

Appendix A11 - Consultation Comments Analysis - July 2022

Number	TIP01	TIP02	TIP03	TIP04	TIP05	TIP06	TIP07	TIP08	TIP09	TIP10	TIP11	TIP12	TIP13	TIP14	Would Vote	
Agree	118	132	127	140	125	140	124	129	119	125	136	126	116	113		
Mostly Agree	26	23	26	14	25	18	24	21	31	27	18	19	28	27		
Disagree	22	5	8	4	7	2	8	2	1	3	3	4	10	15	Yes	135
No Opinion	7	8	6	9	9	6	6	9	10	6	4	12	7	6	No	25
-	9	14	15	15	16	16	20	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	-	22
Total	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	Total	182
Percentage																
Agree	64.8%	72.5%	69.8%	76.9%	68.7%	76.9%	68.1%	70.9%	65.4%	68.7%	74.7%	69.2%	63.7%	62.1%		
Mostly Agree	14.3%	12.6%	14.3%	7.7%	13.7%	9.9%	13.2%	11.5%	17.0%	14.8%	9.9%	10.4%	15.4%	14.8%		
Disagree	12.1%	2.7%	4.4%	2.2%	3.8%	1.1%	4.4%	1.1%	0.5%	1.6%	1.6%	2.2%	5.5%	8.2%	Yes	74.2%
No Opinion	3.8%	4.4%	3.3%	4.9%	4.9%	3.3%	3.3%	4.9%	5.5%	3.3%	2.2%	6.6%	3.8%	3.3%	No	13.7%
-	4.9%	7.7%	8.2%	8.2%	8.8%	8.8%	11.0%	11.5%	11.5%	11.5%	11.5%	11.5%	11.5%	11.5%	-	12.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Total	100.0%

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

In amending the plan some policy and paragraph numbers have changed. The comments column refers to the regulation 14 version of the plan. The responses column refers to the regulation 16 version of the plan with the original refence in {} should the reference have changed. [Text in blue indicates modifications to the plan.](#)

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP01?	TIP01 - Tiptree Spatial Policy - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section B		
92	TR	7	Disagree	B: Why a minimum of 400? If we must have 400, let it be 400 not lots more.	<p>The housing allocation was agreed with CBC based on housing demand, Government policy, current infrastructure and the expected improvements in infrastructure over the plan period.</p> <p>The allocation is a minimum target that must be met during the plan period and is specified in the Colchester Local Plan Tiptree Policy SS14.</p> <p>The upper limit will be determined by the size of the allotted development sites, the proportion of 1, 2, 3 or more bed houses, open space and exclusion areas which cannot be built on due to underground infrastructure such as water pipes. It should not greatly exceed the totals specified in the NP.</p> <p>Clarified in Paragraph 12.2 (new paragraph) with footnote added to TIP01.</p>	Yes
133	TR	1	Disagree	Too many houses for such a rural area. No upper limit of houses to be built.		
134	TR	1	Disagree	1)No maximum number of houses.		
182	TR	1	Disagree	to say a Minimum of 400 should be built within the next 11 years is a worry. Where is the Maximum figure? could be an infinite number seeing the record amount of houses being built currently not only in Tiptree, but in Feering, Kelvedon and now the giant site in Heybridge. Not forgetting the never ending building in Stanway. If the building works carry on at this rate, we won't be a village anymore! The roads are disgraceful, the doctors facing longer waits than ever and a dentist I have never been able to use even though I have lived here for 34 years.		
196	TR	7	Mostly Agree	I was given to understand that there would be a maximum of 400 not 400 plus.		
208	TR	7	Mostly Agree	While additional development is usually regarded with regret, some new houses are needed, and 400 new houses over 10 years is not unreasonable. However, the plan provides for "a minimum" of 400", and I feel that this figure should not be over exceeded.		
2	TR	7	Disagree	My opinion is that insufficient evidence has been given by government to support the call for 250000 new homes per year until 2033, of which the proposed development plan for Tiptree is a part.	Comment noted. The NP cannot address this. It is suggested the responcee takes this up with their MP.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP01?	TIP01 - Tiptree Spatial Policy - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
84	TR	1	Disagree	400 homes in one area is too many why not space them out in different areas of 50 or so to keep Tiptree looking like a village	Small developments of 50 or so would not maximise the planning gains such as a new Health Centre and would result in housing in inappropriate areas creating traffic related problems in busy roads. The NP seeks to retain a 'village feel'. See Policies TIP01 D.d {C.iv} and TIP02 A.b (A.ii).	No
134	TR	1	Disagree	Point about minimum continued ... 4)Communications by committee have indicated 400 additional houses for Tiptree. This contradicts such communications from the Committee made to the village (eg e-mail update of Feb 22).	There is no contradiction. The email text was, 'The eagerly awaited new plan is similar to the previous plan but differs, firstly, in that it only proposes 400 new homes and, secondly, in including an acre of land set aside, potentially, for a new Health Centre.' The intent of the email wording was to contrast the change from 600 homes to 400 homes but as planning is not an exact science (for the reasons given above), the number is expressed as a minimum. However, that number should not be greatly exceeded.	No
195	TR	7	Disagree	No more development	Comment noted. Government policy requires local authorities to meet housing targets. It is a choice between a plan led approach or a free for all.	No
207	TR	1	Disagree	If have more houses than the doctors won't cope with the amount of people as they can't cope now.	In conjunction with development, the NP seeks to meet the infrastructure requirements. In this respect the Plan includes a plot set aside for a new Health facility.	No
17	TR	3	Agree	B. If additional new housing is required under the plan these seem to be suitable locations within the boundary.	Comment noted	No
23	TR	7	Mostly Agree	B1 B2 not sure the sites away from the village are a good idea, though I realise it will save the village from extra traffic.	There are no available sites of sufficient size in the current village envelope.	No
133	TR	1	Disagree	Additionally the land to the west of Tiptree has been identified as an area of rural interest but the same applies to the land to the north of Tiptree.	Tiptree is surrounded by rural areas but only SSSIs, Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves are protected.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP01?	TIP01 - Tiptree Spatial Policy - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
134	TR	1	Disagree	<p>2) Building up to the village boundary. Ideally would have maintain land between Tiptree and Messing village boundary to maintain identity of Tiptree (separate from Messing). If link road goes in subsequent years ahead it will allow Messing to also get benefit of link road by using this to take their housing allocation.</p> <p>First version of plan was rejected by Examiner for this reason so Tiptree Neighbourhood planning committee appears to have approached Colchester Borough Council to amend their plan ahead (re link road around North of Tiptree/South of Messing) before Tiptree voted i.e. request by Tiptree Neighbourhood planning committee pre-supposes outcome of neighbourhood plan by requesting such change - yet no public vote today. Query democratic process.</p> <p>3) West side of Tiptree is well within Tiptree Parish boundary but have been discounted based on the Pits/Green spaces. I do not understand why the space on East of pits has been labelled as Wildlife Spaces. If anything the proposed sites North of the village have just as much importance. It is unclear why North West/South West sides have been discounted over above the North sites (access can be achieved to A12).</p>	<p>The statement of common ground between Tiptree PC and Messing cum Inworth PC allows for the future adjustment of the parish boundary to facilitate the completion of the link road in a subsequent planning period. The adjustment will prevent further infill between Tiptree and Messing and the link road will discourage the use of Messing village as a 'rat run' to Colchester Road.</p> <p>The Colchester Local Plan was subject to public consultation and the NP is derived from public consultation and once made will be subject to referendum.</p> <p>The meadow east of the pits is a flower meadow containing several rare species worthy of its designation as a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>The NP spatial strategy is outlined in the NP and further elucidated in the SEA and the Housing Topic Paper.</p>	No
39	TR	6	Agree	<p>The location of these sites and the additional amenities are good for Tiptree. The residents should they occupy properties on these sites will enjoy good vehicle access to major routes out of Tiptree, access to the A12 and train stations. It will mitigate any increase in through running traffic on Maldon Road, which is already a busy road. The proposed additional amenities are a welcome asset to the whole village.</p>	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP01?	TIP01 - Tiptree Spatial Policy - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
59	NR	0	Agree	I am in favour of necessary development. I prefer a green space to be preserved between Tiptree and Tolleshunt Knights and accordingly agree that a policy of development to these northern sites is suitable.	Comment noted	No
69	TR	6	Agree	Best location for development	Comment noted	No
106	TR	4	Agree	While we would prefer no not have any more development, putting it on the side of Tiptree with best access to the A12 and mainline railway stations is the best approach to not add commuter and other traffic to that in Tiptree village center. The need for the developments to address employment and infrastructure such as health and education is very much needed.	Comment noted	No
104	TR	7	Mostly Agree	It seems sensible to allow some expansion of housing to the North of Tiptree to meet the needs of the village. There appears to be less impact on existing housing and roads in the area unlike the Barbrook Lane development. My only concerns are the impacts during the construction of homes on the Highland Nursery site on the B1023 (which is a key road into the village) and Perrywood Nurseries (which is a key attraction for the village). Similarly during the construction of homes on the Elms Farm site the impact on Oak Road (which is narrow in places) and Colchester Road (another key road) should be taken into account. Construction traffic travelling down Barbrook Lane has been totally unacceptable in my mind. So my concerns relate to how housing construction on the the sites is managed rather than selection of the sites themselves.	Planning consent will agree conditions for construction when planning permission is granted.	No
105	TR	6	Disagree	The 2 development sites at Elm Farm and Highland Nursery have not been selected based on valid evidence. There has been no evidence produced to explain why the other sites considered were not viable.	The evidence is clearly laid out in the Housing Topic Paper and the SEA – both are published alongside this NP. The Vision and Objectives derived from public consultation have been an important part of this process.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP01?	TIP01 - Tiptree Spatial Policy - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section C1		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Housing provision must include local people at affordable prices.	Comment noted. See Policy TIP01 D.a {C.i}, TIP05 and paragraph 13.2	No
223	TR	4	Agree	Housing needs to be affordable for local people, not for those moving from cities!!		
				Sub-section C3		
17	TR	3	Agree	C.3. It is clearly necessary to include extra community facilities within a development of the proposed size.	Comment noted	No
56	TR	6	Agree	It is most important that item 3 is pursued to ensure infrastructure is in place	Comment noted	No
32	TR	3	Agree	Colchester Borough Council needs to ensure that key infrastructure is delivered before or in tandem with housing, and not afterwards	This is not usually possible as the sale of new homes pays for the necessary infrastructure. Planning permission sets a schedule for when gains are realised and depend on the number of dwellings sold. A new Health Centre is also dependent on third parties taking up the offer of land.	No
108	TR	5	Mostly Agree	but think they should stipulate that community hub eg medical centre and car park should be built first, as these companies seem to run out of money		
111	TR	6	Agree	Providing the A12 junction goes ahead in time for the developments and that there is adequate footpath infrastructure.	The A12 widening project is independent from the CBC local plan. CBC has targets for delivery of housing.	No
38	TR	1	Disagree	Roads and medical centre already stretched and traffic calming is needed in other areas such as oak road	Comment noted	No
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of infrastructure	The plan-led approach allows many infrastructure needs to be met and ensures that future development is sustainable. The alternative is a 'free for all' and speculative development which provides very little community infrastructure and often results in more problems than it solves. See Policy TIP01 D {C}.	No
51	TR	2	Agree	Appreciate houses are needed but very concerned with the infrastructure problems. How is the volume of extra people going to be managed with regard to health and traffic.	Comment noted. See previous responses.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP01?	TIP01 - Tiptree Spatial Policy - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
60	TR	2	Agree	Accepting that even more housing must be provided, it is important that the environmental requirements from development are adhered to. Further problems associated with flooding and drainage, including sewerage must not be impacted.	Environmental policies, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are included in the plan. Utility providers have a legal duty to provide for new development.	No
64	TR	7	Disagree	Extra amount of traffic coming out onto Kelvedon Inworth Road no pavements for walkers no cycle lane.	Improvements to the pavements in Kelvedon Road is included in the plan. See Policy TIP15.h {TIP13.g}.	No
94	TR	7	Disagree	I am worried that the infrastructure will not be able cope with the extra demand placed on it.	Comment noted. See previous responses.	No
147	TR	2	Disagree	Same song, different tune. Everytime something like this comes up, we're promised new doctor, new dental, improved roads, improved infrastructure and NOTHING happens. Over and over and over.....	The NP will become a legally binding part of the Colchester Local Plan – guiding development in Tiptree. When planning permission is granted the NP conditions will be built into that permission. Tiptree has not benefitted from an NP before. Land is set aside for a Health Centre and there are financial contributions, however it is necessary for the NHS, CCG and the Practice partners to participate.	No
223	TR	4	Agree	I agree with the policy, however one would have to query whether the developers are going to adhere to these carefully crafted points?		
119	TR	1	Mostly Agree	Agree providing that the advertised benefits including medical centre, community hub and link road are actually built.		
119	TR	1	Mostly Agree	Agree providing that the advertised benefits are actually built. If not then this is just massing development in one small area of the village with no benefits.	Comment noted. See previous responses.	No
182	TR	1	Disagree	The roads are disgraceful, the doctors facing longer waits than ever and a dentist I have never been able to use even though I have lived here for 34 years.	Comment noted. See previous responses.	No
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	New infrastructure must be a reality not just lip-service. Before new link roads are made, the current roads in Tiptree need repairing, there are some huge potholes!	Comment noted. Development will contribute to new facilities, council tax covers routine maintenance.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP01?	TIP01 - Tiptree Spatial Policy - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
71	TR	6	Agree	Grange Road and the Kelvedon Road are both accessed from A12 over narrow bridges and the roads themselves are very narrow in places, particularly Grange Road, especially in the area of the recently development. Difficult for trucks to pass one another. And no kerb. Also getting out of Grange Road onto the Braxted Park Road, is very difficult due to lack of vision, perhaps consider a roundabout?	Comment noted. Tiptree PC will continue to lobby Essex Highways and National Highways but these issues do not fall within the remit of a NP.	No
116	TR	2	Agree	I have concerns about directing more traffic down the Braxted Wall which is already congested in the mornings particularly over the bridge which only allows traffic in one direction at a time.	Paragraph 7.8 is about maintaining the status quo and is worded thus. <i>Table 13.1 the third {second} item under Traffic & Transport is amended to match 7.8: Seek to ensure mitigation measures are in place to encourage southbound traffic to continue to use Station Road and Braxted Park Road rather than Church Road to access the A12. (New text in bold)</i>	Yes
				Sub-section C4		
103	TR	4	Agree	C4 is of real importance to keep Tiptree character	Comment noted	No
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Landscaping should be kept to a minimum. Tiptree is a semi-rural community, not a town.	Comment noted. See Policy TIP01 D.d {C.iv}	No
				Sub-section D		
93	TR	6	Mostly Agree	I'm concerned that all of the future development will be in my part of the village. This has introduced a need for a link road which I think could lead to Vine Road becoming a "rat race" which in turn could lead to traffic calming measures being needed. I think that some of the development could have been on the Tiptree Heath side which would still have access to the A12 via Braxted Road therefore stopping the need for a link road.	The Link Road will facilitate access to Colchester and Inworth Roads from the new developments without exacerbating traffic at pressure points such as Windmill Green roundabout. It will have little effect on existing traffic. The link road is forward planning to distribute current and future traffic to avoid traffic congestion on routes to key destinations. The development is an opportunity to create an additional route to the long term benefit of Tiptree as a whole. The sites were chosen to protect Church Road. North bound	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP01?	TIP01 - Tiptree Spatial Policy - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
					traffic will not use Braxted Park Road – even from Tiptree Heath.	
109	TR	6	Mostly Agree	The link road needs to intersect the B1023 Kelvedon Road closer to Oak Road and to continue through/past the Tower Business Park to link up with Grange Road towards Braxted to relieve the traffic that has been generated by the football ground and housing developments in Grange Road and Vine Road. The two indicated sections of road should also link up and not stop at the Parish Boundary. The design of the road should include noise reduction measures such as surface treatment, earth banks and trees.	<p>The link road has been positioned to keep most new Tiptree housing inside it to avoid repeating the Maldon Road syndrome of cutting off even more people from the interior of Tiptree. The link road can only be accommodated on the land made available. There is provision to connect the two portions of the northern link in a future planning period. The Tower End site was intended to continue the link to Grange Road.</p> <p>Re noise reduction, houses are expected to be set-back (see Policy TIP07F). It is a single carriageway in each direction and is not expected to require measures over and above the buffer zones stated.</p>	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP02?	TIP02 - Good Quality Design - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
12	TR	7	Agree	Really important policy addressing the environmental needs as well as the human ones.	Comment noted	No
17	TR	3	Agree	A. It is vital that good quality design is made a pre-requisite in any new development.	Comment noted	No
46	TR	6	Agree	This is important as in the past development has not taken these points into consideration, particularly the houses being built in Grange Road. The development is an eyesore. It is taking far too long.	Comment noted	No
71	TR	6	Agree	Safeguard to Ensure green areas stay green areas.	Comment noted	No
74	TR	4	Agree	Good quality design for any new housing development is vitally important so that it blends in well with the surrounding area and should adhere to the proposals as set out in A above.	Comment noted	No
106	TR	4	Agree	Ensuring good design and access is vital, vs cramming as many cloned houses onto the land as is possible.	Comment noted	No
208	TR	7	Agree	Good quality design, green space, off-road parking and safe access for all street users is essential.	Comment noted	No
23	TR	7	Agree	Seems a lot to ask, but great if it can be achieved	An adopted NP makes achievability much more likely.	No
64	TR	7	Mostly Agree	If all ideas can be included ie pavements cycle routes flora and fauna and every new property has off road parking.		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Important for developers to take onboard. Tiptree is a semi-rural community - we don't want it spoilt.		
182	TR	1	Disagree	Just look at the stage of the Grove Road Estate now - not enough parking or green space. Cars parked on the pavements, etc - try driving through there on a weekend - be the same on every other estate now. Houses crammed in just to make more money for the developers.	Tiptree has suffered from the lack of a NP in the past.	No
134	TR	1	Mostly Agree	1)I agree with the thought process but compliance after initial building needs to be considered (eg removal of hedges after transfer of building to new home owners).	The NP cannot control all outcomes but it can ensure good design as befits the village character.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP02?	TIP02 - Good Quality Design - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Sustainable development includes creating beautiful spaces in which to live and this policy is designed to ensure that development is in keeping with the village feel. (N.B. This comment is repeated against most policies by this resident).	No
				Sub-section A1		
110	TR	4	Agree	A1 I feel strongly that the character of the village needs to be protected.	Comment noted	No
119	TR	1	Agree	The plan should definitely aim for a mix of styles and have a good amount of garden space to prevent a massive estate building up.	Comment noted	No
202	TR	6	Agree	It is hoped there is a way to prevent any front gardens to be paved in order to help prevent surface water being able to soak away slowly.	There are regulations about paving and porosity.	No
77	TR	7	Disagree	I disagree with A.1 above. One only has to look at the appalling new housing developments that have been recently built locally such as Stanway and now in Tiptree off Barbrook Lane. A policy like this will not allow modern architects to design housing reflecting the technical advances and the modern century we live in.	Taken together with other NP policies (e.g. TIP04), the NP seeks to ensure good quality design and avoid some of the mistakes of the past.	No
				Sub-section A3		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Good idea all the new planting, but why not keep the mature trees we've already got? Trees take years to become mature and effect screens. Ensure they're not cut down before building begins.	Policy TIP02 A.c {A.iii} affords protection to mature trees and hedgerows.	No
223	TR	4	Agree	I do however question developers retaining mature trees and hedgerows. It is a known fact that they remove these prior to applying for planning permission! Perhaps a survey should be done at the two area prior - to show which trees / hedge are where and		

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP02?	TIP02 - Good Quality Design - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A6		
97	TR	7	Agree	I assume a leafy lane means "lane mainly bounded by hedges and trees" and should be defined as such.	A new paragraph 11.3 brings clarity.	Yes
125	TR	7	Agree	A.vi - 'Leafy lanes' could be open to interpretation, the term is also mentioned in 11.2 where examples should be given: such as Park Lane, Pennsylvania Lane and the single track section of Grove Road.		
				Sub-section A7		
84	TR	1	Disagree	There are bats, rabbits, deer and many varieties of birds on the Elms farm site they should not be disturbed	Planning permission will set conditions to evaluate and protect.	No
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Developers are notorious for ignoring biodiversity.	Planning permission requires developers to provide a biodiversity net gain.	No
				Sub-section A10		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	We need to be very careful to putting too much reliance on electricity for cars!	This is government policy	No
				Sub-section C		
104	TR	7	Mostly Agree	My only concerns relate to (C) on street parking. I believe this should be minimised to encourage the use of public transport, cycling, and reducing traffic in the village by encouraging house owners to have fewer cars. All homes built should have adequate off street parking for two cars. In walks around the village e.g. through Kiltie Road you have numerous cars blocking the pavements because there are too many cars, insufficient off road parking, and the roads are too narrow. The result is pedestrians, wheelchairs, and prams have to go into the road or squeeze past parked cars. This shouldn't be allowed to happen on the new housing sites.	Residential parking is fully dealt with by Policy TIP03. This Policy simply requires space to ensure a well-managed streetscape. The reference to street parking has been removed from TIP02 C as this policy deals with on-site storage and parking rather than off-site.	Yes
105	TR	6	Mostly Agree	On street parking should be minimised as this causes traffic flow issues, as seen on the recent local new developments		

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP02?	TIP02 - Good Quality Design - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
125	TR	7	Agree	C. could imply on-street parking is encouraged, it should be made clear so as not to conflict with TIP03 C that it is encouraged in lay-bys.	As the response above.	
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	On street parking bad idea as new roads seem to be a lot narrower. As personally experienced in Colchester when visiting relatives.		
196	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Do not agree with on street parking.		
				Sub-section Other		
2	TR	7	Agree	I would add that any developer offering to incorporate public amenities in their plan, should be constrained by law to do so, rather than be allowed to wriggle out of that element of the plan after the properties (homes) have been built	Comment noted	No
134	TR	1	Mostly Agree	2)I would specify specific areas between existing dwellings and any new sites (buffers). i.e. define the buffer areas so not open to interpretation when subsequent planning requests go in.	Add to TIP15 and TIP16 {TIP13 & TIP14}: 'The provision of a green buffer between the existing houses and the new development.'	Yes

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP03?	TIP03 - Tiptree Residential Car Parking - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
12	TR	7	Agree	There is currently too much on street parking.	Comment noted	No
13	TR	5	Agree	The provision of adequate off and/or on street parking is an essential requirement for new housing development.	Comment noted	No
60	TR	2	Agree	It is important to learn from poor design layouts and parking provision such as found throughout the Grove Road development which has totally inadequate parking for vehicles, due both to lack of thought about growth of vehicle numbers, but more importantly badly designed garages (too small) and the poorly laid out and unused parking drives. This all makes for antisocial on road parking causing traffic flow problems and also service and emergency vehicle access.	Comment noted	No
110	TR	4	Agree	Strongly agree with all A B and C	Comment noted	No
128	TR	7	Agree	side roads are a nightmare with parked cars	Comment noted	No
211	TR	4	Agree	Driving through Wilkin's estate demonstrates how difficult it can be with cars parked either side of narrow roads.	Comment noted	No
21	TR	2	Mostly Agree	To put this in place the style of houses need to be designed to deliver this so parking land should be adequate to take at least two cars per family.	Parking provision is determined by the Essex County Council <i>Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice</i> (2009).	No
72	TR	7	Agree	The estate on wilkin drive is a perfect example of bad parking infrastructure. Not enough spaces per household. Too many cars parked on the roads(usually on the pavements)	However the NP also requires a well-managed streetscape to avoid the mistakes of the past.	
88	TR	2	Mostly Agree	Need to specify how many parking spaces should be provided for each size of house.	Off-street parking provision is set by the Essex County Council <i>Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice</i> (2009)	No
103	TR	4	Agree	Off street parking for more than 1 vehicle per household would be a high priority so as to keep the village from becoming 1 big car park.		

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP03?	TIP03 - Tiptree Residential Car Parking - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
106	TR	4	Agree	The more recent developments in the centre of Tiptree show the issues if insufficient parking is provided (problems with emergency vehicles and waste collection vehicles being able to get down the roads). It is particularly to allow for more than 1 car parking space for multi-bedroom houses.	As the response above.	
125	TR	7	Agree	6.7 The Essex Parking Standards are given for the whole county, but give provision for more car parking where needed. The standard should be recognised as a minimum for Tiptree as a rural area with a declining bus service. This might also apply to the policy para A.		
182	TR	1	Disagree	See previous comment about cars - most families now have 3 + cars or vans.		
202	TR	6	Agree	It must allow sufficient parking so as to avoid the situation that arises on the Grove Road development when emergency vehicles could have difficulty reaching their destination.		
214	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Most houses have 2 cars - this must be taken into consideration		
13	TR	5	Agree	... Designs must ensure that on-street parking is not allowed to encroach onto public footpaths in order to provide a suitable environment for pedestrians and to minimise the potential for damage and ongoing repairs.	The NP requires a well-managed street scape including on-street parking in laybys and the adoption of 'Building for a Healthy Life' standards to avoid poorly designed streetscapes.	No
104	TR	7	Mostly Agree	... and don't allow parking on the pavements (use yellow lines or bollards).		
119	TR	1	Mostly Agree	Parking allocation in previous new developments has been woefully inadequate leading to on pavement parking preventing wheelchairs and buggies getting past safely. This must be enforced. The majority of residents rely on cars due to the very hit and miss nature of public transport in the area.		
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	It will be provided but will residents use it. As most are too lazy to use them properly, just look at some of Colchester.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP03?	TIP03 - Tiptree Residential Car Parking - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section B		
110	TR	4	Agree	Strongly agree with all A B and C	Comment noted	No
27	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Parking of larger commercial vehicles, e.g. Luton vans, lorries, etc. should be disabled or have width or physical barriers to discourage from parking in residential areas.	Comment noted	No
93	TR	6	Disagree	As many households have 2 cars developers should be encouraged to include garages as this would enable the parking of 2 cars, 1 in the garage and 1 on the drive. Without this developers would only provide parking for 1 car.	Houses with 2 or more bedrooms would have off-street parking for at least two cars. This may or may not include a garage however garages are often used for storage rather than parking.	No
29	TR	4	Disagree	Garages, whilst seldom used for cars nowadays, are an important storage and amenity feature for modern houses.	Comments noted. The NP does not ban garages so long as parking provision is met. TIP02 C specifies sufficient external amenity space.	No
109	TR	6	Disagree	Lack of garages reduces security and conflicts with secure design as required in TIP02.		
208	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Whilst garages are rarely used for cars, if well designed, they can prove visually better than sheds or other storage provision.		
212	TR	1	Agree	I put my car in my garage every night. I am disappointed that there is no provision for garages. Cars are valuable and by putting them away at night avoids vandalism to cars. There is a lot of vandalism to cars parked outside in our road.		
211	TR	4	Agree	People rarely use garages for cars these days.	Comment noted	No
37	TB	0	Disagree	'Parking courts', or shared parking areas do not solve street parking, are a nuisance to use in terms of parking and leaving as well as then navigating to the dwelling. In addition they are not suitable for electric vehicle charging as it requires charge points to be in the parking court itself, which will require permission from the estate management company which will be both expensive and time consuming to obtain. Parking alongside the dwelling should be encouraged at all times.	New developments are required to include electric car charging points. This can be provided in parking courts. The law now requires all new dwellings to be provided with charging points.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP03?	TIP03 - Tiptree Residential Car Parking - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section C		
110	TR	4	Agree	Strongly agree with all A B and C	Comment noted	No
21	TR	2	Mostly Agree	Lay-bys are a cheap answer but need to make sure the roads are wide enough and not made into single through lanes.	Road dimensions are determined by the Essex Design Guide however paragraph 6.8 specifies that street parking should be in laybys with sufficient remaining road width for two cars to pass.	No
104	TR	7	Mostly Agree	A great policy buy why only 'encourage' the use of lay-bys, make it mandatory and ...	Comment noted	No
				Sub-section Other		
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted	No
46	TR	6	Mostly Agree	I agree that where garages are not able to be included, other areas of parking should be allocated nearby, with the provision of being able to stop and unload near the premises.	Comment noted	No
56	TR	6	Agree	surface water drainage should be considered for all "front garden" parking spaces	There are current regulations regarding porosity of surfaces.	No
109	TR	6	Disagree	All of street parking should have provision for EV charging.	Covered in TIPO2 A.j {A.x}	No
114	TR	4	Agree	People with existing driveways to asked to park their cars on their driveways and not on road or footpath	Comment noted	No
116	TR	2	Agree	Should avoid lots of roundabouts as on Grove Road Estate as people end up parking on them.	Comment noted	No
210	TR	6	Agree	Provision of parking may need to over-ride any need for garden space especially for houses at the lower-end of the price-range.	Comment noted	No
222	TR	2	Agree	To make all new housing estates to ban road parking, as Wilkin Drive areas are unacceptable.	The NP seeks to create well-managed streetscapes	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP04?	TIP04 - Building for a Healthy Life - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
103	TR	4	Agree	Greenery and open spaces a must for healthy living and should be encouraged	Comment noted	No
194	TR	6	Agree	Need to fit the needs of more local people, the young especially.	Comment noted	No
64	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Builders will build what ever they want and poss disregard policies	The NP will ensure a better quality of build than might otherwise be the case.	No
13	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Encouragement is not sufficient to ensure that major residential developments meet the Healthy Life standards. We should be holding developers to a higher standard by making this a mandatory requirement (where it is possible to do so).	There are some things the NP can require and other things that are subject to negotiation at the time of a planning application. However, the inclusion of these issues in the NP ensures they are 'on the table' for discussion and many of the desires expressed in the NP will be met.	No
128	TR	7	Agree	Not only demonstrate but be made to keep to the agreed plan.		
147	TR	2	Disagree	They'll promise and nothing will be done.....		
182	TR	1	Disagree	Another joke - developers say anything to get their plans passed.		
211	TR	4	Agree	But standards must be adhered to by developers in all cases.		
223	TR	4	Agree	I think caution must be taken with this as often is the case; that the developers will say they will implement and follow protocol, when in fact they don't.		
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted	No
6	TR	5	Agree	Shoild all new housing have solar panels	This is subject to national building standards. The NP cannot enforce this.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP05?	TIP05 - First Homes - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
119	TR	1	Agree	Very important for our area	Comment noted	No
208	TR	7	Agree	First houses, especially for young local people working in the area, are essential to prevent the local population becoming exclusively the older generation.	Comment noted	No
32	TR	3	Agree	Will it be a requirement that the affordable housing must be allocated to people with a Tiptree connection first? (see you've covered this in 13.2)	Affordable homes include rented, shared ownership and 'First Homes'. There is limited provision to prioritise applicants with a local connection. Section 13.2 of the NP explains what such applicants should do. This has been clarified in paragraphs 6.15 and Table 13.1	Yes
49	TR	2	Agree	Affordable housing for residents those living in Tiptree should be given priority		
58	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Would be better to make it possible to local people to stay local for the number of affordable homes to be increased.		
103	TR	4	Agree	Affordable homes should be for local residents children/ families and not sold off to london borough		
110	TR	4	Mostly Agree	For local young people with families in the village.		
128	TR	7	Agree	Allowing local people a chance would be a great option.		
208	TR	7	Agree	Priority should be given to the children of Tiptree residents.		
223	TR	4	Mostly Agree	For locals - who actually grew up and work in the area.		
14	TR	7	Agree	I feel that it is essential that the proportion of affordable homes and the First Homes are adhered to, and that any 'backsliding' or resubmission of planning permission intending to reduce the proportion of both is strongly resisted.	Comment noted	No
15	TR	7	Agree	It is important that the part of the policy referring to First Homes is adhered to.	Comment noted	No
13	TR	5	Agree	Whilst I agree that affordable homes are needed and laud the attempt to designate them as first homes. It is unclear how the discount can be sustained after the first sale.	There are conditions attached	No
56	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Must get the balance of "affordable" to "market value" right	There is a formula.	No
64	TR	7	Agree	Housing for young families and single persons should be within income brackets ie upto £100000	Income is a criterion used in assessing the <i>First Homes</i> discount.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP05?	TIP05 - First Homes - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
204	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Some 1 or 2 bedroom for single pensioners need.	Paragraph 6.11 - 38% of all units to be 1- and 2-bedrooms in CBC policy	No
108	TR	5	Mostly Agree	and only sell to those that already live in the Tiptree post code	This is not feasible, not least because the Housing Needs survey reveals a limited demand from existing residents. Local residents looking for affordable housing should apply to the Colchester Borough Council as outlined in paragraph 13.2	No
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted	No
111	TR	6	Agree	25% is minimum required as Tiptree sadly lacks the number of affordable homes needed.	Can't mandate more than CBC policy	No
95	TR	6	Disagree	% should be higher for affordable homes		
114	TR	4	Mostly Agree	At least 30% of affordable units should be supplied.		
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Percentage wise not enough at least 30% to 40% preferable.		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	But think the 25% should be increased to nearer 50%. Local people need to be able to afford homes at realistic prices in their home village. Therefore better to have more smaller affordable homes than more large detached homes.		
223	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Should be more than 25% affordable for locals	Affordable homes include rented, shared ownership and 'First Homes'. This has been clarified in paragraphs 6.15 and Table 13.1	Yes
13	TR	5	Agree	I think it would be better to ensure these homes remain as social housing stock in the long term by requiring them to be handed over to Colchester Borough Council and/or a housing association to be rented rather than bought.		
212	TR	1	Disagree	We don't need affordable houses. What we really need in Tiptree is more COUNCIL HOUSES to rent!		
125	TR	7	Agree	6.15 Does DM8 specify the need for housing association / council housing which has been identified in Tiptree by the Housing Needs Survey? Will it ensure that Tiptree will get an increase in this kind of housing for local people?	The Housing Needs survey identified a limited need for affordable housing by local residents. These residents should apply to CBC as indicated in paragraph 13.2 This has been clarified in paragraphs 6.15 and Table 13.1	Yes

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree
 Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP05?	TIP05 - First Homes - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
134	TR	1	Mostly Agree	When building affordable houses need to consider materials built from. It is cheaper to build with materials which require more maintenance in the future (typically those in affordable housing cannot always afford). eg render needs painting regularly but brick finish does not. Suggest widening to consider such items.	All housing should be built to the required standards.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP06?	TIP06 - CYCLING, WALKING AND DISABILITY ACCESS ROUTES – comments (renamed - Non-Motorised User Access Routes)	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
44	TO	7	Agree	Safe pedestrian/ cycling routes very important to discourage car usage and thus improve the environment for all.	Comment noted	No
57	TR	7	Agree	A family member in a wheelchair makes this aspect very important - walkways flat and wide enough to accommodate disabled people.	Comment noted	No
202	TR	6	Agree	As the number of elderly people within the village increase a suitable route for those using a mobility scooter is important.	Comment noted	No
208	TR	7	Agree	Pedestrian access essential, especially with regard to CO2 emissions and climate change.	Comment noted	No
27	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Parking or otherwise obstructing such routes should be discouraged with suitable bollards or appropriate no parking signage.	Comment noted	No
81	NO	0	Agree	All such cycling and pedestrian routes should be put in place before any major development takes place.	This is rarely possible. New paths and cycleways are constructed as an estate is built out.	No
				Sub-section B		
12	TR	7	Agree	There are many areas of Tiptree where paths for walking do not exist or do not connect up appropriately.	Comment noted	No
119	TR	1	Agree	This is essential especially as the new development area is building on farmland towards messing where many villagers use these routes for recreation and exercise.	Comment noted	No
59	NR	0	Agree	I would like to see the re-establishment of footpath access from the Nine Acres housing development (or the associated allotment area) into Birch Wood. The footpath linkage all the way from Factory Hill to Layer Marney would, in this way, be created/reinstated.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP06?	TIP06 - CYCLING, WALKING AND DISABILITY ACCESS ROUTES – comments (renamed - Non-Motorised User Access Routes)	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section E		
17	TR	3	Agree	E. Is there scope within the plan to improve existing pedestrian routes: for example extending the footpath from the village centre, passing the Highlands Nursery site, and continuing right up to Perrywood Garden Centre? See this has been addressed in TIP13.	In areas where there is development there is scope to improve pedestrian routes, as in the example given here.	No
				Sub-section Other		
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan’s objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted	No
57	TR	7	Agree	Church road is very busy and crossing from Mill Close to the available pavement on the opposite side of the road can be very tricky.	Comment noted	No
116	TR	2	Agree	Need to ensure adequate street lighting so people feel safe walking after dark. Unlike street lighting recently put in place in Heaton Way!	This is beyond the scope of the NP. ECC policies cover this.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP07?	TIP07 - Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic through Tiptree Village - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
60	TR	2	Agree	Keep heavy traffic off Church Road!!	Comment noted	No
103	TR	4	Agree	Some roads in the village should have weight restrictions and access only weight restrictions so larger HGV vehicles are encouraged to stay on the A12 and not use Tiptree as a quicker route when A12 is slow, the roads are being torn up by these super heavy HGVs	Comment noted	No
85	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Due to extra traffic passing through Church Road to the Village the road surface needs to be improved, perhaps a mini-bout at Asda entrance, speed checks and a pedestrian crossing near the duck pond/ Asda!,	These concerns have already been expressed to ECC, they are not in the remit of the NP unless associated with development sites.	No
125	TR	7	Agree	Para A neither Colchester Road nor Kelvedon Road are in the centre of Tiptree, the policy should either only mention the B1022 and B1023 or list all the road names along the B roads within the settlement boundary.	Clause A amended to read 'Colchester/Maldon Road (B1022) and Kelvedon/Church Road (B1023).	Yes
172	TR	4	Disagree	Does not address the issue with increased traffic passing through village.	The NP seeks to minimise any increase in traffic passing through the village centre in accordance with Objective 3. Policy TIP07 is part of this strategy. See also Table 13.1.	No
114	TR	4	Agree	Part A - Need a proper roundabout at the junction of Kelvedon Road/Colchester Road/Maldon Road/Church Road.	This is in the remit of ECC, they would probably say that it is a proper roundabout and that the staggered junction makes other solutions less cost effective.	No
114	TR	4	Agree	Also something needs to be done about the junction of Church Road/Station Road/Factory Hill/Chapel Road to ease conjection at peak times.	This is an ongoing issue between TPC and ECC	No
				Sub-section C		
27	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Access routes to the new developments should not be directly or almost opposite other junctions to avoid avoidable congestion.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP07?	TIP07 - Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic through Tiptree Village - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section D		
17	TR	3	Agree	D. The consequence of failing to join the 2 sections of link road together would be disastrous.	It is intended that the link road will be completed in a future planning round. This NP takes certain decisions that, if not taken now, will not be possible in the future. Clarification has been made in 7.12.	Yes
109	TR	6	Mostly Agree	The two indicated sections of road should also link up and not stop at the Parish Boundary.		
210	TR	6	Mostly Agree	It isn't clear how the link road will link the Highland Nursery and Elm's Farm sites.		
119	TR	1	Agree	The link road must happen as part of this development, otherwise the traffic will just increase with no mitigation whatsoever. ...		
81	NO	0	Agree	New infrastructure should be in place before major building starts to avoid more difficulties in an already overstretched system.	This is unlikely as it is the sale of the houses that pays for the road.	No
119	TR	1	Agree	The link road For me to fully support this plan, it would need to be a condition of the permission that the link road was built and opened before the completion of any development.		
84	TR	1	Disagree	This will mean much more traffic in Oak Rd which is too busy as it is New residents on the Elms Farm site will have to drive through Oak Rd to access Kelvedon Rd again far too busy. This will cause congestion at Inworth Rd with traffic trying to access the A12	The new residents will have a choice. In the first instance they will join Colchester Road where they could travel to Colchester or proceed to Maypole Road to reach Kelvedon Road. This might be a better option than using the tricky junction to Oak Road and will avoid having to turn right out of Oak Road without the assistance of a roundabout. The long term plan is that the link road will be used.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP07?	TIP07 - Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic through Tiptree Village - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
134	TR	1	Disagree	Disagree with Item D Please see earlier comments on link road. This has been proposed to Colchester Borough Council by the Tiptree Neighbourhood COMmittee after the first one was rejected by the Examiner but there has been no vote by Tiptree residents. i.e. by approaching CBC to change their plan is pre-supposes that this will be accepted by people of Tiptree. Query democratic process. Why has this approach been taken rather than reviewing other sites previously discounted? How do you stop Messing using such link road in future for their housing allocation?	Public consultation is at the heart of neighbourhood planning and has guided the plan-making process. The public have consistently expressed opinion on the chosen sites: 1. Open exhibition comments 2. Questionnaire 3. Vision & Objectives exhibition 4. Reg 14 (2019) 5. Reg 16 (2020) 6. Reg 14 (2022) The SHLAA process does not favour sites remote from the settlement boundary in question.	No
207	TR	1	Disagree	Not suitable link road option as will put pressure on other roads and houses.	Any building in Tiptree will put pressure on existing roads and houses. The link road was chosen for the best long term outcome for Tiptree.	No
				Sub-section E		
211	TR	4	Agree	Will there be a bus route in reality?	Probably not in the conventional style of bus transport, but it is specified to indicate the standard of road. New forms of bus transport may well arise. Table 13.1 includes improvement of transport to railway stations. The possibility of a community bus for Tiptree should be explored and has been added to Table 13.1.	Yes
				Sub-section F		
109	TR	6	Mostly Agree	The design of the orad should include noise reduction measures such as surface treatment, earth banks and trees.	Comment noted. Please see the response to this point made under TIP01 D.	No
				Sub-section Other		
5	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Traffic management is required, what approaches have been considered?	This is in the remit of ECC, but various approaches have been made to them under the auspices of TPC. Roundabouts, traffic lights, alternative flows, zebra crossings, traffic calming such as rumble strips, traffic speed cushions could all be implemented with the agreement of ECC.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP07?	TIP07 - Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic through Tiptree Village - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
106	TR	4	Agree	Ensuring that new development is on the side of Tiptree with best access to the A12 and mainline railway stations is the best approach to not add commuter and other traffic to that in Tiptree village center.	Comment noted	No
4	TR	4	Mostly Agree	If there are to be increased traffic flows, especially using Station Road, what measures will be put in place to ensure speed limits are kept to?	Paragraph 7.8 is about maintaining the status quo and is worded thus. The third {second} item under Traffic and Transport in table 13.1 has been edited to make this clearer.	Yes
12	TR	7	Agree	Anything to reduce the flow of traffic, particularly heavy vehicles, must be supported.	Comment noted	No
23	TR	7	Agree	How much will all this cost?	It will be funded from developer contributions	No
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted	No
93	TR	6	Mostly Agree	I'm concerned that all of the future development will be in my part of the village. This has introduced a need for a link road which I think could lead to Vine Road becoming a "rat race" which in turn could lead to traffic calming measures being needed. I think that some of the development could have been on the Tiptree Heath side which would still have access to the A12 via Braxted Road therefore stopping the need for a link road.	The link road is forward planning to distribute current and future traffic to avoid traffic congestion on key routes. It is not expected to have any impact on Vine Road traffic. The development is an opportunity to create an additional route to the long term benefit of Tiptree as a whole.	No
182	TR	1	Disagree	its never happened up to now, so why would that change. Huge developments on Grange Road - not a very safe road already, especially in the winter, so hasn't happened there.	In the past Tiptree has not benefited from a NP to guide development.	No
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	But Grange Road used as a secondary route not suitable, not wide enough and no footpaths for pedestrians at Pennsylvania Lane. Plus gets too busy already and not really suitable for large HGV lorries.	The Tiptree Road / Grange Road route is signposted as a route to Tiptree from Braxted Park Road and is already in use by HGVs. The principles of this plan will be used to engage with ECC to request improvements which will be considered in the light of contemporary traffic flows.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP07?	TIP07 - Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic through Tiptree Village - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
214	TR	5	Agree	What does "Resulting from future development in the Grange Road area mean (P31 7.13)? More infill = more traffic in this area??	There are ongoing developments along Grange Road. This route is already used for traffic between Tiptree and the southbound A12 and there is a long term aim to improve the route.	No
98	NB	0	Disagree	Provision needs to be made for a western access to the Elms Farm allocation off Oak Road by incorporating land to the west within the allocation. See separate representations.	Oak Road must be protected from increased traffic. Any land outside the allocation would need to be connected to the allocated sites and to the outside world via the link road. A new paragraph 12.16 provides for access via the allocated sites.	Yes
111	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Better public transport links needed to reduce traffic.	This is in the remit of ECC. TPC continues to make representations for better public transport.	No
125	TR	7	Agree	There is recent evidence to support the idea of considerable through traffic in 7.5 and support the conclusion of 7.8. Lengthy road closures by Anglian Water firstly in Station Road increased traffic to unacceptable levels in Church Road and Maldon Road causing congestion at junctions along their routes. The following closure of Factory Hill removed the vast majority of traffic from Church Road, which indicates that through traffic is the main component since very little traffic of Tiptree origin wishing to access the shopping centre was forced to divert. This should be recognised in the plan or evidence base.	TPC is aware of this issue and is working to ensure that the Braxted Park Road route remains the preferred route for A12 southbound traffic. 7.5 has been modified to reflect this.	Yes
130	TR	6	Mostly Agree	We need to ensure that when the works are happening that there are proper and well signposted diversion routes on main roads (these have not been historically very good).	In the remit of ECC	No
133	TR	1	Mostly Agree	The road in question floods severely during winter months & this is without increased traffic.	There is surface water flooding shown on Oak Road but is only severe where such flooding is associated with the built land in the vicinity. The land allocated for building does not show any surface water flooding risks close to Oak Road. Policies TIP13 & 14 specify Suds. There are regulations to avoid impervious concreting over.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP07?	TIP07 - Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic through Tiptree Village - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
223	TR	4	Disagree	I do not think this can or will be achieved - the infrastructure and volume are not comparable. If anything, it will continue to worsen.	Comment noted	No
214	TR	5	Agree	Only benefits new developments. We need junction improvements now for existing routes, e.g. junctions: Braxted Road / Maldon Road (as accidents every week!) and Station Road / Church Road / Chapel Road junction - roundabout or lights.	Braxted Park Road is in the remit of ECC and representations have been made by TPC. Factory Corner junction is an ongoing dialogue between TPC and ECC.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP08?	TIP08 - Tiptree Village Centre - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
15	TR	7	Agree	There are far too many fast food outlets in the village and existing businesses e.g. hairdressers must be protected. Some have been in existence for over fifty years.	Whilst appreciating your concerns, individual commercial decisions are out of the remit of the NP or TPC. Planning permission is only required with a significant change of use to/from retail. Church Road is designated as retail.	No
58	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Policy A; Would be beneficial to all if there could be a greater variety of business/shops rather than so many hairdressers and beauty parlours and charity shops.		
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Not enough diversity in retail		
206	TR	7	Agree	A variety of shops needed in town centre. There are more than enough hairdressers / barbers in fact another hairdressers is about to open. Where are the clothes / shoe shops?? Also another Estate Agent and Solicitor opened, we don't need anymore.		
23	TR	7	Agree	A Not sure how the range of retail units etc can be protected and enhanced/		
49	TR	2	Agree	Local amenities are needed to help the environment from road usage	Yes we need a vibrant centre to reduce the need for travel.	No
204	TR	6	Agree	And one or two benches for elderly to sit and rest.	Two new ones have recently been added.	No
52	TR	6	Agree	We have now lost all banks in Tiptree. I've lived here 58 years, and there were three, plus building societies.	This is a national trend, alternative provision is already being investigated. To 'investigate alternative banking provision' will be added to non-policy actions, Table 13.1	Yes
64	TR	7	Mostly Agree	We will have no banks in Tiptree after July 2022.so people will have to travel. what provision is likely to be made for more frequent bus links to Maldon Witham and Colchester.for none car drivers.		
71	TR	6	Agree	Banks will have all left, can we contact another bank, such as Santander to see if they would like to open?		
103	TR	4	Agree	Banks are a priority also retail should be encouraged around the already established high street.		
111	TR	6	Mostly Agree	A: Too late for the banks		

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP08?	TIP08 - Tiptree Village Centre - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
125	TR	7	Agree	It is important to encourage new banking facilities such a banking hubs as firstly the current post office will struggle to provide for the additional custom and secondly the loss of banking facilities in Tiptree may have a knock on effect on the shops as people travel elsewhere to bank and take the opportunity to shop at the same time. The Tiptree shops were an important life-line during the covid lockdowns. Should the parish council agree to support any measures, then maybe this should be added to the Non-Policy actions.	As the response above.	
182	TR	1	Disagree	Barclays has gone, Lloyds is on its way out so im not sure that will work.		
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	We will be losing Lloyds Bank come July, the second one to go, causing people to go out of the village for the use of. Therefore will shop elsewhere to make it viable.		
204	TR	6	Agree	Bank needed!!		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	There will be no bank in Tiptree from 25/7/22. What is being done to encourage the bank to stay? It is busy every day and the community is growing.		
222	TR	2	Agree	Banks!! What banks! There are no banks left in Tiptree.		
223	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Shame the only bank is now closing - irony!		
				Sub-section D		
109	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Creating additional car parking will increase congestion. What is needed is to remove cars from the village by introducing a circular bus route that criss-crosses estates as well so that nobody has to walk more than 200 - 300 yards to a bus stop. The service should stop in car parks of all major stores and close to all shopping areas and be operated by a fleet of small, agile, EV minibuses with facilities for disabled access. The service should operate continuously. Alternatively, look at an on-demand service such as "dial-a-ride. Think outside the box, do not encourage more parking.	This project has already been identified by TPC. ECC is already trialling dial-a-ride services. Nevertheless, Tiptree no longer has any public car parks and would welcome provision if it came available. The need to investigate a community bus service has been added to Table 13.1, Non-policy Actions.	Yes

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP08?	TIP08 - Tiptree Village Centre - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
182	TR	1	Disagree	Where will the car park be located?	New car parking will only be provided if car parking is offered as part of a suitable planning application in an appropriate location.	No
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Where will the new public car park be cited?		
				Sub-section Other		
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of infrastructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted	No
54	TR	4	Agree	Some provision within the Village Centre for Police Officers would be welcome. With the increase in houses/people, a Police presence would, hopefully, avoid anti-social behaviour etc.	This is a national trend and beyond the reach of the NP. Communities much larger than Tiptree have lost their permanent police presence.	No
77	TR	7	Mostly Agree	I would personally add that 'all proposals should allow for ease of access for the disabled and those with other handicaps. They all must comply with 'the Equality act 2010' which requires all buildings to have disabled access.	The NP is supplementary to existing regulations	No
105	TR	6	Mostly Agree	B doesn't stipulate any necessity for disability access to these offices above ground floor level		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Restrict the height of buildings (retail) in Church Road to stop them looking imposing and taking away the essence of Tiptree.	Although a specific restriction cannot be imposed by the NP, buildings would need to conform to the character of the area as specified in TIP02 A.a {A.i}. In this respect TIP02 A.a has been modified to refer to all building styles rather than just houses.	Yes

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP09?	TIP09 - Small-Scale Commercial Workspaces - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
34	TR	2	Mostly Agree	There are already so many houses which have been built by independent developers and no provision has been made by anyone to encourage new businesses. At the moment, there are very few jobs available for residents, meaning that they have to travel elsewhere, increasing their carbon foot print. So new business units would be a good idea.	Comment noted	No
49	TR	2	Agree	Local business should be established and remain in Tiptree	Comment noted	No
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Keeps it on the edge of the village therefore fewer lorries hopefully.	Comment noted	No
111	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Providing the type of business allowed to operate are non polluting in there manufacturing/function.	There are appropriate conditions and regulations for small-scale workspaces	No
210	TR	6	Mostly Agree	I support allowing having office-space throughout the village. The prevalence of empty retail units suggests that these are too expensive for many potential businesses, and as there is always a shortage of parking in Tiptree, I am not clear how this can succeed.	The retail units in Tiptree have always been well occupied provided they were available to be used. Tiptree bucks the empty high street trend.	No
				Sub-section B		
56	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Should be confined to the district centre or by expansion of existing facilities on the Inworth road	There is no space at the existing facility on Inworth Road. Land has been made available nearby.	No
57	TR	7	Mostly Agree	B c) Slight concern about village centre and extra delivery vehicles for start up businesses which would impact on the amount of traffic using Church Road. However very much in favour of micro-businesses in general.	They would need to comply with TIP08	No
				Sub-section C		
223	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Needs to be appealing, not any eyesore.	See Policy TIP09 C	No
				Sub-section Other		
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree
 Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP09?	TIP09 - Small-Scale Commercial Workspaces - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
125	TR	7	Agree	9.5 is a little misleading as the beginning conflicts with the end. The first sentence should indicate that it is research of the commercial sector to contrast with the final sentence.	The last sentence of paragraph 9.5 has been revised	Yes
85	TR	7	Agree	What Banks!,	The closure of the local banks is beyond our control; however, the investigation of alternative banking provision has been added to Table 13.1	Yes

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP10?	TIP10 - Provision of Community Infrastructure - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
2	TR	7	Agreeexcept to say that the sentence "Other sites shall make financial contributes towards provision where appropriate and justified." appears to acknowledge that developments outside the village plan may be accepted. I believe that interpretation of the sentence would justify its removal from the plan.	It is unlikely but Tiptree would want a contribution if it happened. It could relate to TIP01A, a 'windfall site' or to losing a planning appeal.	No
207	TR	1	Agree	As long as they do what is said in the provision.	Comment noted	No
208	TR	7	Agree	Community infrastructure is essential to support the increased population resulting from 400 new houses.	Comment noted	No
213	TR	7	Agree	This is very necessary	Comment noted	No
				Sub-section B		
12	TR	7	Agree	Important to support the provision of space for a larger medical centre appropriate to the size of the village.	Comment noted	No
14	TR	7	Agree	We desperately need a second medical centre as the situation with the single existing one is woeful especially with the over subscription. The additional new homes which this development will bring, adding to the village population, will only further add to the issues. A top priority in my opinion.	Comment noted	No
15	TR	7	Agree	The provision of a second medical centre is essential, not only for our current situation, but even more so given the additional people which these new developments will bring to the village.	Comment noted	No
31	TR	7	Agree	The village needs a new medical center, as it is near impossible to get an appointment at the current center. I recently had to go to Colchester hospital, as despite having a chest pains and cough could not get into Tiptree Health Center. Colchester said I should use my local center, and speak to the practice manager. I realise if we had a 2nd Center we still need Drs, staff etc. But Tiptree Health Center is no longer fit for purpose.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP10?	TIP10 - Provision of Community Infrastructure - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
34	TR	2	Agree	The current Medical centre is at capacity and we certainly need to attract more doctors into the area. A difficult task countrywide.	Comment noted	No
38	TR	1	Mostly Agree	If this many houses are built then a larger staffed medical centre is extremely important	Comment noted	No
46	TR	6	Agree	If a new medical centre is built, it must have more adequate parking. As this will not be in the centre of the village, provision should be made for the elderly to access it	Comment noted	No
49	TR	2	Agree	Urgently need to provide additional Medical and Dental Services fir the increasing population in Tiotree	Comment noted	No
56	TR	6	Agree	Encourage GPs to run the new centre	Comment noted	No
63	TR	7	Agree	Tiptree definitely needs a much improved medical facilities now!	Comment noted	No
64	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Must be made available New Dr's surgery and Dentist. ...	Comment noted	No
92	TR	7	Disagree	B If the medical centre is moved out of the village centre it must have plenty of parking available for patients and staff.	Comment noted	No
116	TR	2	Agree	The village urgently needs additional medical facilities as the current one already cannot cope with the current population.	Comment noted	No
118	TR	6	Agree	Provision of a new, updated and larger medical Centre is a must for Tiptree if we are to accommodate all the required new homes.	Comment noted	No
194	TR	6	Agree	Medical Centre certainly most needed.	Comment noted	No
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	The allotment size needs increasing from 0.4 hectares.	Allotment provision is based on population growth	No
101	TR	7	Mostly Agree	B. It should be a condition of planning permission that community infrastructure must be built and available for use at the same time as housing. Occupancy of new houses should be restricted until such facilities are in place.	The sale of houses pay for the infrastructure.	No
64	TR	7	Mostly Agree	... A cinema would be handy as nearest is Colchester ,Braintree you can get there but cannot get back to Tiptree as no buses.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP10?	TIP10 - Provision of Community Infrastructure - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
17	TR	3	Mostly Agree	B. I would not like the existing Community Centre to be lost as a result. In my view it is important to have such facilities in a more central location that is most easily accessible to the majority of residents.	<p>There is no intention to dispense with the existing community centre.</p> <p>There is a clearly identified need for increased provision of health care in Tiptree and there is no room for the necessary expansion of the existing facilities. This NP seeks to support the provision of increased facilities in the future but the decisions are in the hands of the NHS, CCG and doctors who wish to work in Tiptree. Please consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 65% stated in the questionnaire they would prefer more than one surgery • The plan does not advocate moving the existing surgery however it is more economical to run one large surgery than two smaller ones. • One large Health & Well-being Hub could provide a bigger range of services. • There is currently no space to expand in the centre of Tiptree • The site proposed for a new Health & Well-being hub is located near the more frequent bus service. 	No
17	TR	3	Mostly Agree	B. I would not like the existing Medical Centre to be lost as a result. In my view it is important to have such facilities in a more central location that is most easily accessible to the majority of residents.		No
23	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Ba A community hub, a Medical Centre outside the village does not seem a good idea, especially for those without transport.		
26	TR	7	Agree	Tiptree is very much in need of more health facilities; doctors, nurses and dentists. I recognise that funding for these does not come from the Parish and so you cannot directly improve matters. However, hopefully, the appropriate authorities will take note of this need. A new health centre at Elms Farm would help but it is away from the centre, so will make access difficult for some patients. I think a new health centre should be in addition to the existing facility in the centre, not instead of.		
42	TR	2	Mostly Agree	Enhancement of medical provision is required without an increase of 600 homes and the population they bring.		
58	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Wherever the medical centre is based sure being outside of the business district will make it difficult for elderly and non-drivers to attend - also no where near the pharmacies so anyone who has walked to the aforesaid medical centre will then have to walk back to the centre to access the pharmacy. This is even before you can staff the new medical centre!!!!		
84	TR	1	Disagree	People without a car and unable to walk any distance would not be able to access the Medical centre as it would be too remote.		

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP10?	TIP10 - Provision of Community Infrastructure - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
111	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Not the best site for a medical centre on the edge of the village, where public transport does not pass by. It leaves the infirm and car less families with a trek to seek medical help. But I do understand that the bird has flown as far as a site in the centre of Tiptree goes.	As the response above.	
134	TR	1	Mostly Agree	B - why create a second hub outside of the village centre. People who have issues accessing it makes more sense that items in a central location. Maybe make transport links from new sites for building with easier corridors to village centre.		
209	TR	3	Disagree	The Health Centre should remain in the centre of the village where most people are able to walk to it. This new location would mean many having to travel by car to get to it.		
24	TR	1	Agree	It must be written in that a medical centre must be built and all other infrastructure written in over the past many things are promised and never actually materialise		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Always say, there's land for a medical centre every time there's a housing development. But, it never comes to anything. We need another doctors if the community is to grow by another 400 houses.		
223	TR	4	Mostly Agree	I very much doubt there will be another doctors. Firstly a doctor needs to invest and set up a surgery, then the failing NHS offer financial help. The only doctors is oversubscribed and financially the NHS is broken.		
81	NO	0	Agree	We agree with the above but past history eg at the Wilkinds development on Factory Hill has shown that developers can renege on promises to make provisions such as medical centres.		
114	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Would the Medical Centre be fictional as is the Dentist at Nine Acres?		
58	TR	5	Mostly Agree	Ba; check your documentation at one point I believe section 8.4 you refer to the medical centre being at Highlands nursery and then later at Elms farm.		

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP10?	TIP10 - Provision of Community Infrastructure - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
119	TR	1	Agree	Again this is essential to my support for the plan. I would like to see firm dates or trigger points for these benefits to be completed.	These benefits will be provided as part of planning consent.	No
195	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Who will provide money for building?	Developer contributions plus investment by the NHS/CCG/Practice partners.	No
				Sub-section C		
92	TR	7	Disagree	Ca The siting of the play equipment currently at the Grove Road playing field currently makes it impossible to use the site for village events as in the past - no more village fete and fair for example. All play equipment should be sited along one side of the field to allow for mixed use.	There is adequate space for events as evidenced by the recent Platinum Jubilee event.	No
134	TR	1	Mostly Agree	C - why not providing play equipment within the area of the proposed developments?	Reduction from 600 to 400 homes means that trigger conditions are no longer met for a range of facilities.	No
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Another park and play equipment is also needed for a growing community.	However, when open space is transferred to TPC, it would be possible to add equipment in the future.	
				Sub-section D		
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	Whereabouts will the burial ground be?	There is no current proposal for the provision of burial land however, if it is offered in a suitable place, it would be considered.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP11?	TIP11 - Green Infrastructure - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
49	TR	2	Agree	Open space in the firm of nature parks, playground fir young and elderly to encourage good health	Comment noted	No
57	TR	7	Agree	Green spaces of the utmost importance.	Comment noted	No
119	TR	1	Agree	Essential including the provision and maintenance of footpaths.	Comment noted	No
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Need more public access to green sites as not many have it already. And if there is a buffer do not let it get any further away or access to countryside will be made more difficult (cars).	Comment noted	No
204	TR	6	Agree	Most important to keep green spaces and wildlife sites. Places to walk are so necessary and not to have to drive to!!!	Comment noted	No
208	TR	7	Agree	Green infrastructure is necessary for mental and physical health & wellbeing.	Comment noted	No
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	We don't want developers who wreck the countryside - it must be minimal to keep the essence of the countryside, community and Tiptree itself.	Comment noted	No
214	TR	5	Agree	Sounds good, meanwhile excessive house development is destroying the 'green' environment.	Comment noted	No
223	TR	4	Agree	I believe it essential will retain areas for nature and wildlife. It is enriching and educational for the younger generation, as well as adults. Good for mental health since the problems are increasing.	Comment noted	No
3	TR	6	Agree	Could access for horse riders and bridle paths be included in this policy please.	Policy TIP06, TIP11 and Table 13.1 are to be modified to include equestrian users and bridleways.	Yes
46	TR	6	Agree	This will be a hard task with developers who will not wish to give up space where a house could stand!	Planning mandates 10% green space	No
				Sub-section B		
2	TR	7	Agree	I would add that any proposals to develop Brook Meadows should be fought tooth & nail from the outset.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP11?	TIP11 - Green Infrastructure - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
118	TR	6	Agree	Development of our existing wildlife sites should be refused especially the area known as Brook Meadow because of the large range of rare and unusual spaces flowers and animals that reside there	Comment noted	No
105	TR	6	Disagree	The parish council should not be designating private land as local wildlife sites when they do not have the power to do so. Plans for biodiversity should be limited to the land that the parish council owns or has within it's control.	Tiptree PC does not designate LWSs and had nothing to do with it. The responsibility lies with CBC. In 2015 CBC commissioned a borough-wide review of LWSs from the Essex Wildlife Trust, which informs designations. The designation is purely based on the wildlife value of the site.	No
84	TR	1	Disagree	There is already a large amount of wildlife on Elms Farm that will be disrupted	The land chosen has been in recent cultivation and hence is not a permanent habitat.	No
134	TR	1	Disagree	B - Why is land on East of the old gravel pits (on West side of Tiptree) defined as a local Wildlife Site. I walk on regularly and some of it is being farmed. How is this different to the North side of Tiptree. I get the impression that West side of Tiptree has been discounted by committee due to these sites. There is other land and query the "wildlife status". In reality the North side has fields and woodland (just over on Messing side) with wildlife corridors through hedgerows.	In 2015 CBC commissioned a borough review of LWS from the Essex Wildlife Trust, which informs designations. The western land has been recognised as an important site of biodiversity, hosting rare species and providing important migratory sites. In the questionnaire the western area received 43% support for a country park against the 25% supporting the southwest. The north received the least support of 6%. The wildlife site to the east of the gravel pits consists of unimproved neutral grass meadow and contains several nationally rare species. It has been mown annually under set-aside for many years.	No
				Sub-section C		
12	TR	7	Agree	This is so important as we try to tackle climate change and the worrying decline in biodiversity.	Comment noted	No
44	TO	7	Agree	A really important policy especially C 1 and 2. The development of a country park would be very welcome.	Comment noted	No
56	TR	6	Agree	My experience with "The Cut" strongly indicates the need for SuDs	Comment noted	No
211	TR	4	Mostly Agree	More care should be taken initially so restoring and creating wildlife habitats is minimal.	Planning permission will mandate that important assets are protected and that there is a 10% net gain in biodiversity.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP11?	TIP11 - Green Infrastructure - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
84	TR	1	Disagree	The drainage system is insufficient at the moment and causes flooding in Oak Rd	There is surface water flooding shown on Oak Road but is only significant where such flooding is associated with the built land in the vicinity. The land allocated for building does not show any surface water flooding risks close to Oak Road. Policies TIP15 & 16 {13 & 14} specify Suds. There are building regulations to avoid excessive concreting over.	No
				Sub-section Other		
42	TR	2	Agree	This shouldn't be as part of a trade off for 600 houses.	Comment noted	No
60	TR	2	Agree	Get the schools involved	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP12?	TIP12 - Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation - comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section A		
211	TR	4	Agree	But financial contribution from developers needs to be substantial not just cursory. Who will enforce this?	CBC regulate this via planning applications	No
				Sub-section B		
111	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Once the damage is done its too late to recreate. B	Comment noted	No
223	TR	4	Agree	They should be penalised or fined if they do not follow this!	Comment noted	No
				Sub-section General		
12	TR	7	Agree	Again, so important to protect habitats or offer appropriate mitigation where damage is inevitable.	Comment noted	No
49	TR	2	Agree	Definitely need these areas for wildlife	Comment noted	No
214	TR	5	Agree	I look forward to seeing this happen	Comment noted	No
42	TR	2	Disagree	I don't believe there should be further residential development.	Comment noted	No
82	NO	7	Mostly Agree	Gladman reiterate comments made in relation to TIP11, the principles contained in the above policy appear to be unnecessary duplication of strategic policies and it may be prudent for the Parish Council to delete it from the Plan.	Necessary at this time as the LP which had passed examination hadn't been adopted. It is an NP and local people need to understand the essence of national policies.	No
109	TR	6	No Opinion	What a load of unintelligible gobbledegook, no idea what it means.	Comment noted	No
204	TR	6	No Opinion	Not sure about Elms farm. Nearly joining Tiptree to other.	There is a reasonable gap of half a mile between settlement boundaries.	No
206	TR	7	Disagree	No development in these sites.	RAMS is a strategic solution to protect the European designated nature conservation Special Protection Areas, including the Essex coast from the recreational pressures of a growing population.	No
207	TR	1	Disagree	Shouldn't be allowed to build on a habitat site as bird and wild animals are in decline already.		

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP13?	TIP13 - Highland Nursery – comments (it is now policy TIP15)	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section Heading		
21	TR	2	Mostly Agree	the word MINIMUM of 200 dwellings is concerning; open to increase of the figure. Should stipulate MAXIMUM	Neighbourhood Planning begins with the agreement with the Local Planning Authority (CBC) to accept a housing target. That target is expressed as a minimum. The actual number will depend on the proportion of 1, 2, 3 or 4+ bed homes plus the size of the sites and other constraints. It all forms part of the negotiation with developers to ensure Tiptree gets well planned and beautiful places to live. The actual number is not expected to significantly exceed the proposed numbers.	No
46	TR	6	Mostly Agree	I note that TIP13 states "a minimum of 200 houses". As a Tiptree resident I would prefer to see "a maximum of 200 houses".		
92	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Again, why a minimum of 200 dwellings? If we must have 200 then lets stick at 200		
134	TR	1	Disagree	No maximum number of houses.		
49	TR	2	Agree	Agree wholeheartedly with this statement	Comment noted	No
71	TR	6	Agree	It's good to see that there is a plan to ensure our environment of being in the country and still a village is protected So much of Essex is being turned into urban unplanned waste poorly designed and look out of place. You can imagine some of todays builds will be tomorrow's slums. We are losing our identity, very sad, perhaps this plan will see a change of direction.	Comment noted	No
116	TR	2	Agree	If we have to have more houses this seems reasonable.	Comment noted	No
214	TR	5	No Opinion	Sounds good, meanwhile excessive house development is destroying the 'green' environment.	Comment noted	No
64	TR	7	Mostly Agree	We still have empty properties in Tiptree far too expensive what will house prices be in future developments. We were a lovely typical English village but no longer.	People are moving in as the population estimate keeps increasing year on year. Planning permission has been amended to allow for building smaller houses as larger ones have not been selling.	No
93	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Please see comments on TIP01. I feel that the new developments could have been split between 3 areas and not 2.	There were 3 sites when the plan was for 600 homes. Larger sites provide better community gains.	No
94	TR	7	Mostly Agree	I hope the infrastructure can cope with the added demands on it.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP13?	TIP13 - Highland Nursery – comments (it is now policy TIP15)	Response	Mod. Plan?
128	TR	7	Disagree	Why should we believe that each and everyone of the above will be met?	Possibly some won't be but most will be and the plan-led approach is so much more likely to give Tiptree high quality development than the alternative which would amount to a 'free for all'.	No
105	TR	6	Disagree	The decision for this site allocation was not based on enough hard evidence	What amounts to 'enough'? Due process was followed and is documented in the Housing Topic Paper that accompanies the NP. A full site assessment process (SHLAA) was carried out in accordance with CBC methodology. There was a rigorous consideration of the alternative options supported by a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Additionally, the vision and objectives derived from Community Consultation also informed the final selections.	No
134	TR	1	Disagree	Agree with development proposals but not the actual site. I believe this is the village boundary with Innworth.	There is a significant distance between the settlement boundaries. 0.3 miles to the nearest Innworth settlement and 0.5 miles to the edge of Messing.	No
209	TR	3	Mostly Agree	Far too many houses for current infrastructure. i.e. schools, doctors and dentists.	The proposed development is sited near schools with current capacity to expand as needed. Land is set aside for a new medical centre, see TIP16.d {TIP14.d}	No
				Sub-section A		
63	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Tiptree needs far more affordable housing. We already have far more 4 and 5 bedroom houses than is necessary.	Comment noted	No
211	TR	4	Agree	Affordable housing is very important. These need to be smaller houses at realistic prices for local people on local wages.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP13?	TIP13 - Highland Nursery – comments (it is now policy TIP15)	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section B		
38	TR	1	Disagree	Large 5 bedroom plus so called detached houses like at Grange road tiptree are not suitable they are well overpriced and look out of place and the road at Grange road is dangerous and has remained unfinished for months and months now	At the 2011 census Tiptree only had 29% of 1 & 2 bedroom houses, The ratio quoted in the CBC local plan for new dwellings will be over 38%. See 6.11	No
223	TR	4	Mostly Agree	I would advise providing mainly 1/2/3 bed as opposed to 4/5 bed accomodation.		
				Sub-section C		
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Link roads will cause congestion, more house, more road users its busy enough now. Are there plans for maybe a roundabout providing they are used properly. Will cause congestion and traffic chaos via proposed link road.	The link roads are specified to help spread the traffic around Tiptree and relieve congestion. The NP can't mandate what ECC will specify, but all recent new estates connecting to through routes have had roundabouts.	No
195	TR	7	Disagree	The B1023 has too much traffic on it now. What will it be like with 200 more houses!	As part of the A12 widening scheme, the B1023 is to be improved by removing pinch points. The destination of the new residents will determine which route they take.	No
215	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Para C Continuation of link road needs to be guaranteed to be delivered.	The CBC local plan includes the northern link road and it is deliverable in a future plan period.	No
				Sub-section E		
204	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Keep our local wildlife spaces and open spaces. Country Park at top end would be good. i.e. Brook Meadows.	Comment noted	No
				Sub-section F		
12	TR	7	Agree	As before - save and improve our green spaces.	Comment noted	No
				Sub-section G		
17	TR	3	Agree	g) It would be good to achieve a continuous footpath from the village centre to Perrywood Garden Centre.	The NP is seeking to achieve this	No
116	TR	2	Agree	If we have to have more houses this seems reasonable. g) Provision of a pedestrian route to Perrywoods from the village would be beneficial.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP13?	TIP13 - Highland Nursery – comments (it is now policy TIP15)	Response	Mod. Plan?
119	TR	1	Agree	Policy G: very important to ensure safe walking routes. Might this also be an opportunity to continue the pavement to ensure a safe walking route to kelvedon station owing to the lack of early/late bus services, this is a quite dangerous route for anyone walking.	Unfortunately, outside the remit of the NP	No
				Sub-section J		
85	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Providing this doesn't effect the flooding risk towards the village where existing drainage is inadequate as it is!	This is what Suds is aimed to achieve	No
				Sub-section Other		
32	TR	3	Agree	Has Messing Parish Council been consulted?	Yes. We have received no official response to the Reg14 consultation but we have met face to face and agreed a statement of common ground.	No
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP14?	TIP14 - Elms Farm – comments (renamed TIP16)	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section Heading		
21	TR	2	Mostly Agree	MINIMUM of 200 houses should stipulate MAXIMUM	Neighbourhood Planning begins with the agreement with the Local Planning Authority (CBC) to accept a housing target. That target is expressed as a minimum. The actual number will depend on the proportion of 1, 2, 3 or 4+ bed homes plus the size of the sites and other constraints. It all forms part of the negotiation with developers to ensure Tiptree gets well planned and beautiful places to live. The actual number is not expected to significantly exceed the proposed numbers.	No
84	TR	1	Disagree	200 homes in this area is too many this will be another concrete jungle like Grove Rd		
92	TR	7	Disagree	Again, why a minimum of 200 dwellings? If we must have 200 let's stick at 200 d It's all very well just giving land for a medical centre. Will it ever be built and who will pay for it and find extra doctors?		
134	TR	1	Disagree	No maximum number of dwellings proposed.		
49	TR	2	Agree	Agree	Comment noted	No
214	TR	5	No Opinion	Sounds good, meanwhile excessive house development is destroying the 'green' environment.	Comment noted	No
128	TR	7	Disagree	we need to know that the above will be met.	Possibly some won't be but most will be and the plan-led approach is so much more likely to give Tiptree high quality development than the alternative which would amount to a 'free for all'.	No
94	TR	7	Mostly Agree	I hope the infrastructure can cope with the extra demands on it.	The policies provide for additional infrastructure	No
209	TR	3	Disagree	Far too many houses for current infrastructure. i.e. schools, doctors and dentists.	The proposed development is sited near schools with current capacity to expand as needed Land is set aside for a new medical centre, see TIP16.d {TIP14.d}	No
				Sub-section A		
41	TR	3	Mostly Agree	You keep on mentioning affordable housing. 1) In the past it rarely gets built. 2) Affordable should mean just that. Also provide flats and accommodation that a single mortgage payer can afford.	CBC Local Plan policy require 30% Affordable Housing on new developments. This includes homes for rent, shared ownership and First Homes.	No
211	TR	4	Agree	Again affordable housing is necessary for local people.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP14?	TIP14 - Elms Farm – comments (renamed TIP16)	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section C		
84	TR	1	Disagree	As the link road will not meet in the middle this will result in far too much traffic in Oak Road and Kelvedon Rd which are already very busy and will cause congestion for vehicles wanting to access A12 in Feering and Kelvedon.	The new residents will have a choice. In the first instance they will join Colchester Road where they could travel to Colchester or proceed to Maypole Road to reach Kelvedon Road, this might be a better option than using the tricky junction to Oak Road and will avoid having to turn right out of Oak Road without the assistance of a roundabout. The long term plan is that the link road will be used.	No
215	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Para C Continuation of link road needs to be guaranteed to be delivered.	It is in the CBC local plan and is deliverable in a future plan period.	No
				Sub-section D		
12	TR	7	Agree	Would be great to support development of new medical centre.	Comment noted	No
210	TR	6	Agree	As mentioned already, a new Medical Centre at Elms Farm site is very much needed for Tiptree.	Comment noted	No
92	TR	7	Disagree	It's all very well just giving land for a medical centre. Will it ever be built and who will pay for it and find extra doctors?	Decision lies with the CCG and doctors who wish to work in Tiptree	No
116	TR	2	Agree	d) New medical centre is essential- need to be sure can be successfully staffed.	Comment noted	No
				Sub-section F		
214	TR	5	No Opinion	If houses had adequate gardens there would be no need for allotments.	Houses need to be affordable. Allotments serve a useful community purpose	No
				Sub-section G		
215	TR	7	Mostly Agree	Para G These proposals need to be guaranteed also.	CBC policy requires 10% usable open space.	No
				Sub-section I		
194	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Pedestrian footpaths along Messing Road and Colchester Road essential.	Some provision can be made under the plan where it relates to the development	No
				Sub-section J		
134	TR	1	Disagree	Need to consider listed houses nearing the curtilage of area being developed not just within it.	Add to TIP16.k (TIP14. j) 'on or adjacent to the site'	Yes

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP14?	TIP14 - Elms Farm – comments (renamed TIP16)	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section L		
60	TR	2	Agree	Must ensure compliance with regulations on water flow	It is a planning requirement	No
84	TR	1	Disagree	Drains must be updated	This is a maintenance issue outside of the NP, please raise inadequate drains with the appropriate authority, giving specific details.	No
119	TR	1	Agree	Strong concerns about the drainage of this development. The road to Messing floods frequently, pretty much every time it rains! As the land is farmland as it stands, I'm very concerned that concreting over vast swathes is not going to improve the drainage of this area.	The surface water flooding map does not show flooding on the road to Messing, is it a blocked or inadequate drain? Policy TIP16 {TIP14} specifies Suds. There are regulations to avoid excessive concreting over.	No
				Sub-section M		
60	TR	2	Agree	Must ensure compliance with regulations on aquifer provision	There are regulations and the NP specifies SuDS	No
				Sub-section Other		
42	TR	2	Disagree	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village.	Comment noted	No
105	TR	6	Disagree	The decision for this site allocation was not based on enough hard evidence	Due process was followed and is documented in the Housing Topic Paper that accompanies the NP. A full site assessment process (SHLAA) was carried out in accordance with CBC methodology. There was a rigorous consideration of the alternative options supported by a Strategic Environmental Assessment Additionally, the vision and objectives derived from Community Consultation also informed the final selections.	No
134	TR	1	Disagree	Disagree with site allocation due village boundary with Messing.	There is a significant distance between the settlement boundaries. 0.3 miles to the nearest Inworth settlement and 0.5 miles to the edge of Messing.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Do you agree with TIP14?	TIP14 - Elms Farm – comments (renamed TIP16)	Response	Mod. Plan?
				Sub-section Comments repeated from TIP13		
17	TR	3	Mostly Agree	d) and e) As commented earlier I would be disappointed if the existing medical centre and community centre were to be sacrificed because of the proposed new buildings.	See responses under TIP13	No
38	TR	1	Disagree	As per last questions answers		
46	TR	6	Mostly Agree	I make the same comment as for TIP13, I am concerned at the statement of a minimum of 200 houses with no upper limit. This is leaving the door open for over development.		
85	TR	7	Mostly Agree	As in Tip 13		
93	TR	6	Mostly Agree	Please see comments in TIP13		
223	TR	4	Mostly Agree	(repeat) I would advise providing mainly 1/2/3 bed as opposed to 4/5 bed accomodation.		

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
2	TR	7	<p>In general terms, the plan seems to be a better proposition for the village than the original plan, the Barbrook development having been taken into account for the total number of new dwellings the village is expected to absorb up to 2033.</p> <p>Would it be possible to get a covenant placed on Brook Meadows that prevents any possible development of that green space?</p> <p>If it doesn't already, as far as realistically possible, the plan should take account of the impact of the A12 widening proposals, and incorporate measures designed to minimise any potential increase in traffic along Church Rd., even to the point of making it a pedestrian thoroughfare. Bus routes would need to be tweaked, as would routes for hgv through traffic, but both are feasible.</p>	<p>Currently Brook Meadows is designated as a local wildlife site. It is in private ownership and the owner would need to agree any covenant.</p> <p>The A12 widening scheme has been taken into account in 4.1c, 7.8, 7.13, 7.14 and section 13 Non-Policy actions.</p> <p>Proposals for Church Road would need to be agreed by ECC, but the link road in the plan is a step on the way to relieving traffic on Church Road.</p>	No
3	TR	6	<p>Tip07 Although not strictly Tiptree the bridge over the River Blackwater at Braxted desperately needs to be developed to improve traffic flow towards and away from Tiptree.</p> <p>At Marks Tey on North Lane towards Aldham they have just completed a single to two lane bridge over a stream just like Braxted. This has transformed road safety and traffic flow, so it can be done.</p>	<p>Appleford Bridge has been taken into account and mentioned 7.8, 7.13 and section 13 Non-Policy actions. Representations have been made to ECC and Highways England with regard to the A12 widening scheme.</p>	No
4	TR	4	<p>Wherever increased traffic flows what traffic management measures are being considered?</p>	<p>Traffic management schemes would need to be agreed by ECC, but the link road in the plan is a step on the way to relieving traffic on Church Road and other congested points.</p>	No
10	TR	1	<p>it would seem that however noble one's intentions regarding a neighbourhood plan, commercial interests seem to have the upper hand, but perhaps I am being too cynical!!</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	No
11	TR	6	<p>The Neighbourhood plan committee have worked very hard to put together a suitable plan for Tiptree. The areas for development have been carefully identified to enhance the village rather than cause a detriment. It is really important that current green spaces and wildlife areas are maintained, protected and enhanced much as possible and this plan aims to do that.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	No
14	TR	7	<p>I have no further comments to make except to say this is an excellent piece of work for our community and to thank those responsible for its creation.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	No
17	TR	3	<p>The Plan appears to have been considered assiduously.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
18	TR	5	I fully support the proposal for the creation of a country park (page 13 and 51). It would take some of the pressure of footfall away from Tiptree Heath which has suffered damage from excessive use during covid restrictions, and would encourage families to pursue their newly found interest in the outdoors and wildlife.	Comment noted	No
21	TR	2	Can see no mention of new school(s) to support expansion due to another 400 houses, not taking into account the new developments already under construction. Also provision should be made to incorporate separate cycle ways and bus stop lay-by(s) assuming our one bus network would be expanded to serve new development.	The Colchester Infrastructure Delivery Plan predicts future school needs and concludes that schools have the capacity to expand 'onsite'. Cycling is covered in TIP06. The bus operators would need to agree bus routes with ECC. There are suitable bus stops in Kelvedon and Maypole Roads. Community transport is on the parish project list.	No
22	SC	7	Feering Parish Council have a neutral view of this Neighbourhood Plan Document. The plan does not appear to have addressed the reality of vehicular traffic on the Inworth Road. Feering Parish Council do not agree that Inworth Road will not be as trafficked as suggested and this needs to be considered in any future proposals. Feering Parish Council are also disappointed that the policy on one- and two-bedroom homes seems disproportionate to other local Neighbourhood Plans.	It is well known that Tiptree has made representations to Highways England about the A12 widening scheme and maintaining Braxted Park Road as a viable route to the A12 but Tiptree has been ignored as it is considered to be out of the zone of influence. Reference is made in paragraphs 7.8, 7.13 and the non-policy actions section 13. You do not state in which way the policy on 1 & 2 bed homes is disproportionate. Tiptree has an historic lack of such housing compared against Colchester Borough and the East of England, the plan has to be in line with the CBC policy and represents an increase which will help to rectify the proportions.	No
23	TR	7	Obviously a lot of work has gone into this, I feel that there would have to be some compromises,	Comment noted	No
24	TR	1	There must be written in that no matter what all infrastructure must be provided especially a new medical centre, new paths, new roads, new flood levitation systems. To many times these big companies promise these things but it doesn't materialise	Developers will have to comply with the NP.	No
26	TR	7	The original plan was for more housing at or near to the current proposed sites. Unfortunately a planning rejection for buildings not part of the plan	Comment noted, however if the number of houses gets reduced too much there will be no gains for Tiptree.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
			was overturned by the Secretary of State. I am please to see that the new plan has subtracted these housing numbers from the new proposal. There are still threats of more building not part of the plan and the Neighbourhood Plan has yet to become adopted. Should further 'rogue' building creep in before adoption, I think the plan building numbers needs to be further adjusted downward and suggest that a note in the preamble say so, so that any future Secretary of State considerations take account of this.		
27	TR	5	The plan has been well developed and communicated and I appreciate all the extensive efforts of those who have contributed.	Comment noted	No
29	TR	4	Excellent, at last. Now let's put it into action please without further prevarication. Well done to all involved!	Comment noted	No
32	TR	3	I wouldn't want to see the capacity/size of the Cleghorn Employment zone in Newbridge Road increased without improved or designated road access. Newbridge Rd and New Road are not suitable roads for the size of HGV's currently using it to access this site.	Comment noted	No
40	TR	7	An excellent plan.	Comment noted	No
42	TR	2	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village. The village has already supported enough residential development without any infrastructure improvements and I very much doubt the village can sustain another 600 houses and the doubtless at least 2000 extra inhabitants. Instead there should be more focus and support for people wishing to self build single dwellings on unused land.	Comment noted	No
45	TR	4	APPEARS TO BE A SOUND AND WELL THOUGHT OUT PLAN	Comment noted	No
46	TR	6	I consider this plan to be a good way forward, although further development in Tiptree would still need to be closely monitored. We need Tiptree to remain a village with the community at its heart.	Comment noted	No
48	TR	4	very sensible plan	Comment noted	No
49	TR	2	A well thought out plan that hopefully will be adopted for those who live in Tiptree now and in the future	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
51	TR	2	As a lay person with no experience of planning the Plan as laid out seems fine. As stated previously the Infrastructure problems of health and the volume of traffic are of great concern. How will the Medical Centre be able to cope with the big increase of people.	The plan makes provision for these points	No
52	TR	6	There is much detail here, much work has been done, some of which I found a little difficult to follow, but all seems excellent, and what Tiptree needs.	Comment noted	No
54	TR	4	I agree with the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan but, as previously mentioned under TIP08 statement, an allocation of Police Officers to avoid future anti-social behaviour would be appreciated.	This is in the remit of ECC	No
57	TR	7	A well thought out plan, I'm personally keen to see the village aspect maintained and access to surrounding countryside. My only concern is with extra building and obvious increase in population the amount of litter around the area will increase. Thank you.	Comment noted	No
63	TR	7	The plan is fair in most respects. However Church Road and the available footpath both need widening and making safe from traffic. Walking that route is dangerous, with large commercial vehicles and buses passing no more than a yard away. Plus reduce speed limit to 20mph. You take your life in your hands trying cross the road, as we do daily, living in Mill Close.	The plan is just one step on the way to making Church Road safer. Representations have been made to ECC in the past. Unfortunately, Church Road is a strategic road in the highways network. More projects for TPC have been added into Table 13.1	Yes
64	TR	7	Too much building development in this village is uncalled for.	There is a national housing shortage however a NP will ensure development is plan-led and sustainable and will protect the village from a 'free for all' of speculative development.	No
74	TR	4	In my opinion this is a very well thought out and constructed plan which will be of enormous benefit to the present community and attractive to those who are hoping to purchase homes in the new developments. Tiptree village is a great place to live yet has many pressures on the services and amenities currently available. This plan will help to alleviate those pressures and provide much needed new facilities that will secure the future of the village through to 2033.	Comment noted	No
76	TR	7	It is an excellent plan with the needs and wellbeing of the residents at heart. I thoroughly applaud it . Let's see if the powers in government actually take	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
			heed of it as they like to imply. Not just take the biggest payout from the largest building company who couldn't care less about the needs of the neighbourhood.		
77	TR	7	I wish to give a sincere thank you to all the volunteers who have worked tirelessly for many years to produce this splendid plan suitable for today's Tiptree Village residents and for the children of the future.	Comment noted	No
81	NO	0	The stance of Tolleshunt Knights Parish Council is emphasised: A buffer between Tiptree and Tolleshunt Knights must be maintained. Major development must be preceded by an improvement to transport infrastructure and medical facilities which are already inadequate. Developers must be required to address these issues and deliver such services before major developemnt takes place.	There is no proposal to develop between the two communities. The sale of houses funds the infrastructure.	No
85	TR	7	Our main concern is that Church Road will have even more heavy traffic! Since we moved in 7 years ago the traffic has increased significantly Especially HGV vehicles and skip lorries on the terrible road surface. This is effecting our property and quality of life.	The new housing has been positioned to reduce this risk.	No
92	TR	7	This is a comprehensive report but some points still stand out for me The builders are just giving land for the medical centre. Who will be responsible for making sure it is built? Who will pay for the building? As there is currently a national shortage of GPs, who will find the extra doctors? As the site is away from village centre parking, will there be enough parking space or additional bus services? As the number of dwellings are proposed as a minimum, are there going to be as many as the builders can possibly squeeze in?	The gift of land is a great help but the final decision is in the hands of the NHS, the CCG and the doctors who wish to work in Tiptree. There are minimum housing targets that must be met. The NP should ensure that the actual number of new homes is close to that target.	No
95	TR	6	Less complicated words would have been easier to understand.	Comment noted	No
101	TR	7	Developers should learn lessons from previous development, e.g. Nine Acres, to ensure services and amenities are built into the plan, and post development issues are avoided. I am referring specifically to the provision of water, but also the promised pedestrian crossing and bus stop.	These issues will be taken into consideration when planning permission is granted.	No
103	TR	4	I think the plan is well thought out and access to the A12 via the new link road is very important. As the village expands infrastructure upgrade is essential to a healthier village which will prosper.	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
105	TR	6	<p>Despite the points raised by the inspector in the previous neighbourhood plan application, there is still no hard evidence for or against the other sites that were originally being considered. Neither up to date traffic studies nor ecology or environment surveys have taken place at all of the sites. The two sites selected were purely based upon the original village survey and the opinions of the neighbourhood plan committee.</p> <p>The development at Elm Farm is situated on an existing road that would not be able to cope with a significant increase in traffic. New Road from Maypole Road towards Messing is narrow and barely wide enough for 2 cars to pass in places. New residents would use this road to get to the A12 north bound. There would also be a significant increase in the traffic using Oak Road which currently has a nearly continuous row of parked cars along one side of the road, already making it difficult for traffic to utilize. The Highland Nursery site would also cause a substantial increase in the amount of traffic using Oak Road to head towards Colchester.</p> <p>The new link road could realistically take decades to build and in the mean time, the traffic congestion towards Messing, Inworth and down Oak Road towards Colchester would be horrendous. The new link road shouldn't be a consideration at this point as it is unknown who will build it or when.</p> <p>Also, having both new developments on the same side of the village doesn't make sense when trying to reduce the amount of traffic at the double mini roundabouts. All traffic from the developments would have to use this junction regularly to access the supermarkets, which are all on Church Road. Both of the suggested sites would be closest to Baynards Primary School, which has the lowest capacity to accept new students (94% capacity). Wouldn't it be wiser to build nearer to schools with a higher number of available places and with the capacity to expand and where existing roads can already cope with traffic flowing in both directions without obstacles? There were other sites submitted around the village with direct access to main roads with more manageable traffic flow solutions without being based on a road that doesn't yet exist.</p>	<p>The evidence is published in the Housing topic paper and the SEA. There has been a rigorous consideration of alternatives in order to arrive at the solution that provides the best outcomes for the village. 3 Strategic transport studies have been commissioned. Further studies will accompany any planning application as will ecological studies. The link road has proven deliverability both in this planning round and for completion in the future.</p> <p>In the short term it may be necessary to control traffic in Oak Road but it is not easy turning right out of Oak Road into Kelvedon Road at busy times so it is expected that most traffic will use the double mini roundabouts.</p> <p>Baynards is the nearest school at 0.5 miles and then Milldene at 0.6 miles and Messing at 0.7 miles. School capacities vary from year to year, both Tiptree schools have grounds which could accommodate additional buildings. Developer contributions fund additional school facilities. Parents have a choice of schools and don't necessarily chose the nearest one.</p> <p>The other most suitable sites to the West of Tiptree could also use the double mini-roundabouts or add traffic to Station Road with a congested junction at Factory Corner.</p>	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
106	TR	4	Overall it seems sensible. Given we can't avoid development it is important that it is properly planned and managed. Ensuring that developers are held accountable to providing the various elements will be vital (e.g. provision of other infrastructure). This hasn't happened in other developments - e.g. there is no sign of the new dentist as part of the Factory Hill Wilkins development, and the land allocated to it seems to be disappearing.	Tiptree hasn't benefited from a NP before. Enforcement is a function of CBC. Land may be allocated, but dentists are private businesses that do not necessarily decide to take up the offer.	No
108	TR	5	I do think we should lower minimum to 100 dwellings, in each housing development	This would not meet the government targets and there would be few benefits for Tiptree	No
109	TR	6	As noted, the proposed link road needs to be re-routed and extended	Comment noted	No
110	TR	4	Good plan working in conjunction with the new link road.	Comment noted	No
111	TR	6	A new primary a school and vastly improved medical facilities are a priority	Comment noted	No
113	TR	3	Good plan.	Comment noted	No
114	TR	4	Sometime ago we attended a meeting about the proposal of a new Scout building on the Nine Acres site. Is this still in the pipeline or has it died a death? There does not seem any provision for young people in this plan and facilities for youngsters are severely lacking in Tiptree.	Currently there are no plans to provide a scout building on the Nine Acres site. A scout/multipurpose youth hub has been included in a list of S106 projects for developers to fund. Youth facilities are mentioned in Section 10 Community Infrastructure and Section 13 Non-Policy Actions.	No
115	TR	6	Well developed and probably the best option to prevent excessive development	Comment noted	No
116	TR	2	If we have to have more houses this seems reasonable. I have concerns about routing increased traffic along Grange Road and Braxted Wall - would need improved road surface and a way to allow 2 way traffic over the bridge.	This is covered in Section 13 Non-Policy Actions.	No
119	TR	1	Generally supportive of this plan, especially if the proposed link road and medical facilities are built. Without these I would not be in a position to support the plan as it stands.	Comment noted	No
125	TR	7	4.1 para c) increasing traffic on the B1023 Kelvedon Road and Church Road. (both need to be stated) 4.1 para f) I think the no. 75 service was considered adequate, but with the recent cutbacks it is less so, so some mention of the declining service should be made.	This edit to 4.1 has been accepted The evening cut back is mentioned, though not the daytime one.	Yes

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
			<p>5.3 should the housing topic paper also be mentioned here?</p> <p>Non-Policy actions</p> <p>Homes and Housing, should this say including rental from Housing Association / Council as many people equate affordable to buying.</p> <p>Traffic and transport item 2 is misleading, and should read more like para 7.8 which states 'to continue to use' as the intention is to maintain the status quo rather than encourage new traffic into Station Road.</p>	<p>This edit to 5.3 has been accepted.</p> <p>This edit has been accepted</p> <p>This edit has been accepted</p>	
128	TR	7	Not convinced that your promises will be delivered.	Comment noted	No
134	TR	1	<p>I do agree with a neighbourhood plan and I am generally open to it being within an area that I live (these development sites are in the area of our dwelling) if done correctly.</p> <p>I am struggling on two counts. I walk much of Tiptree and I believe the areas to the North/North East, East and South to be of the prettiest/most wildlife interest.</p> <p>The West outside of Tiptree village has already been disturbed by the extraction of gravel in the area of the pits. In a development these PITS could take up surface water, which benefits wildlife and creates a green area within a development. There are also links to the South of the village and the A12. Yet this area has been discounted by the committee because of the Pits when I believe it provides answers to many of the problems and impacts relatively few people and maintains our village identify.</p> <p>I am unclear why such Wildlife designation has been assigned to these areas ahead of other areas.</p>	Local Wildlife Sites are designated by Colchester BC. Inworth Grange LWS consists of lakes, woods and unimproved grass meadows that contain a number of rare species. Planning policy dictates that development should be avoided here unless there are no alternatives.	No
188	TR	6	Although I have no wish for more houses to be built. I agree with having a plan in place so that at least there will be some input from the people that live in Tiptree	Comment noted	No
194	TR	6	Tiptree doesn't feel like a village anymore, too many houses and not enough of amenities and essentials to go with them. E.g. open accessible green	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
			spaces, play areas, medical facilities all take a back seat. The look and feel of a place is just as important, Tiptree always seems to be treated as the poor relation (badly put upon). Covers most of it.		
208	TR	7	Although I have only lived in Tiptree for about a year, I have known it for over 50! Since moving here, I am aware of the ageing status of the population, which is why I feel strongly about the comments made in TIPO5. I also support the non-land use issues detailed in table 13.1	Comment noted	No
209	TR	3	The plan includes far too many houses for the roads and infrastructure to support. The number of vehicles both private and commercial would have a great detrimental effect on the lives of the residents of Tiptree and the environment i.e. air pollution etc.	The number has been allocated as part of government strategy.	No
211	TR	4	The plan seems to be sensible and doable for Tiptree. It will be harder to keep developers sticking to the proposals and making the Borough Council enforce the rules and regulations on them.	Comment noted	No
214	TR	5	It is a shame that existing facilities and road structure do not meet the current requirements and these should be addresses prior to more development.	Comment noted	No
215	TR	7	Not only affordable housing is needed but council housing for people to rent who cannot afford to buy.	Affordable Housing includes both homes for rent and for purchase.	No
217	TR	7	I have completed this with the view that change is inevitable. Ideally apart from road and accessibility improvements I do not support more housing.	Comment noted	No
218	TR	4	Page 51 Non-Policy actions 13.1 Traffic and transport, 2nd para. I am not happy about encouraging more traffic to use Station Road. We already have great juggernauts using Station Road as well as all sorts of other vehicles. A great many of them breaking the 30 mile an hour speed limit. It has become so much worse over the years than it used to be. Please don't make it any worse!	This will be edited to make it clear that the aim is to maintain the status quo in so far as traffic in Station Road is concerned.	Yes
222	TR	2	Before any further building is agreed, the Tiptree infrastructure needs to be addressed. Doctors, dentists etc need to be increased substantially.	Infrastructure comes with development. New health facilities require decisions from the NHS, CCG and partners.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree
 Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	General Comments	Response	Mod. Plan?
			Not everyone does online banking, so the banking situation needs to be addressed.	Resolving the banking issue has been added to Table 13.1	Yes
223	TR	4	<p>I understand there is no choice on developments, but it does make you wonder, with increasing costs, who will be able to afford these homes?</p> <p>As a resident, having lived here all my life (37 years), the countryside is really important to me and my family and I believe we need to nurture and retain what we do have.</p>	Comment noted	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Would you be inclined to support this plan in a referendum?	If no, please can you tell us why, apart from any comments you have already submitted.	Response	Mod. Plan?
23	TR	7	No	Would like to see the amendments first	Comment noted	
38	TR	1	No	As previously said we have grange Road development that is not finished looks out of place and roads are dangerous, houses overpriced, also living on oak road traffic is very busy and toad calming here is needed.	The plan is providing a long term solution to traffic in Tiptree. The foundations of this plan needs to be laid now to avoid years of congestion on the B1022, B1023 and various junctions in Tiptree. Tiptree is at a vital crossing point in the area and will take traffic from other communities with new housing which is beyond local control.	No
42	TR	2	No	I struggle to understand how this meets the plan's objectives of being sustainable in terms of instructure and in keeping with the rural nature of the village. The village has already supported enough residential development without any infrastructure improvements and I very much doubt the village can sustain another 600 houses and the doubtless at least 2000 extra inhabitants. Instead there should be more focus and support for people wishing to self build single dwellings on unused land.	Comment noted	No
82	NO	7	No	Gladman have provided comments on a number of the issues that have been identified in the Council's consultation material and recommend that the matters raised are carefully explored during the process of undertaking the Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered that significant flaws exist in the SEA and Site Selection process and at present the plan cannot be considered to meet the basic conditions.	Comment noted	
83	TO	0	No	See comments above and LPP letter 28th April 2022 and plans.	Comment noted	
92	TR	7	No	I've put no because there isn't a maybe. I need more answers before I can commit to yes.	Comment noted	

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Would you be inclined to support this plan in a referendum?	If no, please can you tell us why, apart from any comments you have already submitted.	Response	Mod. Plan?
95	TR	6	Yes	Despite reading each segment, I still see nothing in relation to helping the current medical centre dilemma? will there be another surgery built to support the amount of new patients?	Section 12.15 {12.13} and TIP16 {TIP14} cover this point.	No
98	NB	0	No	Not in the current form but would support with appropriate amendments reflecting comments in these representations.	Comment noted	
99	NO	0	No	In current form the Plan could not be supported unless amendments are made in line with the recommendations made within these representations.	Comment noted	
100	NO	0	No	In its current form the Plan could not be supported without amendments to reflect the comments reflected in these representations.	Comment noted	
109	TR	6	No	Not until it has been modified in line with comments made	Comment noted	
128	TR	7	No	Need to convince people your promises will be kept.	Developers will have to comply with the NP once adopted.	No
134	TR	1	No	I do agree with a neighbourhood plan and I am generally open to it being within an area that I live (these development sites are in the area of our dwelling) if done correctly. I am struggling on two counts. I walk much of Tiptree and I believe the areas to the North/North East, East and South to be of the prettiest/most wildlife interest. The West outside of Tiptree village has already been disturbed by the extraction of gravel in the area of the pits. In a development these PITS could take up surface water, which benefits wildlife and creates a green area within a development. There are also links to the South of the village and the A12. Yet this area has been discounted by the committee because of the Pits when I believe it provides answers to many of the problems and impacts relatively few people and maintains our village identify.	A planning inspector refused a planning appeal for a site near the pits in July 2020. Responses have already been made to these points.	No

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to online Comments

Capacity: TR-Tiptree resident, TB-Tiptree Business, TO-Tiptree Organisation (authorised representative), prefix N = non-Tiptree Area Codes: 7-Central, 1-N, 2-NE, 3-SE, 4-S, 5-SW, 6-NW, 0-Outside Tiptree

No	Capacity	Area Code	Would you be inclined to support this plan in a referendum?	If no, please can you tell us why, apart from any comments you have already submitted.	Response	Mod. Plan?
				I am unclear why such Wildlife designation has been assigned to these areas ahead of other areas.		
203	TR	2	No	Why is a referendum required? The delay of this plan has resulted in the Barbrook Lane development being built. Any further delay could be disastrous for the village. It would also result in money being wasted that would be better spent cleaning up our neglected village.	It is part of the regulations that have to be fulfilled to make a Neighbourhood plan. The Plan carries little weight until the process is complete.	No
209	TR	3	No	(repeat) The plan includes far too many houses for the roads and infrastructure to support. The number of vehicles both private and commercial would have a great detrimental effect on the lives of the residents of Tiptree and the environment i.e. air pollution etc.	Comment noted	No

Comments from Statutory Consultees & Developers that have the potential to revise a Policy

Ref	Name of body	Representation	Response by Tiptree NP	Amendment to Plan
	Essex Bridleways	P14 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 3 has an aspiration to <i>'improve movement through Tiptree for vehicular traffic, but also for walking and cycling...'</i> 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 need to be considered too. The Objectives are too 'inward looking' and need to acknowledge the need to link with the open countryside outside of the immediate village and the parish/NP boundary.	There is no call for equestrian access to the countryside from the village centre however Objective 3 should be reworded to acknowledge the link with the open countryside.	'the countryside' added to Objective 3
		P26 Policy TIP06 Cycling, Walking and Disability Routes -This policy, by virtue of its heading, excludes equestrians which is unacceptable. Any new off-road route, especially those which lead	It is unrealistic to expect routes within the built up area to enable equestrian users. however TIP06 E should be reworded as shown on right:	Development must retain and enhance the quality and accessibility of Public Rights of Way and <u>bridleways</u> . main pedestrian and cycle

	<p>into the wider countryside and linking with the existing network, should contain a requirement for them to be fully accessible to all user groups where practical. Point E should therefore be amended to read: <i>'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...</i>. This is supported in the NPPF in para 98 where it states: <i>'Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users...'</i>.</p>		<p>routes—and <u>It must</u> adequately mitigate the impact of additional traffic movements on the safety and flow of pedestrian and cycle access, especially at road junctions. Proposals to create new or enhance existing off-road routes which lead into the wider countryside are encouraged. Where possible, these routes should be designed to accommodate walking, cycling, disabled access and equestrian users.</p>
	<p>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>	<p>Accept Title change to TIP06.</p>	<p>'Non-Motorised User Access Routes'</p>
	<p>P41 TIP11: Green Infrastructure A. should be re-worded as follows: <i>'to improve the connectivity for as many</i></p>	<p>Accept change to TIP11 A.</p>	<p>'to improve the connectivity for as many user groups as possible between wildlife</p>

		<i>user groups as possible between wildlife areas and green spaces through measures such as improving and extending existing footbaths, cycle paths and Bridleways..'</i>		areas and green spaces through measures such as improving and extending existing footbaths, cycle paths and Bridleways..'
		P51 Non Policy Actions, it states that the village's aspiration is to create a new country park in the Tiptree area, and we ask that if this comes to fruition that all user groups will be able to access this. We would suggest that line 4 under Countryside and Green spaces should read <i>'to establish a country park in the Tiptree area accessible to all user groups'</i> .	Accept change to line 3 under 'Countryside and Green Spaces' in Non-Policy Actions.	<i>'to establish a country park in the Tiptree area accessible to all user groups'</i> .
	Natural England	For example, the earlier objective (11) which sought "to integrate green corridors for ...recreation and wildlife into new developments" would not be achieved through the proposed Objective 4.	Given the comments made by the previous Neighbourhood Plan Examiner, the objectives for the new Tiptree Plan have been refined and reduced significantly from the previous version to now cover 6 objectives. Given the importance of the natural environment, the objective can be expanded to be broader in scope.	Objective 4 to be updated to read as: <i>To protect and enable Tiptree's green environment, wildlife and biodiversity to thrive and grow. To protect local, national and international designated sites and habitats, and integrate green corridors into new</i>

				<i>developments.</i>
		Also, the specific reference in the earlier objective (29) to protect and enhance “local wildlife sites and other valued habitats in the surrounding area” is not as clearly reflected in the proposed Objective 4.	See above.	See above.
		In our response to consultation on the previous Regulation 14 Plan Natural England advised that Objective 29 should also refer to nationally and internationally designated sites to ensure protection for all relevant designated sites and not just those at a local level. The same advice applies to the proposed wording for Objective 4.	See above.	See above.
		The proposed wording for Policy TIP01 does not reflect Objective 4 or the general expectation that housing development of the scale proposed in the site allocations should incorporate good quality green infrastructure. This requirement could be included as an addition to section C of the policy. For consistency, it may also be appropriate	Accept addition to TIP01 of section Cv.	incorporate high quality green infrastructure including through the provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).

		to identify the provision of SuDs as a specific expectation within section C.		
		<p>TIP12: Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation</p> <p>The wording for the policy in this draft of the Neighbourhood Plan includes the addition of Section B. The wording for Section A makes clear the expectation for mitigation for recreational disturbance from the in-combination effects of new housing so Section B appears superfluous.</p>	Delete Section B.	TIP 12: delete clause B. (=TIP14 in Reg 16 version)
		<p>Policy TIP13: Highlands Nursery and TIP14: Elms Farm¹</p> <p>The Site Allocations chapter identifies Objectives 1,2,3 and 6 as relevant drivers for the delivery of the proposed site allocations. Natural England considers that Objective 4 would also be relevant and it is reflected in the wording for the two site allocation policies.</p>	Add Objective 4.	(Objective 4 added to Section 12)

¹ The numbering of Policies TIP13 (Highland Nursey) and TIP14 (Elms Farm) accord with the Regulation 14 edition of the TNP. With the introduction of two policies, several policies have been renumbered in the Regulation 16 edition of the TNP. The Highland Nursey Policy is now TIP15 and Elms Farm is TIP16.

		As indicated in previous consultation responses, the policy requirement for the provision of public open space focuses mainly on provision for recreation whereas a policy requirement for the provision of multi-functional green infrastructure would deliver greater benefits in terms of biodiversity and the wider natural environment. Accordingly, Natural England would encourage the inclusion of reference to good quality green infrastructure as an addition to both policies.	Accept amendment to TIP13e & 14g.	Provision of multifunctional green infrastructure to enhance biodiversity and provide public open space to
	Gladman	3.2.4 Similarly, although a summary of the Stage 2 SHLAA has been published on the Parish Council's website, a full version of the results is not available and therefore it is difficult to ascertain whether the Council's assessments are robust.	The process conforms to that used by CBC. Each site was objectively assessed and only at a later stage did the emerging vision and objectives resulting from community consultation have a bearing on final site selection.	None
		3.3.5 As currently presented, Gladman do not consider that the current iteration of the SEA has addressed issues highlighted by the Examiner of	TNP disagrees with this conclusion. The SEA tests reasonable alternatives – including Tower End – and arrives at the conclusion that the proposed strategy is the most suitable for	None

		the previous plan and significant flaws persist with the SEA and associated policy direction of the Plan.	meeting the TNP's objectives and the requirements of Policy SS14 in the Local Plan Part 2.	
		3.4 Policy TIP01: Tiptree Spatial Strategy 3.4.1 Firstly, Gladman highlight that it is not in the remit of the neighbourhood plan to determine planning applications as this is the sole responsibility of the local planning authority and recommend that reference to 'permitted' is deleted.	Once made, the TNP will be part of the development plan which will be used to determine planning applications. Clearly it does not determine planning applications itself; it is used by the local planning authority to do this.	None
		3.5 Policy TIP11: Green Infrastructure 3.5.1 In general, Gladman support the requirements of Policy TIP11, however it is considered that criterion C) sets out unnecessary duplication of policies that are set out in the emerging Local Plan in Policy ENV1.	Policy TIP11 complements CLP S2 Policy ENV1 by identifying the locally specific environmental features and issues that need to be considered when development proposals are brought forward.	None
		3.6 Policy TIP12: Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation 3.6.1 Gladman reiterate comments made in relation to TIP11, the principles contained in the above policy appear to be unnecessary	Although the RAMS policy is in the CLP S1, a RAMS policy has appeared in all Colchester BC NPs.	None

		duplication of strategic policies and it may be prudent for the Parish Council to delete it from the Plan.		
	Lawson PPL	Argues for the re-instatement of Florence Park within the settlement boundary.	Florence Park should be removed from the SB because there is no reason to include a Sports field within it. Florence Park is protected by CLPS2 policy DM17 as it provides an important contribution to the green infrastructure network and to the character of the general area. Furthermore, FP is not suitable as a housing allocation because its availability depends upon Colchester United finding an alternative space thus there is uncertainty about deliverability. It is the role of the NP to define the SB. If the SB around Florence Park is re-instated then the area becomes a windfall site potentially suitable for another 120 homes (with the landowners making clear that this level of housing would be required to cross-subsidise any move by CUFC). This is in contrast to an employment area where the land use is protected by the designation for	None

			employment use. With the additional 130 homes granted on appeal, the inclusion of Florence Park would push the total new homes to something over 850 when Tiptree's current and expected infrastructure was deemed suitable for 600 new homes.	
	Savills (Mark Hodgson representing E&SW)	It is noted in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Plan dated March 2022 that the Tower End site appears in Growth Scenarios 2, 3 and 4. According to Table 6.1 in this report the Tower End site performs best in terms of landscape, heritage and land, soil and water.	The Tower End site has potential for future development. However overall it is not the best option in the consideration of alternatives in the SEA.	None
	Savills (James Firth representing Marden Homes)	Page2. It is clear, for example, that the Draft TNP SEA has considered the potential for sites to facilitate delivery of the new link road the Draft TNP proposes as a determinant factor in site and option selection.	This is not the case. All sites were objectively assessed before a consideration of the NP objectives was applied. Objective 3 relates to the desire to provide easy access to the main routes whilst minimising the impact on the village centre. This was a factor (as were the other objectives) in the determination of the sites that were most strategically positioned. The link road proposal followed as a	None

			further means to enable easy access to the main routes.	
		Page3. The Draft TNP SEA does not include an assessment of the sustainability or otherwise of a new link between the B1022 and B1023, and instead appears to proceed on the false basis that this is required of any TNP and therefore there is no alternative option to this. As discussed, this cannot be the case.	The LP inspector allowed the references to the northern link road in policy SS14 and accepted the modification to require a 'strategic transport assessment' rather than a 'detailed transport assessment'. To this end 3 transport studies have been completed by Cottee Transport Planning. They are referenced in the NP and were made available at Reg 14 consultation.	None
		Page3. A further concern with the reliance on a new link to inform the spatial strategy is that the central section of the proposed route lies outside Tiptree Parish and in neighbouring Messing-cum-Inworth Parish. To be completed, the link road requires land that is beyond the scope of the TNP - and located within Messing-cum-Inworth Parish. The Draft TNP acknowledges this at paragraph 7.12.	The statement of common ground between Tiptree Parish Council and Messing cum Inworth Parish Council (MCIPC) outlines a possible mechanism for the completion of the northern link road. The land was offered under the TPC call for sites and is under the same ownership and developer as the NP development sites.	None

		<p>Page4. It appears that the upper number of new homes to be provided through the TNP has been prematurely determined without proper consideration and appraisal through SEA of alternative options.</p>	<p>The Tiptree NP proceeded on the basis of an agreed allocation of new homes with CBC based on what the current infrastructure plus anticipated improvements in infrastructure could reasonably be expected to accommodate. That number was 600 (subsequently reduced to 400 in the light of the Barbrook Lane appeal being granted). The number is, for obvious reasons, expressed as a minimum.</p>	None
		<p>Page 5. The delivery of any such piece of major infrastructure requires the cooperation of a number of landowners and stakeholder, with any landowner needing to know that their land can deliver additional development to fund the physical delivery of the road. Each individual landowner or developer also cannot control land outside of their site boundary.</p>	<p>The TNP does not address the issue of the completion of the Link road. However the Statement of common ground with Messing cum Inworth PC provides a mechanism for modifications to the Parish boundary. Furthermore the relevant land is under the same ownership, the same developer and was offered on the Call for Sites as part of TIP49. The completion of the Link Road is deliverable in a future planning round.</p>	None
	Cerda on behalf of Kler	<p>This is a highly material consideration. Emerging Policy SS14 has been</p>	<p>The SS14 map has been modified to exclude the arrow across KGL land.</p>	None

	<p>Group</p>	<p>modified through the examination process (for example reducing the minimum requirement at Tiptree to 400 houses as a result of recent commitments), however the preferred direction of growth remains an important pillar underpinning the policy requirements for strategic growth at Tiptree.</p> <p>We raise these issues since the preferred direction of growth includes the KGL land. It is evident that in examining the Part 2 Local Plan the Inspector for Colchester saw fit to continue to support strategic growth on the KGL land. It was open to the examination – whether that promoted by Colchester Borough Council, Tiptree Parish Council, or a requirement of the Inspector – to remove reference to a preferred direction of</p>	<p>The preferred directions of growth are now stated to be ‘to the south west and north/north west’ but not ‘west’. The SS14 map has been modified accordingly. The new SS14 policies map (and CLP S2) can be found here.² In this plan period the TNP directs growth to the north and the reasons for doing so have been explained in the housing topic paper and come in the light of the SEA. Policy SS14 makes it clear that the TNP will allocate specific sites for housing allocations and will define the extent of a new settlement boundary. Policy SS14 also accepts the potential afforded by the northern growth location for a new road which would ultimately link the B1022 and B1023. There is thus no variance with strategic policy.</p>	
--	---------------------	--	--	--

² <https://www.colchester.gov.uk/local-plan/>

		<p>growth across the KGL land. No such amendment is being promoted, as confirmed by the reproduction of emerging Policy SS14 on page 6 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
		<p>The site selection process is flawed, not properly evidenced, and risks the failure of the Neighbourhood Plan if not rectified.</p>	<p>This assertion is based on the argument above concerning preferred directions of growth – which is itself fallacious as explained above. The TNP fully conforms to strategic policy.</p>	<p>None</p>
		<p>We say that the process is crude, because the site selection methodology adopts a traffic light (red, amber, green) system for assessing sites. This is a narrow approach, with no ability to fully critique sites and properly grade each element of a site assessment in coming to a conclusion as to the relative merits and constraints of any given site. A metric scoring system – for example assessing each element of any given site from 1</p>	<p>We disagree. The approach taken conforms to the CBC approach and was proportionate to the task at hand, namely to identify sites with potential to deliver the housing requirement. The RAG scoring system does not try to introduce a level of precision that is not possible to achieve without full site surveys. A 1-10 scoring system would potentially create a far greater likelihood of challenge and disagreement, particularly for sites near the ‘cut off’ for allocation. It is common practise to use a RAG scoring system for assessing sites through the</p>	<p>None</p>

		to 10 – provides a much more refined approach and allows the individual circumstances of a site to be fairly represented in the assessment process.	plan making process.	
		We say that the process is flawed because the SEA adopts an incorrect methodology. As drafted, the SEA takes as read the growth option and then assesses sites against that option. The correct approach is to consider the site options and then turn to consider the growth options.	The SEA has been professionally produced by AECOM and follows standard practice. The sites are objectively assessed before the TNP Objectives are brought into consideration.	None
		This is indeed the case for this part of Inworth Grange Pits LWS, which is privately owned and has no public access. It is therefore inappropriate for the HRA to imply that, by inclusion of this land as a 'green space' on Map 11.1, that this land could in any way function as an open space that could absorb potential recreational effects on Habitats Sites arising from	There has been public access to Brook Meadow for over 20 years.	None

		development allocated within the TNP.		
		<p>The Screening Report claims that CBC's HRA for the Section 2 Colchester Local Plan identified Tiptree sites (proposed at the time) as having "moderate" potential impact on functionally linked habitat so must be screened in for further assessment. In fact, in relation to Policy SS14 (Tiptree), Table 5.5 of CBC's HRA (LUC, September 2021) states that the assessment of suitability for SPA qualifying birds is: "To be determined when allocated sites are published in the emerging Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan." No such assessment is provided within either the Neighbourhood Plan or the HRA Screening Report, contrary to the clear recommendation and expectation of the CBC Section 2 HRA.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this significant omission, the Neighbourhood Plan Screening Report concludes that the loss of offsite functionally linked</p>	<p>Firstly, it is worth highlighting that no representation was received from Natural England to the HRA or the Tiptree NHP Regulation 14 Consultation. Secondly, It should be recognised that there will be an Appropriate Assessment provided to support the Tiptree NHP, the Screening Report is the first step in the process. To date, no conclusions have been drawn regarding whether there are any significant effects to habitat sites alone or in combination, rather only those issues being identified for further consideration (screened in) through the Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>As identified by ADP, the requirement for wintering bird surveys has been included within Policy SS14 of the Colchester Local Plan Section 2, which has been the case for any other allocation within the Plan which was assessed as having a high or moderate suitability for SPA qualifying birds.</p>	None

		habitat should be screened in for further assessment. However, no such further assessment has been carried out of such potential effects of the Neighbourhood Plan either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.	ADP advises that winter bird surveys have been carried out at Elms Farm and will be carried out at Highland Nursery in the winter of 2022/23. They also confirm that this process is needed at the planning application stage rather than in a NP.	
	NHS/NE Essex CCG	We would welcome the addition of a simple statement, to confirm that Tiptree Parish Council will support North East Essex CCG and NHS England in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Tiptree. North East Essex CCG would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the Parish Council potential solutions to ensure sustainable care services for the local community going forward.	There is already a statement to this effect in Non-Policy Actions. However, given the importance of healthcare provision, a similar statement will be placed within the main body of the Plan. This could be at the very end of Section 10, after Policy TIP10:	10.6 In view of the need for a new health facility, Tiptree Parish Council will support North East Essex CCG and NHS England in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Tiptree.
	Colchester Borough Council	Paragraph 2.11 This section should also include reference to the Tiptree Jam Factory Plan which forms part of the Colchester Development Plan.	Accepted addition of new paragraph 2.13.	Tiptree Jam Factory Plan (2013) Although there is no longer the intention to build a new Jam Factory, this plan still

				forms part of the Colchester Development Plan. It guides development for the Tiptree Jam Factory and adjoining land.
		<p>Paragraph 5.8</p> <p>This paragraph could also include reference to the Colchester Local Plan Section 2 Policy OV2, which further provides the policy context for development within the countryside.</p>	Accepted addition to paragraph 5.8.	Policy OV2 further provides the policy context for development of small scale rural exception sites to meet local affordable housing needs.
		<p>Paragraphs 5.9 to 5.12</p> <p>It is unclear why these paragraphs relating to flood risk and sustainable drainage systems are included with the Spatial Strategy chapter. These sections may be more appropriate within Chapter 11. If these paragraphs are moved here, Chapter 11 could be renamed to 'Green Infrastructure, Green Spaces and Countryside'.</p>	<p>Accepted - the section titled 'Flooding', paragraphs 5.9-5.12 to be moved to Section 11 following paragraph 11.4.</p> <p>Chapter 11 to be renamed, <i>COUNTRYSIDE, GREEN SPACES AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</i></p>	Accepted
		<p>Policy TIP01 – Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The policy could be updated to consider coalescence between Tiptree</p>	Accepted re-wording of Policy TIP01A.Development proposals outside the settlement boundary will only be

		and Tiptree Heath, given that both settlements are within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.		<p>permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. it relates to necessary utilities infrastructure and where no reasonable alternative location is available; orii. it is in accordance with Colchester Local Plan Section 2 Policy SG1 (Colchester's Spatial Strategy) and Policy OV2 (Countryside) in respect of development in the countryside; andiii. there is no coalescence between the built up area of Tiptree village and the hamlet of Tiptree Heath. (done)
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Map 7.1 Sustainable Movement</p> <p>This map could be updated to include cycleways and bridleways to show all potential sustainable travel methods.</p>	<p>Map 7.1 illustrates sustainable movement within the built up area of Tiptree. There are very few cycleways that do not correspond to the road network and only two Bridleways (Pennsylvania Lane & Park Lane). Moreover, this baseline context is not the point of the map which shows the main routes where pedestrian movement can best be increased in light of the site allocations.</p>	None
	<p>Paragraph 7.14</p> <p>As it is currently unknown the final details of the A12 widening scheme from Junctions 19 to 25 and that the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan is likely to proceed ahead of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process which will grant planning permission, the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan could commit to considering the need for undertaking a focused review once permission is granted.</p>	<p>TNP has been actively involved in the A12 process and has considered the various alternatives – whatever the final decision regarding the site of Jnc 24 it will potentially have impacts on the NP and there will be issues to pursue (some of which are listed in NPA). TPC will consider the need for a review at this time.</p>	None
	<p>Paragraph 8.5</p> <p>A footnote should be added to provide</p>	<p>Accepted – footnote added to paragraph 8.5.</p>	EBC 2.16 Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (December 2015) and EBC

		the full reference of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) report which is an evidence base document to the Colchester Local Plan.		2.15 Executive Summary form part of LPP2 Evidence Base Supporting Documents Section 2. <i>Housing and Population.</i>
		Chapter 9 – Employment This chapter could include an additional policy to safeguard existing employment areas within Tiptree, particularly any areas outside of those identified in the Section 2 Colchester Local Plan.	The shops and services in the village centre are protected through the CLPS2 District Centre designation and the Employment Zones are also protected by the CLPS2. There are no other significant areas that are not protected by the CLPS2.	None
		Paragraph 9.3 This paragraph should make clear that the Local Employment Areas (LEAs) are allocated in the Section 2 Colchester Local Plan as per policies SG4 and SS14.	Accepted – paragraph 9.3 amended.	9.3 Besides Tiptree District Centre, the LPP2 Policy SG4 and SS14 designate four Local Economic Areas (LEAs) in Tiptree.
		Policy TIP09 – Small Scale Commercial Workspaces The principle of this policy is supported. However, it is currently unclear from the policy and supporting text, the evidenced need for 1.1 ha of employment land within Highlands	This land was designated as an exchange for the land designated for employment use at Tower End in both the previous LP and newly adopted CLPS2. Although CBC gave evidence at the Marden Appeal that the land was no longer needed to be designated for	None

		Nursey.	employment use, it still figures in the SS14 policy map. An Employment Topic Paper has been prepared which includes up-to-date evidence from local agents regarding the kind of employment land that is in demand. Moreover, because the allocation at Highland Nursery requires the provision of some serviced land and units, it will be more attractive to prospective occupiers – and possibly to village centre trades that wish to relocate.	
		Clause b, paragraph b should be updated to include the Section 2 Colchester Local Plan policy references SG4 and SS14.	Accepted – TIP09 Clause B.b amended.	B. b. The Local Economic Areas (LEAs) specified by LPP2 Policies SG4 and SS14.
		Chapter 11 – Countryside and Green Spaces Given the extent of green infrastructure, landscape character and green spaces surrounding Tiptree, this chapter could be updated to include a policy regarding landscape impacts/character.	A new policy regarding the integration of development with the landscape (No hard edges, protection of lanes etc.) will be added to the TNP.	New policy (TIP12 in Reg 16 version)

		The Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan should also consider designating land as Local Green Spaces in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 101 to 103.	Areas that have proven worth to the community should be designated using evidence from the community Questionnaire.	New Policy (TIP13 in Reg 16 version)
		The Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan could consider preparing a Landscape Character Assessment and/or Environmental Audit to support any further policies.	This is not necessary as we have the necessary evidence in support of the two new policies in Chapter 11.	None
		Paragraph 11.3 A footnote should be added to provide the full reference details of the Local Wildlife Sites Review which is an evidence base document to the Colchester Local Plan.	Accepted – footnote added to paragraph 11.3 (11.4 in Reg 16 version).	EBC 4.2 Colchester Borough LoWS Review 2015 (Final Version November 2017) forms part of LPP2 Evidence Base Supporting Documents Section 4. <i>Environment</i> .
		Policy TIP13 – Highland Nursey As mentioned in response to Policy TIP09, it is currently unclear the evidenced need for 1.1ha of employment land within this allocation.	See earlier comment to CBC response to Policy TIP09.	None
		There is no mention of community facilities within this policy.	The reason is that the community facilities are proposed to be located at Elms Farm alongside the medical centre. This was felt to be the most accessible location for the community	12.9 The site allocations also provide the opportunity to deliver important community infrastructure. As explained in the Section

			<p>and was where the site promoters were offering the land. A statement (para 12.9) will be added to the supporting text to explain shared community facilities.</p>	<p>10, the two sites are required to deliver a community hub – incorporating a medical centre, community hall and car parking – and allotments. All this provision is proposed for the Elms Farm site because this is considered to represent the most accessible location for the community, with the hub enabling the potential flexible use of spaces as necessary for a wide range of complementary users, e.g. GP surgery, therapies, exercise classes, meeting spaces, etc. The developer is also able to offer the land here for such facilities. Both site allocations will also make contributions towards the provision of these facilities.</p>
		<p>Policy TIP 14 – Elms Farm Within supporting text to policy TIP10 –</p>	<p>Accepted – text to be added to the end of paragraph 12.14 (12.17 in Reg 16</p>	<p>In this regard the opportunity to create a</p>

		<p>Provision of Community Infrastructure, the Wording is more flexible for a 'Health and Wellbeing Hub'. Further explanation/commentary should be provided within the supporting text to Policy TIP14 to provide more clarity of the vision for the Hub. Similarly, an additional clause should be added to Policy TIP14 to outline that there is scope for the medical centre and community hall to be considered as one 'health and wellbeing hub'.</p>	<p>version).</p> <p>Accepted – wording of clauses d. and e. of Policy TIP14 (TIP 16 in Reg 16 version) are re-worded:</p>	<p>'Health and Wellbeing Hub' that incorporates elements of primary care, with community and voluntary partners supporting the community and enhancing their health and wellbeing is supported.</p> <p><i>d. Land totalling at least 0.4 hectares for a new medical centre <u>(as part of a health and wellbeing hub)</u> and vehicle parking to be provided.</i></p> <p><i>e. Land and contributions towards a community facility of at least 300m² floor space <u>that will form part of a health and wellbeing hub. This will preferably which may be co-located with the medical centre or, if this is not possible, as a standalone facility.</u></i></p>
--	--	---	---	--

	<p>Icarus Homes (Edward Gittins)</p>	<p>A request to include TIP17 in the development at Elms Farm.</p>	<p>The NP does not preclude future development here and developers in the Elms Farm area may wish to consider retaining access from site TIP04. A clause to this effect to be added to the supporting text</p> <p>The agreed housing allocation of 600 homes (including Barbrook Lane) meets the requirements of LPP2 and was based on what the present infrastructure in Tiptree together with expected improvements during the plan period could be expected to support. We have already exceeded this capacity with the granting of the Marden Appeal for 130 homes with little contribution towards addressing infrastructure needs. It is unreasonable to ask Tiptree to accommodate another c50 homes in this planning round as the infrastructure of Tiptree will be very stretched to accommodate this level of growth sustainably. With regard to the water pipes TNP has the following statement provided by ADP on behalf</p>	<p>12.16 (Reg 16 version) It is recognised that adjoining land behind the Bonnie Blue Oak public house may have potential for development to meet future housing targets established in any review of the Colchester Local Plan. For this reason the retention of a possible future road access from the Elms Farm area is encouraged so as not to preclude this opportunity should it arise in the future and be needed to support the sustainability of a future plan.</p> <p>None</p>
--	---	--	--	--

			<p><i>of Mersea Homes, 'the development capacity has taken account of potential site constraints and infrastructure requirements, and despite these constraints, the site is still being planned at a low density level and can easily accommodate the housing numbers.'</i></p>	
	<p>Hall Road (Edward Gittins) site ref: TIP10 (plus further land extending to the south)</p>	<p>The NP fails to have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which notes the contribution small and medium-sized can make to meeting the housing requirements of an area - especially as they are often built-out relatively quickly. Accordingly, the NPPF states that land to accommodate at least 10% of the housing requirement should be found on sites no larger than one hectare unless there are strong reasons for not doing so. Contrary to this stipulation, and without the necessary justification, the NP relies on large allocations for the whole of its minimum housing requirement and makes no provision for small and medium-sized sites. This is contrary to NPPF paragraphs 69 and</p>	<p>The SEA and Housing Topic Paper give the justification for the site selections. Furthermore, the NPPF does not say that neighbourhood plans must allocate small and medium sized sites (the wording in para 70 is 'give consideration to'). Development on larger sites provides more by way of community gains than on a series of small sites but in the NP the final selection of sites was influenced by the Vision and Objectives derived from community consultation and the infrastructure these sites could deliver. Even so, all submitted sites were considered and three small, potential 'windfall' sites are included within the revised settlement boundary. These sites are included because they were available and suitable sites but were</p>	<p>None</p>

		<p>70 which specifically emphasise the importance of ensuring provision is made for small and medium-sized sites especially in the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans;</p>	<p>not allocated because the landowners were not prepared for them to come forward as part of a comprehensive approach to the Highland Nursery site. However, to exclude them from the amended settlement boundary would create an illogical and incoherent settlement boundary. Therefore they are included because of the geography and the importance of providing coherence to the spatial strategy. NPPF paragraphs 69 & 70 require Local Planning Authorities to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than 1 hectare unless..... The relevant LPA is CBC, so the 10% should apply to Colchester Borough as a whole, but even then there are exceptions to this requirement. Also there is no concern that the large site allocations may take time to come forward. The Barbrook Lane site is under construction (200 dwellings), The Marden Homes site has been granted permission on appeal (130 dwellings) and the developer of the site allocations in the TNP – Mersea</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			Homes - is ready to proceed so the pipeline of housing development in Tiptree in the short term will be significant.	
		The NP does not explain and justify the delineation of the Tiptree Settlement Boundary as shown on the Tiptree Policies Map which is drawn without making the necessary provision for allocated sites of under one hectare to supplement its main housing allocations;	The proposed revision to the settlement boundary includes three small, potential 'windfall' sites of 0.5 to 1.0 ha each. These sites are included for the reasons explained above.	None
		The Settlement Boundary is, in certain locations, both anomalous and inconsistent in the way it includes or excludes established development and hence requires review.	The change to the boundary has been shaped by LPP2 Policy SS14 and the directions for growth. The result of the site assessment process and the accompanying potential to amend the boundary in these directions has resulted in 2 site allocations that will address the requirements of SS14.	None
		The whole of the minimum housing requirement of 400 dwellings is therefore taken up by these two large sites.	As explained earlier, the approach to the site allocation process to meet the minimum requirement of 400 dwellings was derived from thorough assessment of an extensive number of sites and the accompanying SEA	None

			<p>process. It was also informed by the objectives of the plan, as established through community engagement. The pipeline of sites under construction and with planning permission in Tiptree is substantial and will deliver a significant level of growth over the short term. Despite this, the site allocations are being taken forward by Mersea Homes, a volume housebuilder with a proven track record of delivery.</p>	
		<p>Indeed, the focus on large sites to the exclusion of small and medium-sized sites is even more pronounced if one takes account of the large Barbrook Lane site released on Appeal. As this site also has an approximate capacity of 200 dwellings, the minimum of 600 new dwellings originally earmarked for Tiptree in the emerging Colchester Section 2 Local Plan would therefore be absorbed in just 3 large sites.</p>	<p>The Barbrook Lane development is now under construction so there is no need to allocate small sites in order to provide an ongoing supply of housing in the early part of the plan period. Furthermore Marden Homes now has permission so will be coming forward in the short term. It is unclear why delivering 600 dwellings on 3 sites means the plan would not meet the Basic Conditions and no evidence has been submitted to explain this further.</p>	<p>None</p>

		<p>There are also significant anomalies in the delineation of the Settlement Boundary as it appears on the Tiptree Policies Map. For example, with regard to the Employment Zones - the Wilkins Jam Factory Employment Zone is included within the Settlement Boundary but the Tower House Employment Zone is excluded. Then, in the vicinity of the Tower House site, housing along the southern side of Kelvedon Road forms part of the village's built-up area but is excluded from the Settlement Boundary. Similarly, a line of dwellings on the eastern side of Hall Road and those on the former International Camp site on its western side, all of which form part of the built-up area, are currently excluded from the Settlement Boundary. We consider such anomalies need to be rationalised.</p>	<p>The Wilkin Employment Zone is included because it is designated employment land adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and was already included within the settlement boundary as shown on the LPP2 Policy SS14 Policies Map. By contrast, the Tower End designated employment land is separated from the new settlement boundary which takes into account the Highland Nursery allocation. It is the other side of Kelvedon Road and extends towards open countryside adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. There is considered to be no justification for extending the boundary in this location. The adjacent land has now been granted planning permission for development therefore the settlement boundary may be extended as and when that development has been built out. There is no clear rationale for the inclusion of the properties on Hall Road but the effect would be to increase the potential for coalescence of Tiptree and Tiptree Heath, contrary to Policy</p>	None
--	--	--	--	------

			TIP01.	
		Specifically, the anomaly in the Hall Road area can be addressed by amending the Settlement Boundary whilst at the same time addressing the need to make provision for small and medium sized sites.	This proposal as shown on Annex EGA1 at the end of this submission creates a potential development site of similar size to either Highland Nursery or Elm Farm. The delineated area is far bigger than the 1Ha threshold for small sites.	None
		Action is therefore required in order to ensure the NP is compliant with the NPPF and we therefore respectfully request an amendment be made to the Tiptree Settlement Boundary to include land at Hall Road and Bull Lane.	The NP is compliant with the NPPF and there are sound reasons for the selection of the proposed sites in terms of providing sustainable development that conforms to LPP2 Policy SS14.	None
	Rhubarb Hall (Edward Gittins) site ref: TIP11		This submission is a repeat of the arguments presented above and the same responses apply. The only difference is that TIP11 is below the 1ha threshold. However, like the above, TIP11 would be delivering a not insignificant amount of growth on the eastern side of Tiptree, which would be contrary to the requirements of LPP2 Policy SS14.	None

	Bloor Homes, site ref: TIP65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TNP is contrary to numerous aspects of national policy and guidance. 	<i>We disagree – see below.</i>	None
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TNP conforms to neither existing nor emerging strategic policies in the Development Plan; 	<i>It does conform to the eLP (as modified).</i>	None
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<i>Evidence is provided – see below.</i>	None
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues of legal compliance in respect of the accompanying Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). 	<i>The SEA is legally compliant and objective.</i>	None
		Paragraph 2.8. There is no evidence that the proposed link road could actually be delivered, nor that the provision of a link road would deliver the sustainability objectives of the TNP.	<i>Strategic Transport Appraisals, as required by eLP Policy SS14, have been completed by Cottee Transport Planning (2021 & 2022) in support of the Northern Link Road proposal. A statement by ADP 28/3/22 on behalf of</i>	None

			<p>Mersea Homes confirms the deliverability of the proposed sites – including land for a medical facility and future highway enhancements. Furthermore the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Tiptree and Messing cum Inworth Parish Councils provides agreement for the future completion of the Link Road ‘missing arc’ and the land it crosses is under the same ownership and developer as the Highland Nursery and Elms Farm sites in this NP.</p>	
		<p>Paragraph 2.11 the TNP appears to merely rely on the requirement for a future application for the site’s development to be accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment. However, such an approach is wholly unsatisfactory, as it leaves very much in doubt whether development can be accommodated at all on the site without harming the significance of designated heritage assets, let alone what quantum of development may be acceptable</p>	<p>The approach is considered proportionate in light of the extent and significance of the heritage assets. No objection to this approach was received either by Historic England or by CBC’s Historic Environment Team.</p>	None

		<p>This Reg. 14 consultation includes a number of documents that provide a high level analysis of transport-related issues, primarily concerned with addressing the shortcomings of the previous TNP. However, the travel to work data is based on the 2011 Census, and fails to take account of the changes in work patterns that have resulted from the COVID-19 pandemic.</p>	<p>It is impossible to know at this stage what impact Covid-19 will have on travel to work patterns over the lifetime of the plan. On this basis, evidence would be impossible to present. It is considered that the evidence used represents the most reasonable available sources.</p>	None
		<p>Paragraph 2.19 This would suggest that the starting point for the analysis of suitable sites has been the delivery of a specific stretch of road, which has weighed disproportionately against other sustainable options.</p>	<p>This is not the case. All sites were objectively assessed before a consideration of the NP objectives was applied. Objective 3 relates to the desire to provide easy access to the main routes whilst minimising the impact on the village centre. This was a factor (as were the other objectives) in the determination of the sites that were most strategically positioned. The link road proposal followed as a further means to enable easy access to the main routes.</p>	None
		<p>Paragraph 2.21. In addition to the lack of evidence to support the selection of sites, there is a similar lack of evidence</p>	<p>This is not the case. Tiptree NP has a professionally produced SEA that deals with these issues as well as the</p>	None

		to support the rejection of reasonable alternatives.	Housing Topic Paper.	
		Paragraph 2.23. However, the TNP does not appear to have considered any of the evidence that the Borough Council utilised to reach its conclusions in respect of the LP and the broad areas of growth identified for Tiptree.	At the time of preparing and finalising the Publication Draft of the emerging Local Plan, Tiptree Parish Council were working collaboratively with the Council and committed to progressing with a Neighbourhood Plan to allocate land for 600 houses to meet the needs in the area and contribute to the Borough's housing requirement up until 2033. The Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan Group launched their own Call for Sites in April 2017, which due to its timing could not be factored into the Emerging Local Plan. However, the early engagement with the community informed a preferred strategy for growth to the north and west of the settlement. This was reflected in the directions of preferred growth arrows that were shown on the submitted Policies Map SS14. Through the Local Plan examination, modifications to these broad direction of growth were refined to take into account the updated evidence base supporting the	None

			<p>Local Plan (including the Local Wildlife Site Review), the Maldon Road, Tiptree appeal decision (which in the Council's opinion presented an alternative interpretation of the broad direction of growth arrows on the SS14 Policy Map) and further evidence supporting the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan. As a result, the broad directions of growth are now within the south west and north/northwest of Tiptree, subject to existing constraints.</p> <p>The Colchester Local Plan Section 2 (CLP S2) was adopted on 4 July 2022. This therefore has full weight. The emerging allocations in the Tiptree NHP are consistent with Policy SS14 in the CLP S2 which outlines a minimum of 400 dwellings are to be allocated in the Tiptree NHP in accordance with the broad direction of growth of the south west and north/northwest, subject to existing constraints. These broad directions of growth are illustrated on the supporting SS14 Policy Map.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>The CLP S2 Inspector considered modifications to Policy SS14 Tiptree in his report (paragraphs 109 to 111) and concluded that modifications to the opening text of the policy to direct growth to the preferred directions of growth were considered necessary to provide a clear direction and flexibility for the delivery of housing through the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Similarly, through the CLP S2 Examination, within Matter 1 of his MIQs, the Inspector asked the question "Are there any policies within CLP Section 2 which are Strategic Policies, and should they be identified as such?" As a result of this, the Inspector required modifications to Policy SG8 – Neighbourhood Plans to clarify which policies are strategic. Policy SG8 states that "Neighbourhood Plans are required to be compliant with the following Strategic Policies in this Plan: Section 1 Policies SP1-9 and Section 2 Policies SG1-8, ENV1- 5, CC1 and PP1". As outlined in the Basic Conditions, Neighbourhood Plans are required to</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			be in general conformity with strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority.	
		Paragraph 2.24. The Tiptree Site Selection Process report dismisses TIP65 on the basis that it could potentially lead to coalescence with Tiptree Heath and add traffic to Maldon Road by Heath School.	The site on offer has some merits however it performs less well in the consideration of alternatives. This site was refused on appeal because of its impact on landscape and coalescence with Tiptree Heath. Furthermore it is a stated objective of the NP to improve movement through Tiptree for vehicular traffic – and Maldon Road is already a busy road. The Bloor plan provided access to the estate close to a position opposite the Heath Primary School – out of which cars from 255 homes would be entering onto Maldon Road. Additionally the Bloor proposals included a school drop off within the development site. This would further add to traffic movements as vehicles enter the estate to drop off their charges and then attempt to exit the estate. It was considered that the potential for significant congestion was considerable. It is considered that by choosing sites to the north, such traffic	None

			<p>congestion could be avoided and the creation of some strategic roads would disperse traffic around the village thus avoiding pressure points and reducing congestion rather than adding to it. Furthermore the sites to the north could provide land for a much needed new medical facility. The proposed sites clearly perform better in the consideration of alternatives.</p>	
		<p>Paragraph 2.38. There remain significant doubts as to the deliverability of the new proposed link road.</p>	<p>A statement by ADP 28/3/22 on behalf of Mersea Homes confirms the deliverability of the proposed sites – including land for a medical facility and future highway enhancements. Tiptree NP has discussed the cross-boundary issues with Messing cum Inworth PC and together with MCIPC has drawn up a statement of common ground. It is accepted that the Parish Boundary could be adjusted to allow the development of the remaining portions of site TIP49 during a future plan period.</p>	None
		<p>Section 3 Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment</p>	<p>Disagree. Tiptree NP has a professionally produced SEA that</p>	None

		and legal compliance	considers reasonable alternatives and takes into account the detailed site assessment work, as presented in the Housing Topic Paper. This and CLPS2 Policy SS14 have informed the spatial strategy in the TNP.	
		Paragraph 3.13. 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 link road is deliverable and there is evidence in support of its benefit however the TNP is not based around the delivery of this road – as explained above.	None
	Matthews & Son LLP (Simon Chaffe)	TIP02 A7 to include '...or elsewhere within the parish.' at the end of the sentence.	Accepted. TIP02 A7 amended.	In order to address the need for biodiversity net gain, integral features of benefit to wildlife should be incorporated into buildings and amenity areas or elsewhere within the parish.
		TIP11 In respect of C the additional text '...throughout the parish...' to be added to the introductory sentence.	Accepted. Policy TIP11 C amended.	In order to address the requirement for biodiversity net gain, development proposals should explore a wide range of opportunities throughout the parish

				including:
		TIP13 Item f) to include additional text 'Such gains should be sought and delivered within the parish in the first instance if available'.	Accepted. Policy TIP13 f amended.	Development should deliver net environmental and biodiversity gains, in addition to protecting existing habitats and species. Such gains should be sought and delivered within the parish in the first instance if available. Any negative impacts on biodiversity, including flora and fauna, and local wildlife must be adequately mitigated and/or offset.
		TIP14 In respect of 'h' the same comment applies as for TIP13 'f'	Accepted Policy TIP14 h amended.	(As above)
	Feering PC	Feering Parish Council have a neutral view of this Neighbourhood Plan Document. The plan does not appear to have addressed the reality of vehicular traffic on the Inworth Road. Feering Parish Council do not agree that Inworth Road will not be as trafficked as suggested and this needs	Regarding bedrooms, the NP conforms to CBC policy and does not have a policy requiring smaller homes to be delivered, as explained in paragraphs 6.11-6.13.	None

		to be considered in any future proposals. Feering Parish Council are also disappointed that the policy on one- and two-bedroom homes seems disproportionate to other local Neighbourhood Plans.		
	Tolleshunt Knights PC	<p>TIP01 Tolleshunt Knights Parish Council agrees with the proposal to focus new development to the north of Tiptree. We consider it vital that a clear green buffer zone is maintained between Tiptree and Tolleshunt Knights in order to keep the separate identity of each village and to prevent Tolleshunt Knights from becoming a suburb of Tiptree.</p> <p>TIP06 All such cycling and pedestrian routes should be put in place before any major development takes place.</p> <p>TIP07 New infrastructure should be in place before major building starts to avoid more difficulties in an already overstretched system.</p>	Usually not possible, regrettably, because the funding of such provision comes from the sale of completed housing.	None
		TIP10 We agree with the above but past history eg at the Wilkins	Allotments will be provided on the Wilkins development in 2022. The CCG	None

		<p>development on Factory Hill has shown that developers can renege on promises to make provisions such as allotments and medical centres. The Plan recognises that these facilities are already severely overstretched, and will become even more so given further development in Tiptree and the surrounding villages. It is noted that one of the options in the review of the Maldon District Local Plan is to focus more development in villages around Tiptree in order to make use of its facilities. Improved services must therefore come before any major development.</p>	<p>did not take up this offer of land. Will MDC be making S106 contributions to Tiptree infrastructure?</p> <p>The Maldon District Local Plan Review recently was published for the Issues and Options consultation, which is at the early stages of plan making process. CBC and TPC will continue to engage with Maldon District Council through the plan making process.</p>	
		<p>TIP13 The provision of a northern link road is essential to avoid future severe congestion.</p> <p>General: The stance of Tolleshunt Knights Parish Council is emphasised: A buffer between Tiptree and Tolleshunt Knights must be maintained.</p> <p>Major development must be preceded</p>	<p>Usually not possible for infrastructure to precede development, regrettably, because the funding of such provision comes from the sale of completed housing.</p>	<p>None</p>

		by an improvement to transport infrastructure and medical facilities which are already inadequate. Developers must be required to address these issues and deliver such services before major development takes place.		