon and Feering will be a car park with that

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			many more houses No building until roads are sorted out and Schools and Doctors.
Feering Parish Council	Comment	Introduction	<p>There appears to be little on sustainability and/or climate change policies, merely ensuring that traffic flows freely within Tiptree, hence the allocation of development near to the Inworth Road (refer to the above comments).</p> <p>We consider that there has been a lack of engagement with Feering Parish Council particularly with regards to transport (A12, railway station) and traffic matters especially as we have common interests and we further extend our invitation to attend our joint Neighbourhood plan meetings which are attended by other surrounding parishes.</p>
Michael Pingram (on behalf of Colchester United FC)	Comment	Introduction	<p>[See representation letter, including appendices] CUFC owns 9.18 hectares (22.69 acres) of land south of Grange Road in the west of Tiptree as well as further parcels to the north and east (see plan at Appendix 1 to this letter). The land occupied by Florence Park training ground contains five football pitches, a sports accommodation building and ancillary parking area.</p> <p>Established in 1937, CUFC has played an important role in the provision and development of Sport in the Borough. CUFC is an asset valued by many members of the community who enjoy participating in and watching football as a key team sport. These activities in turn contribute to inspiring members of the community of all age groups and levels to take up sport themselves. CUFC is also a valued local employer and its reputational benefits have positive effects for associated elements of the local economy.</p> <p>CUFC has invested significantly in its sports facilities, including the Community Stadium and the Florence Park training ground, in recent years. In addition, CUFC has also invested in the Warriors Rest Ground located east of Tiptree and owned by Colchester Borough Council (CBC).</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Planning permission was granted for the Florence Park training ground in 2010 (reference 091627). The development was partly dependent upon cross-funding from the provision of 103 dwellings on adjacent land to the north and south of Grange Road (granted under permission references 122134 and 151886).</p> <p>Tiptree also has a local community football team known as Tiptree Jobserve Youth Football Club, open to all youth players in the locality. The Club is extremely popular and runs several teams for varying age groups and uses the ground at Warriors Rest and the designated community pitch at Florence Park and associated facilities.</p> <p>In order to maintain its positive influence in the provision and development of Sport in the Borough, CUFC cannot sit still; it must continually advance its offer and grow as a professional sports club and business. Fundamental to CUFC's long term development strategy is the need to achieve Category 1 status as a football training academy as designated by the Football League's Elite Players Performance Plan (EPPP) youth development scheme.</p> <p>If CUFC is able to achieve Category 1 status, it will be able to set up a football training academy to attract the very best talent, which will in turn raise its profile, increasing its influence encouraging more members of the community into sport and enhancing its ability to re-invest funds directly into community aspects such as the local community football team.</p> <p>Working towards achieving Category 1 status has formed a cornerstone of CUFC's sports strategy for several years, but unfortunately the training ground at Florence Park is not of sufficient size to allow this accreditation</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>to be achieved. The current site also suffers from restrictions imposed on its use under planning conditions (controlling hours and times of operation), and expansion into adjacent land has been ruled out due to a lack of availability and suitability.</p> <p>As the Parish Council is aware, CUFC has therefore, been looking to relocate its existing facilities to a new larger site which is capable of attaining Category 1 Status and this search remains ongoing.</p> <p>However, it is also important to note that the requirements to continue to meet the current Category 2 status are constantly evolving, with one such example being a likely future obligation to provide a 3G pitch with associated floodlighting. At present there are no floodlighting facilities at Florence Park and residential amenity considerations could be a constraint to such provision if lighting was needed. Therefore, while Florence Park is currently able to retain Category 2 status, there is a real possibility that it will not continue to be the case, which would represent a significant backward step for CUFC's academy status and sport development in general. This would further reduce the likelihood of attracting the best young players in the area, thereby negatively impacting upon the Club's profile and ability to invest in the local community sport provision.</p> <p>As part of the above strategy, and in order to cross-fund a relocation, CUFC will seek to redevelop some of the existing Florence Park training ground to provide housing for approximately 120 new homes. However, it would also retain the current first team pitch to enable it to be utilised by local community teams and retain the high quality sports building and car park, again for community use at least in part, as shown on the attached illustrative concept masterplan.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>The above strategy has been shared with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and formed part of CUFC's submission to the Neighbourhood Plan 'Call For Sites' consultation in 2017 (see LPP letter dated 10th July 2017 and accompanying illustrative concept plan at Appendix 2). The strategy was further discussed during a meeting with the Steering Group which took place following this on 8th October 2018, and was also detailed within previous representations to the 2019 consultation edition, submitted 18th July 2019 (see Appendix 3). However, despite previous engagement and submission of related representations, this strategy and necessary amendments have not been allowed for in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Consequently, CUFC has been further pressed into expending further resources into seeking the required revisions to the draft Plan.</p> <p>In summary, CUFC provides a range of wider community and sustainability benefits, which create positive impacts socially, economically and environmentally. The Club's longstanding redevelopment strategy is therefore, consistent with the objectives of local and national policy to date, which seeks to encourage, rather than hinder these benefits from accruing. Although the Local Plan provides a policy framework to enable this development strategy and vision to be realised, the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which is not compliant with the Development Plan for the area, is disappointingly at odds with both elements and remains 'unsound' and prejudicial to CUFC's legitimate planning and sports development objectives.</p>
Edward Gittins (Rhubarb Hall)	Comment	Introduction	<p>[see representation letter and site plan]</p> <p>We act for the landowner of the area edged red on the accompanying Plan which is located at Grove Road, Tiptree and forms land associated with the residence known as Rhubarb Hall and which we refer to as "the Site". Our representations point to serious deficiencies in the process of site selection and allocations and allege that the plan strategy is not</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>adequately justified. We nevertheless indicate that we believe the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) can be made sound subject to the redistribution of housing land requirements to include specific provision for medium and smaller sized sites in order to counterbalance the heavy concentration of housing allocations in the northern part of the village. We envisage that this adjustment can be achieved by allocating the Tower End site for future employment alongside the remainder of the northern village housing allocations to enable its housing capacity of 175 dwellings to be found elsewhere in order to provide a reasonable choice of location in the future housing market. This would then enable sustainable sites such as that at Bull Lane to come forward to provide greater diversity in the delivery of new housing and off-set the heavy concentration of growth to the north.</p> <p>We therefore outline the site's attributes and context before setting out the reasoning which we consider requires the Plan to be modified.</p> <p>Site Attributes & Context</p> <p>The Site lies on the north eastern edge of the built-up area of Tiptree and comprises a rectangular block of agricultural land with a frontage to Grove Road. The site frontage comprises a gap between the residence of Rhubarb Hall and established ribbon development which extends up to the junction with Newbridge Road. The land slopes gently away to the north east and there is a common boundary with the sewage treatment works.</p> <p>The Site is referenced TIP11 and TIP24 on the Tiptree Strategic Land Availability Assessment - 2018 Plan on page 44 of the Consultation Document - having been promoted initially through the Colchester Call for Sites process.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>The Site is flat and is defined with hedges and field boundaries and by the Grove Road frontage. Such strong defensible boundaries can serve as a long term edge to Tiptree were the Site to be included within the Tiptree Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>Out representations seek the inclusion of the combined site within the Tiptree Settlement Boundary but alternatively, the inclusion of TIP11 – the frontage site only.</p>
Edward Gittins (Bull Lane, Egg Farm)	Comment	Introduction	<p>[see representation letter and site plan]</p> <p>We act for landowner of the area outlined in red on the accompanying Plan and which is located at Bull Lane, Tiptree - henceforth referred to as “the Site”.</p> <p>Our representations point to serious deficiencies in the process of site selection and allocations and allege that the plan strategy is not adequately justified. We nevertheless indicate that we believe the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) can be made sound subject to the redistribution of housing land requirements to include specific provision for medium and smaller sized sites in order to counterbalance the heavy concentration of housing allocations in the northern part of the village. We envisage that this adjustment can be achieved by allocating the Tower End site for future employment alongside the remainder of the northern village housing allocations to enable its housing capacity of 175 dwellings to be found elsewhere in order to provide a reasonable choice of location in the future housing market. This would then enable sustainable sites such as that at Bull Lane to come forward to provide greater diversity in the delivery of new housing and off-set the heavy concentration of growth to the north.</p> <p>We therefore outline the site’s attributes and context before setting out the reasoning which we consider requires the Plan to be modified.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Site Attributes & Context</p> <p>The Site lies on the south western edge of Tiptree and to the south of Station Road. It is largely enclosed by Bull Lane to the east and south, by Hall Road to the west, and Surrey Lane to the north with agricultural land to the south. It comprises land occupied by Tiptree Farm Eggs and contains a large complex of poultry houses which are accessed off Bull Lane. There is a small group of established houses to the south and along the eastern side of Hall Road.</p> <p>Bordering the Site, there is established housing development to the west on Hall Road and in Salis Close, with the Brookland estate and frontage properties on Bull Lane to the east, and with village housing along Surrey Lane to the north.</p> <p>The Site is flat and is defined by either hedges, field boundaries or roads with established development adjoining the Site. It has strong defensible boundaries that can serve as a long term edge to Tiptree were the Site to be included within the Tiptree Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>The Tiptree Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2018 (SLAA) on page 44 of the current consultation document identifies a site with the reference TIP10 which is the subject of these current representations.</p>
Edward Gittins (Bull Lane and Hall Road)	Comment	Introduction	<p>We act for landowners within the area outlined in red on the accompanying Plan and which is located at Bull Lane and Hall Road, Tiptree - henceforth referred to as “the Site”.</p> <p>Our representations point to serious deficiencies in the process of site selection and allocations and allege that the plan strategy is not adequately justified. We nevertheless indicate that we believe the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) can be made sound subject to the redistribution of housing land requirements to include specific provision</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>for medium and smaller sized sites in order to counterbalance the heavy concentration of housing allocations in the northern part of the village. We envisage that this adjustment can be achieved by allocating the Tower End site for future employment alongside the remainder of the northern village housing allocations to enable its housing capacity of 175 dwellings to be found elsewhere in order to provide a reasonable choice of location in the future housing market. This would then enable sustainable sites such as that at Bull Lane and Hall Road to come forward to provide greater diversity in the delivery of new housing and off-set the heavy concentration of growth to the north.</p> <p>We therefore outline the site's attributes and context before setting out the reasoning which we consider requires the Plan to be modified.</p> <p>Site Attributes & Context</p> <p>The Site lies on the south western edge of Tiptree and to the south of Station Road. It is enclosed by Bull Lane to the east and south, by Hall Road to the west, and Surrey Lane to the north. It comprises land occupied by Tiptree Farm Eggs and contains a large complex of poultry houses which are accessed off Bull Lane. There is a small group of established houses to the south and along the eastern side of Hall Road.</p> <p>Bordering the Site, there is established housing development to the west on Hall Road and in Salis Close, with the Brookland estate and frontage properties on Bull Lane to the east, and with village housing along Surrey Lane to the north.</p> <p>The Site is flat and is defined by either hedges, field boundaries or roads with established development which surround the Site. It has strong defensible boundaries that can serve as a long term edge to Tiptree were the Site to be included within the Tiptree Settlement Boundary.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>With regard to the Colchester Local Plan (CLP) and Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) process, the site contains Sites 113 and 011 in the CLP Call for Sites stages which were amalgamated into an extended site – the subject of representations submitted during the last round of consultation on the TLP in July 2019. The Tiptree Strategic Lane Availability Assessment (SLAA) on page 44 of the current consultation document identifies a site with the reference TIP10 but this only covers the northern half of the site. The enlarged site was the subject of duly made representations in July 2019 and is therefore not covered by the SLAA. This same enlarged site is the subject of these current representations.</p>
<p>Sam Hollingworth on behalf of Bloor Homes</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Introduction</p>	<p>[see full representation and appendices]</p> <p>Bloor Homes is actively promoting the development of Land at Maldon Road, Tiptree ('the Site') (site reference TIP65 in the Neighbourhood Plan process) for housing. The Site is referenced TIP01 in Colchester Borough Council's (CBC) Local Plan process.</p> <p>The Site was subject of an outline planning application (reference 192025) for residential development of up to 255 dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping, public open space areas, SuDS, link road, associated infrastructure and provision of parent drop-off area for Tiptree Heath Primary School. This application was refused by Colchester Borough Council under delegated powers on the 5 February 2020, and is currently subject of an appeal.</p> <p>In overview, the key concerns include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TNP is contrary to numerous aspects of national policy and guidance.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TNP conforms to neither existing nor emerging strategic policies in the Development Plan; • There is a lack of justification for the approach taken, including for the selection of sites contrary to the emerging Local Plan and the rejection of those that do conform to the emerging Local Plan; • The spatial strategy which the TNP proposes to pursue is based on delivery of infrastructure for which there is a distinct lack of evidence to justify its needs or its benefits, and lack of evidence of its deliverability; and • Issues of legal compliance in respect of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA). <p>The TNP is considered to fail basic conditions a), d), e) and f) for the reasons described in this section of this representation, as follows.</p>
Sam Hollingworth on behalf of Bloor Homes	Object	Introduction	<p>Separately to the issue of compliance with the SEA Regulations, there are additional matters of concern pertaining to relevant legislation and to the process of preparation of the TNP.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Area and the TNP</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan area designated in respect of the TNP is co-terminus with the boundary for Tiptree Parish Council, as confirmed in the Basic Conditions Statement and in the original application to designate a Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>The Basic Conditions Statement suggests at paragraph 1.6 that the TNP sets out policies that relate to the development and use of land within only the Tiptree Neighbourhood Area.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>However, Map 8.3 of the TNP clearly shows that the proposed new road to the north of Tiptree will extend into the neighbouring parish of Messing-cum-Inworth. Indeed, without the section of road being delivered within this neighbouring parish, the proposed road would serve no purpose at all, as this stretch is required to form the link the TNP desires.</p> <p>As touched upon in Section 2 of this representation, where land is within an area of a Parish Council, only that Parish Council may prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for it as prescribed by S61G (2) of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act. If a Neighbourhood Plan is to cover land within a neighbouring parish then the express permission of that neighbouring Parish Council is required (Section 61F (2) of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act). It is not clear that such permission has been sought or given.</p> <p>In any case, a Neighbourhood Plan may not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Plan Area (S38 B (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). Messing-cum-Inworth Parish Council applied to the Borough Council to designate a Neighbourhood Plan in 2013. Progress since is unclear, but it at the very least raises the prospect of a potential conflict.</p> <p>Consultation Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires consultation to be undertaken on a pre-submission iteration of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is evidently the case that consultation did take place on the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan at the pre-submission stage.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>However, we identified a number of concerns relating to the consultation carried out at that stage, as set out within our representations at the Regulation 14 stage.</p> <p>Such issues included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to publish site selection work undertaken alongside the draft Neighbourhood Plan (dNP) • Whilst the dNP included the eLP text in respect of Policy SS14, it failed to show the accompanying Policies Map which shows the location of the broad areas of growth within which the eLP instructs the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites. <p>Respondents were not presented with an accurate picture of the framework in which the eLP proposes the Neighbourhood Plan will set. Nor were respondents presented with information relied upon to justify the selection of sites. It is not enough for consultation to simply have taken place. It must be meaningful. However, given the aforementioned issues, it is difficult to see how this could be the case in respect of key issues the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to address.</p> <p>We had suggested that an appropriate remedy to this issue may well have been to rectify these issues and undertake a further Regulation 14 stage. However, the Neighbourhood Plan has simply been progressed to the next stage.</p> <p>Nature of examination The PPG (Paragraph: 056 Reference ID: 41-056-20180222). confirms that examinations of Neighbourhood Plan will usually take the form of written representations.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>However, it also notes there will be cases where the Independent Examiner concludes it is necessary to hold a public hearing, in order to give interested parties fair chance to put forward their case.</p> <p>In this instance, we are mindful of the complexities of the issues raised which go beyond the basic conditions and into matters of legal compliance.</p> <p>We consider that the only way to ensure that all parties are given a fair opportunity to respond to matters / put forward a case would be through a public hearing, and that failure to do so may well prejudice the interests of one or more parties.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is respectfully request that a public hearing be used as the vehicle through which the TNP is examined.</p>
Caroline Moran	Object	Introduction	<p>I would like to object to the proposed 625 houses North of Tiptree. There still isn't an alternative route to access the A12 other than going through Feering & Kelvedon. The roads are busy enough, the noise and pollution is bad, and made all the worse by the unchecked speeding. We already have hundreds of houses locally in Feering, Tiptree, Coggeshall and Kelvedon to deal with. Another 625 will just make it worse. Please stop building on our countryside.</p>
Virginia Hall	Support	Introduction	<p>I have had to email my comments here about the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan as I seem unable to do so anywhere else on your website.</p> <p>I would like to say this plan has been many years in the making and at each stage the Parish Council has involved the residents of Tiptree. We have viewed the plans, made comments regarding preferences and pointed out glaring errors. There is a lot of hard work gone into this document to help make new development successful in Tiptree.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>I as a resident of Tiptree have read through this plan and would wholeheartedly recommend it to be adopted by Colchester Borough Council, for the future development of our village.</p> <p>I must add here I am extremely disappointed that the Gladman development appeal for land off Barbrook Lane was heard during lockdown and subsequently approved after it was first rejected.</p>
Gloria Streat	Support	Introduction	<p>Regarding the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan, I wanted to say that I support it and should be adopted. HOWEVER....</p> <p>What is the point of a Neighbourhood Plan when you have land merchants/developers like Gladman & Bloor Homes running amuck submitting planning applications even when our neighbourhood isn't in place? Our NP which was put on a temporary hold due to the Pandemic lockdown was completely ignored. First, by the Planning Inspector who ran the public hearing for the Gladman appeal in a disgraceful and shambolic way-----I've seen circuses better organized-----and then we have the Secretary of State who blatantly and completely ignored the fact that we have a plan in progress, and approved the Gladman/Barbrook Lane appeal. Absolutely appalling, and thoroughly disgusted with the way that was handled.</p> <p>In conclusion, IF approving the TNP can assure that the future of Tiptree will not be taking advantage of by the likes of businesses such as Gladman & Bloor Homes, then count me in.</p>
Gladman	Comment	Introduction	<p>Gladman are promoting land in the neighbourhood area, land off Barbrook Lane, Tiptree. Since the closure of the Regulation 14 consultation this site has been subject to appeal (reference: APP/A130/W/19/3223010) which was called in by the Secretary of State and approved on the 7th April 2020. This site now has outline planning permission for up to 200 dwellings (including 30% affordable housing), provision of 0.6ha of land safeguarded for school expansion, new car</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			parking facility, introduction of structural planting and landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS), informal public open space and a children's play area. Access will be achieved through demolition of 97 Barbrook Lane to form vehicular access from Barbrook Lane. We are therefore seeking for amendments to be made to the TNP to reflect this planning permission.
T Pailthorpe	Comment	Introduction	<p>Thank you for forwarding a copy of the above and providing this opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Site Allocations We note that the Housing for Tiptree is made by Colchester B.C. In view of Inspector Clews recent Report on Garden Communities are the figures in this Plan the latest ACTUAL requirements now?</p> <p>Traffic Impacts The proposed site allocations and housing numbers (600+) to the N.W of Tiptree will generate more traffic which is likely to want to use the A12 and this will be by journeys through Feering and Kelvedon, already suffering congestion. The A12 access problems have been identified elsewhere in the Report but no solutions been offered.</p> <p>There does not seem to be any extra provisions for allotments.</p>
Paul Mitchell	Comment	Introduction	Have the impacts from the Governments planned relaxation in planning processes and the knock on effects on Tiptree been adequately addressed in your proposals thus far?
Essex County Council	Comment	Introduction	Thank you for consulting Essex County Council (ECC) on the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan). ECC acknowledges and welcomes the changes made since the Regulation 14 consultation that respond to our representations but provide further comments where we feel changes can be made to ensure more robust proposals and, in some cases, accurately reflect ECC's statutory role and functions. ECC looks forward to engaging constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with the

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			Parish Council and Colchester Borough Council to facilitate the Plan's delivery for those areas where responsibility lies with ECC.
Sport England	Comment	Introduction	<p>Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.</p> <p>https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.</p> <p>https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England’s guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.</p> <p>http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</p> <p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.</p> <p>http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government’s NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England’s Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p> <p><i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i></p>
Edward Gittins (Rhubarb Hall), Edward Gittins (Bull Lane, Egg Farm), Edward Gittins (Bull Lane and Hall Road)	Object	Introduction	<p>The TNP Process</p> <p>The Consultation Document reaches a professional standard of presentation and content with a clear and comprehensive set of policies and proposals and an extensive suite of supporting studies and appendices. It is also clear that great efforts have been made to engage the public and to take account of public opinion. There are, however, deep flaws in the justification of the proposals and policies - principally as follows in relation to: -</p> <p>The limited identification and analysis of alternative strategies; and Insufficient reasons for the rejection of alternative strategies and sites.</p> <p>What appears to have occurred is that a principal Plan objective emerged at an early stage of Plan formulation that the location of future housing development should not worsen the existing impact of through and local traffic movements on the existing built-up area. Major new housing provision should therefore contribute to diverting traffic away from the core of the village and established development and should fund investment in road infrastructure to help achieve this objective.</p> <p>Whilst this is a laudable Plan objective and one which gained considerable public support in the village survey and consultation stages, the envisaged traffic benefits has led to a highly concentrated focus whereby all the new housing allocations are found to the north of the</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>village. There are undoubtedly certain benefits in such concentrated growth – in that larger sites are often better able to fund new infrastructure, deliver copious amounts of affordable housing, and provide a wide range of different house types, but at the same time, there are also certain disbenefits : it results in a dearth of provision of small and medium-sized sites to provide choice between large estate development on the one hand and small or non-estate housing development on the other; it limits opportunities for securing smaller scale environmental or social benefits elsewhere in the village; and it severely handicaps the ability of smaller builders and trades to contribute to local house building with consequential disbenefits for the local economy. Sadly, there has been no balancing exercise undertaken to weigh the relative advantages and disadvantages of concentrated large-scale growth versus a more dispersed pattern of smaller and medium-sized sites – or indeed, a hybrid strategy which combines both these different strategic approaches.</p> <p>Given the importance of the road links to the A12 and to Maldon and Colchester, any largescale development to fund road infrastructure would need to be on the western and northern edges of the village. It was subsequently determined that the western side of the village was too environmentally constrained and therefore large-scale development should be directed towards the north. There is nothing necessarily illogical or unreasonable per se in the thought process which led plan-makers to identify the main housing allocations at the northern end of the village, but as noted above, there is scant indication that alternative strategies have been adequately identified and tested. Nevertheless, large scale housing allocations to the north have been pursued in the full knowledge that many of the highway benefits arising from a northern bypass would not be forthcoming in the short term for two reasons : firstly, part of the route of any northern bypass/link road lay outside the TNP area and there was therefore no means of ensuring the entire route could</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>be delivered through the provisions of the TNP; secondly, large scale allocations would be likely to require a longer lead-in time compared to a more diverse portfolio of smaller sites.</p> <p>This is not to say that all the proposed northern allocations are ill-conceived. However, as that strategy has been pursued it required that an alternative strategy which would enable the release of some medium of smaller sites elsewhere on the edge of the village should have been adequately and comprehensively evaluated and found inferior in order to justify and proceed with the preferred strategy. That is not what has happened. The evaluation of individual sites was largely undertaken on the basis of a “+” or “o” box filling exercise in relation to a series of objectives with no ranking of sites to enable sites to be compared and filtered. This simplistic exercise was supplemented to a degree by the evaluation of a certain number of individual sites as part of the SEA and testing sites against individual policies - but none of these site assessments amount to a testing of alternative strategies. This calls into question the claim on page 43 that:</p> <p>“The alternative sites have all been appraised fairly and consistently and the SEA Report justifies why the preferred sites have been selected and explains why the alternatives have been rejected.”</p> <p>Crucially, therefore, the adopted strategy does not stem from the evidence base and a comparative evaluation of alternative strategies or a robust evaluation of site attribute has not taken place. Whilst not going so far as to suggest this reflects a predisposition in favour of the selected strategy and retro-fitting the housing allocations to the north, it is highly unusual for such a high level of growth to be found in only one part of the village to the exclusion of reasonable alternative strategies and sites. In any event, the chosen strategy does need far greater justification if only on the basis that it is stated on page 43 of the Consultation document</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>that: “.....no site(s) stand out as performing more strongly than the others.”</p> <p>Thus whilst acknowledging the benefits that can justify a northern focus – the proposed large scale allocations are being pursued to the virtual exclusion of all other provisions for growth elsewhere. A strategy involving a more dispersed distribution of new sites to meet the housing requirements represent a reasonable alternative and has not been adequately evaluated to enable a comparison to be made with the strategy adopted. This is a serious defect in the Plan process and sufficient for the Plan to be found unsound.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Whilst appreciating the positive elements in the Neighbourhood Plan and acknowledging the genuine efforts to take account of public opinion, the process by which key proposals have been evaluated is flawed and there has been a failure to consider reasonable alternative strategies. The pursuit of a strategy focusing all new housing allocations at the northern end of the village has occurred without adequate justification and has resulted in the rejection of many sustainable alternative sites – again without adequate justification. On that basis, the Plan in its current form is not sound.</p> <p>It is nevertheless considered that the Plan can be made sound subject to certain further work leading to Modifications. These Modifications should address the need to secure a better balance for future village housing in terms of both location and site size based on an amended strategy that is compatible with the allocations at the northern end of the village.</p> <p>In order to diversify the locations of new village housing and also to provide for local employment as a worthwhile aim in its own right, we suggest that the Tower End housing allocation be reallocated for</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>employment and its 175 dwelling capacity found elsewhere in the village in the form of medium and smaller allocations. This re-allocation will still enable the proposed link road across the site between Kelvedon Road and Grange Road to be provided.</p>
Edward Gittins (Rhubarb Hall)	Object	Introduction	<p>If the above adjustments are undertaken to make the Plan sound, we draw attention to the particular attributes of Rhubarb Hall and its ability to meet the sustainability objectives of not only the National Planning Policy Framework but also to diversify the choice of housing locations within the village. TIP24 has the capacity to provide both market and affordable housing whilst TIP11 is a rounding-off site which would provide under 10 market dwellings whilst amalgamated with TIP22 it would constitute a medium-sized site for market, affordable and special needs dwellings.</p> <p>The Site therefore has the ability to be developed as either a medium-sized or smaller housing site - both of which are already in short supply and will remain so unless adjustments are made to the Neighbourhood Plan's allocations.</p>
Edward Gittins (Bull Lane, Egg Farm)	Object	Introduction	<p>In order to diversify the locations of new village housing and also to provide for local employment as a worthwhile aim in its own right, we suggest that the Tower End housing allocation be reallocated for employment and its 175 dwelling capacity found elsewhere in the village in the form of medium and smaller allocations. This re-allocation will still enable the proposed link road across the site between Kelvedon Road and Grange Road to be provided.</p> <p>If the above adjustments are undertaken to make the Plan sound, we draw attention to the particular attributes of the Bull Lane site and its ability to meet the sustainability objectives of not only the National Planning Policy Framework but also to deliver market and affordable housing on one of the few medium-sized sites available.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Edward Gittins (Bull Lane and Hall Road)	Object	Introduction	<p>In order to diversify the locations of new village housing and also to provide for local employment as a worthwhile aim in its own right, we suggest that the Tower End housing allocation be reallocated for employment and its 175 dwelling capacity found elsewhere in the village in the form of medium and smaller allocations. This re-allocation will still enable the proposed link road across the site between Kelvedon Road and Grange Road to be provided.</p> <p>If the above adjustments are undertaken to make the Plan sound, we draw attention to the particular attributes of the Bull Lane and Hall Road site and its ability to meet the sustainability objectives of not only the National Planning Policy Framework but also to deliver market and affordable housing on one of the few medium-sized sites available.</p>
Bob Bundy	Support	Vision and Objectives	<p>I have not been able to respond using your response system so I'm hoping this email will suffice. Please confirm.</p> <p>I am in full agreement with the Plan in the form that has been painstakingly developed by the hard work of many people in Tiptree over a number of years. However, I have been dismayed to find that other planning applications, rejected by the Parish and Borough, have been allowed at appeal despite these applications failing in many respects to meet the plan.</p> <p>In particular, Objectives 1,4,7,8,12,13,14,15,17 and 18, all fail to be met by these other builds. What was the point of all that hard work if it can be overturned by Government officials who clearly haven't considered local democracy at all?</p> <p>At the time of writing, approval in this manner has been given to builds comprising several hundreds of extra houses. This will have a disastrous effect. But it seems nothing can be done to avoid this.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>However, the requirement on Tiptree was for 600 new homes by 2033. Part of that allocation will be met by these 'off-plan' builds. So the 'on-plan' figures should be adjusted downwards to keep the total at 600.</p> <p>This is my only proviso in accepting the proposed plan.</p>
Natural England	Object	Vision and Objectives	<p>We note and welcome the changes to policy wording as requested in our previous responses. However regarding objective 29, we are disappointed to see this policy does not take on board our previous comments adequately regarding hierarchy of designated sites as per NPPF 170 and 174: “identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity...” As the parish does fall within the Essex Coast RAMS which looks at European hierarchy, from a biodiversity and protected sites sense this should have been included to ensure compliance with national policy. We would be happy to discuss this further with relevant parties.</p>
Essex Bridleway Association	Comment	Vision and Objectives	<p>P16 Objectives: We are disappointed to see in the Objectives that provision for walkers and cyclists only seems to have been considered but equestrians ignored. For example, Objective 11 has an aspiration to ‘integrate green corridors for foot and cycle paths, recreation and wildlife...’ Considering that the NP area has only a couple of peripheral bridleways where equestrians are able to access, the aspiration to include access for ALL non-motorised users should be embedded within the Objectives of the Plan. After all, if a path is accessible by horse and rider, it is fully accessible for those using mobility scooters for example, and it is not acceptable for the Plan to discriminate against any user group. Objective 16 has a similar wording; again equestrians should be included – whilst equestrian-accessible paths may not be needed going to the village centre, the Objectives should also consider the wider access to the surrounding countryside and here equestrians desperately need to be considered too. The Objectives are too ‘inward looking’ and</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>need to acknowledge the need to link with the open countryside outside of the immediate village and the parish/NP boundary.</p> <p>We suggest therefore that the wording of Objective 11 is amended to read: 'To integrate green 'corridors' for foot, cycle and equestrian paths, recreation and wildlife into new developments' and Objective 16 to read: 'To promote the provision of multi-user routes from new developments to existing village amenities including the village centre and the wider countryside'.</p> <p>It is of concern that there is no acknowledgement of the existence of equestrians let alone their needs in the entire Plan. For a village with a large countryside environs and a significant level of horse ownership (which contributes in no small way to the local economy and is essential to many residents' health and wellbeing) it is unacceptable that they have been ignored entirely. There is not even one mention of their existence. This should be rectified, and the Plan's aspirations amended accordingly.</p>
Gladman	Comment	Vision and Objectives	<p>Gladman remain concerned with Objectives 12 and 14 of the Plan and how they appear to have pre-determined the spatial strategy for the neighbourhood plan, with little evidence to support the need for these objectives. Since the Regulation 14 consultation, development has been approved in the areas that these objectives are trying to protect. The perceived issues identified in these objectives were considered in the recent approved appeal decision by Gladman, which when considering the evidence, found development would be sustainable. Therefore, continuing to pursue these two objectives, contrary to the findings of the recent appeal decision, is likely to prejudice against other landowners and stakeholders with land in the listed areas in the neighbourhood area. In principle, we would not object to an objective that seeks to avoid congestion on existing roads and junctions in and around Tiptree but references that seek to steer where this development should take place without sufficient evidence are unsubstantiated and should be removed.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Edward Gittins (Rhubarb Hall), Edward Gittins (Bull Lane, Egg Farm), Edward Gittins (Bull Lane and Hall Road)	Object	Vision and Objectives	<p>Measures to achieve a more balanced distribution to meet the future housing requirement</p> <p>We have acknowledged the benefits that would accrue from the northern allocations but at the same time have registered that this is currently to the disbenefit of providing wider choice in the location and scale of new housing developments and for the local rural economy. The recent granting of a 200 dwelling development on Bargate Lane on Appeal has further emphasised the “large site” approach and whilst introducing greater choice of location, does not alleviate the dearth of medium and smaller sites as an alternative to living on a large housing estate. We therefore advocate that modifications are required to the Neighbourhood Plan which would complement rather than replace the strong northern bias and supplement the limited housing land availability elsewhere in the village. We therefore put forward for consideration the following possible Modifications which would enable some supplementary medium-sized and smaller sites on the edge of the village sites to be allocated.</p> <p>Objective 8 could be amended so that the 600 homes required by 2033 are stated to be a minimum figure.</p> <p>Objective 9 could be amended to state: “To include variety and choice to meet existing and future housing needs in terms of location, size of developments, housing type and tenure.”</p>
Michael Pingram on behalf of Colchester United FC	Object	Spatial Strategy	The current adopted Local Plan Policies Map for Tiptree (October 2010) identifies the training ground at Florence Park as lying within the settlement boundary and affords it an open space designation to which the Local Plan Development Policy DP15 (Retention of Open Space and Indoor Sports Facilities) and Core Strategy Policy PR1 (Open Space) apply. Policy DP15 and the emerging Local Plan equivalent DM17, allow

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>for the redevelopment of existing sports grounds subject to meeting specific criteria.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that following CUFC's earlier representations, the Florence Park training ground is now designated for 'private green space', as shown on the 'Tiptree Policies Map' on Page 18. This is welcomed and partly reflects the sites status within existing and proposed Local Plan policies. However, the exclusion of the sports ground from the settlement boundary, would limit its redevelopment options in policy terms due to conflict with draft Neighbourhood Plan TIP01, which restricts the diversification of uses.</p> <p>CBC Emerging Local Plan Policy SS14 (Tiptree) explains how the Neighbourhood Plan will define its own settlement boundary and open space allocations. The draft Neighbourhood Plan confirms that prior to the adoption of the emerging Local Plan, the current adopted Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which together constitute Colchester's Local Development Framework (LDF), should be consulted as a guide to future growth and development. The Tiptree Proposals Map (2010) forms part of this LDF, and therefore, any policies contained within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should seek to be compliant with the current adopted and emerging Local Plan rather than depart or undermine them, as explained in paragraph 29 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>As previously confirmed, the purpose of any change to the settlement boundary, should be to accommodate new development growth such as the proposed additional 600 new homes, or to reflect a clearly identified abandoned site-specific policy. It should not be used to intentionally 'de allocate' existing local plan designations, or to seek to reverse planning policies and proposals which are in compliance with national and local plan policy, for sites such as Florence Park where there is a clear and</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>legitimate planning strategy in place. Consequently, the draft Neighbourhood Plan's attempt to re create 'white land' in this way, represents a perverse and 'unsound' measure, which is again requested to be rectified. A key consequence of excluding Florence Park from the settlement boundary is that Part B of draft Policy TIP01 would apply, which significantly limits the redevelopment potential of the land, which otherwise could be compliant with established planning policy and could also unreasonably prejudice CUFC's sports development strategy.</p> <p>Paragraph 91(c) of the NPPF requires that planning policies seek to support the provision of sports facilities and paragraph 92(a) requires planning policies to <i>"plan positively for the provision of community facilities"</i>, including sports facilities. Paragraph 97 permits sports facilities and playing pitches to be built upon if they would lead to better provision or the benefits would outweigh the loss.</p> <p>The CBC Settlement Boundary Review document (2017), which provided an evidence base to the emerging CBC local plan, notes that the Council does not generally seek to substantially alter settlement boundaries as they need to ensure they continue to <i>"reflect both national and local policy aimed at promoting brownfield development, allocating the most sustainable sites and protecting the countryside"</i> (page 8).</p> <p>The CBC Settlement Boundary Review document also explains that settlement boundaries have been drawn to <i>"define the main nucleus of the settlement"</i>. Thus, to date, the spatial and functional relationship of the Florence Park training ground to the settlement has been acknowledged; this being evidenced by the inclusion of the sports ground within the adopted Local Plan settlement boundary for Tiptree.</p> <p>CUFC is therefore, unclear why the settlement boundary has been redrawn within the Tiptree Policies Map (page 18 of the emerging</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Neighbourhood Plan) to specifically to exclude the Florence Park training ground. This decision is particularly perplexing given this issue was previously raised within our earlier representations and it is evident that given the ongoing housing redevelopment of the site adjacent to the east, Florence Park is more closely related to the larger Tiptree settlement than has historically been the case.</p> <p>An obvious inconsistency in this regard, is the inclusion of the Tiptree Academy's sports ground and playing fields, which like Florence Park lie on the edge of the settlement yet unlike Florence Park is included within its boundary and without any protective open space designation.</p> <p>Consequently, CUFC objects to the exclusion of the Florence Park training ground from the settlement boundary as this has the direct effect of removing the principle in favour of this site being redeveloped for housing, subject to compliance with national and local policy which already comprehensively control the circumstances by which the loss of a sports facilities may be acceptable, particularly where the re-provision of more improved facilities is proposed, which remains CUFC's position.</p> <p>This action could prejudice the Club's strategy to obtain Category 1 status or retain its existing Category 2 status, reducing its potential to offer sustainability benefits to the local community and the Borough as a whole. This runs contrary to the general principles of both the local and national policy to support the expansion of sports facilities, and is also not in general conformity with the approach applied elsewhere in the Borough regarding settlement boundary changes.</p> <p>Until the above actions have been rectified, the emerging Neighbourhood Plan is not justified, effective or consistent with local policy or National policy. CUFC therefore, considers that the settlement boundary designation should be reinstated to help enable its future development</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>vision to be realised. This amendment is also necessary to ensure that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan is 'sound', does not undermine, and is in general conformity with, local and national policy.</p>
Anglian Water	Object	TIP01	<p>In our previous comments we had raised concerns that Policy TIP01 as drafted did not refer to water and wastewater infrastructure as being acceptable in principle in the designated countryside.</p> <p>We note that the intention of the Parish Council that for operational development it would very straightforward to demonstrate that there is no reasonable location within the settlement (Consultation Statement).</p> <p>The policy as drafted includes a requirement for utilities development including that proposed by Anglian Water to demonstrate that alternative sites have been considered as part of a site selection process. It is unclear on what basis Anglian Water would be required to demonstrate the consideration of alternative sites particularly as there is existing water and wastewater infrastructure located outside of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>We therefore the remain of the view that the Neighbourhood Plan should be amended to state that the principle of development which is proposed by Anglian Water as an infrastructure provider within the designated countryside is supported subject to other development plan policies.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the final sentence of Policy TIP01 be amended as follows: 'iv. they relate to necessary utilities infrastructure [<i>and where no reasonable alternative location is available.</i>]' (Text in italics and square brackets to be deleted.)</p>
Maldon District Council	Object	TIP01	<p>The approach taken on the settlement boundary and restricting development in the countryside is supported.</p> <p>As you will be aware, an appeal (APP/A1530/W/19/3223010) in relation</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>to the development of 200 new homes located on land adjacent to Barbrook Lane has been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate and the decision has been upheld by the Secretary of State. This development alone amounts to a one third increase to the number of homes to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is considered advantageous for the Neighbourhood Plan's clarity that Map 8.1 on page 27 be amended to reflect the Barbrook Lane housing development planning permission, alongside some text within the Plan which addresses the inclusion of the site within the village's land supply.</p> <p>It is also considered necessary for the purposes of the Plan's soundness to express whether the appeal site's inclusion in the village's land supply impacts on what the Neighbourhood Plan planned for. Evidence may highlight some additional implications which require further mitigation, or further evidence to be produced, or the adjustment of the Plan's intended policies to compensate for the additional growth.</p> <p>Suggested Changes to the Plan:</p> <p>Map 8.1 on page 27 needs to be amended to reflect the Barbrook Lane housing development planning permission, alongside some text within the Plan which addresses the inclusion of the site within the village's land supply.</p> <p>The Plan should explain whether the appeal site's inclusion in the village's land supply impacts on what the Neighbourhood Plan planned for. Evidence may highlight some additional implications which require further mitigation, or further evidence, or the adjustment of the Plan's intended policies to compensate for the additional growth.</p>
Mark Hodgson (On	Support	TIP01	NWL supports this policy in the context of both its operational requirements where the policy allows for development outside the

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Behalf of Northumbrian Water Ltd)			settlement boundary for necessary infrastructure but also where the boundary also is being extended to accommodate the housing allocations.
Feering Parish Council	Comment	TIP01	<p>The 600 homes allocation does not include the Wilkin & Sons site (Developer: Crest Nicolson) or the Vine Road development - both of which are nearing completion and these sites are closer to the village Centre.</p> <p>Considering Colchester's Council's Local Plan has effectively been rejected due to the Inspector finding two of the Garden Villages unsound, do the sections of Tiptree's plan referencing Colchester's Local Plan including the CBC required housing number of 600 homes need to be re-visited?</p>
Gladman	Object	TIP01	<p>This policy seeks to amend the Tiptree settlement boundary to incorporate the draft allocations of the neighbourhood plan yet excludes the recently approved planning permission at Brooks Lane. For consistency Gladman is seeking the inclusion of the approved development at Brooks Lane within the settlement boundary. It is important that the TNP settlement boundary reflects the most up to date position at the time of making the neighbourhood plan to ensure the longevity of the boundary throughout the duration of neighbourhood plans lifespan.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this position, Gladman object to the use of settlement boundaries in circumstances such as this where they preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward or indeed already approved development. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements does not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Whilst Part B sets out the circumstances that development would be considered appropriate outside the settlement boundaries these are considered to be drafted unclearly, likely to be applied inconsistently and could be used to restrict sustainable development, conflicting with national policy.</p> <p>Whilst the TNP is seeking to amend the current settlement boundary to incorporate the draft site allocations to meet the draft requirement of the emerging plan this figure is yet to be tested through examination in public and due to the identified issues with the Local Plan Part 1 is likely to change and should not be relied upon. Therefore, Gladman suggest that this policy should be worded more flexibly in the interim to be in accordance with Paragraphs 11 and 16(b) of the NPPF (2019) and the requirement for policies to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change and prepared positively.</p> <p>In this regard, Gladman submit that sustainable development proposals adjacent to the development boundary that are proportionate in size to Tiptree’s role as a settlement within the borough should be supported and wording should be added to the policy to reflect this. Indeed, this approach was taken in the examination of the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 4.12 of the Examiner’s Report states:</p> <p><i>“...Policy GMC1 should be modified to state that “Development ...shall be focused within or adjoining the settlement boundary as identified in the plan.” It should be made clear that any new development should be either infill or of a minor or moderate scale, so that the local distinctiveness of the settlement is not compromised. PM2 should be made to achieve this flexibility and ensure regard is had to the NPPF and the promotion of sustainable development. PM2 is also needed to ensure that the GNP will be in general conformity with the aims for new housing</i></p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<i>development in the Core Strategy and align with similar aims in the emerging Local Plan."</i>
Essex County Council	Comment	TIP01	The Plan makers should consider whether references should be made to the MLP and WLP as statutory plans forming the Development Plan within the Tiptree Parish, similar to clause iii. While no change is expressly required as minerals and waste development is defined as a County Matter (as set out above), limits placed on 'development' through Policy TIP01 cannot act to constrain minerals and/ or waste development.
Essex County Council	Comment	TIP01	Point Bi. As a provider and commissioner of adult social care and aged care/housing, ECC does not support the provision of sheltered housing and nursing homes as acceptable outside the settlement boundary. This form of housing should be located within the settlement and as close to services and amenities as possible as residents are likely to be without a private vehicle and public transport can be infrequent.
Jacqueline Bakker	Support	TIP02	This policy will ensure good design in Tiptree.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP02	This policy is supported, as it endeavours to protect the character of the village.
Helen Cripps	Comment	TIP03	Community consultation revealed an average of 1.77 cars per household, which is believed to be an underestimate, and it is stated that 'For these reasons parking provision should be at least as generous as Policy DP19 of the CBC Development Policies'. Therefore only demanding parking provisions meet the minimum standard for residential areas of 1 car parking space for each 1-bedroom dwelling would likely be insufficient and increase the demand for street parking, of which there is already a lack in the residential areas of the village outskirts where these new housing sites are proposed.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP03	This policy is supported, as it recognises the role private cars have in enabling access to employment and everyday services, and the subsequent need to ensure that sufficient off-street parking is provided in new developments.
Laura Dudley-Smith on behalf of Marden Homes	Object	TIP03	<p>We welcome the removal of the previous requirement for every space to be able to accommodate a 'transit' style van. However, our previous concerns about the policy requiring excessive parking requirements remain.</p> <p>Essex County Council's parking standards introduced in 2009 provide a well-tested approach across Essex and are used within Colchester and replicated in adopted policy. The NP seeks to deviate away from these, requiring a higher level of parking.</p> <p>The evidence for this appears to be that within Tiptree there is an average of 1.77 cars per household, based on community consultation, which is higher than the average of 1.34 in the Department of Transport data from 2015/16, and higher than an average of 1.54 cars in Tiptree in the 2011 census.</p> <p>However, there was only a 24% response rate to the community consultation referenced, which does not represent the majority of Tiptree. The average figure could, therefore, significantly vary from this. With the Department of Transport data quoted being from 2015/16, it is unclear whether Tiptree does actually have a higher level of car ownership per household than the East of England or not, so we do not consider that this represents sufficient evidence for increasing the parking provision.</p> <p>Requiring a greater amount of parking could result in a very urban character to sites which are visually dominated by car parking and the associated hardstanding, contrary to the vision of the NP seeking to 'retain an attractive village feel to Tiptree' and objective 1. It would be</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>likely to encourage the provision of parking on-street, in large parking courts and on large driveways which would reduce space for front gardens and planting.</p> <p>Furthermore, the excess of parking could encourage future residents to own a greater number of cars, contrary to the promotion of sustainable development as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There is a fine balance between providing appropriate parking spaces to manage the impact of cars on a scheme, but also not encouraging car usage so much so that it discourages residents from using the public transport, walking and cycling opportunities available to them. The above raises concerns that Policy TIP03 does not meet the basic conditions of contributing towards achieving sustainable development and being in general conformity with the strategic policies.</p> <p>We also have concerns over Policy TIP03 discouraging the provision of garages. The evidence for this appears to be a statement that ‘they are often not used for car parking’, with no evidence to support this assertion.</p> <p>Garages can provide a well-designed parking space and additional storage, including for bicycles. The Essex Parking Standards recognise that cars have typically become larger than they were historically and that people do also use garages for storage, with garages required to be a minimum of 7x3m to be counted as a parking space. This is considered sufficient to park a modern car and for some storage, including for bicycles.</p> <p>The NP completely disregards this and simply discourages the provision of garages. This will lead to additional hardstanding being required, alongside further structures to store bicycles and so on, which could otherwise be within a garage. The Neighbourhood Plan should consider the implications of such restrictions given that it would likely encourage</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>the introduction of excessive external storage and visually disruptive domestic paraphernalia that would in normal circumstances be stored within a garage. It may also discourage the ownership of bicycles if storage is not easily available.</p> <p>Combined with the increased parking requirements, there are concerns that this will result in developments dominated by cars, rather than being well designed places that encourage sustainable transport measures, contrary to adopted strategic policies, the NPPF and the basic conditions.</p> <p>To overcome these concerns, we recommend Policy TIP03 is revised to require parking in accordance with the Essex Parking Standards and to remove the discouragement of garages. These changes would result in a policy in accordance with strategic policies that would contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development.</p>
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP04	<p>The ambition of this policy to improve design of the built environment is supported.</p> <p>However, as this policy only 'encourages' developers to design to Building for Life standards it is unenforceable, and therefore is of limited value.</p>
Gladman	Comment	TIP04	<p>This policy reads more as an aspiration rather than a policy in encouraging development to meet Building for Life standards. Therefore, it is considered that this should not form a policy itself and may be better located in the supporting text to Policy TIP02: Good Quality Design in suggesting how applicants can meet design expectations.</p>
Maldon District Council	Object	TIP05	<p>Sections A and B are rather generic.</p> <p>Section C which requires a percentage of homes to be built to accessible and adaptable standards or wheelchair accessibility standards is a commendable aspiration. However, the requirement for all affordable housing to meet one or other of these standards may be</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>disproportionate in comparison to the requirements placed on market housing in the policy.</p> <p>Suggested Changes to the Plan: Reduce the proportion of affordable homes that are required to meet Part M4(2).</p>
Feering Parish Council	Comment	TIP05	The new homes are not located near to Tiptree Centre and as a need to provide for an increasing number of older residents has been identified, the proposed sites - especially the north-west Elm Farm site isolates the older community from amenities.
Gladman	Comment	TIP05	<p>Policy TIP05 attempts to guide housing mix and set requirements for Buildings Regulations in the neighbourhood plan area. However, it is stated throughout Planning Practice Guidance that it is the role of the local planning authority through housing needs assessments and other available datasets, to determine whether further policy is required in Local Plans to provide enhanced accessibility or adaptability in reference to Requirement M4(2) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations. Furthermore, the Local planning authority should also consider the impact of applying such regulations as part of their Local Plan Viability Assessment, where these policy requirements can then be interrogated robustly at examination in public.</p> <p>The Government introduced these technical standards for housing in 2015. A Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) is clear that the optional new technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Guidance. Neighbourhood plans should not be used to apply the new national technical standards. Therefore, this approach does not meet the basic conditions and should be deleted.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>The aspirations for the setting of these standards has been removed from other neighbourhood plans. In the Botesdale and Rickinghall Neighbourhood Plan Report3, the Examiner stated: <i>'My understanding is that Part M of the Building Regulations requires all new dwellings to which Part M of the Building Regulations applies should be designed to a minimum of M4(1) 'visitible dwellings' and that local authorities can opt into, or 'switch on', requirements for M4(2) and M4(3) via Local Plan policy. However, it is clear from the WMS that neighbourhood plans cannot set this standard.'</i></p>
<p>Michael Pingram on behalf of Colchester United FC</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Traffic and Movement (page 29 particularly)</p>	<p>The emerging Neighbourhood Plan allocates land to the west and north of the village for housing and the plan aspires to provide a <i>'possible future road'</i> to the north of Tiptree to connect these.</p> <p>It is noted that the 600 dwellings proposed on these sites are the minimum that the Neighbourhood Plan should seek to provide. The draft Neighbourhood Plan should seek to maximise its potential to provide sustainable windfall sites within the settlement boundaries in order to ensure that, should the major strategic sites not come forwards, the effectiveness of the plan is not compromised.</p> <p>CUFC raises concerns that the possible future road, which is required to mitigate the highways impacts of the new housing proposed may not be deliverable due to land assembly issues; the allocated land is in multiple ownerships and not likely to come forward at the same time. In addition, some of the land required is not allocated and lies outside the settlement boundary of Tiptree.</p> <p>Page 29 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan states that <i>"Currently there is only light traffic in Grange Road/Tiptree Road (Marked in mauve on Map 8.3) however the present development of over 100 homes will increase the traffic and therefore, inevitably, the pressure on the Vine</i></p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p data-bbox="877 233 1896 337"><i>Road/Kelvedon Road junction. The provision of the alternative Grange Road – Kelvedon Road link is an essential part of a strategic plan for Tiptree.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="877 380 1896 630">While this revised plan has partly accepted CUFC’s previous representations in acknowledging that the proposed 103 homes development at Grange Road would not ‘significantly’ increase the traffic and pressure on the Vine Road/Kelvedon Road junction, the assertion still remains that the provision of the alternative Grange Road to Kelvedon Road link is justified due to the developments’ associated highway harm.</p> <p data-bbox="877 672 1896 1107">As previously highlighted, there is no justification for this, particularly as the 103 homes development has been the subject of a Transport Assessment and is delivering significant transportation improvements to both Grange Road and the Vine Road/Kelvedon Road junction and an improved pedestrian route to the village centre to the south. This mitigation was undertaken with the sole objective of ensuring that traffic impacts from the development will not be “<i>significant</i>” in highways terms (see paragraph 108 of the NPPF), while it is also noted that as per paragraph 109 of the NPPF if there was considered to be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, the housing development would not have been granted planning permission.</p> <p data-bbox="877 1149 1896 1393">CUFC therefore, requests that the paragraph identified above is removed in its entirety from the plan given that this reasoning is not factually correct, not backed up by any technical survey work that we are aware of and therefore is unjustified in the context of its assertions towards the necessity for future highway mitigation measures. Again, this background position was explained to the Neighbourhood Plan Group and within our previous representations in July 2019, and therefore it is</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>disappointing to note that CUFC's related planning and transport work does not appear to have been properly considered. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore, include reference to the delivery of the Grange Road – Kelvedon Road link, but only in relation to the strategic housing allocations TIP13 & TIP14.</p>
Essex County Council	Comment	Traffic and Movement	<p>ECC in its role as Highways Authority which includes responsibilities for sustainable travel and passenger transport provides the following comments.</p> <p>As there is already a good network of main pedestrian routes, the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Group should consider what could be done to encourage more people to use such routes, if they are not already doing so. This will assist in delivering 'sustainable movement'.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Plan include information regarding Travel Planning and the following comments are made.</p> <p><i>Residential Travel Plans (RTPs)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that travel plan conditions are applied to all development applications in line with ECC's RTP thresholds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 to 249 dwellings – Residential Travel Information Pack (including bus/train tickets/vouchers where applicable) ○ 250+ dwellings – Travel Plan Monitoring Fee, Full Residential Travel Plan, and Travel Information Pack (plus tickets/vouchers where applicable) • All sites above the full RTP threshold should appoint a Travel Plan Coordinator to deliver/manage the Travel Plan. • Residential sites should provide on-site electric vehicle charge points where possible. • Neighbourhood Car Club(s) should be considered.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p><i>Workplace Travel Plans</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel Plan conditions should to be applied to workplace/commercial applications of 50 employees or above, with the addition of Travel Plan Monitoring Fees. • Workplaces should appoint a Travel Plan Coordinator to manage/deliver Travel Plans. <p><i>General Comments (Residential and Workplace Travel Plans)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel Plan targets should be agreed with ECC. • Regular travel/traffic surveys should be conducted in line with ECC protocol. • Undertake regular review of Travel Plans. • Promote walking, cycling, public transport, electric vehicles, car sharing and other sustainable modes of travel. • Conduct Personalised Travel Planning to help inform residents/employees of sustainable alternatives. <p><u>Passenger Transport (Public Transport/Bus Services)</u></p> <p>The allocations and subsequent developments coming forward, represent a rare opportunity for the Parish Council to secure the required bus services and the Plan could state more explicitly that the developments provide an avenue to secure these. ECC can also assist by looking favourably towards other developments along the bus routes, which could pool resources to help ensure that such improvements could be 'pump primed' until the service has sufficient patronage.</p>
Essex Bridleways Association	Object	TIP06	P26 Policy TIP06: This policy, by virtue of its heading, excludes equestrians which is unacceptable. Any new off-road route, especially those which lead into the wider countryside and linking with the existing network, should contain a requirement for them to be fully accessible to

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>all user groups where practical. Point E should therefore be amended to read: 'Development must retain and enhance the quality and accessibility of Public Rights of Way, where possible upgrading them to include all users, and main pedestrian and cycle routes...'. This is supported in the NPPF in para 98 where it states: 'Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users...'. Finally, the title of the Policy should include all users; therefore, we suggest it is amended to 'Non Motorised User Access Routes'. This includes all those user groups who need protection from the ever-increasing traffic on the roads.</p>
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP06	This policy is supported. This policy is consistent with the draft Essex Walking Strategy.
Essex County Council	Comment	TIP06	<p>ECC in its role as Highways Authority which includes responsibilities for sustainable travel and passenger transport provides the following comments.</p> <p><u>Policy TIPO6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point A – To note. ECC practice is generally for shared footway/cycleways unless it is a strategic cycleway and due to the volume of cycle/pedestrian traffic for safety reasons segregation is necessary.
Gloria Martin	Object	TIP07	I live at [removed address] Tiptree and I see from one of your plans that a link road is being proposed across the back of my property on the farm. I strongly object to this for health reasons I am being surrounded by traffic. Colchester Road at the front and the lane going to Messing, so if the link road comes into effect I will be surrounded by traffic and this will be a health problem for me and my neighbours.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>I moved to Tiptree because of the quiet countryside. Which will be taken away from me and my neighbours. I thought that Tiptree Council was trying to keep the green land and not building upon the precious land.</p> <p>If this does come into effect and goes forward what are the proposal for noise abatement please.</p>
Jacqueline Bakker	Support	TIP07	The new land allocations will provide the opportunity to divert traffic from the center of Tiptree which will be positive.
John Lindsay Mary Lindsay Kim Gozzett Matt Gore	Objection	TIP07	<p>[See representation for attachment including map]</p> <p>Traffic implications and problems for Inworth, Feering and Kelvedon</p> <p>Highland Nursery and Elms Farm The two developments will have between them 450 homes, most of the traffic from which will feed onto the B1023 connected by the “route corridor” that appears to be in the Messing cum Inworth parish.</p> <p>The “Commercial area” shown on the Policies Map will generate additional commercial traffic using the B1023.</p> <p>NB. There is currently no nursery where Highland Nursery is shown. It is an area of farmland adjacent to Hill Farm.</p> <p>Tower End Tower End is allocated for approximately 175 homes. The criteria must be met include a ‘primary street’ connecting Kelvedon Road with Grange Road.</p> <p>Location of Developments means big increase in traffic on B1023 These development areas are concentrated on the northern side of Tiptree and will feed additional traffic from a total of 625 new homes and</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>onto the B1023 Kelvedon Road via the "link roads". The industrial and commercial development will further increase the already high volume of commercial vans and heavy lorries.</p> <p>The proposed developments in this area will impact considerably on the volume of traffic heading to and from Kelvedon and the A12 on a road that is already working beyond its capacity.</p> <p>Weak bridge Hinds Bridge in Inworth carries the B1023 Inworth Road/Kelvedon Road over Domsey Brook. The bridge is an old brick arch construction and when inspected in 2018 it was shown to be in poor repair and in need of urgent strengthening work. While this work was being carried out a weight limit was also imposed on the bridge.</p> <p>For the work to be safely carried out the B1023 had to be completely closed for several weeks in the summer of 2018 until work was completed in October. Increased traffic, especially lorries, generated by the Tiptree developments will result in more damage to this already overloaded bridge.</p> <p>Safety and damage to property The village of Inworth already suffers greatly from the current volume of traffic and the size of the lorries. Large lorries have demolished fences and there is very little safe footpath for residents to use. There are often road accidents in the centre of Inworth caused by speeding vehicles losing control.</p> <p>Damage to road surface and infrastructure</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>A water main in the road near the Stonefields Farm Shop is frequently damaged by the weight of traffic and has to be repaired on a regular basis necessitating the use of traffic lights.</p> <p>There are several manhole covers that are already damaged and the surface of the road is breaking up in places.</p> <p>Alternative link road urgently needed There is already an urgent and immediate need for better access to the A12 from Tiptree.</p> <p>The increase in traffic generated by the development plans added to the huge increase in vehicles per hour on this road predicted by the surveys carried out by Highways England in connection with the imminent A12 improvements will lead to gridlock at pinch points such as Gore Pit corner in Feering and Kelvedon High Street.</p> <p>A sensible solution would be for the traffic to be routed west of Tiptree towards Rivenhall where the proposed junction between the A120 and the A12 is located. This would also save Feering and Kelvedon villages from constant through traffic to and from the A12. It would also provide good access to the A120 avoiding the need to route through Kelvedon and Feering.</p> <p>If the existing roads to Braxted Park and the A12 are not suitable a new link road should be constructed now to avert the inevitable problems. This should be part of the Tiptree plan and the developers should make a contribution to the cost.</p>
Christopher Vigrass	Object	TIP07	The proposed developments at Elms Farm, Highland Nursery and Tower End will have serious adverse implications for the residents of Inworth unless amended. Most traffic from those developments will head to the A12 and the railway by the B1023 through Inworth. Inworth already

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>suffers greatly from the current volume of traffic. There is very little safe footpath. Fences have been demolished. Road accidents have been caused by speeding vehicles. Further, Hinds Bridge over Domsey Brook is narrow and relatively fragile.</p> <p>Proposed Changes to the Plan: An alternative link road is required to provide better access to the A12 from Tiptree. The increase in traffic generated by the proposed developments would add to the large increase in vehicles per hour on the B1023 predicted by the surveys carried out by Highways England in connection with the imminent A12 improvements. An alternative link road is required for traffic to be routed west of Tiptree towards Rivenhall, where the proposed junction between the new A120 and the A12 is likely to be located. This would also alleviate the problems experienced in Kelvedon and Feering by reason of the volume of traffic transiting to and from Tiptree. Such an alternative link road, either using the Braxted Park road or a new road, should be within the Tiptree Plan. The developers of any of the proposed developments should contribute to the costs of any such link road.</p>
Susan Allen-Sheperd	Support	TIP07	<p>I fully support this policy, seeing the advantages of providing alternative free-flowing routes around Tiptree to facilitate a safe and pleasant shopping centre. As Tiptree increases in size as well as the increasing size of surrounding communities and more traffic needing to achieve its destination by way of Tiptree, alternative routes need to be provided so that in the longer term traffic calming measures can be taken in Church Road so that traffic not visiting the shopping centre and that general location can be diverted onto other routes. It is important that any other large developments outside those provided for in TIP13 and TIP14 follow the same principles of TIP13 and TIP14 of providing or connecting to new primary streets to mitigate against the only routes through and around Tiptree being exclusively large parts of the B1022 and B1023.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Maldon District Council	Object	TIP07	<p>TIP07(D) This policy conflicts with policy TIP02 – Good Quality Design. The restriction on driveways not accessing the primary streets will result in the construction of excess and unnecessary roads through new developments. Houses on the existing primary roads through Tiptree have direct driveway access. This policy could create new developments that do not reflect the existing character of the village.</p> <p>TIP07(E) Maldon District Council is concerned that despite the Neighbourhood Plan’s approach to mitigating the impact of vehicular traffic through Tiptree village, the scale of additional housing in the village will nevertheless impact on traffic flows, through and around the village, especially the routes to the A12, including the routes via the historic Appleford and Grey Mills bridges at Great Braxted and Kelvedon respectively. Maldon District Council does, however, recognise that improvements to the access roads to the A12 and to the junctions on the A12 itself are outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>TIP07(F) is supported, as it clarifies the term ‘primary street’.</p> <p>Suggested Changes to the Plan: Reword TIP07(E) to ensure new developments reflect the existing character of Tiptree village.</p>
Messing cum Inworth Parish Council	Object	TIP07	<p>[See representation for attachment including map and supporting evidence]</p> <p>Messing cum Inworth Parish Council have taken the time to read through and understand your plans for Tiptree of which the B1023 plays a major part in its access arrangements. We need to make you aware that using the B1023 as a main access route for the additional homes planned for Tiptree is flawed, as the road, due to its size and nature, is not fit for purpose nor can it be improved to be so.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Please read below our remarks to your plans and also note our aims for Inworth to ease the dangerous traffic flow already taking place. We request a meeting with you at your earliest convenience to see if common ground can be found on this important matter.</p> <p>We are also interested to learn how your new (bypass) roads will be funded and if this is to be via the developers, how can it be written into policy by Colchester Borough Council before planning permission is granted on these sites.</p> <p>Highland Nursery and Elms Farm The two developments will have between them 450 homes, most of the traffic from which will feed onto the B1023 connected by the “route corridor” that appears to be in the Messing cum Inworth parish. The “Commercial area” shown on the Policies Map will generate additional commercial traffic using the B1023. NB. There is currently no nursery where Highland Nursery is shown. It is an area of farmland adjacent to Hill Farm.</p> <p>Tower End Tower End is allocated for approximately 175 homes. The criteria must be met include a ‘primary street’ connecting Kelvedon Road with Grange Road.</p> <p>Location of Developments means big increase in traffic on B1023 These development areas are concentrated on the northern side of Tiptree and will feed additional traffic from a total of 625 new homes and onto the B1023 Kelvedon Road via the "link roads". The industrial and commercial development will further increase the already high volume of commercial vans and heavy lorries.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>The proposed developments in this area will impact considerably on the volume of traffic heading to and from Kelvedon and the A12 on a road that is already working beyond its capacity.</p> <p>Weak bridge Hinds Bridge in Inworth carries the B1023 Inworth Road/Kelvedon Road over Domsey Brook. The bridge is an old brick arch construction and when inspected in 2018 it was shown to be in poor repair and in need of urgent strengthening work. While this work was being carried out a weight limit was also imposed on the bridge.</p> <p>For the work to be safely carried out the B1023 had to be completely closed for several weeks in the summer of 2018 until work was completed in October.</p> <p>Increased traffic, especially lorries, generated by the Tiptree developments will result in more damage to this already overloaded bridge.</p> <p>Safety and damage to property The village of Inworth already suffers greatly from the current volume of traffic and the size of the lorries. Large lorries have demolished fences and there is very little safe footpath for residents to use. There are often road accidents in the centre of Inworth caused by speeding vehicles losing control.</p> <p>Damage to road surface and infrastructure A water main in the road near the Stonefields Farm Shop is frequently damaged by the weight of traffic and has to be repaired on a regular basis necessitating the use of traffic lights.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>There are several manhole covers that are already damaged and the surface of the road is breaking up in places.</p> <p>Alternative link road urgently needed There is already an urgent and immediate need for better access to the A12 from Tiptree.</p> <p>The increase in traffic generated by the development plans added to the huge increase in vehicles per hour on this road predicted by the surveys carried out by Highways England in connection with the imminent A12 improvements will lead to gridlock at pinch points such as Gore Pit corner in Feering and Kelvedon High Street.</p> <p>A sensible solution would be for the traffic to be routed west of Tiptree towards Rivenhall where the proposed junction between the A120 and the A12 is located. This would also save Feering and Kelvedon villages from constant through traffic to and from the A12. It would also provide good access to the A120 avoiding the need to route through Kelvedon and Feering.</p> <p>If the existing roads to Braxted Park and the A12 are not suitable a new link road should be constructed now to avert the inevitable problems. This should be part of the Tiptree plan and the developers should make a contribution to the cost.</p>
Kim Gozzett	Object	TIP07	<p>I have recently been made aware of the Tiptree Neighbourhood plan under consideration by the Planning Authority.</p> <p>The greater size of Tiptree has implications for the residents of Inworth as most traffic heading for the A12 and the railway station will come through the village. We are already blighted by 40 tonne lorries which shake the houses and many RTA's have occurred in the village centre due to speeding traffic.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>I noted that a traffic survey was carried out in Inworth during LOCKDOWN, we would be very angry if this was ever referred to in official documents in terms of traffic flow through our village.</p> <p>I attach our summary of the problems as we as a village see things and urge you to provide a link alternate links to the A12 particularly the Braxted Wall to link to the A120 junction with the A12 to divert traffic from an already overburdened country road.</p> <p>I am the owner of the grade II listed building Hill Farm. Over the last 15 years there has been massive development at Perrywood garden nursery which has increased the large lorries along the Kelvedon Road. The traffic along this road has increased considerably as drivers from Tiptree and further afield access the station and A12. This has resulted in many accidents outside our property and damage to our property. Bad weather also increases this problem as cars cannot get up the hill in icy weather. The junction at the end of the Inworth Road into Feering is already ridiculous to navigate at peak times. The number of cars make it increasingly dangerous to exit our property safely.</p> <p>In addition there is the issue of the houses themselves proposed to be built on surrounding agricultural land. This would completely ruin the outlook to Hill Farm and given the close proximity to this property which was built around 1650 would surely be unacceptable given the challenge we have as property owners to make any changes to its surroundings. I assume if it goes ahead that you will therefore consider allowing development on the land at Hill Farmhouse.</p> <p>The fact that this consultation is going ahead at a time when we cannot hold meetings as a neighbourhood to discuss the proposals is also completely unacceptable despite the revised consultation period. This</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>should not be considered until such time as there is the opportunity for the neighbourhood to hold such meetings in an open forum rather than during lockdown when large gatherings are not permitted.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposals in their entirety and the building of further houses without proper infrastructure (not that proposed) and proper and appropriate consultation.</p>
Matt Gore	Object	TIP07	<p>I have recently been made aware of the Tiptree Neighbourhood plan under consideration by the Planning Authority.</p> <p>The greater size of Tiptree has implications for the residents of Inworth as most traffic heading for the A12 and the railway station will come through the village. We are already blighted by 40 tonne lorries which shake the houses and many RTA's have occurred in the village centre due to speeding traffic.</p> <p>I noted that a traffic survey was carried out in Inworth during LOCKDOWN, we would be very angry if this was ever referred to in official documents in terms of traffic flow through our village.</p> <p>I attach our summary of the problems as we as a village see things and urge you to provide a link or alternate links to the A12 particularly the Braxted Wall. This is to link to the A120 junction with the A12 to divert traffic from an already overburdened country road.</p> <p>I live at Hill Farm on the Kelvedon Road with my wife, who owns the property. It is a grade II listed building. Over the last 15 years there has been massive development at Perrywood garden nursery which has increased the large lorries along the Kelvedon Road. The traffic along this road has increased considerably as drivers from Tiptree and further afield access the station and A12. This has resulted in many accidents outside our property and damage to our property. Bad weather also</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>increases this problem as cars cannot get up the hill in icy weather. The junction at the end of the Inworth Road into Feering is already ridiculous to navigate at peak times. The number of cars make it increasingly dangerous to exit our property safely.</p> <p>In addition there is the issue of the houses themselves proposed to be built on surrounding agricultural land. This would completely ruin the outlook to Hill Farm and given the close proximity to this property which was built around 1650 would surely be unacceptable given the challenge we have as property owners to make any changes to the external aspects of the house. In addition, we do not understand why our property has been carefully left outside of the proposed settlement boundary. As a lay person this looks illogical and contrived. I request that our property is included in the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The fact that this consultation is going ahead at a time when we cannot hold meetings as a neighbourhood to discuss the proposals is also completely unacceptable despite the revised consultation period. This should not be considered until such time as there is the opportunity for the neighbourhood to hold such meetings in an open forum rather than during lockdown when large gatherings are not permitted.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposals in their entirety and the building of further houses without proper infrastructure (not that proposed) and proper and appropriate consultation.</p>
Toby Gozzett Charlotte Lawrence	Object	TIP07	<p>I have recently been made aware of the Tiptree Neighbourhood plan under consideration by the Planning Authority.</p> <p>The greater size of Tiptree has implications for the residents of Inworth as most traffic heading for the A12 and the railway station will come through the village. We are already blighted by 40 tonne lorries which</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>shake the houses and many RTA's have occurred in the village centre due to speeding traffic.</p> <p>I noted that a traffic survey was carried out in Inworth during LOCKDOWN, we would be very angry if this was ever referred to in official documents in terms of traffic flow through our village.</p> <p>I attach our summary of the problems as we as a village see things and urge you to provide a link alternate links to the A12 particularly the Braxted Wall to link to the A120 junction with the A12 to divert traffic from an already overburdened country road.</p> <p>I live at the grade II listed building Hill Farm. Over the last 15 years there has been massive development at Perrywood garden nursery which has increased the large lorries along the Kelvedon Road. The traffic along this road has increased considerably as drivers from Tiptree and further afield access the station and A12. This has resulted in many accidents outside our property and damage to our property. Bad weather also increases this problem as cars cannot get up the hill in icy weather. The junction at the end of the Inworth Road into Feering is already ridiculous to navigate at peak times. The number of cars make it increasingly dangerous to exit our property safely.</p> <p>In addition there is the issue of the houses themselves proposed to be built on surrounding agricultural land. This would completely ruin the outlook to Hill Farm and given the close proximity to this property which was built around 1650 would surely be unacceptable given the challenge we have as property owners to make any changes to its surroundings. I assume if it goes ahead that you will therefore consider allowing development on the land at Hill Farmhouse.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>The fact that this consultation is going ahead at a time when we cannot hold meetings as a neighbourhood to discuss the proposals is also completely unacceptable despite the revised consultation period. This should not be considered until such time as there is the opportunity for the neighbourhood to hold such meetings in an open forum rather than during lockdown when large gatherings are not permitted.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposals in their entirety and the building of further houses without proper infrastructure (not that proposed) and proper and appropriate consultation.</p>
Vivienne Watson	Object	TIP07	<p>I wish to object to the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan's 2020 -2033 proposal to construct in excess of 600 new dwellings, due to the impact of increased vehicular traffic on the B1023 through the village of Inworth.</p> <p>I have recently been made aware of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2033 under consideration by the Planning Authority.</p> <p>The plan to build a large number of houses on the outskirts of Inworth will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding areas of Inworth, Feering and Kelvedon due to the inevitable increase of traffic on the B1023. This road is already inadequate to cope with the volume and type of traffic it sees on a daily basis – a task for which it was never intended. Vehicles regularly strike each other at numerous points and in addition cause damage to fencing due to excessive speed. Many householders already find it very difficult to exit their driveways safely, despite employing safety precautions. Royal Mail considers the road unsafe at certain points in Inworth because of '<i>heavy speeding traffic</i>' and daily postal services are suspended as a result of this. Any addition to existing traffic levels will only compound this problem.</p> <p>It appears that objective TIP07 <i>Mitigating the impact of vehicular traffic through Tiptree Village</i> has been fully considered, but does not</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>in any way, take into account the devastating effect it will have on the surrounding areas of Inworth, Feering and Kelvedon. It is clear the vast majority of cars connected with these new houses will choose to access the A12 in both directions via the B1023, thus ensuring that traffic through these villages will increase considerably. Houses in Inworth, many of them listed buildings, are already blighted by the effect of excessive vehicle noise and damage due to ground tremor caused by Heavy Goods Vehicles passing through. The increase in the size of Tiptree has implications for the residents of Inworth, as most traffic heading for the A12 and Kelvedon and Witham railway stations will come through the village, only adding to what is already an untenable situation.</p> <p>As part of the Tiptree Neighbourhood plan to build these homes and in order to gauge the volume of existing traffic conditions, it must be made clear when the most recent traffic survey was carried out on the B1023. I am concerned that a traffic survey may have been carried out in Inworth during the Covid 19 LOCKDOWN period, which would in no way reflect the volume or type of vehicles using the B1023 through Inworth village on a normal day.</p> <p>To make this plan and any future developments sustainable, I strongly urge the planning authority to provide an alternate link to the A12 from Tiptree, bypassing Inworth, Feering and Kelvedon on the B1023. A link to the A120 junction with the A12 to divert traffic from an already overburdened country road might be one such solution.</p>
Andrew Watson	Object	TIP07	[See attachment - Post Office Letter]

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>I am writing to object to the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan under TIP07, Section 8 of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Edition, referencing “Traffic and Movement” pages 26 through to page 31.</p> <p>The proposed building plan for 625 houses North of Tiptree will have a direct impact on the villages along the B1023 particularly Inworth. This historic village, which contains numerous listed buildings, has witnessed an increase in heavy lorry and vehicular usage along this B road section, with the 30-mph speed limit being exceeded on a regular basis. The residents of this village have had to bear increased noise, construction traffic, road vibration and speeds, which are all having a detrimental effect on the buildings along this road. This will only be compounded by the increase in traffic as a direct result from the additional houses the TNP are proposing to build in the north sector of Tiptree.</p> <p>The additional houses, equating to approximately 1300 extra vehicles will, in the majority of cases, use the B1023 to access the nearest railway station or to access the A12 for either London or Colchester and beyond. This additional volume of traffic is unsustainable on an already busy road.</p> <p>The Tiptree and Colchester Borough Planning Council, along with the developers must provide an alternative route to B1023 in order to preserve the historic villages and buildings along this country road. This must be given the utmost precedence by those involved.</p> <p>At present it is difficult for residents of Inworth to safely exit and enter their property from this road. There are regular incidents of vehicles striking each other when passing, even to the extent of damaging boundary fencing. This will only increase with the volume of traffic generated by these new developments.</p> <p>It appears traffic flow through Tiptree has been addressed in objective TIP07 of the plan. However, Colchester Borough Council has a</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>responsibility to ensure that traffic is also managed effectively and safely in the surrounding areas which this plan makes no provision for.</p> <p>The TNP is required to protect the interests of its residents but in doing so will ensure that the B1023 becomes even busier and more dangerous than it is at present.</p> <p>Attached is a letter from the Royal Mail stating that due to “heavy speeding traffic” the postal services to the property were to be suspended to protect the safety of their staff members.</p>
Steve Bays	Comment	TIP07	<p>The new primary street, North of Tiptree has been used to address the public concern about traffic traveling through the Centre of village North to South along Church Road.</p> <p>This only alleviates traffic East to West and additional commuter traffic away from Church Road.</p> <p>Overwhelming concerns from consultation related to do with Church Road itself, and the number of through heavy goods movements as this street is the main shopping area of Tiptree.</p>
Karen Pye	Object	TIP07	<p>As a resident of Kelvedon I object to this proposal. The objection isn't against the number of houses but the lack of an alternative route for the additional traffic this will bring along the B1023, through Inworth, Feering and Kelvedon.</p> <p>Objection is against TIP07, Transport and that an alternative route to the A12 is required beforehand. Kelvedon already has far too much traffic passing through, including too many large heavy lorries. Our village is already being ruined this will make it even worse.</p>
S Osborne	Object	TIP07	I wish to voice my objection to tiptree neighbourhood plan, TIP07.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>I am deeply concerned regarding the amount of traffic that will be generated on top of the amount of traffic that will be accumulative through all the approved planned housing in Kelvedon and Feering.</p> <p>I am not opposed to the housing in the tiptree neighbourhood plan , but I do oppose the lack of infrastructure with no direct to the A12. This traffic from Tiptree needs an alternative route to the A12, so it bypasses Kelvedon high street.</p> <p>The traffic, esp. during the hours of 08h00 to 09h00, i.e. school run and starting work time is especially high. The junction with the high street and station road in Kelvedon has limited visibility. This is a safety risk.</p> <p>Further housing is also planned in Kelvedon and Feering. This will have a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of the Feering and Kelvedon residents.</p> <p>Please ensure that such traffic generated from the planned building of houses in Tiptree neighbourhood plan is accounted for and policies are in place to divert such traffic from the villages of Kelvedon and Feering, esp. Inworth Road.</p> <p>You could request financial contributions from the developers towards a A12 access, and so protecting neighbouring villages.</p> <p>At the least a full traffic assessment and implications needs to be undertaken for the relationship between tiptree neighbourhood plan and the approved housing plans in Feering, messing, inworth, Kelvedon and coggeshall.</p> <p>Both pollution, and constant traffic will have negative impacts both regards to physical and mental health. This, I feel, goes against the nppf.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Feering Parish Council	Comment	TIP07	<p>The objectives and text mention the issues with inadequate transport links to the A12 and neighbouring towns and railway stations, but these are not addressed in any of the policies.</p> <p>The majority of the proposed allocation of homes (600) are allocated near to the B1023, Kelvedon / Inworth Road. This additional scale of development would have a significant impact on the existing overstretched local highway infrastructure and congestion problems which would be further compounded by the other proposed Inworth road (housing)developments sites (i.e. Crown Estates Land in Feering).</p> <p>To alleviate this, the Tiptree plan policies should /must include the requirement for an all ways A12 junction including a means of connecting the Inworth /Kelvedon Road to the A12 (southbound and northbound) that takes away the need for traffic to go through Feering and Kelvedon to access the A12. These infrastructure improvements need to be in place prior to / contiguous with these sites being constructed in order to remove traffic from the current overstretched and congested highway infrastructure.</p>
Tom Flint	Object	TIP07	<p>I would like to lodge my objection to the above neighbourhood plan. I don't object to the houses being built or the proposed number of houses. But I oppose the proposal of the access from Tiptree to the A12 not being amended. The current proposal suggests continuing to use the existing route through Feering/Kelvedon which as things stand is already causing problems with traffic to residents.</p> <p>I'd like to see a new alternative route created to Tiptree from the A12 before the proposal is accepted.</p>
Laura Dudley-Smith on behalf of	Object	TIP07	<p>As previously confirmed, Marden Homes are willing to provide the element of the link road on land within their control as part of the residential development of the site proposed under Policy TIP13.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Marden Homes			<p>However, we have some concerns about the details contained within TIP07.</p> <p>Firstly, we note that criteria 'd' has been added since the previous consultation, requiring driveways not to be accessed from the primary streets. Whilst we accept this as a principle, we consider that flexibility should be offered in this regard to avoid excessive link road infrastructure and illogical in some instances. Kelvedon Road is currently almost exclusively made up of dwellings that access directly from the main road and we are not aware that this causes any significant issues. It encourages a prevalent character of detached dwellings on large plots suited to the semi-rural location. The excessive use of cul-de-sacs and shared driveways could again encourage an overly urban grain for any future development in Tiptree.</p> <p>We previously raised concerns that the wording in Policy TIP07 was unclear as it seemed to suggest that developments should provide additional contributions towards the road alongside constructing the road within the allocation. The wording has been amended from developments being 'expected to contribute' to 'expected to make appropriate contributions'.</p> <p>This is still very unclear and imprecise, and suggests that additional financial contributions may be expected.</p> <p>This could have significant implications on the viability of schemes and could lead to them becoming unviable and undeliverable, thus leading to the link road not being implemented. The risk of sites becoming unviable due to the contributions required, could result in the failed delivery of the 600 dwellings required in Tiptree, so would therefore not comply with relevant strategic policies nor contribute towards achieving sustainable development, contrary to the basic conditions.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>We suggest that Policy TIP07 should be amended to clarify that sites allocated in TIP13 are expected to provide the link road within that site only, and no other contributions are to be requested in this regard.</p> <p>It must be reiterated that each landowner can only be responsible for the delivery of link road infrastructure within their own site. They cannot ensure the cooperation of other landowners, nor the delivery of adjoining sites.</p>
Granville Developments	Support	TIP07	In line with the support registered for Policy TIP14 C(iv), it follows that we support limb F in Policy TIP07: Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic Through Tiptree and F(ii) in particular.
David Stringer Jan Stringer	Object	TIP07	<p>I would like to lodge my objection, as a Feering resident who lives on the junction of the B1023 and London Road Feering, to further development of any scale (apart from in-fill) without direct road access to the A12 (in both directions) being in place prior to commencement. I also note that you are hoping to improve access to Kelvedon station and I do need to be consulted on what this represents in more detail. We have witnessed significant growth in traffic numbers using the Tiptree access over the last 5 years to the extent that it is often very difficult to exit our own drive way and we have to keep front windows closed because of the effects of noise and pollution which are of detriment to our quality of life. It is clear that your plan wishes to avoid congestion in the centre of Tiptree, and the siting of the designated development areas means that our village will indeed suffer the traffic, noise and pollution impact instead. Braintree District council has already, or is in the process of, granting permission to significant new housing developments in both Kelvedon and Feering which will put further pressure on our road network. We urge that an integrated approach to road traffic modelling be done between all local authorities before any plans are adopted or additional development permissions given.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Michael O'Brien	Object	TIP07	The house building targets are totally unacceptable in relation to the additional traffic it will create in surrounding villages, most notably Kelvedon, Feering and Inworth. As such, no further development should be allowed in Tiptree until dedicated access to the A12 from Tiptree is provided.
Mark Fussell	Object	TIP07	I would like to make an official objection to TIP07 of the recent Tiptree neighbourhood plan. I understand there is a need for additional housing throughout the county however as a Kelvedon resident who lives on the main road, we experience a great deal of through traffic to/from Tiptree and unless the A12 North and South junctions are improved upon I don't think any future developments should be approved. The impact any development in the village and it's neighbouring areas, has on the local traffic volumes should be a big consideration. The local infrastructure has needed major improvements for years but yet has just been neglected.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP08	Although the aim of the policy is supported, the restrictions on change of use may not be enforceable due to permitted development rights.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP09	This policy is supported. The aim to provide older persons' housing in the heart of the village, within easy reach of services and facilities is supported.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP10	The allocation of new employment land in the Plan is supported.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP11	This policy is supported.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP12	This policy is supported as it will ensure that the new developments will integrate with one another and the village.
ADP (Mr D Hall and Mr M Campbell)	Comment	TIP12	Policy TIP12: Comprehensive Development has been positively prepared and represents a 'sound' overarching planning policy to guide the site allocations.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>We note that 'Part C' has been inserted in this latest version of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan. This criteria states: <i>Planning applications must be accompanied by Transport Assessments, the scope of which must be agreed with ECC Highways in advance of any application. In particular, the Transport Assessments must demonstrate that the new link roads will satisfactorily mitigate traffic impacts of the proposed development and address existing road congestion issues in Tiptree village.</i></p> <p>It is our understanding that this policy has been developed following extensive discussions with Essex Highways. This criterion is 'sound' and fully complies with national planning policy and DfT Circular 02/2013 'The Strategic Road Network and the delivery of sustainable development' (the Circular).</p> <p>Of particular note, paragraph 109 of the NPPF states: <i>Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.</i></p> <p>Paragraph 9 of the Circular states: <i>Development proposals are likely to be acceptable if they can be accommodated within the existing capacity of a section (link or junction) of the strategic road network, or they do not increase demand for use of a section that is already operating at over-capacity levels, taking account of any travel plan, traffic management and/or capacity enhancement measures that may be agreed. However, development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.</i></p> <p>In the context of Policy TIP12 of the Neighbourhood Plan, any planning application for development at the site allocations will need to be accompanied by a transport assessment that has been prepared in</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			consultation with Essex Highways, to demonstrate and mitigate its impact upon the highway network. This meets national policy requirements and does not need to be expanded any further within this or any other policy.
Mark Hodgson (on behalf of Northumbrian Water Ltd)	Object	TIP12	<p>This policy seeks to ensure that the proposed residential development comes forward in a coordinated way. However, it is unclear how the requirement for an overarching masterplan should be provided. If applications are submitted by individual landowners with indicative masterplans for the remaining areas of the allocation, this should be considered acceptable by the local planning authority. Otherwise it is unclear what status or process is to be used to consider the overarching masterplan.</p> <p>There will need to be an element of coordination across the differing land ownerships in order to ensure that the 'primary street' is delivered in a coherent manner. However, any particular landowner should not be prevented from bringing forward an application on their land provided they meet the relevant policy requirements on land within their control. Provided that an individual application does not prejudice the overall delivery of the 'primary street' then this should not be used as a reason to withhold planning permission.</p> <p>Finally with regard to criterion C, it is important to note that planning applications for new development cannot provide contributions to address existing deficiencies or existing problems. Therefore we think that the requirement in criterion C that a Transport Assessment which demonstrates that the new link roads will address existing road congestion issues in Tiptree is unreasonable.</p> <p>Consequently, we believe that the policy should be amended as follows:</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>A. Applications for development on the site allocations contained in Policies TIP13 and TIP14 should be underpinned accompanied by overarching <u>indicative</u> masterplans. These masterplans are to have been informed by a process of active engagement with the community of Tiptree and with the other land owners/developers involved in the plan. These masterplans should demonstrate, where necessary, that they align with one another, particularly with regard to the connectivity <u>will not prejudice the delivery of the 'primary street'</u> and will contribute towards the delivery of the overall vision for Tiptree.</p> <p>B. These masterplans will set out general design principles and provide an indicative framework to guide the development of the area in accordance with the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan and demonstrate an understanding of the intrinsically semi-rural nature and evolution of the Tiptree settlement pattern.</p> <p>C. Planning applications must be accompanied by Transport Assessments, the scope of which must be agreed with ECC Highways in advance of any application. In particular, the Transport Assessments must demonstrate that the new link roads will satisfactorily mitigate traffic impacts of the proposed development and address existing road congestion issues in Tiptree village.</p>
<p>Laura Dudley-Smith on behalf of Marden Homes</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>TIP12</p>	<p>Policy TIP12 requires applications for development on the allocated sites to be underpinned by overarching masterplans, to be informed by engagement with residents and other landowners/developers. The masterplans for the two allocations are expected to align with one another.</p> <p>We have significant concerns regarding this approach. The NP should provide sufficient guidance for the development of the sites to come forward and should not seek to unnecessarily constrain development from being delivered.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>With multiple landowners and developers involved in the two allocations, producing a masterplan agreed by all parties will take a considerable length of time, if indeed a mutual agreement is even attained, and it is unclear what this is intended to achieve that could not be achieved through individual planning applications.</p> <p>With the site allocations being physically separated from one another, it is for the NP to set any necessary overarching design guidance and not for landowners or developers. With the NP containing design guidance, we consider it does provide sufficient guidance for sites to be developed and planning applications submitted, without the need for a lengthy masterplan process.</p> <p>Criteria B of Policy TIP12 states that the masterplans should demonstrate an understanding of the intrinsically semi-rural nature and evolution of the Tiptree settlement pattern, but the NP has already done this through decisions in where to allocate sites. Planning applications can then provide greater detail on the specific nature of the development in terms of the design of dwellings, and so on.</p> <p>We remain unclear as to the intention of the masterplans and consider this requirement will unnecessarily constrain development, particularly when some sites are ready to come forward in the short term and start delivering homes and infrastructure within Tiptree. Such a requirement places a disproportionate and unnecessary burden on the site allocations and will delay achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>Criteria C has been added since the previous iteration of the NP and now requires applications to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment, which must demonstrate that the new link roads will satisfactorily mitigate traffic impacts of the proposed development and address existing road congestion issues in Tiptree.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>We consider this is outside the scope of a Transport Assessment - the role of which is to assess the impact of a development on the existing road network only. Any new planning applications should not be expected to address existing road congestion issues as a necessity. In safeguarding land for a link road, the NP should be supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this is necessary and will alleviate existing congestion.</p> <p>This requirement could also cause a delay for applications to be determined, as if one site seeks to come forward ahead of the other allocations, it will be difficult for the Transport Assessment to demonstrate how the link road will mitigate existing road congestion issues as it will only form part of the link road.</p> <p>It could also place a disproportionate burden on the first site to come forward, as the extent of highways work required to demonstrate how the existing traffic issues will be mitigated will be significantly greater than for subsequent proposals which will benefit from the initial data and from having part of the link road delivered.</p> <p>With part of the link road being outside of the Tiptree NP area and no proposals or allocations for this to be delivered, we have concerns over whether it will be possible for individual applications to demonstrate that their part of the link road does mitigate existing congestion.</p> <p>We consider that these are matters that should already have been addressed within the NP and that they are not for individual planning applications to consider.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate the need for masterplanning and cohesive development, the expectations of masterplanning work should be</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>managed. There may be opportunities to demonstrate opportunities for links between sites, basic development parameters and general design principles for example, but a masterplan should not expect the designation of specific unit numbers, nor should it be expected to serve as a commitment to matters that would ordinarily be dealt with through individual planning applications.</p> <p>The NP should respect the planning application process and the ability at this point to ensure that individual developments appropriately respond to those around it so as to not hinder the delivery of sites through overly prescriptive pre-planning requirements and commitments.</p>
Anglian Water	Object	TIP13	<p>In our previous comments we had asked for reference to be made to the location of existing water main and a rising main (pressurised sewer) which crosses the allocation site.</p> <p>We note that both Policy TIP13 and the related supporting text have been amended to address the comments made by Anglian Water.</p> <p>Anglian Water is generally supportive of TIP13 as drafted although we would ask that point xi. of policy refer to both water supply and sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that Policy TIP13 is amended as follows:</p> <p>‘In addition the operational water mains and rising main across the site will be protected from development to ensure that access can be maintained’</p>
Essex Bridleways Association	Comment	TIP13	<p>P37 Policy TIP13 point iii: Unfortunate typo here – should read ‘complementary’ instead of ‘complimentary’. Surprised this has not been picked up in proof reading.</p>
Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	TIP13	<p>Fully support this policy. The primary street will help to divert some traffic away from Baynards School and Windmill Green. It will also enable traffic</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			from the TIP14 site to head towards the London bound direction of the A12 without passing along the B1022 and B1023 to any great extent.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP13	The revised policy is supported as it now provides more detail for the development of this site, for example the provision of a Gypsy/Traveller pitch.
Mark Hodgson (on behalf of Northumbrian Water Ltd)	Support	TIP13	<p>NWL generally supports this policy for development in Tower End. The detail of the numbers of dwellings to be provided should be the subject of detailed masterplanning through the various planning applications. Consequently we consider that the phrase 'approximately 175 homes' should be amended to 'a minimum of 175 homes'.</p> <p>NWL also supports the new settlement boundary as proposed by the new map to accompany the Neighbourhood Plan as this will accommodate sufficient space for the proposed new development. Similarly, NWL supports the criterion relating to the protection of the operational water mains that run across the southern portion of the site north of Grange Road.</p> <p>Criterion (v) requires the provision of the 'primary street' between Kelvedon Road and Grange Road. Each landowner is likely to be responsible for delivering the portion of road which is in their ownership but this will need to be subject to viability assessment as outlined under criterion (ii). Depending on the outcome of the viability assessments it might be prudent to include a pooling mechanism for the road to be delivered.</p>
Laura Dudley-Smith of behalf of Marden Homes	Support	TIP13	<p>We support the allocation of Tower End under Policy TIP13 for residential development.</p> <p>The allocation accords with the emerging Local Plan and contributes towards the requirement for the Tiptree NP to allocate land for at least 600 homes.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Marden Homes control land within TIP13 (site reference TIP08 and TIP16), which has clearly defined boundaries and a degree of built form already present on the site. The site has no ecological, environmental or heritage designations that constrain its development. The site is in a sustainable location with good connectivity to both Tiptree and surrounding settlements. It's landscape value is minimal given its enclosed nature, its previously developed elements, and other existing uses.</p> <p>It is a suitable site for the development of homes, with its allocation and subsequent development contributing towards the provision of sustainable development and the overarching principles of the NPPF.</p> <p>With Marden Homes having an interest in the land, and having submitted a planning application to Colchester Borough Council, the availability and deliverability of the site have been confirmed. It is appropriate for the short term delivery of homes to ensure that housing is delivered consistently throughout the Neighbourhood and Local Plan periods.</p> <p>Policy TIP13 states the allocation is for 'approximately 175 homes'. Whilst we support this as a minimum, we suggest it should be 'at least 175 homes'.</p> <p>It is unclear how the NP has sought to calculate the number of homes allocated within the site allocations, with the evidence suggesting significantly more could be accommodated within the allocation confirmed under TIP13. This would ensure efficient use of the land, as sought by the NPPF. With reference to the potential risks in relation to site viability and deliverability that the masterplanning and link road requirements could have on the sites, as detailed earlier in this representation, it is paramount that the sites are able to deliver an extent of development that is reflective of their size and characteristics.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>The only available evidence on housing numbers appears to be within the 'SHLAA ComparisonV10-1' Excel spreadsheet. In relation to TIP08 and TIP16, against a site area of 5.15 this refers to the provision of 130 homes. There is no evidence, however, of how 130 homes has been calculated.</p> <p>This spreadsheet does seem to show that the total allocation area could provide around 188 homes, in excess of the 175 subsequently allocated.</p> <p>With a requirement in national policy to make efficient use of land and to significantly boost the supply of houses, we consider that Policy TIP13 should take the opportunity to allocate 'at least 175' homes on the site which can comfortably accommodate over this number of dwellings. As things stand, the delivery of only 175 dwellings across the approximate allocation area of 10ha, would result in an average density of 17.5 dwellings per hectare. This is very low density and is certainly not supportive of the contribution and infrastructure requirements also expected through the allocation.</p> <p>Individual planning applications would then be required to demonstrate that efficient use was made of the land, whilst achieving the other aims and aspirations of the NP and complying with relevant policies, including achieving good design.</p> <p>Providing housing over and above 175 dwellings within the Tower End allocation should be viewed positively, as it will provide additional choice and variety in the housing market, and reduce pressure for development on other less sustainable and suitable sites, especially at a time when the Government are actively encouraging development and have just published planning reforms aimed at significantly increasing the rate of housing delivery. The Tiptree NP should therefore take this opportunity</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			to contribute towards this and actively encourage further sustainable development to fully accord with the basic conditions.
Essex County Council	Comment	TIP13	<p>[see representation letter for Map 1]</p> <p>The proposed housing allocations were tested for any minerals and/ or waste safeguarding implications. Whilst each allocation is at least partially within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel, in each case this is below the 5ha which would trigger MLP safeguarding policy as it relates to mineral resources.</p> <p>There are no safeguarded existing, permitted or allocated minerals and/ or waste developments located in Tiptree Parish. As such, none of the proposed allocations are in either a Minerals Consultation Area or a Waste Consultation Area as designated through MLP Policy S8 and WLP Policy 2 respectively. Such consultation areas extend up to 250m from safeguarded facilities (400m for Water Recycling Centres), with the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority being a statutory consultee for all development proposed within.</p> <p><u>Map 1 – Mineral Safeguarding Areas within Tiptree Parish</u></p> <p>The following map sets out the extent of the Mineral Safeguarding Area within the area pursuant to the emerging Plan. Regard should be had to the requirements of Policy S8 of the MLP when 5ha or more of a development falls within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. It is recognised that development currently proposed in the Plan does not meet this threshold.</p>
Essex County Council	Comment	TIP13	Policies TIP13 and TIP14. The policies should seek biodiversity new gain in all developments as required by NPPF paragraph 175.
Anglian Water	Support	TIP14	<p>In our previous comments we had asked that the Parish Council consider reference to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) being the preferred method for surface water management for the proposed allocation sites.</p> <p>We note that additional text has been added to include reference to use</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			of multi-functional SuDS for these allocation sites which is fully supported.
Karen Armstrong	Object	TIP14	<p>Elms Farm is far too small for this amount of houses it will result in another concrete jungle like Grove park, why not have numerous smaller sites with 50 or so houses spread around the village, to keep it looking like a village.</p> <p>Oak road is so narrow it struggles with parking, too many lorries and vans, most traffic travels in excess of 40mph, this development would make it much worse, a pedestrian crossing there is asking for trouble.</p> <p>Why not use this site as a country park so as not to displace the wildlife, deer, bats, rabbits and numerous varieties of birds.</p> <p>Make the development much smaller so as to make the houses attractive and inviting and have more green space around them.</p>
ADP (Mr D Hall and Mr M Campbell)	Support	TIP14	<p>Policy TIP14: Highlands Nursery and Elms Farm has been positively prepared and represents a 'sound' and 'robust' overarching planning policy to guide these site allocations as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a transparent, objective and robust methodology for assessing the site allocations and that has been applied on a consistent basis. • The consultation process at each stage has been thorough and wide-reaching, covering all aspects of the community and stakeholders. The Parish Council has engaged with the landowners of these sites constructively and fairly. • It is clear from the evidence gathered that the strategic infrastructure providers are capable of servicing the needs created by the allocations within this policy.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="926 272 1906 378">• The land at Highlands Nursery and Elms Farm represents the most sustainable location within Tiptree to meet the vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan objectives. <p data-bbox="877 415 1906 667">Expanding upon the last bullet point, it is clear that Highlands Nursery and Elms Farm are the most appropriate site allocations, as: This land is available for development – The landowners have been actively engaged with the Parish Council and have signed a Memorandum of Understanding to reaffirm their commitment and willingness to bring this land forward for development through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p data-bbox="877 708 1906 959">The land is suitable for allocation – The landowners have been involved in the neighbourhood planning process from very early in the process and have developed a strong working relationship with the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group, and have sought to agree a collective vision for this land that meets the needs and aspirations of the local community, and delivers the essential local infrastructure, including the need and local desire to reduce traffic travelling through the village.</p> <p data-bbox="877 1000 1906 1105">There are no known constraints that would prevent the development from being delivered, as evidenced by Tiptree Parish Council and Colchester Borough Council’s emerging Local Plan evidence base.</p> <p data-bbox="877 1146 1906 1365">This allocation will also deliver essential highways infrastructure that will relieve the existing congestion problems within Tiptree, as well as help to mitigate the impact of any new trips generated by the proposed developments. No other site put forward can achieve this objective. This approach has been supported by Essex Highways, as evidenced in the correspondence between them and Tiptree Parish Council.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Overall, this site allocation would represent a logical extension to the village that would contribute to the strategic aims of the emerging Colchester Borough Local Plan and that of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Development at these sites is deliverable – The site is viable for development. The Colchester Local Plan Viability Study (2017) provides the evidence to demonstrate that a major development in Tiptree would be viable.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan process has fully considered all the reasonable alternative sites, and through this process it is clear no other site as closely matches the aim and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan or scored as highly in terms of the sustainability benefits.</p> <p>The approach followed complies with the guidance set out in the paragraph 098 of the PPG [Reference ID: 41-098-20190509] as it is clear that the Parish Council has followed the relevant guidance and neighbourhood planning toolkits on assessing sites and they have carried out a strategic environment assessment. They have also clearly identified on a map all the sites they have considered.</p> <p>By allocating the land at Highlands Nursery and Elms Farm, the Neighbourhood Plan has demonstrated that it has been planned positively for new homes and provides greater certainty for the infrastructure providers and the community.</p> <p>trust these comments will be considered during the Independent Examination and we look forward to the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan being taken forward to the Referendum.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			I understand that the Examination will be heard via written representations, but in the event that a Public Hearing is called, as the agent representing the landowners of the proposed allocations under Policy TIP14, we would request attendance at such a hearing.
Tracy Chapman	Objection	TIP14	<p>Objection (TIP14) to the ELMS Farm and Nursery Site Allocations due to impact on the Heritage Assets</p> <p>Reason: The proposal is in conflict with proposed policy TIP17: Historic Environment <i>Any listed building or heritage asset and their setting within the Neighbourhood Plan Area should be maintained or where possible to protect from any future development.</i></p> <p>Proposed development particularly at Elms Farm, but also potentially at Highland Nursery will impact on the setting of a number of Grade II listed buildings. The TNP fails to take into account Historic England's guidance on setting. Broadly, the guidance outlines that the extent of setting embraces all of its surroundings from which an asset can be experienced. It also makes clear that settings of heritage assets do not have fixed boundaries, and elements of a setting may have a positive or negative contribution to the significance of the asset. The open countryside contributes to the settings of these particular heritage assets.</p> <p>The provision of 450 homes in this area will have a significant impact on the setting of these listed buildings, positively contributes to the significance of the heritage assets. Development of this scale around these listed building would result in substantial harm.</p> <p>Paragraphs 195 and 196 of the NPPF also require Local Planning Authorities to weigh that harm against the public benefits of the development proposed, including securing the optimal viable use of the</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>heritage asset. Any harm should require clear and convincing justification and can arise from the loss of historic fabric or features of significance as well as impact on the setting of a heritage asset. In accordance with paragraph 194 of the NPPF, both ‘substantial’ or ‘less than substantial’, any harm should be avoided and should be exceptional in the case of Grade II listed buildings and wholly exceptional in the case assets of highest significance. The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to consider whether the public benefits of the proposed development outweigh the harm that may arise and whether it is justified. In the case of substantial harm, Local Planning Authorities should consider whether the harm is necessary to deliver the public benefits. The greater the harm the greater the justification required. It is considered that the provision of housing would not outweigh the perceived harm and that any allocated sites should be located away from heritage assets and their setting.</p>
Helen Cripps	Object	TIP14	<p>There are several houses and blocks of flats in the streets adjacent to Oak Road, which do not have off-street parking and therefore rely solely on street parking. Due to the large volume of vehicles on the estate, finding street parking is already very difficult and often results in residents having to park along Oak Road. Even the street parking along there has become increasingly difficult to find. With an additional 230 homes on the Elms Farm site, unless suitable off street parking is provided for every household there will potentially be even greater demand for street parking in the vicinity.</p> <p>In addition to this, Oak road is already used as a cut through road between Kelvedon Road and Maypole/Colchester Road, as map 8.2 shows, and the Elms Farm site would increase this flow of traffic significantly, especially as linking of the new primary roads to the north joining the Highlands Nursery and Elms Farm sites to Kelvedon Road, is not guaranteed. Residents from the 230 new dwellings on the Elms Farm site wishing to drive towards Inworth and Feering would all therefore need to drive down Oak Road, increasing traffic, noise and pollution for</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>those of us already living in the vicinity and reducing the amount of safe street-parking available.</p> <p>With a large increase in population, the impact on services such as GP and Dental surgeries also needs to be considered and provisions made to increase these in correlation to the increase in demand.</p> <p>Suggested Changes to the Plan:</p> <p>A reduction in the number of houses for the Elms Farm Site. An increase in the allocated off road parking spaces per household from 1 space per 1 bedroom dwelling to 2 spaces per 1 bedroom dwelling. The optimum route corridor (indicative) and the primary streets be guaranteed, to prevent a significant increase in through traffic on Oak road. Consideration of the provision of parking laybys in existing roads, as well as the new estates, to increase available street parking for current and future residents and to prevent traffic being impeded.</p>
Susan Allen-Sheperd	Support	TIP14	Fully support this policy. The primary street will in time help to divert some traffic away from Baynards School, Windmill Green and Thurstable School, whilst reducing the pressure on Oak Road an ancient community of Tiptree which is lacking in footpaths and that is often used as a rat run. It will also enable traffic entering Tiptree from the A12 to head towards the communities to the east without having to use the B1022 and B1023 to any great extent.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP14	This revised policy is supported as it now provides more detail for the development of this site.
Feering Parish Council	Comment	TIP14	The objectives and text mention the issues with inadequate transport links to the A12 and neighbouring towns and railway stations, but these are not addressed in any of the policies.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>TIP 14 C: The north-west Elms Farm site (225 or 230 homes allocation), which is on the north-west boundary of Tiptree parish, appears to be particularly unsustainable and intrusive into the surrounding countryside. The plan includes an "indicative route corridor" which is across farmland in the parish of Messing-cum-Inworth not Tiptree. The text on page 38 specifically states that "No development is planned in the section between these two areas that lies outside the parish boundary and therefore outside the direct influence of this Neighbourhood Plan".</p>
Granville Development	Support	TIP14	<p>As outlined in our 17 July 2019 representation submitted during the previous round of consultation, Granville Developments are joint promoters with Mersea Homes of land forming a major part of the Elms Farm allocation at the northern end of Tiptree. As such, we lend strong support to the Highland Nursery and Elm Farm allocation and Policy TIP14.</p> <p>We foresee the need to work closely with the local community in the future in order to put flesh on the bones of Policy TIP14 and Sections A&C of that policy in particular.</p> <p>With regard, therefore, to Policy TIP14 we register the following comments:</p> <p>A(i) Consideration should be given to the inclusion of a references to special housing or key working housing rather than just "affordable housing"</p> <p>A(ii) This limb is concerned with dwelling size rather than type and therefore it is incongruous to make special reference to bungalows as such can be larger than small two storey dwellings.</p> <p>A(iii) support.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>A(iv) The reference to Perrywood Garden Centre should be replaced with “nearby centres of employment”.</p> <p>A(v) support.</p> <p>A(vi) support.</p> <p>A(vii) support.</p> <p>A(viii) support.</p> <p>C(i) support.</p> <p>C(ii) support.</p> <p>C(iii) we consider the last sentence referring to the Colchester Local Plan to be superfluous as the Neighbourhood Plan must not be in conflict with the Local Plan and will ultimately take precedence in the implementation of policy.</p> <p>C(iv) support.</p> <p>C(v) The reader of this limb of the policy will not be clear as to which land is being referred as the land behind the Bonnie Blue Oak is not identified or defined in the Plan.</p> <p>C(vi) Support.</p>
Essex County Council	Comment	TIP14	<p>[see representation letter for Map 1] The proposed housing allocations were tested for any minerals and/ or waste safeguarding implications. Whilst each allocation is at least partially within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel, in each</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>case this is below the 5ha which would trigger MLP safeguarding policy as it relates to mineral resources.</p> <p>There are no safeguarded existing, permitted or allocated minerals and/or waste developments located in Tiptree Parish. As such, none of the proposed allocations are in either a Minerals Consultation Area or a Waste Consultation Area as designated through MLP Policy S8 and WLP Policy 2 respectively. Such consultation areas extend up to 250m from safeguarded facilities (400m for Water Recycling Centres), with the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority being a statutory consultee for all development proposed within.</p> <p><u>Map 1 – Mineral Safeguarding Areas within Tiptree Parish</u> The following map sets out the extent of the Mineral Safeguarding Area within the area pursuant to the emerging Plan. Regard should be had to the requirements of Policy S8 of the MLP when 5ha or more of a development falls within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. It is recognised that development currently proposed in the Plan does not meet this threshold.</p>
Essex County Council	Comment	TIP14	Policies TIP13 and TIP14. The policies should seek biodiversity new gain in all developments as required by NPPF paragraph 175.
Edward Gittins (Rhubarb Hall), Edward Gittins (Bull Lane, Egg Farm), Edward Gittins (Bull Lane and Hall Road)	Object	TIP14	<p>The Tower End allocation could be re-allocated for employment use and its capacity redistributed elsewhere.</p> <p>We consider the Tower End allocation should be reviewed to form a new employment site for the village. It represents a logical extension to the existing Tower House employment site and is well-placed for access to the A12 and to benefit when the new northern link road is available. The proposed link road between Kelvedon Road and Grange Road would be retained. It would also provide a convenient source of local employment for the remainder of the northern allocations which would still have the considerable capacity of 450 dwellings. Re-allocating Tower End would</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			enable the displaced capacity of 175 dwellings to be found in medium and smaller sites elsewhere and provide a far wider choice of location for future village housing.
Essex Bridleway Association	Comment	Countryside and Green Spaces	P44 Recreational Disturbance: in the last paragraph, it states that the village's aspiration is to create a new country park for Tiptree, and we ask that if this comes to fruition that all user groups will be able to access this.
Essex County Council	Comment	Countryside and Green Spaces	<p>It is recommended that the Plan include further information regarding green infrastructure. Chapter 13 provides objectives and policies on the provision and protection of green/open spaces and biodiversity, but a holistic and connected approach could be provided in the next iteration of the Plan. This could summarise the wider 'environment' objectives at the beginning of the chapter, then have the subheadings describing the context, intent, policies and rationale. There is an opportunity to have a policy encompassing green infrastructure as a whole.</p> <p>Green infrastructure is a network of multi-functional high quality green spaces and other environmental features, (such as footpaths, play parks, village greens, street trees) which together delivers multiple environmental, social and economic benefits, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributing to the quality and distinctiveness of the local environment and landscape character; • creating a 'green wedge' and buffer; • providing opportunities for physical activity, improving health and well-being and generally adding to quality of life; • adapting and mitigating against a changing climate through the management and enhancement of existing habitats and the creation of new ones to assist with species migration, to provide shade during higher temperatures, reduce air pollution and for flood mitigation; and

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> encouraging a modal shift from car to walking and cycling by linking publicly accessible green space wherever possible to form walking and cycling routes. <p>The Plan could take into consideration the following policy to ensure connectivity of all green infrastructure, such as play parks, recreational grounds, village greens and other public open spaces:</p> <p><i>‘New developments should integrate with the current green infrastructure network, seeking to improve the connectivity between wildlife areas and green spaces through measures such as improving and extending the existing footpath and cycle path network, allowing greater access to housing and retail facilities, green spaces, public open spaces and the countryside.’</i></p> <p>The document, ‘Neighbourhood Planning: Local Green Spaces’ by My Community is a useful guide on how Neighbourhood Plans can address green spaces and green infrastructure. A weblink is provided below.</p> <p>https://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/NP_Green-Space_0217.pdf .</p>
Jacqueline Bakker	Support	TIP15	The policy clearly shows the designated Local Wildlife Sites which need to be protected. Tiptree needs this policy to protect these areas. During the Covid 19 pandemic all of these areas saw an increase in use, demonstrating how important these areas to the local community.
Essex Bridleway Association	Comment	TIP15	P43 Policy TIP15: In point A, reference should be made to making green spaces more accessible to more user groups so that the Policy is fully inclusive. This is supported by the Rights of Way Improvement Plan and should be embedded within this Plan as an aspiration for the future.
Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	TIP15	Far too much of the large scale greenspaces in Tiptree are on the furthest reaches of the village away from the centre which means that many people need to access them by car in order to do so safely. Tiptree Heath

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			SSSI is often at the limit of its capacity for recreational use and suffers heavily in the wet season. Object 31 is vital for the long term well being of Tiptree residents, with the local wildlife site Co10 being an ideal site for country walks, where many people already walk, being much closer to the centre of the village.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP15	The policy is supported, although the Parish Council will need to ensure that it has sufficient long-term resources to manage and maintain the open spaces it gains from development in the village TIP15(D).
Essex County Council	Support	TIP15	Policy TIP15 Countryside and Green Spaces. The policy is supported which seeks to conserve and enhance the designated biodiversity assets of the parish. It is recommended that Priority habitats and species present within the plan area are also noted with opportunities to link these are encouraged as required by NPPF para 174.
Maldon District Council	Support	TIP16	The inclusion of this policy is supported.
Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	TIP17	Heritage assets whether built or natural must be protected. It is most important that quiet lanes and walks are not degraded by the close proximity of houses or roads and that new roads should not cross them nor that they are changed to accommodate more traffic. There are some wonderful old lanes, evocative of times past, which must be protected.
P. Hughes	Comment	Non Policy Actions	<p>There is mention in the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan of the establishment of a Country Park.</p> <p>I don't think this is a sound idea, as there isn't space for one of meaningful dimensions within the Parish boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, if there IS to be one developed NEAR Tiptree, it will be outside the Parish boundary, and therefore -presumably- will fall under the auspice of CBC, ECC or some 3rd party NFP-type organisation, such as Essex Wildlife Trust for example.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Beyond that point, careful consideration should be given to the impact of visitors to any putative Country Park. In my experience of -for example- Thorndon CP, Hylands Park, Weald Park, Cudmore Grove CP & others, people flock to these places in huge numbers. I don't think anywhere near Tiptree could accommodate the traffic that would be created by the existence of such a facility.</p> <p>Further, there are several places not that far from Tiptree that locals could visit easily if their desire to experience a country park is strong. For example, Park Road Nature Reserve could be considered to be a small CP. There is a reserve at Fingringhoe (run by EWT I believe); Cudmore Grove CP on Mersea Island; Abberton Reservoir & surrounding lands could easily be construed as being a CP - to highlight just a few. All except Park Road Reserve have facilities. With them in such close proximity, it is difficult to see why a CP is needed in/near Tiptree, and/or how it would be of major benefit to the community compared with the cost of establishing & maintaining it.</p> <p>Therefore, on balance, I feel obliged to object to this element of the plan.</p>
Essex Bridleway Association	Comment	Non Policy Actions	The non-policy actions on page 47 should also reflect the need to include all user groups; for example within 'Countryside and Green Spaces' we ask that the third point is reworded thus: 'to negotiate public access for as many user groups as possible to Local Wildlife Sites...' and for the fourth point 'to establish a country park in the Tiptree area accessible to all user groups'.
Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	Non Policy Actions	Tiptree has strong need of a country park where simple country recreation can be guaranteed. Existing sites can no longer support the population and many of them are in private ownership. It is important to negotiate new facilities that do not just depend on long term common usage.

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
Natural England	Comment	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	We welcome the clarification on dwelling numbers that we requested in our previous response. We have no further comments to make on the SEA.
Historic England	Comment	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	Having now had a chance to review the SEA Report, as well as the R16 version of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan, I can confirm that Historic England has no further comments to make at this time.
Michael Robson (on behalf of Kler Group)	Object	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	<p>TIP03 Site Assessment</p> <p>At Appendix 3 of the SEA are the site appraisals, including assessment of TIP03. There are concerns that site TIP03 has been inaccurately scored in some categories which are as follows.</p> <p>Objective 2 seeks to ensure that increased congestion is avoided on existing roads and junctions and promotion of cycleways and footways to the village amenities. The site has been afforded a neutral scoring with commentary referring to ‘All sites are likely to provide sustainable transport infrastructure as reducing congestion and promoting sustainable travel are objectives of the plan’. Whilst this statement may not be inaccurate, it does not specifically assess the proposed site. In order to establish the likely increased congestion on local roads, the scoring should have specific regard to the proximity of the site to the village centre in order to better understand the likelihood of residents walking into the centre.</p> <p>TIP03 is well located to the village centre and would encourage walking to and from the centre. There is concern that the proposed allocations to the north of the village would not encourage as many walking trips to the</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>village amenities. The sustainability of TIP03 has been underestimated in meeting this objective and should be afforded a positive contribution.</p> <p>Objective 5, sub-objective 2 seeks to protect or enhance biodiversity for which TIP03 has been afforded a double negative contribution. The commentary identifies that all sites have the potential to increase recreational pressure on Tiptree Heath SSSI and Abberton Reservoir SPA. It goes onto note that to avoid adverse impacts on these sites, high-quality green infrastructure and circular routes should be included on sites and it acknowledges that the potential to achieve biodiversity net gains is achievable. The commentary acknowledges the Inworth Grange Pits Local Wildlife Site (LWS) but provides no commentary on the effects.</p> <p>The main body of the SEA states the following in relation to the biodiversity effects of TIP03:</p> <p>‘TIP03 is likely to lead to significant negative effects on biodiversity. This site is adjacent to the Gravel Pit and forms part of Inworth Grange Pits Local Wildlife Site (Co10). It is a lowland meadow and an Essex BAP priority habitat containing at least two scarce and declining indicator species: green-winged orchid (<i>Orchis</i> [now <i>Anacamptis</i>] <i>morio</i>) and southern marsh orchid (<i>Dactylorhiza praetermissa</i>).’</p> <p>The site appraisal for TIP03 differs significantly from the above assertion within the body of the SEA. The site appraisal acknowledges that adverse effects can be mitigated through inclusion of open space within the site and does not assume an adverse effect on the LWS. TIP03 is sufficiently sized to include the necessary mitigation to ensure residents do not increase recreational pressure elsewhere.</p> <p>With regards to the effect on the LWS, ecological and biodiversity assessments have been undertaken this summer to establish the</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>significance of the species which seek to justify the designation. There are limited examples of the indicator species and it should be noted that the LWS it is presently unmanaged. Without proper management of the LWS, the species will decline further. But with proper management, the species numbers can expand. TIP03 would only result in development of a small part of the LWS which makes a limited contribution to the significance of the LWS. However, the development would include significant green infrastructure including proper management of the LWS area within the site which provide a positive benefit.</p> <p>The negative contribution afforded to TIP03 does not have regard to the quality and present circumstances of the LWS. Development on site TIP03 could mitigate any adverse effect on the SSSI and SPA and enhance the remaining LWS.</p> <p>Lastly, the summary commentary identifies that the site maybe reliant on TIP09 for highway access. Appropriate access can be achieved from Brook Meadows and therefore TIP03 can be brought forward independently.</p> <p>In light of the above, site TIP03 should be afforded a higher scoring, making it the most sustainable location for development in the settlement.</p>
Steve Bays	Comment	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	<p>The SEA report was never consulted upon, or distributed in public, but forms strong opinions.</p> <p>Page 20, of the SEA report, does not include publicly owned land 33 acres at Warriors Rest, and the land at Park lane.</p> <p>Page 20, of the SEA report, has been doctored from the original document by John More, the watermarks, are not shown on the green spaces of Brook meadows and Park Lane.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>The initial assessment by the SLAA group used the original map. These assessments were then redone using this new doctored map.</p> <p>Page 36, of the SEA report, this map was created very early on in the NHP process, but was refused to be discussed by the Steering Group, at a Working Party meeting, or at an open / closed meeting at Parish Council full Council.</p> <p>It was removed from agendas item during a full council meeting. These alternative routes have never been discussed and could have given further options to the public to consider.</p> <p>The document however states, these routes have been given considerable amount of consideration.</p>
Sam Hollingworth on behalf of Bloor Homes	Object	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	<p>Whilst Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) is not always required in respect of the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan, it clearly is in the case of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan, given that it will make decisions on strategic issues such as the location of new development and the provision of new roads.</p> <p>Indeed, the Basic Conditions Statement prepared alongside the TNP confirms that the need for SA/SEA of this Neighbourhood Plan was agreed at an early stage in its preparation.</p> <p>As noted in Section 2, as the TNP is a plan for which SA/SEA is required, the SA/SEA must meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations.</p> <p>The TNP is accompanied by an SA/SEA.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>However, there are a number of concerns in respect of the SA/SEA and compliance with the SEA Regulations, as set out within this section of the representation.</p> <p>We raised concerns in respect of the SA/SEA in our representations at the Regulation 14 stage. However, many of the issues have not been resolved, and we are also concerned that issues raised have not been fully considered. A copy of our representations made at the Regulation 14 stage, including issues raised in respect of the SA/SEA process are provided in full as Appendix D.</p> <p>One of the more troubling statements within the section of the SA/SEA which purports to address comments submitted on previous iterations, is made in concerns raised where it states, “Sustainability Appraisal is not required for neighbourhood plans”. One could infer from this that it is being suggested that defects are considered to be less relevant, because it is thought that SA/SEA is not required, and this is in some way excuses these. However, not only is SA/SEA required in this instance, even if it were not, the PPG is clear that SA/SEA can be a useful tool to help inform a Neighbourhood Plan and it would be wholly inappropriate for such an important process to be allowed to be defective.</p> <p>As addressed within Section 2 of this representation, flaws in the SA/SEA have contributed to the TNP’s failure to meet the basic conditions required of Neighbourhood Plans, particularly in respect of the need to justify decisions made. This section of this representation concerns flaws with the SA/SEA insofar as they relate to matters of legal compliance, and does not repeat other concerns, unless they relate to legal compliance as well as the basic conditions.</p> <p>Evaluation of alternatives and the need for this to be on an evidential basis</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Regulation 12(2) of the SEA Regulations requires the SA/SEA to identify, describe, and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of proposed options, as well as on reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Regulation 12(3) sets out the information required to be included within an SA/SEA, referring to Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations. In turn, Schedule 2 states that SA/SEA should consider short, medium and long term effects; permanent and temporary effects; positive and negative effects; and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects.</p> <p>The judgment in <i>Heard v Broadland DC, South Norfolk DC & Norwich City Council</i> [2012] EWHC 344 (Admin) confirms the need to consider reasonable alternatives through SA/SEA, and to do so to the same level of detail as the preferred option.</p> <p>Separately, the judgment in <i>Stonegate Homes Ltd v Horsham DC</i> [2016] EWHC 2512) confirms that flaws in the assessment of sites can result in an SA/SEA failing its requirement in respect of Regulation 12; and that it is imperative for conclusions reached by the SA/SEA on an evidential basis.</p> <p>In our view, <i>Stonegate</i> is of particular relevance to the TNP and how it has considered alternatives. We have already noted the parallels between <i>Stonegate</i> and the assessment of Site TIP65 within Section 2 of this representation. We do not repeat the details of this again here. But, to confirm, the lack of evidential basis for the SA/SEA conclusions that development of Site TIP65 would result in harm to a Local Wildlife Site or give rise to concerns in respect of highway impacts not only means that the TNP fails to meet the basic conditions, but is considered to also constitute a breach of the SA/SEA Regulations.</p> <p>The requirement to avoid premature fixing of a spatial strategy</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Both <i>Heard</i> and <i>Stonegate</i> confirm the need to avoid the premature fixing of a particularly strategy without proper consideration of alternatives.</p> <p>However, in the case of the TNP a lack of willingness to depart from an already agreed strategy, regardless of the findings of SA/SEA is evident.</p> <p>For example, we set out concerns in our Regulation 14 stage representations in respect of how the proposed Elms Farm allocation had been assessed through SA/SEA at this juncture. The SA/SEA at this time assessed the proposed allocation as having a score of “O” against sustainability objective 6 (to value and protect our heritage). There was no explanation as to how the Grade II listed building in close proximity to this proposed allocation has been considered by the SA/SEA, or how the current, open, undeveloped setting of this listed building could reasonably be considered to be unaffected by the proposed residential development.</p> <p>The SA/SEA published alongside has revised the scoring of Elms Farm against objective 6, and now considered it to have a negative impact against this objective.</p> <p>However, despite this, there is no suggest that conclusions have been altered to reflect this correction. Critically, there is no evidence to suggest plan-makers have considered this assessment in the preparation of the TNP – the allocation is simply as per the Regulation 14 stage, and appears to ignore the findings of the SA/SEA in this regard.</p> <p>In respect of the proposed new relief road Policy TIP07 suggests, the SA/SEA concludes there are no reasonable alternatives to this or to its proposed route. We consider such a stance to be totally untenable, and very much indicates that a strategy based around the provision of a new relief road has been fixed. Even if it were the case that no alternative</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>routes were available, then it is eminently the case that the provision of no relief road is itself still a reasonable alternative. Again, there are clear parallels with the issue in respect of <i>Heard</i> (albeit at a different scale). In <i>Heard</i> a key flaw was that the authorities had not considered alternatives to a strategy that entailed provision of a new road (in this case the Northern Distributor Road). Similarly, the TNP appears based around an assumption (and one for which there is little evidence) that a relief road to the north of Tiptree forms part of a suitable strategy and is deliverable. The SA/SEA expressly fails to consider alternatives, resulting in a very similarly failing to that identified in <i>Heard</i>.</p> <p>Reason for the selection of options and the rejection of alternatives Regulation 16 of the SEA Regulations requires that the reason for the selection of options, and the reasons for the rejection of reasonable alternatives, be made clear within the SA/SEA. This requirement in relation to plan-making has been confirmed through case law (for example, <i>Save Historic Newmarket Ltd v Forest Heath District Council</i> [2011] EWHC 606 (Admin)).</p> <p>Again, the judgment in <i>Heard</i> and its confirmation of the need for conclusions to be evidentially based, is relevant here. Put simply, the SA/SEA must back up its conclusions with evidence. In this instance, it manifestly fails to do so.</p> <p>As already noted in Section 2 of this representation, the reason for the selection of sites and rejection of alternatives is flawed and based on assertions without evidence. This includes in relation to certain sites having a positive impact in respect of highways, and others a negative impact, without any reference to technical evidence to support this. Indeed, in the case of TIP65 the SA/SEA ignores evidence that the site would not have an adverse impact on highways.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>As noted in Section 2 of this representation, the SA/SEA also makes reference to the ability of sites to help deliver a new link road as being a determinant factor in their selection. As already addressed in Section 2, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed new link is needed, would be of benefit, is deliverable, or represents the optimum route for a new link road. As such, not only does reliance on it to justify sites selected give rise to concerns in respect of meeting the basic condition, it also becomes a legal compliance issue in respect of Regulation 16 of the SEA Regulations.</p> <p>Consultation on the SA/SEA Regulation 13 of the SEA Regulations sets out the consultation requirements of SA/SEA.</p> <p>Regulation 13 requires <i>inter alia</i> that as soon as reasonable practicable after the preparation of the SA/SEA, the responsible authority should bring this to the attention of persons who are affected or likely to be affected by, or have an interest in its findings.</p> <p>As confirmed through case law (<i>Kendall vs Rochford District Council</i> [2014] EWHC 3866 (Admin)), Regulation 13 requires that consultations must make clear that views specifically on the SA/SEA are being sought, and merely publishing an SA/SEA alongside a draft plan being consulted upon is not sufficient.</p> <p>At the Regulation 14, we brought to the Parish Council's attention our concerns that comments were not being sought (and had not been sought) on the SA/SEA published alongside that particular consultation iteration of the Neighbourhood Plan, and the legal implications of this in relation to the SEA Regulations.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>We have seen no evidence that consultation on the SA/SEA published alongside the Regulation 14 Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan was subsequently undertaken in an attempt to rectify this issue.</p> <p>Furthermore, and despite the issue having been raised at the Regulation 14 stage, we note that the current Regulation 16 consultation again fails to expressly invite comments on the SA/SEA published alongside the TNP. Indeed, if one were to use the Borough Council's online consultation portal to make representations (as one is encouraged to do by the Borough Council) there is no facility to enable one to make a comment on the accompanying SA/SEA.</p> <p>The repeated failure to consult on the accompanying SA/SEA through the preparation of the TNP represents a significant concern in respect of legal compliance, and one we suggest requires urgent attention.</p> <p>Ensuring the SA/SEA is legally compliant As we set out in our Regulation 14 representations, case law (see <i>Cogent Land LLP v Rochford District Council</i> [2012] EWHC 2542 (Admin)) confirms that defects in the SA/SEA process can be addressed.</p> <p>However, <i>Cogent</i> also confirms the need to avoid any additional SA/SEA work undertaken being merely <i>ex post facto</i> justification of a strategy already agreed. It will be necessary for defects in the SA/SEA to be addressed and for the TNP to be reviewed to reflect these.</p>
Gladman	Comment	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	<p>Gladman included substantial commentary on the proposed approach to site allocations and the Strategic Environmental Assessment in our previous submissions and do not wish to repeat much of what was previously submitted. Gladman note that the assessment of sites has been updated following our submissions. However, we remain concerned with the conclusions of the SEA and the assessment of Barbrook Lane. The assessment of the proposed sites remains</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/Com	NP Section	Representation
			<p>inconsistent with The Landscape Capacity of Settlement Fringes in Colchester Report being used to weigh against the proposal, yet this report does not readily appear to have been a consideration of other proposed sites. The site is well screened with little wider impact, a fact endorsed in the approved appeal decision. Gladman consider that if this site had been assessed under these circumstances the outcome of the sites proposed for development may well have differed.</p>
Natural England	Comment	Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA)	<p><i>As per our previous advice “NE agree with the broad conclusions in that an adverse effect on the integrity of the identified designated sites can be avoided through appropriate mitigation measures. Additionally we noted that, the Appropriate Assessment suggests that where on-site Green Infrastructure measures are not/cannot be provided, in such cases an additional financial contribution will be sought towards the creation and improvement of an existing area at Inworth Grange Pits. As a Local Wildlife Site, the use of Inworth Grange Pits will need to be carefully considered to be further utilised as a ‘SANG’ as described in the Appropriate Assessment and therefore further detail is needed to ensure that the important flora and fauna of this area are maintained and improved. This should include a suitable site management plan to ensure an appropriate balance between the mitigation requirements and the conservation management of the existing species and associated diverse flora. We would advise that this is drafted in co-ordination with local environment bodies, such as the Essex Wildlife Trust”.</i></p> <p>We note this has been taken on board and that the HRA states ‘This would be subject to successful negotiations with the current owners and the agreement of Natural England. To further develop this idea further work will be required to establish ownership and responsibility for the maintenance and management of the site;’ Therefore our previous comments remain the same.</p>