



Wivenhoe Town Council's position on the Draft Statement of Common Ground (SoGC) and draft heads of terms as produced by Savills.

We have several issues with this statement but the overriding one is that it skirts around the fundamental issue. The most important aspect of this to the people of Wivenhoe and the authors of the Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) is the blatant land grab. The Plan clearly shows the land allocated for development as agreed with the public following a democratic process and we see no benefit to the people of Wivenhoe to reject their referendum result.

Our concerns are set out below by SoCG topic for ease of reference.

## 5. Planning Policy Framework

'5.14 The site allocation total 11.58 hectares and is allocated for a minimum of 120 dwellings'

All reference within the Wivenhoe Neighbourhood plan specify that 4 hectares of land is allocation for 120 homes. And 2 hectares for sport pitches.

'5.15. In broad terms the Town Council is accepting of the principle of new development'

This is correct however to 'respect the scale and character of the existing environment' this needs to be at a density of at least 30 dwellings per hectares (120 divided by 4 hectares) and not 20 dwellings per hectare (120 divided by 6 hectares) as proposed.

## 6 Areas of Common Ground

'6.4 The area of site to be developed for residential extends to 3.5 hectares'

We disagree the developable area for residential is at least 4 hectares.

### 'Principle of Development

The site is allocated under Policy WIV29 of the Neighbourhood Plan. The site allocation total area comprises 11.58 hectares and is allocated for a minimum of 120 dwellings.'

This contradicts the two references in the WNP (17.33 – of 4.06 hectares and 17.40 – of 4 hectares) and so we are not in agreement.

## 'Public Realm/Pedestrian Movements

The proposed pedestrian movements across the site are considered acceptable.'

We are not in agreement as the proposals do not comply with (ix) and (x) of WIV 29 in the Wivenhoe Neighbourhood plan. Additionally, the path to Broad Lane is too close to the fence line of existing dwellings to comply with the NPPF Promoting healthy and safe communities (92).

## 'Ecology

6.17' We are not aware of what the mitigation measures are, and development over a larger area than prescribed in the WNP will cause more environmental damage than deemed acceptable.

## Flood Risk and Drainage

6.22 'flood risk and drainage have not been identified as a disputed matter and the proposed development is therefore agreed to be acceptable in this regard.'

We are not in agreement with the land grab created by the attenuation feature. We believe there are alternative location for these, or alternative solutions that could be incorporated.

## 7 Matters in Dispute

We agree with the matters in dispute. We would wish to see the addition of connectivity and sustainability as these matters have not been effectively addressed. See details under Public Realm/Pedestrian Movements, or our submission statement. We also wish to take this opportunity to reiterate the requirement to maintain the open views into countryside that very much part of the rational, reasonable and considered approach to this site taken by the authors of the WNP.

We are also in dispute over the land allocated in the WNP for Sports fields. The WNP envisioned delivery in a local context. These sports fields should be delivered as prescribed by the WNP as part of the social contract between Wivenhoe residents and the promise by both Government and Colchester Borough Council that our Neighbourhood Plan would be defensible policy. It is an inherent feature of the WMP that residents did not want development but accepted it in exchange for described and agreed community gain. It is worth noting here that attention must be given to the provision of access to the sports fields.

