

## Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation - Schedule of Responses Summary

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
<b>Natural England</b> Via email	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p><b>Ref: 344352: Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan Submission Consultation</b></p> <p>Thank you for your consultation.</p> <p>Natural England has previously commented on this proposal and made comments to the authority in our letter ref – 316301, dated 19 June 2020. I have attached a copy of it for ease of access.</p> <p>The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this submission consultation.</p> <p>Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p> <p><u>Letter ref – 316301, dated 19 June 2020.</u></p> <p>Planning consultation: Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Opinion and Sustainable Environment Assessment screening</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above received 06 May 2020. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan Policies</p> <p>The Marks Tey Parish falls in its entirety within one or more of the Zones of Influence (ZoI). Therefore residential development within the parish area</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/C om	NP Section	Representation
			<p>which will be subject to the requirements of this strategic solution. This will be in accordance with the RAMS supplementary planning document once adopted. Natural England welcomes Policy MT12- Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) within the neighbourhood plan. We would also suggest an addition to this policy directly referencing the need for the consideration of avoidance measures within the boundaries of any developments such as on-site greenspace and links to footpaths to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) It is our advice, on the basis of the material supplied with the consultation, that, in so far as our strategic environmental interests are concerned (including but not limited to statutory designated sites, landscapes and protected species, geology and soils) are concerned, that there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan. Guidance on the assessment of Neighbourhood Plans in light of the SEA Directive is contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>The guidance highlights three triggers that may require the production of an SEA, for instance where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> a neighbourhood plan allocates sites for development</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the neighbourhood area contains sensitive natural or heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals in the plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the neighbourhood plan may have significant environmental effects that have not already been considered and dealt with through a sustainability appraisal of the Local Plan.</li> </ul> <p>Natural England acknowledges that there are no European designated sites within the plan area itself, but does contain Marks Tey Brick Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). As has been identified within the HRA</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/C om	NP Section	Representation
			<p>screening for both the Neighbourhood Plan (as referenced below), the plan area does fall within the Zone of Influence for the Essex Coast Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) which is currently in development. Notwithstanding this, in light of there being no housing allocations within the Neighbourhood plan, Natural England would agree with the conclusion of no likely significant effect as identified and that in our view the proposals contained within the plan will not have significant effects on sensitive sites that Natural England has a statutory duty to protect.</p> <p>We are not aware of significant populations of protected species which are likely to be affected by the policies / proposals within the plan. It remains the case, however, that the responsible authority should provide information supporting this screening decision, sufficient to assess whether protected species are likely to be affected.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this advice, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all potential environmental assets. As a result, the responsible authority should raise environmental issues that we have not identified on local or national biodiversity action plan species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites or local landscape character, with its own ecological and/or landscape advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local landscape and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by this plan, before determining whether an SA/SEA is necessary.</p> <p>Please note that Natural England reserves the right to provide further comments on the environmental assessment of the plan beyond this SEA/SA screening stage, should the responsible authority seek our views on the scoping or environmental report stages. This includes any third-party appeal against any screening decision you may make.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			<p>Habitats Regulations Screening Natural England welcomes the consultation on the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) undertaken for The Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan. Noting the context of the plan area in that there are no residential allocations, we would agree with the conclusion of No Likely Significant Effect and have no further comments to make in this regard. We would also take this opportunity to advise you that any windfall applications which would be in excess of what has been assessed in the Neighbourhood Plan Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), would need to be subject to their own, project level HRA. I hope the above comments are helpful.</p> <p>For clarification of any points in this letter only, please contact me on 020 802 6326. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: <a href="mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk">consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</a></p>
<b>Tiptree Parish Council</b>  By email	<b>Support</b>	<b>Generally</b>	Tiptree Parish Council is pleased to note the completion of the Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan for Marks Tey and wishes to express its full support for the proposed plan
<b>Mr Edward Gittins</b>  By email	<b>Support</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p><b><u>Land at “The Car Boot Field” (Summary)</u></b></p> <p>We act for Granville Developments who have an interest in land known as "The Car Boot Field" which lies partly within Marks Tey Parish. Our Clients have formulated draft proposals for this large site which extends to 8.51 hectares (21.04 acres) and which were originally submitted to Colchester Borough Council and considered as part of the emerging Colchester Borough Local Plan. These proposals were not supported by the Borough Council and the site was omitted from the Section 2 Local Plan. Notwithstanding the uncertainties surrounding future village housing provision and major road schemes, the consultation document provides an excellent interim context for the consideration of future village housing sites and is commended in this particular respect</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			<p>The NP is welcomed because it provides an excellent enabling document which will positively influence future development and enhance the village in terms of its setting and facilities. A case has been outlined to demonstrate the contribution The Car Boot Field can make through a comprehensive approach to the delivery of village housing and open space. However, because the site straddles the boundary of two Civil Parishes and two separate Neighbourhood Plan Areas, it will require a common purpose and close collaboration in order to deliver the package of development proposals outlined here. This is not seen as a handicap but as an opportunity for two Parishes to work together and co-ordinate their proposals via their respective Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Our clients would be more than willing to work alongside the Parish Councils to amend and refine these basic proposals and in order to establish a robust process for the delivery of the scheme as a whole. In the meantime, it is hoped that our response is of assistance in proceeding to the next stage of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<b>Boyer Planning on behalf of Mr Andrew Mattin By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p><b><u>Land at Livelands, London Road Marks Tey (summary)</u></b></p> <p>These representations to the Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan Submission Consultation are made on behalf of Mr Andrew Mattin in respect of land at Livelands, London Road, Marks Tey.</p> <p>The existing principal use of the land is the storage of unoccupied caravans. The site benefits from existing access. The site is previously developed land and is suitable and available for residential development. It is considered that development of the site would improve the character of the area. It is important to consider that the settlement boundaries are flexible and capable of review. The supporting text to MT05 and the policy is supported. Policy MT13 is generally supported. The boundary identified in Policy MT14 should align with that in the emerging Local Plan.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
<b>Nikki Lax Colliers By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p>I am contacting you on behalf of W H Collier Limited, Marks Tey. I am one of the directors and shareholders of the company, I also grew up in the village of Marks Tey as my late father was kiln manager and later MD of the company. I have a few comments regarding the Neighbourhood plan (which I have previously noted when the NP was open to residents, although it seems these haven't been amended).</p> <p>2.17 our history and current status is incorrect; We were taken over in 1988 by Christian Salvesen, in 2005 we became an independent company once again.</p> <p>-2.12 No mention of W H Collier in the Business community (we are probably the oldest local business in Marks Tey).</p>
<b>Edward James Historic England By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p>Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the Regulation 16 Submission version of this Neighbourhood Plan. We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan but do consider it necessary for Historic England to provide detailed comments at this time. We would refer you to any previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 stage, and for any further information to our detailed advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-yourneighbourhood/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-yourneighbourhood/</a></p> <p>I would be grateful if you would notify me if and when the Neighbourhood Plan is made by the district council. To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed NP, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment. Please do contact me, either via email or the number above, if you have any queries.</p>
<b>David Hill Dandara Milton Keynes</b>	<b>Comment/ object</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p>These representations are made in relation to <b><u>land north of Coggeshall Road, Long Green, Marks Tey, Colchester</u></b>. (Summary) We support the production of a Neighbourhood Plan for the area as it provides more local</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
By email			<p>control over decision-making and increases the proportion of funding (generated by development) delivered locally for the benefit of the local community. The land north of Coggeshall Road, Marks Tey provides the opportunity to expand the settlement north into an unconstrained area of land adjoining the settlement boundary as is identified in the Master-planning document appended to the Neighbourhood Plan. It provides the opportunity to enhance and improve the links across the A120 which are identified as a key barrier to the settlement in the plan. It also presents an opportunity to deliver infrastructure and / or services and facilities in combination with residential development to enhance the sustainability of the settlement. As currently drafted, the Neighbourhood Plan does not include any sites for residential development and so in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF (2019) the plan will not hold any weight in relation to applications where the “tilted balance” applies. We believe that allocation of this site will provide the plan material weight going forward and will deliver a housing scheme that will contribute to the settlement as well as meet need arising over the plan period.</p>
<b>Barton Willmore On behalf of L&amp;Q, Cirrus Land and G120 Land By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p>(Summary)</p> <p>These representations are made on behalf of L&amp;Q, Cirrus Land and G120 Land (the ‘Promoters’) to the Marks Tey Neighbourhood Development Plan (the ‘NDP’) Regulation 16 consultation which runs until 5th April 2021, before its submission for Examination. L&amp;Q is a regulated charitable housing association and one of the UK’s most successful and dynamic independent social businesses. They would take on a master developer role committing to long-term investment in the local community and on-going stakeholder management. Marks Tey was one of several parishes that was previously identified as being covered by Braintree/Colchester Garden Community identified in the earlier iteration of the emerging North Essex Strategic Local Plan Section 1. Following the Inspectors final report, this draft allocation was removed via main modifications to the Plan.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/C om	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Consequentially, Marks Tey no longer has any housing allocations in the Colchester Borough Section 1 or 2 Local Plans which is currently open for Matters, Issues and Questions consultation until 6th April 2021 with Examination in Public due to run between 20th and 30th.</p> <p>The previous allocation for a new Garden Community has been removed from the now adopted Section 1 Local Plan. The principal reasons for this related to viability around the delivery of necessary infrastructure. More fundamentally, the proposals were of such a significant scale, and were to be delivered over such a long, almost unconceivable period, during what is widely anticipated to herald a new era of transport and technological change. Whilst the Promoters do not agree with the Inspectors decision it is acknowledged that an alternative approach is required, with a more hands on approach from them.</p> <p>The Promoters remain committed to the delivery of a new settlement at Marks Tey, but one that is of a reduced scale and therefore more conceivable, that responds to the unique needs and challenges facing the local community, is focused on high quality design, net zero carbon and healthy living, and which embraces existing and future innovation. The Promoters are committed to working with Marks Tey Parish Council and its Neighbourhood Plan Group to identify and secure the many opportunities that are presented by such a proposal.</p> <p>We are pleased to respond to the NDP document in the following sections.</p> <p>The document has a clear and concise structure which is accessible and professional. We note the evidence base has had regard to the future development taking place at Marks Tey, which is positive.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			<p>As identified, Marks Tey benefits from a range of facilities and excellent connectivity, but congestion during peak times primarily along the A120 is a major concern for residents.</p>
<b>Matthew Corcoran CDS Planning By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p><b><u>Land on the north side of Coggeshall Road and west of Mott's Lane.</u></b> (Summary)</p> <p>Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan Consultation, Colchester Borough Council Site Address – Land on the north side of Coggeshall Road, Marks Tey, Colchester Please see enclosed representation form and this cover letter confirming that the site referenced above is available and deliverable for development and should be considered for housing as part of the Neighbourhood Plan to include both private and affordable tenures. CDS Planning are acting on behalf of the Landowner and we consider that the site represents an excellent development opportunity to deliver a high quality housing development that would be in keeping with the surrounding area.</p> <p>The site is located on the north side of Coggeshall Road, Marks Tey within a sustainable location on the edge of the existing settlement.</p> <p>CDS Planning consider that the site could contribute towards meeting the Parish's development needs for housing and to include homes for local people. Currently the site does not contribute to the community and there is an opportunity to add value and provide a positive housing proposal to the existing settlement</p>
<b>Michael Ward Strutt and Parker By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p><b><u>Land north of Old London Road</u></b> (Summary)</p> <p>On behalf of our client, Marks Tey Limited, we write to make the following representations to the Borough Council concerning the Submission Draft of the Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2033 and the current Regulation 16 Consultation on that Plan.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/C om	NP Section	Representation
			<p>Marks Tey Limited has land interests relating to the land north of Old London Road at Marks Tey. Within previous representations, we expressed concern in respect of the approach to our client's wider land interests.</p> <p>The Basic Conditions Statement (at paragraph 5.1) confirms that "<i>The Local Plan relevant to the neighbourhood plan is therefore the Adopted Local Plan 2001 to 2021</i>" including the Site Allocations DPD (2010), which allocates an area of 8.03 hectares of land suitable for employment use in the NP area. As drafted, the Neighbourhood Plan fails to satisfy in full the Basic Conditions for the preparation and examination of Neighbourhood Plans in that it has failed to take account of extant site allocations in Page 2 of Colchester Borough Council the adopted Development Plan.</p>
<b>Andrew Martin Planning</b> (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited)  By email	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Generally</b>	<p>(Summary)</p> <p>These responses to the Marks Tey Parish Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation are submitted on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R. F. West Limited. R.F. West Limited own a substantial area of land comprising in total approximately 155 hectares to the south of the village, and Crest Nicholson have an option on approximately 55 hectares within this overall area and to the south of London Rad, as shown on the attached plan. Both parties have jointly promoted through various stages of the emerging Local Plan a comprehensive residential-led mixed use development comprising approximately 1,000 homes, a new local centre, primary school, employment, open space landscaping and ancillary development. The current scheme is now proposed as a sustainable extension to Marks Tey.</p> <p>Proposals could include the construction of a deck over the A12 to form a 'green' or 'living' bridge; a focus on the significant group of listed buildings and moated grounds at Marks Tey Hall,</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			Generally, the preparation of the Parish Neighbourhood Plan is to be applauded, together with the content of the two supporting documents.
<b>Mrs Patricia Beech Representation ID: 7762</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>The Neighbourhood Plan Area</b>	Under the Historic Environment section, the 'Neighbourhood Plan' clearly and correctly states there are 27 Listed buildings found within the area. However, supporting documents such as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report 23,03,20 states there are only 23! They have lost 4 listed buildings/structures. If these can be overlooked is anything else of importance missing from their reports?
<b>Essex Bridleways Association Representation ID: 7755</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Vision and Objectives</b>	The Vision should be amended to incorporate an aspiration to improve access to the countryside for ALL vulnerable road users and not just specify 'paths and cycleways'. The correct terminology would be Highways, public rights of way network, and footways and cycleways.
<b>Mr Edward Gittins By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Vision and Objectives</b>	<p><b><u>Land at “The Car Boot Field” (Summary)</u></b></p> <p>Our approach in relation to design at this site is to retain an undeveloped green gap between the existing settlement boundaries for Marks Tey and Copford in order to retain them as free-standing settlements. The benefits from the proposed scheme - combining village-scale housing development to accessible open space - will help fulfil one of the Plan's Core Objectives: To create a more connected and cohesive community.</p>
<b>Mrs Julie Briggs</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT01 A12/A120 Station</b>	I would like the station car parking problems to be sorted. People Park along all of North Station Road making it a dangerous road to drive along and to cross as a pedestrian. The car park cannot cope with the existing resident's car use but people are also coming from Stanway and other

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
Representation ID: 7751		Infrastructure Improvements	suburbs of Colchester since the density of population has increased all around Colchester because parking in Colchester North Station cannot provide sufficient spaces. Maybe a bus from the estate to the station and from Stanway estate would ease this.
<b>Barton Willmore On behalf of L&amp;Q, Cirrus Land and G120 Land</b> By email	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT01</b> A12/A120 Station Infrastructure Improvements	<p>Section 3.22 provides a useful SWOT analysis of the plan area on which we believe is a fair articulation of the experience of Marks Tey. However, we make the following comments:</p> <p>Under Strengths low density development considers space for house extensions as a strength. This may also be considered a weakness as extending existing housing will over time make the current stock more unaffordable and inaccessible to younger generations.</p> <p>Under weaknesses very poor accessibility to places, shops and services for the mobility impaired is outlined. Should this poor accessibility be clarified as being by foot and cycle routes to highlight why movement is overly car reliant.</p> <p>We note the concerns of residents that development could only be considered once the A120 and A12 infrastructure projects have been delivered. However, each application needs to be judged on its own merits and must be evidence based. The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) is clear that development should be refused where the highways impact is severe (paragraph 109). Furthermore, large developments could be approved with suitably worded conditions or legal agreements which would prevent development past certain trigger points (monitor and manage) until infrastructure has been complete.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			The above paragraphs also cover our response to policy MT01, around severity of impact and the approach being evidence based on the time of submission. It may be more appropriate to refer to the severity of impact rather than the significance of movements generated.
<b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> Representation ID: 7757	<b>Object</b>	<b>Policy MT02 – Creating walking and cycle friendly neighbour hoods</b>	<p>This Plan should contain an aspiration to improve facilities for ALL vulnerable road users – walkers, cyclists, equestrians and the less mobile – and not restrict its aims to just walking and cycling, and this aspiration should be reflected within both Policies and the reasoned justification for the Policy. Such an omission is discriminatory and should be addressed.</p> <p>We therefore request that this Policy MT02 on page 44 of the Plan should incorporate the aspiration to improve off-road access for ALL vulnerable road users including equestrians.</p>
<b>Mrs Julie Briggs</b> Representation ID: 7750	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT02 – Creating walking and cycle friendly neighbour hoods</b>	I would like to be able to cycle or walk safely in the local area. At the moment if I need to go to the local shops I often go by car rather than walk because of the weight of traffic making the journey unpleasant, noisy and with poor air quality.
<b>Feering Parish Council</b> Clerk to Feering Parish Council via email	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Policy MT02 – Creating walking and cycle friendly</b>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Feering Parish Council. We have some comments in relation to the above consultation, however, they are neither supporting nor objecting to the plan so it was not appropriate to respond to the online response.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
		neighbour hoods	<p>Feering Parish Council's comments are as follows:</p> <p>As set out in Feering Parish Council's response to the regulation 14 consultation, there is still no mention of Elm Lane, which borders Feering, in any of the policies in terms of improving walking / cycling, nor as a rural lane.</p> <p><b>Policy MT02 – Creating walking and cycle friendly neighbourhoods</b></p> <p>Table 6.1 – provide new pedestrian and cycleway connection – we would like to see Elm Lane added to point 3. The Marks Tey to Feering connection is not just along the A12 joint cycleway / footway. Elm Lane is a well-used cut through from the A120 to Feering and this should be made more cycle friendly.</p>
<b>Mr Edward Gittins By email</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Policy MT02 – Creating walking and cycle friendly neighbour hoods</b>	<u>Land at "The Car Boot Field" (Summary)</u> <i>'Our Proposals'</i> - The proposed open space will be highly accessible and large enough to replicate the amenities of more open countryside, with space to roam and cycle or simply sit and relax. The landscaping proposals incorporate, as noted, provision for walking and cycling in line with Policy MT02: Creating Walking and Cycle Friendly Neighbourhoods. We strongly support the requirements of Policy MT02 to "increase the attractiveness of walking and cycling in the parish as a whole." Also, the inclusion of "...walking and cycling routes as part of the design" and "...ensuring these are accessible for people less able including those using wheelchairs, mobility scooters or prams."
<b>Barton Willmore On behalf of L&amp;Q, Cirrus</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT02 – Creating walking and cycle</b>	Policy MT02 focusing on cycle and pedestrian friendly neighbourhoods is fully supported. Any new development should identify how local facilities can be improved and new facilities provided to enable more sustainable forms of movement. However, without development of a certain scale to

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
<b>Land and G120 Land By email</b>		friendly neighbour hoods	unlock some of the infrastructure identified in the NDP, this will be difficult to achieve.
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited) By email</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT02 – Create Walking and Cycle Friendly Neighbour hoods:</b>	This policy is fully supported, and all these requirements would be incorporated into the Crest Nicholson scheme.
<hr/>			
<b>Essex Bridleways Association Representation ID: 7758</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Policy MT03 – A120 Coggeshall Road: A Quality street for all</b>	There is a huge opportunity for the parish when the A120 is built and the old road de-trunked. Much of the PROW network is severed by the A120 and there should be an aspiration within the Plan to address historical severance, and the PROW network be enhanced for all users, including equestrians. Safe crossings for all vulnerable road users should also be required within the Plan – and any measures must be useable by walkers, cyclists and equestrians and not just walkers and cyclists. Policy MT03 should be amended to incorporate improvements for ALL vulnerable road users, including equestrians.
<b>Mrs Julie Briggs Representation ID: 7749</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Policy MT03 – A120 Coggeshall Road: A Quality street for all</b>	I do not think a 20 mph limit will help traffic congestion, there will be more miles of stationary traffic which will make it more difficult to join at the estate roundabouts. We need the section of A120 going through MarksTey to be only local traffic, not big lorries.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited) By email</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT03 – A120 Coggeshall Road: A Quality Street for All</b>	Is fully supported, but this would have to be secured by others, because it is outside the control or scope of the Promoters.
<b>Anglian Water Representation ID: 7747</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT04 Village Settlement Boundaries</b>	<p>We have previously sought changes to the Neighbourhood Plan so that it refers to utility infrastructure as being a use which is acceptable in principle outside of the defined village settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Policy MT04 has been amended to refer to utility infrastructure being an appropriate countryside use and is therefore supported</p>
<b>Mrs Julie Briggs Representation ID: 7752</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT04 Village Settlement Boundaries</b>	<p>As already stated, I would like to be able to walk or cycle freely around the village area but the current weight of traffic makes crossing the A120 a big problem on foot which currently separates the church and church hall which is heavily used by the village community as far as pedestrians are concerned causing many to use their cars rather than wait to cross the A120 with children.</p> <p>I also agree with the considerations to keep Marks Tey and Little Tey as separate villages with their unique identities.</p>
<b>Mr Edward Gittins By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT04</b>	<p><b><u>Land at “The Car Boot Field” (Summary)</u></b></p> <p>With regard to Housing Policies, we note and support the thrust of Policy MT04: Village settlement boundaries and the text within paragraph 6.6.4, namely: "Some development may be considered appropriate on the edge</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
		Village Settlement Boundaries	of the settlement boundaries where development could bring specific benefits to the village such as improving pedestrian connectivity of the wider parish or meeting parish specific housing needs". Our proposals abut the Marks Tey settlement boundary and will deliver a wide range of associated community benefits: Market, affordable or special needs housing, extensive and accessible open space, enhanced biodiversity and amenity in the form of wildflower meadow, woodland and wetland features, an upgraded setting for the village, and a landscaped acoustic bund to attenuate traffic noise from the A12.
<b>Boyer Planning on behalf of Mr Andrew Mattin</b> By email	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT04</b> Village Settlement Boundaries	It is considered that this policy essentially replicates emerging local plan policy and it is therefore questioned whether it is strictly necessary given that no allocations or amendments to the settlement boundary are currently proposed. It is important to consider that the settlement boundaries may need to be flexible and capable of being reviewed to allow appropriate sites to come forward in the future, particularly as the proposed allocation in the emerging Local Plan is not coming forward as previously anticipated
<b>Nikki Lax Colliers</b> By email	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT04</b> Village Settlement Boundaries	I find the lack of 'multiuser paths' rather disappointing. When talking about the wider countryside and accessibility - being a horse rider (keeping my horses on Church Lane, Marks Tey) we are often overlooked and with the definitive 2026 map deadline coming up it is vitally important to record paths and roadways correctly as well as the importance of defining new routes as 'multiuser routes' rather than just 'footpath' or 'cycleway' etc. It is vitally important to allow all users access to the countryside (with only 1 bridleway accessible from Motts Lane or Church Lane (the later only if paying to use the East Anglian Farm Rides) we are restricted.  6.11.4- The brick pit here at the works cannot be seen from any public right of way as there are no public rights of way near it. This concerns me as it encourages people to 'take a look', and it is still an active quarry!

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			<p>Having looked on the CBC consultation I felt my comments are not about whether I agree or disagree with the policy rather than some of the information is incorrect.</p> <p>As I said earlier, I hope I am correct in contacting you directly but please do let me know if I should be contacting another department or Marks Tey PC directly.</p>
<b>Barton Willmore On behalf of L&amp;Q, Cirrus Land and G120 Land By email</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT04 Village Settlement Boundaries</b>	<p>Policy MT04 relates to the village boundary and reflects the currently adopted position. It should be noted that if the Colchester Local Plan Part 2 was to be adopted before the NDP, the preamble would need to be updated. The policy is supported in so far as it does allow for large-scale development outside of the settlement boundary of Marks Tey provided it can demonstrate community benefits and low carbon homes and sustainable energy usage. Development should focus on reaching net zero carbon at a large-scale as quickly as is viably possible, including the potential on-site energy generation and district heating. The Environment Bill is due to come into force in the Autumn 2021. This will require 10% biodiversity net gain for new development, which will present a significant opportunity for Marks Tey.</p>
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited) By email</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT04 – Village Settlement Boundaries:</b>	<p>Policy MT04 – is generally supported.</p> <p>No allocations are proposed until a more definitive and precise strategy is in place via the emerging Local Plan. However, the policy does acknowledge that development proposals coming forward as part of strategic development allocated in the Local Plan will be supported subject to the stated conditions. Furthermore, it is inevitable that future strategic allocations will require the existing settlement boundaries to be revised.</p> <p>The additional wording to Policy MT04 relating to support for proposals that conform with the stated two exceptional</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			circumstances is supported by the promoters.
<b>Essex Bridleways Association Representation ID: 7759</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Policy MT05 Local Character and Design</b>	Policy MT05 should include an aspiration to connect the PROW network and make it accessible to more users throughout the Plan area.
<b>Mrs Julie Briggs Representation ID: 7753</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT05 Local Character and Design</b>	I wish to retain Marks Tey's character and increase the community feel within our village. Any development needs to include infrastructure like a doctor's surgery, dentist and sufficient school provision and local shops to ensure people don't have to jump in a car for everything. We could do with at least a clinic which older/ disabled people can go to without needing a car. The infrastructure needs to be in place before the houses are built.
<b>Feering Parish Council Clerk to Feering Parish Council via email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT05 Local Character and Design</b>	Policy MT05 – Local Character and Design  Under: For proposals in the Little Tey Character Areas:  On the final bullet point we would like to see “ . . . and beyond to Colchester and across to Feering, Kelvedon Station and the A12 via Elm Lane.
<b>Boyer Planning on behalf of Mr Andrew Mattin By email</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT05 Local Character and Design</b>	Policy MT05 – Local Character and Design - The Village The supporting text to Policy MT05 and the policy itself is supported. The supporting text emphasises the importance of the landmark of Marks Tey Hall and its associated buildings with moat and medieval fishpond, being the former hub of the community. As stated earlier it is considered that development of the Livelands site, in combination with the wider development to the south of London Road or as a standalone development, would assist in helping to address the current separation of

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			Marks Tey Hall from the community and further assist with enhancing its setting.
<b>Barton Willmore On behalf of L&amp;Q, Cirrus Land and G120 Land By email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT05 Local Character and Design</b>	We have no comments to make on Policy MT05 and support a design-led and collaborative process with all stakeholders.
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited) By email</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT05 – Local Character and Design</b>	<p>The Village, pages 61-65 including Policy MT05 – Local Character and Design: this whole section is fully supported. The explanatory text between 6.7.25 and 6.7.31 represents a sound summary of the character of “The Village” and its wide range of facilities. It stresses the importance of the landmark of the listed Marks Tey Hall and its associated buildings with moat and medieval fishpond, and formerly the hub of the community and former home to Marks Tey Lord of the Manor. As stated in the Context Section of this response, the Promoters’ comprehensive proposals for land south of London Road would act as a catalyst to redress the current separation of Marks Tey Hall from the community and would provide the opportunity to create a new hub and focus to this part of the Village. The uncertainties created by the proposed CBBGC and final A12 route have in effect blighted this important group of heritage assets and a solution needs to be found urgently to safeguard their future.</p> <p>Consequently, Policy MT05 is supported and the Promotors proposals would meet fully the requirements set out under the heading “For Proposals in The Village”.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
<b>Mrs Julie Briggs</b> Representation ID: 7754	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT06</b> Landscape character, views and Setting	Agree with this section, any development must retain as many views as possible.
<b>Barton Willmore On behalf of L&amp;Q, Cirrus Land and G120 Land</b> By email	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT06</b> Landscape character, views and Setting	With regard to MT06, whilst we acknowledge that Marks Tey and the surrounding subsidiary settlements (ie: Little Tey) are surrounded by countryside, much of this land is in agricultural use and therefore in reality much of this countryside is only accessible by walking along public rights of way. New development should provide far greater accessibility to open space, newly planted woodland and biodiversity, leading to significant health and wellbeing benefits.
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited)</b> By email	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT06 – Landscape Character, Views and Setting</b>	Policy MT06 – Landscape Character, Views and Setting: It is inevitable that any major future growth and proposed allocations to extend Marks Tey would result in various degrees of impact on landscape character, views and settings. However, it is considered that a scheme that follows Garden City principles, which include more generous provisions of green infrastructure than most developments, would mitigate any such impact or harm. The Promoters' proposals would enhance the setting of Marks Tey Hall, by restoring the original garden layout, by appropriate and sympathetic management by the moat and medieval pond, and restoration of the historic community hub and focal point.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited) By email</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Policy MT07 Non-designated Heritage Assets:</b>	Policy MT07 Non-designated Heritage Assets: It is considered that the words “as well as any additional area and included in the most up to date Colchester Borough Local List” should be deleted because it is unreasonable to include any buildings that subsequently may be deemed to be included. The Parish Council should have sufficient local knowledge to identify such non-designated heritage assets now and should rely on any that may subsequently be identified. This part of the policy is unreasonable and unjustified.
<b>Essex Bridleways Association Representation ID: 7760</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Policy MT08 - Rural Lanes</b>	Page 72 para 6.10: this covers rural lanes, and again it is unfortunate that their use by pedestrians is only given consideration here (even cyclists have been omitted!). Their use by all vulnerable road users - walkers, cyclists and equestrians - should be acknowledged and the lanes protected for all users, not just walkers.
<b>Feering Parish Council Clerk to Feering Parish Council via email</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT08 - Rural Lanes</b>	Policy MT08 – Rural Lanes Paragraph 6.10.3 – we would request that Elm Lane is added to the list of Lanes. Elm Lane is on the eastern edge of Character Area 1 – Little Tey (Map 4.3). Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT09 Local Green Space</b>	A Stronger Community, Pages 74 & 80: are generally supported.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
R.F. West Limited) By email			
<b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> Representation ID: 7761	<b>Object</b>	<b>Policy MT10</b> Protecting and Enhancing the Quality and Quantity of our Green Infrastructure	Page 80 para 6.13.3: Policy MT10 deals with protecting and enhancing green infrastructure and again, this should contain an aspiration to enhance the public rights of way network for ALL users, not just walkers. Any new routes should be of bridleway status so that they can be used by walkers, cyclists and equestrians.
<b>Braintree District Council</b> Representation ID: 7756	<b>Object</b>	<b>Policy MT10</b> Protecting and Enhancing the Quality and Quantity of our Green Infrastructure	Amend policy as follows for clarification on the location and extent of green corridors.  'iii. An aspiration to create a continuous, accessible green corridor to the west of Marks Tey incorporating historic landscapes of Long Green and Potts Green as indicated in map 6.6;'  and  'iv. An aspiration to create a continue accessible green corridor to the north of Marks Tey broadly following Roman River Corridor and the surrounding countryside as indicated in map 6.7; and'
<b>Mr Edward Gittins</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT10</b> Protecting	<u><b>Land at “The Car Boot Field” (Summary)</b></u> The open space, embodying the principles and ideas shown in the landscaping proposals in Annex EGA2, will make a major contribution to

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
By email Info@egaplanning.com		and Enhancing the Quality and Quantity of our Green Infrastructure	biodiversity alongside recreational and amenity uses whilst enhancing the village setting. The site therefore has the potential to fulfil the aims of Policy MT10 - Protecting and enhancing the quality and quantity of our green infrastructure.
<b>Andrew Martin Planning</b> (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited) By email	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT10</b> Protecting and Enhancing the Quality and Quantity of our Green Infrastructure	A Stronger Community, Pages 74 & 80: are generally supported.
<b>Mr Edward Gittins</b> By email	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT11:</b> Protecting and enhancing our Natural Environment:	<u>Land at “The Car Boot Field”</u> (Summary) Here, we also note the wording of Policy MT22: Protecting and enhancing our Natural Environment:- "Development proposals will be expected to retain existing features of biodiversity value and provide a measurable gain in biodiversity, for example:- • The creation of new natural habitats • The planting of additional trees and hedgerows • Creating new wildlife corridors linking up existing ones." The open space, embodying the principles and ideas shown in the landscaping proposals in Annex EGA2, will make a

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
			major contribution to biodiversity alongside recreational and amenity uses whilst enhancing the village setting
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited) By email</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT11</b> Protecting and enhancing our Natural Environment	A Healthier Environment pages 81 & 84:  are generally supported.
<b>Natural England Via email</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT12- Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS)</b>	The Marks Tey Parish falls in its entirety within one or more of the Zones of Influence (ZoI). Therefore, residential development within the parish area which will be subject to the requirements of this strategic solution. This will be in accordance with the RAMS supplementary planning document once adopted. Natural England welcomes Policy MT12- Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) within the neighbourhood plan. We would also suggest an addition to this policy directly referencing the need for the consideration of avoidance measures within the boundaries of any developments such as on-site greenspace and links to footpaths to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations.
<b>Boyer Planning on behalf of Mr Andrew Mattin</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT13 – Housing Mix and Housing Choice</b>	This policy is generally supported, however, it should be stipulated that as the situation in terms of housing need may change over time, the policy will need to be monitored. It should therefore be flexible and capable of being reviewed and revised as the evidence base changes.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
By email			
<b>Barton Willmore On behalf of L&amp;Q, Cirrus Land and G120 Land</b> By email	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT13 – Housing Mix and Housing Choice</b>	<p>Policy MT13 considers housing mix and choice. We recognise the need for a range of new housing in Marks Tey. Representations will be made to Colchester on the Matters, Issues and Questions consultation before Examination in Public of the Section 2 Plan. Marks Tey is one of the most sustainable locations in the borough that is capable of delivering much needed houses for Marks Tey and the surrounding housing market area</p> <p>We note there is an absence of any policy encouraging new employment opportunities at Marks Tey. This is particularly important given the changing work practices accelerated by the Coronavirus pandemic. More people are working from home and there is widely anticipated to be a greater need in the future for co-working and flexible working spaces closer to people's homes. We would recommend that consideration be given to how employment may be delivered as part of any mixed-use development.</p>
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited)</b> By email	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT13 Housing Mix and Housing Choice</b>	<p><u>Housing</u>, pages 87-91: this section is noted and Policy MT13 <u>Housing Mix and Housing Choice</u> is generally supported.</p> <p>However, much will change over time. The evidence base of the SHMA published in December 2015 is now dated and should be reviewed. Therefore, this section of the NP should be constantly monitored and Policy MT13 should be applied with flexibility.</p>
<b>Boyer Planning on behalf of Mr</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Policy MT14 – London</b>	The renaming of this area is noted. It is also noted that Neighbourhood Plan Map 6.9 shows a larger area for the London Road Centre than is currently shown in the emerging Local Plan, including some of the

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
<b>Andrew Mattin</b> By email		Road Centre	Livelands site within its boundary. It is considered that this should be amended to reflect the boundary as proposed in the emerging Local Plan.
<b>Andrew Martin Planning</b> (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited) By email	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT14 – London Road Centre</b>	<p><u>Business and Employment pages 92-98:</u> this section is fully supported and the Parish Council's desire to see the imaginative proposals listed is fully supported. The Promoters' proposals would make a major contribution to these. Furthermore, the Promoters' land ownership and interests place them in the most advantageous position to make a major contribution towards delivering these proposals, including the 'green' or 'living' bridge idea (paragraph 6.19.6). The recently announced preferred route for the A12 and need to re-design the detail of Junction 25 now creates the opportunity to deliver this bridge and create a new central public realm for Marks Tey. Additionally, it would enhance considerably the connectivity between the southern and northern parts of The Village and links to the railway station.</p> <p>Appendix One - London Road Parade: this updated plan showing the existing details of the existing businesses is welcomed. It demonstrates the importance and diverse nature of this village hub, which is of significant benefit to the local community. However, its survival and future viability is dependent upon additional growth to support and encourage its enhancement and expansion.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Obj/Sup/C om</b>	<b>NP Section</b>	<b>Representation</b>
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited)</b> By email	<b>Support</b>	<b>Policy MT15 – Marks Tey Employment Sites</b>	<u>Policy MT15 – Marks Tey Employment Sites:</u> The Promoters generally support this policy.
<b>Andrew Martin Planning (on behalf of Crest Nicholson and R.F. West Limited)</b> By email	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Other</b>	<u>Section 7.0 Community Projects:</u> Paragraph 7.1: reflects the difficulties of preparing a NP whilst the final selected routes for the A12 and A120 were unknown. It is stated that " <i>One of the aspects which the NP steering group initially wanted to address through the NP was to steer the direction of development sites to come forward during the Plan period. However, we still don't know the routes for the A12 and A120 and without this certainty it would be premature to undertake this work</i> ". This is no longer the case and there is no reason why an allocation can be proposed in the NP. For reasons explained in point 9 above, the area to the south of London Road, as proposed by the Promoters, and the adjoining land of Livelands, is the logical and preferred direction of growth to improve accessibility, attractiveness and viability of the Village Centre. Community Actions 1-5 are supported. In particular, the Promoters could assist and contribute towards Community Action 3 – London (Road) Parade Improvements through the delivery of their comprehensive proposals on land to the south of London Road. The quantum of proposed development and increase in local population generated by approximately 800-1,000 homes would create a significant requirement for additional retail and other community services. This would act as a catalyst to support not only the current parade, but also the need for additional facilities within the development. In addition, the Promoters' existing land

Respondent	Obj/Sup/C om	NP Section	Representation
			<p>ownership boundaries provides the opportunity to create new and enhanced pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the existing Village and railway station.</p> <p>COMMENTS ON OTHER DOCUMENTS SUPPORTING THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</p> <p><u>Marks Tey Character Assessment</u></p> <p>1. As referred to in point 3 above, the Character Assessment document is a very comprehensive and thorough body of work and well-executed analysis of the Parish. It forms an important and significant part of the evidence base for plan making and should be kept up-to-date as necessary as the NP progresses through subsequent stages.</p> <p><u>Master planning Support Document</u></p> <p>1. The comment in the second sentence of the point above also applies to the Master planning Support Document. This is dated December 2017 and parts of the Planning Policy Context are now out of date. For example, the NPPF 2019 has replaced the 2012 version and the Government has also published in October 2019 The National Design Guide : Creating Well designed Places. Also, on page 7 the document refers to the David Lock Associates (DLA) masterplan for the West of Colchester Garden Community and the 'Plan for Colchester Braintree Borders Community, Issues and Options Report 'EB/034, which included the DLA Concept Masterplan. However, this document is no longer relevant and has been overtaken by events, in particular the removal of the GC from the Section 1 Plan.</p> <p>2. The Urban Design Analysis on pages 10 to 21 is considered to be a fair and reasonable assessment of the current situation. At the next stage it should refer and take into consideration the National Design Guide referred to above. However, use of the headings derived from the Design Companion to Planning and Place Making (RIBA 2017) are relevant and are an appropriate way of</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/C om	NP Section	Representation
			<p>analysing the various urban design characteristics within Marks Tey Parish. In particular, the finding that Marks Tey “<i>Due to the dispersed settlement pattern, lack of connected footpath network and the discontinuous nature of footpaths along the main routes, walking within the village is a challenge to most residents,</i>” (page 14) is a key consideration for future masterplanning. So are the challenges of how new growth can help overcome existing severance and how to create a clear identity (page 18). The document also acknowledges that “<i>new development should not just provide new homes but a balanced mix of homes, jobs and local retail and community infrastructure such as new health and education facilities. All new developments should provide clear, easily navigable, safe and welcoming streets for all</i>”. (page 19)</p> <p>The comprehensive proposals south of London Road by the Promoters will achieve all the above objectives, together with contributing towards the public realm improvements within the existing Village Neighbourhood Centre at London Road (page 21 &amp; 30).</p> <p>3. For reasons set out in points 9, 13 and 28 above, the Promoters fully support the statement under the heading ‘Development Scenarios on page 32 that “<i>A local planning strategy should be prepared with the aim of maximising accessibility to the centre and improving its attractiveness to all. Ideally new housing should be located within 600 m of the centre of London Road to improve viability. Local policy should set out the criteria for siting other local centres that may come forward in the future</i>”.</p> <p>However, this Section presents a series of illustrative development scenarios prepared by the consultant, Out Design, “<i>to help facilitate the workshop with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2017</i>”. Although the document acknowledges that the preparation of a spatial plan for Marks Tey is beyond the scope of the reports, it goes on to state that the scenarios presented “<i>may inform more detailed masterplanning work and the preparation of</i></p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup/C om	NP Section	Representation
			<p><i>development briefs for individual sites. These would be subject to more detailed site investigation and engagement with all stakeholders including landowners and the local planning and highway authorities”</i></p> <p>4. The illustrative development scenario for Marks Tey South covers an area of some 20.39 ha, the majority of which is owned by R.F. West Ltd and under option to Crest Nicholson. Although this is indicated to have a potential residential capacity of 367 dwellings at 30dph or 612 at 50 dph, the scenario does not include any other uses that are necessary to create a community. In contrast to the Promoters’ proposals, the limited scale of development indicated in this scenario is insufficient to deliver a viable mixed use scheme as described in (31) above, together with contributing towards the other wider benefits and improved connectivity referred to in the documents. In any event, current circumstances relating to the A12, A120 have resulted in this section of the Masterplanning Support document being no longer relevant.</p> <p>5. The Promoters have considered their proposals in relation to the preferred route for the A12 and proposals for the Junction 25 improvements. Two indicative Concept Masterplan Options have been prepared, which are attached, to illustrate how their proposals could be delivered and to test viability. Option 1 shows an alternative arrangement for the A12 southbound on/off slip roads and closure of the existing southbound on slip. This would be a major benefit to the proposed enhancement to the London Road Parade. Option 2 retains the current Highways England proposals for the southbound on-slip but with traffic calming measures to London Road to reduce speed. The two options also indicate two alternative scales and arrangements for providing additional commercial uses to the south of London Road, which could apply in either case.</p>