

Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation (30 August – 12 October 2022)

Schedule of Representations

78 Respondents and 800 Comments

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Foreword		
Mr Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Hatchett	Support	I support Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan. Current infrastructure cannot support any more housing.
Mr Michael Hatchett	Support	I support the plan as it provides an appropriate foundation for the commercial, social and environmental sustainability of the village and surrounding area.
Mr Kevin Paul	Support	[PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT PHOTO] I fully support the neighbourhood plan, it has been carefully prepared with full consultation with active members of the Parish Council as well as the village as a whole and in my opinion represents the preferred options for the majority of Tiptree Village. Having lived previously in other parts of Essex I have seen Neighbourhood plans driven through by Parish Councils with minimal consultations with the actual residents of the towns involved, often resulting in developments unwanted and not desired by the very residents effected. THIS IS NOT THE CASE WITH THIS PLAN judging by local Facebook pages
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Although only allowing consultation this way does alienate a large number of your target group.
Mrs Emma Cooper	Support	I support the neighbourhood plan
Mrs Danielle Riley	Object	There is still a distinct lack of evidence for and against all of the original sites that were put forward around Tiptree. Minimal traffic surveys and no environmental or ecological investigations conducted. Oak Road and New Road towards Messing can not handle any more traffic and will cause chaos if there is an increase in this area. Oak Road is already very difficult to drive along due to the cars parking on the edge of the road. There is rarely any follow up from the parish council to ensure road works are completed adequately when new housing is built, i.e. Grange Road where the road tarmac and pavement incomplete, plus road signs that have never been

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		installed properly; or that the allocated facilities ever become available i.e. dental and doctor surgeries, pedestrian crossings.
Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mrs Mia Quinn	Object	We moved to Tiptree in April 2021 to live in a quieter part of Essex with countryside and that is now being taken away. We are lucky at the moment that our property overlooks open fields, it would completely ruin our quality of life if we were then surrounded by hundreds of new build homes. Tiptree is simply not big enough to accommodate this many homes and the people it will attract. I feel strongly that it will ruin the village if this is agreed not to mention how much wildlife it will kill off.
Mr Owen Cass	Support	Very well thought out and planned.
Mr Richard Buckmaster	Support	I believe this plan will improve the day to day lives of my family and everyone else who lives and works in the village.
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mr Kevin Kelly	Object	[This comment is about the Brook Meadows appeal which is due to open on Tuesday 25th October. Planning reference number: 202604 and appeal reference: APP/A1530/W/22/3301862] I object to the development in Brook Meadow Tiptree. Tiptree doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with more developments. Not enough GP support for the area. Not enough Dental support to cope with the current population, let alone more. Poor road layout, too much heavy traffic.
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	Definitely support the Tiptree NP. We deserve to choose how our community grows and we have had quite a few developments and do not need anymore. Especially Brook Meadows which is a fabulous area for nature/wildlife. If the development is built it will cause a lot of problems for Tiptree including traffic/infrastructure/crime. 100% support Tiptree NP
Mr Steve Read	Support	I fully support the adoption of this plan
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree with the statements made in this introduction
Mr Colin Smith	Support	Gives us influence over development
Ms Jodee Mayer	Support	Whilst I cannot understand why the majority of the residents wish Tiptree to remain denoted as a village, the fact remains that Tiptree cannot support further housing developments without substantial investment in amenities including but not limited to medical and dental practices, the

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>road network, and water supply. It is equally crucial that the green spaces are maintained as this attracts people to the village, be it walkers, dog walkers, runners, horse riders or day trippers.</p> <p>This plan has been well considered and thought through and I support the same.</p>
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Robert Cross	Support	I support the Neighborhood plan and believe it is a well thought out document representing local residents needs.
Mrs Melanie Kellier	Support	I agree with the neighbourhood plan and I want to see it implemented as soon as possible.
Miss Amanda Lucia	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Sheperd	Support	Tiptree really needs this carefully considered and well put together plan. Tiptree is a unique place with specific current problems which will be highly exacerbated if speculative development is allowed, to say nothing of ruining it for the 9000+ who already live here.
Mr Ed Birkin	Support	Important that there is a well constructed plan for future development, rather than a free for all for developers
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Lynn Leather	Support	agree
Introduction		
Anglian Water	Support	<p>[See Attachment for full comment]</p> <p>Anglian Water supports the direction taken in the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan - subject to the suggested clarifications - and taken with the recently adopted Colchester Local Plan is consistent with our strategic direction. Our view is that further prominence could be placed on integrated water management in the proposed allocations to maximise efficiencies in water supply and water recycling processes, whilst providing environmental benefits.</p> <p>Whilst not fully within the remit of this neighbourhood plan, the scope of development to the north of Tiptree and need for the completion of the link road to manage traffic movements, which is facilitated in part by the two proposed allocations, it is logical that development will need to come forward in between both allocations to deliver the full extent of the link road. As this central area is within Messing-cum-Inworth Parish, there seems to be a missed opportunity for strategic delivery</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>or master-planning wider development over the longer term (beyond the plan period) - although it is noted that common ground as been established between the two parishes regarding the completion of the 'missing link'. Master-planning the whole area and associated phasing of infrastructure would offer a more feasible and viable route for delivery and provide greater opportunity for efficiencies and carbon savings. Development of this central area and completion of the link road can only be facilitated through Local Plan policies.</p>
Sports England	comment	<p>Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 98 and 99. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.</p> <p>https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.</p> <p>https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 99 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</p> <p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England’s Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p>
Essex County Council	Comment	<p>[See attachment for full comments from ECC]</p> <p>Housing and adaptability ECC are the Adult Social Care (ASC) authority and must ensure that the needs of older adults and adults with a disability are reflected in line with our duty under the Care Act 2014 and the wider prevention and maximising independence agendas. This includes reviewing both general needs housing, and any specialist housing provision. ECC recommend that the Plan makes specific reference to both the Building Regulations Part M4 (2) and M4 (3) as below: “On housing developments of 10 or more dwellings, 10% of market housing should be to Building Regulations Part M4(2) ‘adaptable and accessible’ standard. For affordable homes, 10% should be to Building Regulations Part M4(2) and 5% should be to Part M4(3) ‘wheelchair-user’ standards.” This need is integrated into the Essex Design Guide for older people, and the principles explored are transferable to all types of care accommodation, including dementia care.</p> <p>ECC would also recommend the NP sets out a requirement that parking for any M4(3) homes also needs to be Part M compliment, i.e., 3.3m or capable of being widened. As a minimum, the number of spaces provided to this standard should reflect the number of Part M4(3) dwellings provided at any development.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste ECC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) welcomes appropriate reference to the minerals and waste local plans.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>For information purposes only, it is noted that minerals and waste developments are defined as a 'County Matter' in the Town and Country Planning (Prescription of County Matters) (England) Regulations 2003, and are therefore outside of the remit of the Plan. As such, where the Plan refers to 'development', this does not apply to development relating to minerals and waste matters.</p> <p>Passenger Transport (Public Transport/Bus Services) The allocations and subsequent developments coming forward, represent a rare opportunity for the Parish Council to secure the required bus services and the Plan could state more explicitly that the developments provide an avenue to secure funding. ECC can also assist by looking favourably towards other developments along the bus routes, which could pool resources to help ensure that such improvements could be 'pump primed' until the service has sufficient patronage.</p> <p>Infrastructure contributions ECC recommends that the NP refers to the Essex Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions should development place pressure on local infrastructure, given the proposed allocations. The guide provides details on the range of infrastructure contributions ECC may seek in order to mitigate the impact of development. These contributions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education - Early Years and Childcare; Schools (primary, secondary, post 16, Special Education Needs); school transport and sustainable travel • Transport - Highways and Transportation; Sustainable Travel Planning; Passenger Transport; Public Rights of Way • Employment and Skills Plans • Waste Management • Libraries • Flood and Water Management and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)
National Grid	Comment	<p>[See attachment for full comments] National Grid has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>
Colchester Borough Council	Support	<p>The Parish Council and Steering Group have worked tirelessly to bring forward the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan, Colchester Borough Council fully supports the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan. It is commended that a positive working relationship has been established with Messing cum Inworth Parish Council, as demonstrated through the Statement of Common Ground.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		Policy SG8 of the Colchester Local Plan Section 2 clearly identifies the strategic policies which a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be compliant with. These are Section 1 Policies SP1-9, Section 2 Policies SG1-8, ENV1-5, CC1 and PP1. The Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan is compliant will all of those policies, and additionally Policy SS14.
Natural England	Comment	<p>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>Natural England welcomes the amendments made to the Plan’s text and policies in response to our previous representations at Regulation 14 (our ref 386583, letter dated 21st April 2022).</p>
Historic England	Comment	<p>Having reviewed the plan and relevant documentation we do not consider it necessary for Historic England to provide detailed comments at this time. We would refer you if appropriate 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 a neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/></p> <p>We would be grateful if you would notify us on eastplanningpolicy@historicengland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@historicengland.org.uk> if and when the Neighbourhood Plan is made by the 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 plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.</p>
ADP Architecture (on behalf of Landowners and Mersea Homes)	Support	<p>[See attachment for full comments]</p> <p>The Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan has been positively prepared and represents a ‘sound’ overarching plan to guide the spatial strategy for the village.</p> <p>As a whole, the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan sets out an appropriate framework to develop these sites in a planned and integrated manner, with specific and appropriately detailed policy elements in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy TIP02: Good Quality Design • Policy TIP03: Residential Car parking • Policy TIP04: Building for a Healthy Life

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy TIP06: Non-Motorised Access Routes • Policy TIP07: Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic Through Tiptree Village • Policy TIP09: Small-Scale Commercial Workspaces • Policy TIP10: Provision of Community Infrastructure • Policy TIP11: Green Infrastructure • Policy TIP14: Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation • Policy TIP12: Landscaping and Biodiversity • Policy TIP15: Highland Nursery • Policy TIP16: Elms Farm • Tiptree Policies Maps <p>The Neighbourhood Plan approach that has been followed complies with the guidance set out in the paragraph 098 of the PPG [Reference ID: 41-098-20190509]. It is clear that the Parish Council has followed the relevant guidance and neighbourhood planning toolkits for assessing sites. The Parish Council has also carried out a robust and thorough strategic environmental assessment.</p> <p>I trust these comments will be considered during the Independent Examination and we look forward to the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan being taken forward to the Referendum.</p> <p>I understand that the Examination will be heard via written representations, but in the event that a Public Hearing is called, as the agent representing the landowners and land promoters of the proposed site allocations, we would request attendance at such a hearing.</p>
Cedra Planning on behalf of Kler Group	Object	<p>[See attachment for full representation]</p> <p>Officer Summary: Background to Neighbourhood Planning process, national policy and guidance.</p> <p>Background to previous Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan process, including examination in Autumn/Winter 2020</p>
Cedra Planning on behalf of Kler Group	Object	<p>[See attachment for full representation]</p> <p>The Colchester Section 2 Local Plan makes clear that Tiptree is a sustainable location. Tiptree ranks highly in the settlement hierarchy and it is clear that the Development Plan for Colchester requires Tiptree to make an important contribution to housing growth in the plan period to 2033.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>The Development Plan refers to Tiptree as a Sustainable Settlement. The spatial hierarchy prioritises growth locations, starting with the urban area of Colchester. The next tier in the spatial hierarchy includes larger existing Sustainable Settlements, which are considered to have the potential to accommodate further proportionate growth; and the Garden Community, which is programmed for long term strategic growth beyond the plan period.</p> <p>This is best expressed through Policy SS14, which sets out a strategic housing delivery requirement – a minimum requirement – to be delivered at Tiptree. The requirement is to deliver a minimum 400 houses in the plan period.</p> <p>The draft neighbourhood plan reproduces emerging Policy SS14 on page 7. The first line of Policy SS14 reads: “Within the preferred directions of growth shown on the Tiptree policies map, to the south west and north/north west, subject to existing constraints, the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan will...”</p> <p>Policy SS14 has been modified through the examination process (for example reducing the minimum requirement at Tiptree to 400 houses as a result of recent commitments). Through the Examination process the preferred direction of growth have also been amended, and where previously there was a preferred directions of growth which included the Kler Group land, this is no longer the case.</p> <p>The Inspectors report in respect of the Colchester Section 2 plan dealing with these changes makes clear at paragraph 109:</p> <p>“At the time of submission of the CLPs2 for examination, Policy SS14: Tiptree set out a criteria-based approach with regard to the requirements and scope of the emerging Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan. This included amongst other things defining the extent of the settlement boundary, the allocation of specific housing sites to provide 600 new homes, associated infrastructure requirements and to give consideration to strategic issues including the A12 junction improvements. However, the examination of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan (October 2020), recommended that it could not proceed to referendum.”</p> <p>The Inspector continued at paragraph 110: “Modifications are therefore necessary for effectiveness to ensure that the policy is up to date regarding the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan along with amendments to the explanatory text and in criterion (iv) of the policy to provide more detailed guidance in relation to the provision of traffic generation forecasts for the proposed</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>new junction 24 onto the A12, and the potential for a new road linking the B1022 and B1023. We have altered the advertised modifications by adding 'a minimum of' before 400 dwellings in the explanatory text to ensure consistency within the policy and replacing the requirement for a "detailed transport assessment" with "strategic transport appraisal" which is more proportionate and flexible. This is consistent with comments received from Essex County Council as the Highway Authority (MM69, MM71). Moreover, it is necessary to provide new guidance within the explanatory text to reflect the latest position in the village following the grant of planning permission for 200 new dwellings at Barbrook Lane, and to incorporate this as an existing commitment in terms of housing supply amending the housing requirement within criterion (ii) of the policy deleting '600' and replacing with 'a minimum of 400 dwellings' (MM70, MM71)."</p> <p>And at paragraph 111: "To provide clear direction and provide the necessary flexibility for the delivery of housing in the village, via the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan, it is necessary to amend the opening text of the policy to direct growth to the preferred directions of growth in the south-west and north/north-west of the village (taking into account existing constraints). Furthermore, it is necessary to provide clear direction to the decision maker with regard to ensuring the protection of habitats by setting out the requirement for surveys and subsequent mitigation for wintering birds identified in the Habitat Regulations Assessment (MM71)."</p> <p>The Councils Hearing Statements submitted to the Examination explain the background to the preferred directions of growth (as they are now referred), and an explanation as to why the fourth arrow – extending out and crossing into the Kler Group site – was proposed to be removed. This is contained in the Hearing Statement to Examination Matter 9. 3.10 At paragraph 9.16.12 the Council stated: "Broad areas of growth direction arrows were included within the CLP Section 2 as a tool to guide the consideration of planning proposals if progress on a Neighbourhood Plans was such that it had not defined the proposed site allocations more specifically within a reasonable timescale. At the time of writing the CLP Section 2, there was still a considerable amount of work to be undertaken for the Tiptree NHP including further site analysis and public consultation. As a result, three broad areas of growth arrows were included on Policies Map SS14."</p> <p>At paragraph 9.16.13 the Council continued: "The Policies Map SS14 is proposed to be amended to reflect the correct delineation of the latest Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) boundaries as identified in the evidence base and to delete the arrows indicating the direction of growth in the area covered by the updated LWS to the west of Tiptree. This area is also considered to have landscape and character importance to maintain the gap between Tiptree and Tiptree Heath as identified in the</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>Maldon Road appeal decision. A further update will be required to Policies Map SS14 to identify Barbrook Lane as an existing commitment. 9.16.14 Additional wording is also proposed to paragraph 14.218 to identify Inworth Granges and Brook Meadows LWS as a constraint to development to the south west.”</p> <p>Further background to the change to the preferred directions of growth in respect of the Kler Group site is found in Housing Topic Paper 6 (Tiptree) put to the Examination. At paragraph 2.5 the Council stated:</p> <p>“The NHP has progressed since submission of the eLP, and the proposed areas of growth have been refined following evidence updates and consultation. This work led to the identification of a mapping error on the Policies Map SS14 in respect of the Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) areas. The Policies Map SS14 as submitted does not reflect the updated evidence provided by a review of the Local Wildlife Sites undertaken in 2015 and the final report dated November 2017. In Tiptree those updates included: a) the extension of two LWS; i. CO10 – Inworth Grange and Brook Meadows; and ii. CO32 – Cadgers Wood & Park Lane Nature Reserve; and b) The designation of a new LWS CO169 – Warriors Rest.” 3.13 And at paragraph 2.7: “These amendments are of most significance in relation to the third most southerly broad direction of growth arrow on Policy Map SS14, as the Inworth Grange and Brook Meadow LWS is substantially extended (COL 10).”</p> <p>In light of this, the Council made clear at paragraph 2.10: “Corrections to the Policies Map SS14 are proposed to reflect the updated LWS areas in line with the updated evidence (Local Wildlife Sites Review 2015, and final report dated November 2017). The arrows illustrating the direction of growth in the area directly to the west have been removed, to more accurately reflect the constraints including the corrected updated LWS boundary around Inworth Grange and Brook Meadow and the evidence collected in the early stages of plan making for the NHP informing the plans vision and objectives. The preferred direction of growth is now focussed on the north.”</p> <p>And went on to state, at paragraph 4.1: “The Policies Map SS14 is proposed to be amended to reflect the correct delineation of the latest LWS boundaries as identified in the evidence base and to delete the arrows indicating the direction of growth in the area covered by the updated LWS to the west of Tiptree. This area is also considered to have landscape and character importance to maintain the gap between Tiptree and Tiptree Heath as identified in the Maldon Road appeal decision. Additional wording is also proposed to paragraph 14.218 to identify Inworth Granges and Brook Meadows LWS as a constraint to development to the south west.”</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>Thus, Policy SS14 as adopted no longer includes a preferred directions of growth extending out and crossing into the Kler Group site, the change arising from a perceived constraint in relation to the Local Wildlife Site. The removal of the preferred direction of growth in relation to the Kler Group site arose solely as a result of ecological considerations and was not related to any other matter such as landscape, heritage or accessibility.</p> <p>Crucially, at no stage in the Section 2 Local Plan Examination was any evidence prepared to determine whether development could take place on the Local Wildlife Site without causing harm. We consider this issue in our submissions below.</p> <p>Site Selection</p> <p>The site selection process is flawed, not properly evidenced, and risks the failure of the neighbourhood plan if not rectified.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This is a matter that can be remedied by way of a thorough review and overhaul of the SEA and is a matter which should be addressed now before the neighbourhood planning process proceeds further. In terms of site selection, we similarly raise serious concerns.</p> <p>The evidence base to the Regulation 16 draft plan includes an assessment of the sites put forward to accommodate the minimum 400 houses to be delivered at Tiptree. This is the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The methodology follows the sieve, assessment and traffic light coding methodology used by the Strategic Land Availability Assessment which informed the Section 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The Kler Group site is assessed in the SHLAA. The site passed the Stage 1a and 1b sieve and progressed to the next stage of the assessment process.</p> <p>Stage 2 of the site assessment considered availability and concludes that, for the Kler Group site, 'there are no major issues identified but site is currently under option to a developer (dated 2014)'.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>Stage 3 considers achievability, and within this stage, the Kler Group site has an overall green rating, as a result the site progressed to Stage 4.</p> <p>Stage 4 considers suitability and sustainability and concludes that the Kler Group site 'may have issues in relation to proximity to Pennsylvania Lane and Gravel Pits. Access could be a problem given restricted byway, private roads and part adopted roads, Perry Road is a narrow local road hardly suitable for a large increase in vehicles. This could be alleviated by combination with neighbouring sites. This site could be considered in relation to TIP01,09,27 and possibly TIP12 to accommodate a large number of dwellings. However, this site was included in a Local Wildlife Site during a reassessment in 2015 and has become a part of Co10, on account of rare species. The Local Plan and National Planning Policy is not to build on a Local Wildlife Site, which rules this site out'.</p> <p>An overall rating/colour code was not given for the Kler Group site in the SHLAA however the site was discounted based on access issues (which, through the subsequent planning application process, application reference 202604, is not an issue taken against the site) and the Local Wildlife Site designation. It is also important to note that the assessment was based on a site area of 11.17 hectares and an assumed development of 335 dwellings, which makes an assumption that a much larger part of the site was assumed to be given over for development than is the case in planning application 202604 for up to 221 dwellings.</p> <p>The SHLAA, within the neighbourhood plan evidence base, also assesses the two sites proposed for allocation in the Regulation 16 draft plan. For the Elms Farm site, these include site references TIP04, TIP50 and TIP69. A map of the sites submitted can be found within Housing Topic Paper. Across the three sites assessed, an overall amber rating has been assigned, due to the distance to the village centre. The assessment also included a number of red ratings relating to agricultural land, distance to health services, distance to train station and distance to centre.</p> <p>For the Highlands Nursery site, the relevant site references are TIP51 and TIP49. Overall, both sites were classified as amber, as with the Elms Farm site, due to distance to the village centre.</p> <p>It is noted that the neighbourhood plan itself identifies unresolved assessment and deliverability issues in relation to the two proposed allocations. This is set out at paragraphs 12.13, 12.14, 12.18 and 12.19.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>The Housing Topic Paper provides a summary of the site assessments. In relation to the Kler Group site, a singular reason was identified as justification for not carrying the site forward in the site selection process, which is the impact on the Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>It is clear that the evidence base to the draft neighbourhood plan positively assesses the Kler Group site save for issues relating to the Local Wildlife Site. However, the neighbourhood plan does not include any evidence to assess whether the Local Wildlife Site is indeed a constraint.</p> <p>It should be noted that in determining planning application 202604 for up to 221 houses on the Kler Group site, the Borough Council did not cite the Local Wildlife Site (or indeed any other ecology or nature conservation issues) as a reason to refuse planning permission.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate that the Borough Councils position in not objecting in relation to Local Wildlife Site issues is the correct approach, appended to these representations is the summary proof of evidence prepared by FPCR in relation to the appeal against the refusal of planning application 202604 for up to 221 houses on the Kler Group site. The submissions make clear that the proposals will not adversely impact upon the 14 Local Wildlife Site and, moreover, in a 'no development' scenario, the site will scrub over and the reasons for the Local Wildlife Site designation will be lost.</p> <p>We consider therefore, firstly that the Kler Group site is a candidate site for allocation which is fully supported by the evidence base to the neighbourhood plan, save for ecology and nature conservation where there is no evidence supporting the proposition that there will be any harm to the Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to engage in the neighbourhood planning process for Tiptree.</p> <p>Our submissions have been made in order to assist the process, to identify where we consider there are deficiencies (some of which are of a legal nature, others a failure to meet the Basic Conditions) so as to allow at this early stage a review of neighbourhood planning for Tiptree so as to ensure that at the point at which the emerging neighbourhood plan proceeds it is fit for purpose and capable of being positively examined.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>There are detailed matters which we cannot explore further at this stage given that we consider the building blocks to the emerging neighbourhood plan need to be thoroughly reviewed first.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to continue to engage in the process and would welcome a meeting with Colchester Borough Council and the steering group responsible for the neighbourhood plan to discuss our concerns and options for remedy further.</p>
Feering Parish Council	Object	<p>Feering Parish Council previously commented on the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 in 2020 which had 600 homes, which was refused by the Inspector. We are submitting a copy of our comments which remain valid as very little has changed in this new document except a reduction in the number of homes from 600 to 400 on the same two sites. This plan does not address the infrastructure issues, nor the difficulty which the Parish Council will have supporting this plan due to the increased traffic which will be coming through Feering. Feering Parish Council still do not agree that the Inworth Road will be as trafficked as suggested which still needs to be considered.</p> <p>A key factor of a Neighbourhood Plan is that the parish producing the Neighbourhood Plan should be consulting with neighbouring parishes, particularly with regard to infrastructure. Feering Parish Council have at no point been engaged in consultation with Tiptree with regards to their plan and as we have previously said this will have a large impact on our village with regard to infrastructure.</p> <p>See attached previous response made in Summer 2020</p>
Sarah Greenwood	Support	This Neighbourhood Plan has been extremely well thought through and written, and needs to be adopted as soon as possible.
Councilor Barbara Wood	Support	Having been heavily involved in various stages of the development of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan I can only say that I am in full agreement with every aspect of the now submitted 'final' plan and I look forward to its inclusion in the Local Plan.
Ms Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Miss Amanda Lucia	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lo Sullivan	Support	I agree with the Tiptree Neighbourhood plan.
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mrs Sarah Costello	Support	[No comment left]
Mr Owen Cass	Support	[No comment left]
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Comment	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Helga Middleditch	Support	I agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree with the statements made in this introduction I agree and support section 2, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	I think it's vitally important that this plan is adopted for Tiptree to protect her village from speculative development going forward and so that we can build good quality houses in the areas best fitting to the village and not destroy some of our beautiful wildlife life sites that we have at present.
Local Context		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Ms Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Mrs Sarah Costello	Support	A
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Support	I agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 3, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Mike Burl	Support	This will be a huge advantage to the village and help protect our natural spaces
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shephard	Support	Tiptree its location and unique problems as a large village, serving a large hinterland. Tiptree is on a significant through-route from its hinterland to the A12, including places as far away as West Mersea. It lacks infrastructure, there is too much traffic in the centre which has a mix of housing, facilities and shops, insufficient Health provision and lack of green space for recreation.
Vision and Objectives		
Anglian Water	Support	[See Attachment for full comment] Anglian Water supports the objectives for the neighbourhood plan and the which set out how the overarching vision will be achieved. We particularly welcome references to delivering growth and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable manner and the aim to protect and enhance the local environment. This aligns with our ambitions to enable sustainable housing and economic growth and work with others to achieve significant improvements to ecological quality across our catchments.
Colchester Borough Council	Support	[See Attachment for full comment] CBC supports the vision and objectives of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan.
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree These objectives accurately reflect the expressed wishes of the majority of the community.
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 4, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Andre Turner	Support	A vision that keeps with the requirements of a village and it's history
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shephard	Support	The plan seeks to support the objectives by making a foundation for reducing the traffic on Church Road and providing much needed facilities for Health and Wellbeing.
Vision for the Tiptree to 2033		
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Ms Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	I agree, important to maintain village status though.
Mrs Julia Magnay	Support	Strongly agree with keeping the village feel and protecting wildlife areas. The suggestion of a country park is also excellent
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Vanessa Crossley	Support	I agree
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mr Andre Turner	Support	This vision keeps the village community and feel
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 4, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Objectives of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan		
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Ms Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Very important to protect the green areas
Mrs Julia Magnay	Support	Particularly in agreement with protecting our green environment for the sake of the wildlife, biodiversity, and the wellbeing of the residents
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Vanessa Crossley	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 4, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Andre Turner	Support	Totally agree with these priorities
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	Just what area needs.
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Spatial Strategy		
Anglian Water	Support	<p>[See Attachment for full comment]</p> <p>Colchester Local Plan: It is noted that the Colchester Local Plan Section 2 (adopted July 2022) allocates a minimum of 600 dwellings to Tiptree, to be delivered within the plan period to 2033. The plan identifies that 200 dwellings already have the benefit of planning permission in Tiptree and Policy SS14, sets out that the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan will, <i>inter alia</i>, allocate specific sites for housing allocations to deliver a minimum of 400 dwellings; set out any associated policies needed to support this housing delivery; and set out the policy framework within the parish to guide the delivery of any infrastructure/community facilities required to support the development in accordance with the requirements of Local Plan Policies SG7 (Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation) and PP1 (Generic Infrastructure and Mitigation Requirements). We are supportive of this approach and the need for infrastructure delivery, including water supply and sewerage connections, to comply with the relevant Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Anglian Water's Developer Services team can advise developers on the water supply and wastewater options to inform the submission of applications on the proposed sites and we recommend early engagement with our pre-planning enquiry team to ensure that infrastructure provision can be planned in a coordinated manner.</p> <p>We note that the plan identifies two areas allocated for development and each comprises several submitted sites that have been promoted by more than one land agent or developer. We agree with the assertion that it is a necessary requirement that each allocation is brought forward in a coordinated manner. This coordination is fundamental in enabling more efficient and effective infrastructure provision, which leads to positive outcomes for future occupiers and the existing</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		community. It also ensures that measures to improve the environmental performance of new developments are more feasible and integrated into the overall scheme.
Mrs Alsion Staff	Support	I agree
Ms Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Important to have improved access to public transport and to railways
Mrs Julia Magnay	Support	Strongly agree with protecting wildlife and biodiversity, and also with having more access to countryside - this is so important for the wellbeing of Tiptree's residents.
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Vanessa Crossley	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 5, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Policy TIP01 – Tiptree Spatial Strategy		
Anglian Water	Support	<p>[See Attachment for full comment]</p> <p>Anglian Water supports the policy approach which enables development proposals for necessary utilities infrastructure outside the settlement boundary where no reasonable alternative location is available; given the nature of our assets, such as pumping stations and water recycling centres, which are in locations outside the settlement boundary or not closely located to existing residential development. This policy provision will ensure that we are able to deliver any future enhancements to our assets so that they are robust and resilient.</p> <p>In delivering development on the site allocations in Policies TIP15 and TIP16 we agree with the key matters identified in Policy TIP01, particularly those in relation to the delivery of utilities, high quality design, and green infrastructure including through the provision of SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems). The use of SuDS to minimise surface water run-off is a key solution to removing surface water from the sewerage system. This provides resilience against the impacts of climate change and addressing risk at our WRCs (Water Recycling Centres). Our Draft Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan identifies a long-term strategy (to 2050) of 50% surface water removal from the water recycling catchment serving Tiptree WRC.</p> <p>We recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan introduces measures identified in the recently updated Planning Practice Guidance for addressing flood risk and suggest that the policy should encourage consideration of sustainable drainage systems early in the design process for development, including at the pre-application or master-planning stages, to ensure better integration, multi-functional benefits and reduced land-take.</p> <p>Furthermore, we advise that the supporting text includes a reference to our pre planning enquiry service and signposts to our standard SuDS guidance and Surface Water Policy advice^[1].</p> <p>^[1] https://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developing/planning--capacity/planning-and-capacity/</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
National Highways	Support	The Tiptree neighbourhood plan acknowledges that the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme will benefit Tiptree and the delivery of this local plan, this is welcome, and the A12 Scheme has no objection to Tiptree policy TIP01: Tiptree Spatial Strategy.
ADP Architecture (on behalf of landowners and Mersea Homes)	Support	<p>[See Attachment for full comment]</p> <p>Policy TIP01 meets the requirements of ‘Policy SS14: Tiptree’ of the adopted Colchester Local Plan, which requires a minimum of 400 dwellings to be allocated on specific sites within the village. This policy also supports the policy approach set out in paragraphs 60 and 61 of the NPPF, i.e. to significantly boost the supply of homes and meet the meet the development needs of the area. Policy TIP01 also meets the collective community vision, needs and aspirations of the local community that has been developed through extensive consultation and evidence gathering. The identified site allocations in Policy TIP01 at Highland Nursery and Elms Farm, both to the north of Tiptree, would represent a logical extension to the village that would contribute to the strategic aims of the adopted Colchester Borough Local Plan and that of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Edward Gittins	Object	<p>1. Our representations on the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) relate to various concerns associated with the Tiptree Settlement Boundary (SB) whose definition we allege is arbitrary and unsound for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SB has not been derived from an evaluation of reasonable alternative spatial strategies. • The SB contains anomalies in relation to the exclusion of established housing and commercial development. • The SB has been defined to exclude sustainable sites without sufficient evaluation or adequate reasons for their omission; and • The SB fails to have regard to NPPF paragraphs 69a) and 70 that provision for at least 10% of the housing requirement should be found in small and medium-sized sites. <p>We now address each of the above issues in turn. The SB has not been derived from an evaluation of reasonable alternative spatial strategies.</p> <p>2. Policy SS14: Tiptree in the now Adopted Colchester Section 2 Local Plan is replicated in the NP and states that one of the functions of the NP will be to: “Define the extent of a new settlement boundary for Tiptree.” In May 2018, the NP Group conducted a Vision & Objectives Consultation and we note the response to the questionnaire (HH3) showed very strong support (86%) for the NP defining a revised SB for Tiptree. We also note there was even stronger support (89%) for HH4 - that the NP should include variety and choice to meet existing and future needs in terms of housing types and tenures.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>3. The SB performs a key role in implementing the spatial strategy - as referred to in the NP's Policy TIP01: Tiptree Spatial Strategy, but only provides for two main allocations - both to the north. With all the minimum housing requirement directed to just two large northern sites, this will impact on "variety and choice", not just on housing types and tenure but also as choice of locations for new housing stock elsewhere in the village will be limited.</p> <p>4. This skewed distribution for new housing has been justified in order to achieve the objective of reducing traffic movements in the village in the longer term through an aspiration to deliver a northern link or bypass between the B1022 and B1023. However, the route of this link lies partly outside the allocations as well as the NP area itself and therefore it remains uncertain if the spatial strategy will in fact ultimately succeed in contributing to the delivery of a complete link. The spatial strategy of confining all the allocations to the north has nevertheless been pursued but without any robust assessment of alternative spatial strategies. The preferred spatial strategy needed to be fully justified having taken account of other reasonable spatial strategies or options. Indeed, this very point was registered by the previous NP Examination Inspector who observed: "6.4 There is no specific appraisal identified to justify the (settlement) boundary." And he went on to advise: "6.8 The (settlement) boundary itself needs to be derived from a clear spatial strategy and based on sufficiently robust spatial option appraisals, including consideration of reasonable alternatives, together with appropriate site assessments, to meet the Basic Conditions."</p> <p>5. The process to be followed in defining an SB was therefore clearly set out by the previous Examination Inspector. Whilst not ruling out a spatial strategy with a strong northern bias, he rightly considered any such preferred spatial strategy needed to be justified based on a consideration of reasonable alternative options. In the absence of such a process, he found himself in a position where he was unable to endorse the preferred spatial strategy as having been properly justified. This fundamental requirement therefore needed to be corrected in any future iteration of the NP.</p> <p>6. The current draft NP adopts the same preferred spatial strategy as before and essentially carries forward the same allocations as the previous version. Again, the NPs evidence base does not provide any indication of an in-depth consideration of alternative options. The nearest one gets to such is the AECOM SEA studies (March 2022 and its Update in August 2022) which is a post facto resume of constraints and individual site options. This does not amount to an adequate assessment of alternative spatial growth scenarios or adequately justify the</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>selection of a preferred spatial strategy. Instead, the approach adopted is a brief examination of Sub Areas and individual “sites” and “site clusters” to the North, East, South and West. There is no evaluation, for example, of spatial options such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retention of growth to the north in association with medium-sized and smaller sites elsewhere on the periphery; • A focus on medium-sized and smaller sites dispersed around the village as an alternative to large scale allocations. • Priority being given to locations in close proximity or with ease of access to the village centre and public transport; or • A spatial strategy with allocations able to deliver more than the minimum of 400 dwellings in order to promote greater variety and choice. <p>7. Sites representing alternatives to northern growth in the East, South and West are summarily dispatched in the recent AECOM studies such that all that is left are the four so-called Reasonable Growth Scenarios - all of which relate to sites or site clusters to the North. (See p21). This process does not satisfactorily address the previous Examination Inspector’s concerns. Quite apart from the failure to take account of the examples of alternative scenarios such as those listed above, there is no clear and robust exposition to support the rejection of growth scenarios to the East, South and West or for the preference for all the Reasonable Growth Scenarios being confined to the North. As noted, this heavy concentration of growth to the north has the effect of restricting choice in the local housing market and, as considered later, will also result in the failure of the NP to make provision for smaller and medium-sized sites as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>8. Instead, the spatial strategy evaluation is largely confined to an assessment of individual sites rather than a comparison of the merits of spatial options, including hybrid options. Crucially, no case has been made that it is essential or even highly desirable for all the housing requirement to be concentrated in only one part of the village. The absence of any clear and robust justification providing sound reasons for the preferred monopoly of allocations to the North therefore remains a continuing defect of the NP process as a whole. Whilst allegations of retro-fitting the spatial strategy are denied by AECOM, the process followed is vulnerable to such allegations because not only do the AECOM assessments come late in the day, they also give inadequate consideration to alternative or hybrid scenarios.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>9. Unfortunately, therefore, we consider the strictures of the previous Examination Inspector have not been heeded and the SB has not been derived from a clear spatial strategy having emerged as the preferred strategy after considering alternative strategies. The overall sustainability credentials and community benefits of focusing all the required housing provision to the north have therefore not been tested against those associated with alternative locations – nor has sufficient weight been afforded the benefits of providing greater choice in terms of the location and scale of future village housing. These deficiencies undermine the spatial strategy on which the NP is predicated. The SB contains anomalies in relation to the exclusion of established housing and commercial development.</p> <p>10. We have previously drawn attention to the fact that the Wilkins Jam Factory Employment Zone is included within the SB but the existing Tower House employment area and housing on Kelvedon Road are excluded. As this area adjoins the SB and is in the vicinity of the new residential allocation at Highlands Nursery and the employment area adjoining Perry Wood, we consider it is anomalous to exclude this area from the SB. Elsewhere, to the south at Hall Road, established housing forming part of the built-up area of the village is excluded from the SB as is a fairly recently developed small housing estate (Salis Close) on the former International (Fruitpickers’) Camp.</p> <p>11. We can see no logic in excluding these already developed areas from the SB which is a consequence of no detailed evaluation having been undertaken to define a logical line to for the SB. Indeed, no reasons have been given as to why such anomalies have not been addressed in the Regulation 16 document despite these having been pointed out at the Regulation 14 stage and earlier. The SB has been drawn to exclude sustainable sites without sufficient evaluation or adequate reasons for their omission.</p> <p>12. By way of example, we identify 3 sites or locations in the North, East and South Sub Areas identified by AECOM which were promoted via the NP but constitute Omission Sites for which inadequate grounds have been given for their rejection. Tiptree North: Site 17: Land off Oak Road adjoining the Elms Farm allocation: Annex EGA1</p> <p>13. The line of the SB is contrived in order to exclude this site notwithstanding the fact that that it forms an obvious tract of land that should logically be incorporated into the northern allocations. We query the validity of the reasons given for its exclusion in the AECOM SEA study of March 2022 and then on Page 16 of the August 2022 Update citing “different land</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>ownership" (from Elms Farm) and the fact that it is "seemingly used informally for dog walking etc.". The AECOM Update nevertheless acknowledges: "There is more evidence the site could contribute positively to comprehensive strategic growth to the north of the village, but still little evidence regarding exactly what could be delivered and what benefits would or could be achieved." Apart from those generalised remarks, no relevant grounds are cited for its exclusion and the rejection is qualified by a bracketed "On Balance". Tiptree East: Site 11: Grove Road – Land at Rhubarb Hall: Annex EGA2</p> <p>14. This site adjoins the SB and has been promoted throughout the previous LP and NP processes, and via the current NP with the option of a frontage site only for about 9 dwellings or an in-depth site of one hectare for about 25 dwellings – the latter associated with a landscape buffer to the nearby sewage treatment works and commercial area. There are no highway constraints as intimated in the AECOM SEA study when referring to a sharp bend, whilst we regard being on the National Cycle Network is a transportation and accessibility benefit.</p> <p>15. Apart from the Barbrook Lane site allowed on Appeal, this site for village housing has been excluded from the SB alongside all other additional growth potential on the eastern side of Tiptree yet it is capable of providing a small or medium-sized site to off-set the dearth of such sites and is associated with landscape and amenity benefits for the setting of the village. Inadequate reasons have been given for its rejection. Tiptree South : Site 10 : Hall Road : Land incorporating Tiptree Egg Farm: Annex EGA3</p> <p>16. If the SB is defined at the southern end of Tiptree as shown in Annex EGA 3, this site has the capability to offer opportunities for smaller estate and smaller site developments, including a rounding-off plot at its southern tip, as an alternative to a spatial strategy in which all the allocations are focused to the north. At the same time, the proposed revision to the SB would remove anomalies where the SB currently excludes previously mentioned existing development whilst retaining a green gap between Tiptree and Tiptree Heath.</p> <p>17. Site 10 constitutes an alternative or complementary direction for growth lying within easy walking distance of the village centre. Historically, this site was promoted through the Colchester Adopted Core Strategy 2006-21 when it was rejected notwithstanding the fact that it had emerged as the second most sustainable site for development in Tiptree at that time.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>18. The AECOM SEA study notes that: “There would appear to be relatively good access to this site, but access could still limit the number of houses achievable”. That latter reservation is not supported by evidence and is not considered adequate as a ground for rejection. Access to the required standard can be obtained off Bull Lane to the east which already serves the medium-sized Brookland estate.</p> <p>19. There is merit in providing a wider choice of locations within the future local housing market and in so doing providing opportunities for smaller and medium-sized building firms. Site 10 is sustainably located and closely-related to the existing built-up area and village services - but inadequate reasons have been given for its exclusion from the SB. The SB fails to have regard to NPPF paragraphs 69a) and 70 that provision for at least 10% of the housing requirement should be found in small and medium-sized sites.</p> <p>20. As we pointed out in our Regulation 14 representations, the NPPF advises Local Planning Authorities and Neighbourhood Plan Groups to make provision for small and mediumsized sites. Paragraph 69a) states: “Small and medium-sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirements of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should: a) Identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare, unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant planning policies, that there are strong reasons why the 10% target cannot be achieved;” Then, in paragraph 70: “Neighbourhood plan groups should also give consideration to the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites (of a size consistent with paragraph 69a)) suitable for housing in their area.”</p> <p>21. In allocating all the minimum requirement of 400 dwellings at the northern extremity of the village, this is not only inconsistent with the NPPF but also with Objective 2 : To meet the housing, infrastructure and service requirements and needs of Tiptree and its residents in a sustainable manner. There are, in fact, many alternative edge of village sites which are far closer and more accessible to the village’s shops and schools.</p> <p>22. What is not in doubt is that the spatial strategy being pursued is inconsistent with the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 69a) and 70 - yet to be consistent with the NPPF, it would not have been essential for the NP to have abandoned its preferred northern bias. As 400 dwellings is a minimum requirement, sites for a further minimum of 40 dwellings (ie: the NPPFs</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>10% minimum) could easily have been found elsewhere in or on the edge of the village. (It could, however, be argued the figure should be 60 dwellings having regard to the Barbrook Lane allocation for 200 dwellings). No action has been taken to provide for small and medium-sized sites. Instead, the NP relies on undefined sites under the broad umbrella as follows: “5.5 The general approach in the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan is that growth will be focused within the settlement boundary on sites with existing planning permission, new allocations and small infill sites (windfalls).”</p> <p>23. Infill site capacity is not quantified whilst windfall sites are not identified and are not eligible to be counted as contributing to the 10% minimum to be found via small and medium-sized sites. 24. The Plan is therefore in conflict with the NPPF in the absence of sufficient provision for small and medium-sized sites.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>25. For reasons stated above, we consider the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan to be unsound.</p>
Lawson Planning Partnership on behalf of Colchester United Football Club	Object	<p>[See attachment for full comments and appendices]</p> <p>The TNP as currently drafted would fail to meet the ‘Basic Conditions’ set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 48 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The ‘Basic Conditions’ not met by the draft TNP are:</p> <p>Criterion a) Inconsistency with national planning policies and advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) concerning delivering sustainable development and providing justified policies based on a proportional evidence base;</p> <p>Criterion d) Failure to plan positively for Sustainable Development, particularly in relation to the provision of sports facilities including community sports provision; and,</p> <p>Criterion e) Lack of conformity with Strategic Policies SP1 and SP6 C) set out in Colchester Borough Council’s (CBC’s) adopted Local Plan 2013-2033 (February 2021) concerning the need to plan for the delivery of sustainable development and working with relevant providers and developers to facilitate the delivery of a range of social infrastructure required for healthy, active and inclusive communities.</p> <p>The Parish Council’s approach is unjustified as no technical evidence has been provided to support its position. Given the lack of consideration given to CUFC’s previous representations, we now request an in person hearing with the Inspector appointed to examine the draft TNP to consider oral evidence relating to our client’s proposals and the justification for reinstating Florence Park within the Settlement Boundary, as set out in the adopted Local Plan Policy Maps.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>Set out below is a brief overview of CUFC's sports development strategy, together with more detailed representations concerning shortcomings within the draft TNP and related evidence base.</p> <p>Background and Sports Strategy</p> <p>CUFC owns and operates Florence Park comprising 9.18 hectares (22.69 acres) of land south of Grange Road in the west of Tiptree, as well as further parcels to the north and east (see plan at Appendix 1). Florence Park Training Ground contains five football pitches, including a community pitch, a sports accommodation building and ancillary parking area. 9. Established in 1937, CUFC has played an important role in the provision and development of sport in the Borough and wider area. CUFC is an asset valued by many members of the community who enjoy participating in and watching football as a key team sport. These activities, in turn, contribute to inspiring members of the community of all age groups and levels to take up sport themselves. CUFC is also a valued local employer, and its reputational benefits have positive effects for associated elements of the local economy.</p> <p>CUFC has invested significantly in its sports facilities in recent years, including the Community Stadium and the Florence Park Training Ground. In addition, CUFC has also invested in the Warriors Rest Ground located east of Tiptree and owned by Colchester Borough Council. Planning permission was granted for the Florence Park Training Ground in 2010 (ref: 091627). The development was partly dependent on cross-finding from the provision of 103 dwellings on adjacent land to the north and south of Grange Road, consented under permission refs: 122134 and 151886 and currently part completed.</p> <p>Tiptree also has local community football teams facilitated by CUFC, including Tiptree Jobserve Youth Football Club, which is open to all youth players in the locality. These clubs are extremely popular and host several teams for varying age groups that use the ground at Warriors Rest and the designated community pitch and associated facilities at Florence Park.</p> <p>In order to maintain its positive influence in the provision and development of sport in the Borough, CUFC cannot sit still – it must continually advance its offer and grow as a professional sports club and business. Fundamental to CUFC's long-term development strategy is the need to achieve Category 1 status as a football training academy, as designated by the Football League's Elite Players Performance Plan (EPPP) youth development scheme.</p> <p>If CUFC is able to achieve Category 1 status, it will be able to set up a football training academy to attract the very best talent, which will in turn raise its profile, increasing its influence and encouraging more members of the community into sport, and enhancing its ability to reinvest funds directly into community aspects such as local community football teams.</p> <p>Working towards achieving Category 1 status has been a cornerstone of CUFC's sports strategy for several years but, unfortunately, the Training Ground at Florence Park is not of sufficient size to</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>allow this accreditation to be achieved. The current site also suffers from restrictions imposed on its use by planning conditions that control the hours of operation and the times of the year when it may be used and expansion into adjacent land has been ruled out on availability and suitability grounds.</p> <p>CUFC has, therefore, been looking to relocate its existing facilities to a new, larger site that is capable to attaining Category 1 status, and this search remains ongoing. A potential relocation site outside of Tiptree has been identified and CUFC is in the process of pursuing related planning actions to help take this forward.</p> <p>However, it is also important to note that the requirements to continue to meet the current Category 2 status are consistently evolving, with one such example being a likely future obligation to provide a '3G' pitch with associated floodlighting. At present there are no floodlighting facilities at Florence Park, and residential amenity considerations could be a constraint to such provision. In addition, the limited hours of operation imposed on Florence Park, as a result of residential amenity considerations, further restrict use of the site for sports purposes.</p> <p>Therefore, while Florence Park is currently able to retain Category 2 status, there is a real possibility that this will not continue to be the case, which would represent a significant backward step for CUFC's academy status and sport development in general. This would further reduce the likelihood of attracting the best young players in the area, thereby negatively impacting on the Club's profile and ability to invest in local community sport provision.</p> <p>As part of the above strategy, and in order to cross-fund a relocation, CUFC will seek to redevelop some of the existing Florence Park Training Ground to provide housing for approximately 120 new homes. However, the Club would also retain the current first team pitch to enable it to be utilised by local community teams, along with the high-quality sports building with car parking, again for local community use at least in part. The illustrative concept masterplan submitted as part of CUFC's previous representations is attached at Appendix 2. The strategy was further discussed during a meeting with the Steering Group, which took place on 8th October 2018.</p> <p>In summary, CUFC provides a range of wider community and sustainability benefits that create positive social, economic and environmental benefits. The Club's long-standing redevelopment strategy is, therefore, consistent with the objectives of national planning and sports policies, which seek to encourage rather than hinder these benefits from being realised. Although the adopted Local Plan currently provides a policy framework to enable this development strategy and vision to be realised, the current draft TNP, which places Florence Park outside its settlement boundary, would effectively prejudice the delivery of CUFC's legitimate and positive planning and sports development objectives.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>Despite setting out this position in CUFC's representations to previous Neighbourhood Plan consultations, the requested amendments to the TNP have not been made for reasons that do not withstand scrutiny in light of planning legislation and policy.</p> <p>With the above context in mind, our representations seek to protect CUFC's planning position and establish a suitable planning policy basis for the TNP, as set out below. Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan Unjustified Settlement Boundary Exclusion</p> <p>The current adopted Local Plan Policies Map for Tiptree (August 2022) identifies the Florence Park Training Ground as lying within the settlement boundary and designates it as 'public open space' to which Policies DM4 (Sports Provision) and DM17 (Retention of Open Space and Recreation Facilities) apply. In line with national planning policy for open space and recreation, as set out in paragraph 99 of the NPPF, these Local Plan policies seek to allow for the development of such sites where alternative and improved provision will be created in a location well related to the functional requirements of the relocated use and its existing and future users. Whilst CUFC can meet this policy criterion, by removing Florence Park from the Settlement Boundary, such a move would create a contradiction with national and Local Plan policy. Excluding the site from the settlement boundary, effectively incorrectly treats the sports ground and associated buildings and structures as 'countryside' which it most certainly is not.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy SS14 (Tiptree) advises that the extent of a new settlement boundary for Tiptree will be defined as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, which will also allocate sites to deliver "a minimum of 400 dwellings", open space and other uses. The Policy also states that proposals for development outside of the settlement boundary defined by the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan once adopted will not be supported. Therefore, it is highly important that the Florence Park site remains within the settlement boundary as currently defined by the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>In order to achieve its improvement strategy and enable the continued and enhanced provision of community facilities, CUFC requires policy flexibility to enable it to redevelop part of the site for housing to help cross fund an improved Training Ground re-provision, whilst maintaining a significant sports asset for the benefit of the Club and Tiptree's community. This would reflect established national and Development Plan policy and could be achieved if the site is retained within the settlement boundary as requested.</p> <p>The purpose of any change to the settlement boundary should be to accommodate new growth (such as the proposed housing allocations), or to reflect a clearly identified abandoned site-specific policy. Colchester Borough Council's Settlement Boundary Review (2017), submitted as part of the Local Plan's evidence base, advises that the Council does not generally seek to substantially alter settlement boundaries in order to ensure they continue to "reflect both national and local policy</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>aimed at promoting brownfield development, allocating the most sustainable sites and protecting the countryside” (page 8).</p> <p>A settlement boundary review should not be used to reverse adopted planning policies and proposals for sites such as Florence Park that are in compliance with national and local policy, and where there is a clear and legitimate planning strategy in place. The draft TNP’s attempt to re-designate Florence Park as ‘countryside’ and prejudice sustainable development opportunities (deliberately or otherwise) represents a perverse and ‘unsound’ measure, which should be rectified in order for the draft TNP to satisfy the required ‘Basic Conditions’ applicable to Neighbourhood Plans. Whilst it is accepted that the settlement boundary is to be defined by the TNP, as explained, any exclusion of land within it, needs to be properly justified, as opposed to representing an arbitrary and contrived removal as appears to be the case with Florence Park.</p> <p>The Borough Council’s Settlement Boundary Review also explains that settlement boundaries have been drawn to “define the main nucleus of the settlement” (page 8). Thus, to date, the spatial and functional relationship of Florence Park to the settlement has been acknowledged and evidenced by the inclusion of the ground within the adopted Local Plan settlement boundary of Tiptree.</p> <p>The update to the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) published alongside the draft TNP identifies the Florence Park site with the reference numbers 20 and 55. There is no discussion within the SEA update of any proposal to remove the site from the settlement boundary, any justification for its removal, or any recommendation in this regard.</p> <p>Instead, the SEA update discusses why the site has not been progressed to a reasonable growth scenario, which CUFC has not requested and is not seeking. In any event, the reasons for not considering the site further are not justified.</p> <p>The SEA update states that traffic flows associated with the adjacent residential development should be understood before any further development in the vicinity is considered. However, traffic modelling based on existing and proposed developments is an accepted means of assessing cumulative highway safety and capacity impacts arising from proposed growth. Therefore, there is no justification for delaying consideration of a site’s development potential until other schemes have been completed and occupied.</p> <p>In any event, highway infrastructure provision was secured as part of the consent for the adjacent residential development and delivered by CUFC to ensure the traffic implications could be appropriately and adequately accommodated.</p> <p>The identification of Pennsylvania Lane as a historic bridleway also does not present a reason to preclude the Florence Park site as an option for future residential development. Such assets are already protected by legislation and policy at national and local level, and any proposal for</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>development of the Florence Park site would have due regard to this in the same way that the preferred housing sites would need to mitigate any impacts on the designated heritage assets they are close to.</p> <p>Similarly, the perceived reduced potential for providing a link road between Kelvedon Road and Grange Road as a result of planning permission granted for the Marden Homes residential development is not a valid reason to discount the development potential of the Florence Park site. Any proposed development would need to address any related highways impacts in accordance with adopted national and local planning policy.</p> <p>Accordingly, there are no valid or justified reasons for discounting the Florence Park site's development potential. In any event, as discussed above, CUFC is not seeking a residential allocation for the site, but requires its reinstatement within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The draft TNP provides only one reference to justification for a proposed amendment to the settlement boundary, which relates to Tiptree Heath. At paragraph 5.1 it explains that removal of the boundary around Tiptree Heath is considered necessary "to preserve the rural nature of what is a hamlet, thereby avoiding it potentially coalescing with the built-up area of Tiptree village". Conversely, there is no reference to any rationale behind the proposed exclusion of Florence Park from the settlement boundary. In the absence of any justification, it is understood that the proposed removal of the site from the settlement to be either an error, or an intentional strategy without any planning justification or purpose.</p> <p>When assessing the previous failed TNP, the Planning Inspector's report (October 2020) noted that there was no evidence of a specific appraisal that identified the proposed settlement boundary. Based on the documents published as part of the current consultation on the updated draft TNP, the concerns raised by the Inspector do not appear to have been addressed, and the Plan still lacks justification for the proposed amendments to the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The proposal should, therefore, be reversed as requested to enable the draft TNP to meet the required 'Basic Conditions' and avoid it failing for a second time. Insufficient Regard to Other Plans and Programmes</p> <p>As discussed in CUFC's previous representations, the draft TNP fails to meet the requirement identified in the SEA Scoping Report (February 2019) to identify other relevant plans and programmes. Indeed, CUFC is notably missing from the Consultation Statement's list (at paragraph 5.16) of "directly interested parties" consulted as part of the TNP preparation process. This unsatisfactory position is particularly disappointing given the previous productive liaison with Chris Bowden (Navigus Planning) and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, where CUFC's overall strategy was discussed in the context of the emerging Plan for Tiptree.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>As a key community sports provider with intended investment plans, CUFC's strategy should have been reviewed, evidenced, and listed as a reference. However, this inadequacy has not been addressed in the current draft TNP despite the prior submission of detailed representations and discussions with the Steering Group.</p> <p>In contradiction to CUFC's previous representations that the Club's proposals do not require the site's allocation for housing development, the SEA continues to discuss assessment of the site for its suitability as a housing allocation. It inaccurately reports CUFC's representations as requesting that the site be taken forward to the reasonable growth scenarios and goes on to explain why the site has been discounted as a housing allocation. As such, there has been little to no regard to CUFC's representations and the Club's improvement strategy in the preparation of the draft TNP.</p> <p>Inconsistent Approach to Windfall Sites</p> <p>The Parish Council's response to CUFC's previous objection (as described in Appendix A11 to the Consultation Statement) states that "if the settlement boundary around Florence Park is re-instated then the area becomes a windfall site potentially suitable for another 120 homes".</p> <p>This position conflicts with that taken in respect of land behind the Bonnie Blue Oak public house. This site lies outside the settlement boundary, but is recognised at paragraph 12.16 of the draft TNP as having potential for development to meet future housing targets (i.e. as a windfall site), despite the SEA update stating that there is "little evidence regarding exactly what would be delivered and what benefits would or could be achieved".</p> <p>This contrasts with the Florence Park position, where CUFC's development strategy has been set out in some detail to identify what would be delivered and the benefits that could be achieved. In order to represent a credible, appropriate strategy to meet Tiptree's identified needs, the TNP needs to take a consistent approach in the consideration of development sites and the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Furthermore, in order to meet the 'Basic Condition' of compliance with national policy, the draft TNP needs to have regard to paragraph 69c of the NPPF, which requires plans to "give great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes". Florence Park represents a suitable site within Tiptree that would generate additional benefits for the community as well as providing a buffer to the identified minimum housing delivery target. Deliverability of TNP Objectives</p> <p>The approach taken within the draft TNP calls into question whether it represents an appropriate strategy to achieve various identified objectives and meet identified needs.</p> <p>In relation to sports and recreation facilities, the TNP lists the sports clubs at Warriors Rest and the Florence Park training ground as facilities that Tiptree benefits from, and which ensure that the Parish is well served (paragraph 3.21). The draft Plan goes on to identify that nearly half of the</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>responders to the previous consultation currently travel outside the village to access leisure and sport activities and would welcome provision of further facilities within the village (paragraph 10.1). Similarly, at paragraph 10.3 the draft Plan identifies the need for a community hall and meeting space provision. Finally, in Section 13 the draft Plan claims that provision of sport and leisure facilities for older teenagers cannot be resolved by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As detailed above, and in previous consultation responses, CUFC's strategy for the Florence Park site would allow for additional community sports facilities to be provided within the village, including floorspace that could (in part) potentially be used for a community hall or meeting space. The strategy would also allow for further investment at Warrior Rest to enhance its community sports and leisure offer for residents of all ages. As such, CUFC's strategy could contribute to addressing the TNP's identified sports and recreation objectives.</p> <p>However, the proposed exclusion of Florence Park from the settlement boundary would prejudice CUFC's ability to progress its strategy and thereby the exclusion would prevent Neighbourhood Plan objectives from being addressed. This outcome would conflict with the NPPF requirement to plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and community facilities, including sports facilities and open space (paragraph 93a).</p> <p>Similarly, the draft Plan identifies Tower Business Park as one of four designated Local Economic Areas within the village. Draft Policy TNP09 supports employment-generating development within such areas. However, the exclusion of the business park from the settlement boundary results in a conflict between draft Policy TNP09 and TNP01, which does not support development outside the settlement boundary. Therefore, the ability to achieve the objective of ensuring that Tiptree is an attractive location for a range of businesses so that its local economy can thrive would be prejudiced.</p> <p>Such a discrepancy would conflict with the NPPF requirement to "set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth" (paragraph 82a)</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In summary, CUFC objects to the exclusion of Florence Park from the settlement boundary, as this has the direct effect of removing the principle in favour of this site being redeveloped for a mixed housing and community sports scheme as part of a purpose planned development and investment strategy. In addition, the proposed exclusion does not acknowledge the site's spatial and functional relationship with the village, and conflicts with national and local strategic policies that support the expansion and improvement of sports facilities for the benefit of all. It is also not in general</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>conformity with the intended approach to reviewing settlement boundary changes advocated across the Borough.</p> <p>The site's exclusion from the settlement boundary is not justified, nor is it based on any available technical assessment, related evidence or good planning reason.</p> <p>In light of the matters discussed above, the TNP (as currently drafted) cannot be considered an appropriate strategy for achieving the stated objectives and meeting Tiptree's identified needs. Until the identified shortcomings have been addressed, the draft TNP cannot be demonstrated to meet the 'Basic Conditions' required for Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Therefore, CUFC considers it to be essential that Florence Park is retained within the settlement boundary, as shown on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map, to ensure the TNP can be found procedurally correct and is able to meet the overall aims and objectives of planning for sustainable development. This would also provide a suitable planning policy basis and related certainty for the delivery of CUFC's development strategy, rather than simply frustrate and delay the achievement of commendable and legitimate planning objectives.</p> <p>In order for the representations above to be adequately and appropriately considered, we hereby request a face-to-face hearing with the Inspector appointed to examine the draft TNP and reserve the right to provide further information at that time, as necessary. Should you require further clarification on the information submitted, please do contact my colleague John Lawson or me using the details provided</p>
Colchester Borough council	Support	<p>[See Attachment for full comment]</p> <p>CBC fully supports this policy. The Colchester Local Plan Section 2 was adopted in July 2022. The spatial strategy is in accordance with the Colchester Local Plan Section 2, particularly policies SG1, SG2 and SS14.</p> <p>The spatial strategy clearly outlines how the Neighbourhood Plan will ensure the housing need as identified in the Colchester Local Plan will be met.</p> <p>The policy has also been updated to consider coalescence between Tiptree and Tiptree Health, which is welcomed.</p>
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Ms Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Luke Magnay	Support	Highland Nursery and Elms Farm are better suited locations for the new proposed dwellings. Hopefully they'll be priced in such a way that they can actually be bought and lived in. Unlike the Nine Acres sites and other new builds (E.G. Redrow estate in Witham) which stand largely unsold given they're asking for £500k plus to purchase.
Mr Sam Milverton	Support	I am supportive of the plan and believe it is manageable for the current residents of Tiptree and the infrastructure.
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Vanessa Crossley	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I agree with the policy
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	I agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 5, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	I fully support the plan
Design and Housing		
Anglian Water	Support	[See Attachment for full comment] Paragraph 6.4 - Whilst we recognise the importance of energy efficiency and low carbon/renewable sources of energy are important to reduce operational carbon from new developments the design of new buildings should also factor the efficient use of resources in general to reduce capital (embedded) carbon, but also encourage more ambitious water efficiency measures that include integrated water management. The significant allocations at Highland Nursery and Elms Farm have the scope to provide water efficient measures such as rainwater harvesting and reuse. When combined with SuDS, this has a positive outcome for future potable water demand within an area identified as being in serious water stress. We suggest that the wording of Policy TIP02 Good Quality Design is amended to read: “Designs that incorporate new technology to increase energy <u>and water</u> efficiency and reduce the carbon footprint will be encouraged.”
Mr Mark Allen	Support	Agree
Policy TIP02 – Good Quality Design		
Essex County Council	Comment	[See attachment for full comments from ECC] ECC as the MWPA recommend that the Policy TIP02 includes reference to promoting waste reduction, re-use and recycling, sustainable building design and the use of sustainable materials,

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>including in relation to their procurement, in the construction of new development or redevelopment, in line with Policy S4 of the Essex Minerals Local Plan (MLP).</p> <p>Energy Efficiency and Zero Carbon Homes</p> <p>It is acknowledged TIP02 states “Designs that incorporate new technology to increase energy efficiency and reduce the carbon footprint will be encouraged”.</p> <p>However, the Plan should include a supportive statement to improve energy efficiency to existing as well as new builds. The Plan should outline requirements for all developments to be ‘zero carbon ready’ by design and, where feasible, for buildings to be certified to a Passivhaus. Whilst energy efficiency targets are set nationally in Building Regulations, there are opportunities for neighbourhood plans to influence new development, through policies requiring developers to demonstrate how they’ve followed the ‘energy hierarchy’ in reducing energy demand before implementing renewable energy, or make the most of solar gain and passive cooling through the orientation, layout and design of the development. ECC recommends reference is made to the Essex Design Guide (2018) ‘Climate Change’ section. This provides guidance on several topics, including Layout Principles and Densities for Sustainable Development. Further guidance on solar orientation and climate change and the historic environment is to be published imminently. The Elmstead Market Draft Neighbourhood Plan provides a good example of what the Plan could say on this important topic. ECC would welcome the inclusion of reference to the Essex Climate Action Commission (ECAC), which is a formal independent cross-party commission established in October 2019.</p> <p>The ECAC’s formal role is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify ways where we can mitigate the effects of climate change, improve air quality, reduce waste across Essex and increase the amount of green infrastructure and biodiversity in the county; and • explore how we attract investment in natural capital and low carbon growth. ECAC published its recommendations in a report titled Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral in July 2021, and ECC is working with its partners, including local authorities, to deliver the report’s recommendations. <p>The recommended text for inclusion in the NP is provided below.</p> <p>“In 2019, Colchester Borough Council declared a climate emergency acknowledging that urgent action is required to limit the environmental impacts produced by the climate crisis. The Council aims to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. This is supported by Essex County Council who established the Essex Climate Action Commission in 2019 to promote and guide climate action in the county and move Essex to net zero by 2050. It is an independent, voluntary, and cross-party body bringing together groups from the public and private sector, as well as individuals from other</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		organisations. The Commission published its report, Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral, in July 2021 and its recommendations are relevant to all Essex local authorities, parish and town councils, as well as Essex businesses, residents, and community groups. The report sets out a comprehensive plan for Essex to: reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050 in line with UK statutory commitments; and to make Essex more resilient to climate impacts such as flooding, water shortages and overheating. The report covers a wide range of topic areas including land use, energy, waste, transport, plus the built and natural environments. The report's recommendations are now incorporated into a Climate Action Plan and a focused work programme over the coming years to ensure the effects of climate change can be mitigated."
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Ms Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Agree
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mrs Julia Magnay	Support	Particularly like the requirement of any new housing areas to have areas to support wildlife such as wildflower lawns, trees & hedges, log piles, and habitat areas for different species.

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Vanessa Crossley	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I agree with the policy
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP02, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Lisa Craig	Comment	We must make sure that any future development in Tiptree is of good quality. Developments like the Grove Road estate should not be repeated.
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	WE NEED THIS TYPE OF REGULATION
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	Agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Policy TIP03 – Residential Car Parking		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I Agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Ms Gemma Bellett	Support	I agree
Miss Heidi Southgate	Support	There should be car parking for at least 2 cars per property and room to install electric charge points
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Off street parking is a must to avoid the situation encountered on the Grove park estate where it is very difficult and dangerous to be a pedestrian or cyclist.
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mr Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Vanessa Crossley	Support	I agree. The parking in the newer estates in Tiptree is dangerously inadequate and affects the ability to walk on pavements or drive round corners safely
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I agree with the policy. It is important that the Essex Design Guide is only used to indicate the absolute minimum parking to be provided. Tiptree's bus service to Colchester and Maldon continues to be reduced during the day in addition to the non-existent evening service. The bus service to the nearest railway stations is woefully inadequate, resulting in households with children of working age needing at least 3 cars, if times and destinations do not facilitate car sharing. Ideally every home that has a double bedroom should have 2 car parking spaces at the very least.
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP03, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Colin Bigg		Previous new large housing developments in Tiptree have not taken the increase in household parking in mind but this plan should take all future car parking in mind.
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agreed
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Agree with proposal
Policy TIP04 – Building for a Healthy Life		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Very important
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Vanessa Crossley	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I agree with this policy
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP04, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Support
Policy TIP05 – First Homes		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Miss Heidi Southgate	Support	Affordable housing for the village community is extremely important to ensure the youth of the village can buy in the village they grew up in.
Mrs Karen Benton	support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree, local families first
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	First homes for locals first.
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	[No comment left]
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Vanessa Crossley	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I agree with this policy
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP05, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	Must be a requirement
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	The village is in desperate need of affordable housing
Traffic and Movement		
National Highways	Comment	<p>[See attachment for full comments from National Highways]</p> <p>National Highways is responsible for the operation, maintenance and improvement of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England on behalf of the Secretary of the State. In the area within and surrounding the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan we have responsibility for the trunk roads A12 and A120. This Neighbourhood Plan is located on the south-eastern side of the A12 between Junctions 23 and 24. The nearest trunk road junction will be A12 Junctions 23 and 24, part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). We have reviewed different traffic-related policy details within the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2033. National Highway's A12 road infrastructure improvement project titled, 'A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme' has considered improving the junction capacity of the A12 (SRN) and surrounding local roads (for example, the B1023).</p> <p>Paragraph 7.8 mentioned the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme improvements, including the increase in traffic on Kelvedon Road and the need to maintain the route to Junction 22 attractive. The A12 to A120 Scheme would like to note that both proposed Junction 22 and Junction 24 are all movement junctions with improved connections to the local road network, we are also providing a bypass to Rivenhall End that will facilitate the traffic from Braxted road to get to Junction 22</p>
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	A dedicated bike path rather than sharing the road with bigger and more vehicles in general. This would encourage more cycle use by younger children
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	no comment

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 7, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Very Much agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Sheperd	Support	<p>Tiptree is a through-route with the majority of traffic using the B1023 and B1022 just passing through. This has been amply demonstrated by the effects of the recent closures, one at a time, of: Station Road; Factory Hill; and Appleford Bridge on Braxted Road; and when there is a problem on the A12.</p> <p>It is important that Tiptree gets the infrastructure support from long term planned development rather than piecemeal development.</p>
Policy TIP06 – Non-Motorised User Access Routes		
Essex County Council	Comment	[See attachment for full comments from ECC] Point A – To note. ECC practice is generally for shared footway/cycleways unless it is a strategic cycleway and then where segregation is necessary due to safety reasons arising from the volume of cycle/pedestrian traffic.
National Highways	Comment	[See attachment for full comments from National Highways] On Policy TIP06: Non-Motorised User Access Routes we note the reference to provide access to the north to the A12 and other towns and railways (paragraph 7.2). The A12 Scheme notes that some of our improvements around Junction 24 would facilitate a link between Tiptree and Kelvedon (train station).
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	More controlled crossings for use by school age pedestrians
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mrs Julia Magnay	Support	Safe walking and cycling is so important.
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	no comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I agree with this policy
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP06, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	It is important to provide non-motorised user access routes if we are to encourage young people to walk to school.
Policy TIP07 – Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic Through Tiptree Village		
National Highways	Support	[See attachment for full comments from National Highways] Policy TIP07: Mitigating the Impact of Vehicular Traffic Through Tiptree Village, this policy is welcomed by the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme team as it tries to address some of the local traffic issues, but notes that only parts of the bypass are proposed, and no further allocations or contributions are sought from the developers to partially fund the full Tiptree northern bypass. Overall, the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme has no objections to the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Colchester Borough Council	Support	[See attachment for full comments] CBC fully supports this policy. This policy provides for the first phase of a northern link road associated with the housing allocations at Highland Nurse (TIP15) and Elms Farm (TIP16). This is in accordance with Policy SS14 of the Colchester Local Plan Section 2. This policy has been informed and is supported by an extensive evidence base including: Review of Transport Issues Note, prepared by COTTEE Transport Planning – January 2021 Review of Transport Issues Note, prepared by COTTEE Transport Planning – April 2021 Strategic Highways Note, prepared by COTTEE Transport Planning – February 2022 As demonstrated by the deliverability statement within the Housing Topic Paper (Appendix C) and as a standalone document , which forms part of the evidence base for the Neighborhood Plan, the developer (Mersea Homes) has confirmed that the proposal at Highland Nurse and Elm Farm is viable and deliverable, including local infrastructure in the form of a land for a medical facility and future highway enhancements.

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Mrs Karen Armstrong	Object	Until the link road can be fully connected this will cause major traffic problems in Oak road which is already far too busy for its size, creating an accident waiting to happen.
Mrs Sue More	Support	Agree
Ms Julie Warmington	Comment	The Maldon Road [REDACTED]. I used to cross the road to enjoy the heath with no problem. With an increased burden of traffic this is increasingly dangerous with animals. I would like to do anything possible to stop increased traffic from funneling down this road
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Miss Heidi Southgate		Support of the link road to ensure that traffic can move freely - closures of Maldon road, station road and church road must be avoided to ensure smooth running of traffic. The Braxted road access to the A12 is extremely important - closure of this route is detrimental to all businesses within the village.
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Agree that driveways should not enter directly onto the new link roads especially as there will be more traffic.
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Owen Cass	Support	no comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr David Godden	Comment	The access to and from the A12 needs to be dramatically improved, probably made as direct as possible and in such a way such that Tiptree does not become a "through-way" to and from the A12 for too many other villages or towns.
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	It is important that the existing route to the southbound A12 via Rivenhall End by means of Station Road, Maldon Road and Braxted Park Road is maintained and enhanced, to avoid the centre of Tiptree experiencing extra traffic and pollution resulting from the proposed A12 improvements. Improvements to the provision of the river crossing near Appleford Bridge should be available to all traffic from Tiptree, including Mersea Island and villages to the South East of Tiptree. Lorries from businesses on Grange Road and Beckingham Business Park in Tolleshunt Major use this route as well as the Commodity Centre in Braxted.
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP07, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	i agree
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	As traffic passing through Tiptree will only increase by far in future this must be part of the Neighbourhood plan
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Agree
Tiptree Village Centre		
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 8, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Policy TIP08 – Tiptree Village Centre		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I Agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Mrs Julie Warmington	Comment	I love the variety of shops in Tiptree and fully support any measure to help them thrive. Boutique family owned shops should be encouraged and welcomed.
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Miss Heidi Southgate	Support	retail units must be protected. The loss of the banks has been detrimental to the footfall and therefore the community businesses. The Parish Council must ensure that we are more than a one trick town, all hairdressers and no shops will result in little trade.
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Encourage a different variety of business to the village centre. Far too many hairdressers/beauty/estate agents and charity shops.
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr David Godden	Support	The village centre needs to be cleaned up and made more attractive. Probably some restaurants (not fast food) would make it a more pleseant place to visit of an evening, at the moment "deadsville".

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy. Following the recent loss of its two banks, alternative in-person banking facilities are needed or considerable enhancement of the Post Office Facility to allow more than one counter to be open. The banks brought in visitors to Tiptree shops. Business rates should encourage shops selling goods to prevent the village becoming full of hairdressers, nail and beauty salons, and take-aways. The correct balance is essential to keeping a vibrant local shopping centre and preventing an increase in car usage.
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP08, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	I agree
Employment		
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 9, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Policy TIP09 – Small Scale Commercial Workspaces		
Lawson Planning Partnership on behalf of Colchester United Football Club	Object	Similarly, the draft Plan identifies Tower Business Park as one of four designated Local Economic Areas within the village. Draft Policy TNP09 supports employment-generating development within such areas. However, the exclusion of the business park from the settlement boundary results in a conflict between draft Policy TNP09 and TNP01, which does not support development outside the settlement boundary. Therefore, the ability to achieve the objective of ensuring that Tiptree is an attractive location for a range of businesses so that its local economy can thrive would be prejudiced.

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		Such a discrepancy would conflict with the NPPF requirement to “set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth” (paragraph 82a)
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Agree
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy. The provision of land at Highlands nurseries would also allow businesses located in the centre of Tiptree, which would be better suited on the outskirts, to re-locate affording them better access to the A12 for use by a range of passing trades people. This would release land for a better range of shops and community facilities and much needed public car parking.
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP09, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	The more industry and small businesses we can bring to Tiptree can only be beneficial to us.
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Agree
Community Infrastructure		
Ms Julie Warmington	Support	Tiptree medical centre is over burdened.. something must be done to support the continual growth of the community and safeguard its health.
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree strongly
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 10, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Policy TIP10 – Provision of Community Infrastructure		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree very strongly
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	A community hub/medical centre so far away from the pharmacies and shops does not seem a good idea so perhaps a pharmacy aswell as a medical centre.
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	no comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr David Godden	Support	Agree Medical Centre is a massive requirement before any further housing devevelopment as the current one cannot deal with the current volume of people.
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy. It allows for the provision of a second medical centre and facilitates those who live away from the centre of Tiptree. If one Medical Centre in the centre were preferred then maybe a land swap could be arranged between existing central businesses, the Highlands or Elms Farm sites.
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 10, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Lisa Craig	Support	Tiptree Medical Centre is already over subscribed. Tiptree cannot become any bigger without more medical facilities. Any promised new facilities must actually be built.
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	I strongly support this.
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Agree
Countryside, Green Spaces and Green Infrastructure		
Essex County Council	Support	Surface Water Management and Flood Risk ECC as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) welcomes appropriate reference to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) within policy and supporting text.
Anglian Water	Support	[See Attachment for full comment] We welcome the section addressing flooding in the neighbourhood plan that identify the current and future risks and signpost developers and applicants to relevant guidance. Early consideration of SuDS can ensure that multi-functional SuDS are utilised effectively and

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>provide a consistent level of protection from surface water flooding. The Planning Practice Guidance on flood risk clearly states “The layout and function of drainage systems needs to be considered at the start of the design process for new development, as integration with road networks and other infrastructure can maximise the availability of developable land.” SuDS are an essential component of the design process for the proposed allocations and future growth over the longer term.</p> <p>Flooding: We welcome the section addressing flooding in the neighbourhood plan (paragraphs 11.6-11.9) that identify the current and future risks and signpost developers and applicants to relevant guidance. Anglian Water can advise developers on SuDS and nature-based solutions for sites, and our manual for SuDS can be found here.</p>
Mrs Karen Armstrong	Object	There will now be no green open space to the north of the village this just creates the opposite, "A hard Edge"
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	protection of local wildlife sites is vital
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	We need to preserve the areas we currently have from speculative development. With a neighbourhood plan at least we will protect what we currently have for a few more years.
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 11, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Very much agree, the need for exercise especially in older people is vital. and a creation of better green spaces should be encouraged.
Policy TIP11 – Green Infrastructure		
Anglian Water	Support	Policy TIP11: We support the approach to the provision of green infrastructure and the reference to its multi-functional benefits including adapting and mitigating against a changing climate. This highlights the need for nature-based solutions, such as natural flood management, to ensure greater resilience to climate change impacts such as flooding. The policy requirement to design Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to maximise the potential for biodiversity to thrive is welcomed and complements our purpose and strategic ambitions.
Colchester Borough Council	Support	[See attachment for full comments] CBC fully supports this policy. This policy will provide protection to the green infrastructure network throughout the neighbourhood plan area.
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree with this policy. Tiptree desperately needs to protect its wildlife areas and green space. The need for these areas to remain was particularly highlighted during Covid lockdown when we needed to find open space for recreation. Open space, accessible on foot, for recreation and dog walking is essential.
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree very strongly

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Ms Julie Warmington	Support	I am 100 percent behind protecting our green spaces. I understand a rare orchid was found recently. It is imperative we protect and value these areas before they are gone forever.
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Miss Heidi Southgate	Support	All building works on green open spaces should be avoided, community open spaces are vitally important for health and well being.
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Whole heartedly support the fact that proposals that removed green space will not be supported.
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mrs Julia Magnay	Support	I agree it is essential to protect the local wildlife sites
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	I strongly support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy. Tiptree lacks open space that can be accessed without having to drive. Brook Meadows is one of the last remaining spaces that is feasible to walk to from the centre of Tiptree. During lockdown we felt we might be fined for trying to access Tiptree Heath or Park Lane

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		as they are too far to walk to (half an hour there and back in a suburban setting) and then walk on for a further hour. A lot of older people can only manage an hour's walk.
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP11, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr David Kellier	Support	We need to protect our environment. Yes the UK needs housing but it is being done behind the scenes and in an unstructured manner
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	This is necessary to keep our rural structure
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Very much agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Green spaces need to be more accessible for better use by the community.
Policy TIP12 – Landscaping and Biodiversity		
Natural England	Support	The revised Plan now provides a more extensive consideration of the value of existing and future green infrastructure provision within the Plan area and the addition of new policies relating to "Landscape & Biodiversity" and "Local Green Spaces" is also welcomed.
Essex County Council	Support	Sustainable development and environment Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Net Gain ECC welcomes the changes made since the last iteration of the Plan and where appropriate reference has been made within policy and supporting text throughout the Plan on these two issues.
Colchester Borough Council	Support	[See attachment for full comments] CBC fully supports this policy. This policy provides a number of criteria to ensure that development will not negatively impact upon the natural environment in Tiptree.
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	the protection of our local green spaces is paramount
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Completely agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	We must protect our green spaces and encourage biodiversity
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	no comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP12, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	Again this is necessary to ensure that the future wildlife and flora is protected
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	agree the need for wildlife to thrive is vital, and the very special nature of spaces like brook meadow must be protected.
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy. It is very important that new development does not intrude on the peace and tranquility of existing green space and lanes. One should not be aware that the new development exists from such green spaces.
Policy TIP13 – Local Green Spaces		
Natural England	Support	The revised Plan now provides a more extensive consideration of the value of existing and future green infrastructure provision within the Plan area and the addition of new policies relating to “Landscape & Biodiversity” and “Local Green Spaces” is also welcomed.
Colchester Borough Council	Support	This policy has been included within the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan following review of the consultation responses received at the Regulation 14 stage. CBC fully supports the designation of Local Green Spaces within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Each Local Green Space is considered to accord with NPPF paragraph 100. This policy is supported by the evidence base, notably the Village Questionnaire Results and the Environmental Group Report .

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Cedra Planning on behalf of Kler Group	Object	<p>[See attachment for full representation]</p> <p>A significant distinction to be made between the Regulation 14 draft neighbourhood plan and Regulation 16 draft neighbourhood plan is the proposed designation of the Kler Group land as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>The draft neighbourhood plan refers to paragraph 100 of the NPPF which, amongst other matters, requires that local green spaces are designated only where the green space is demonstrably special to a local community, and holds particular local significance for example because of its beauty, historical significance, recreational value (such as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife. 17 3.47 Paragraph 11.14 of the draft neighbourhood plan refers to the Kler Group land as being the largest area of open grassland within the Parish and it is highly valued for its wildlife and its great recreational value.</p> <p>So far as richness of wildlife, the summary proof of evidence prepared by FPCR which accompanies these representations sets out the value of the site for wildlife, and that a biodiversity net gain can be achieved on the site.</p> <p>In terms of recreational value, the site is not formal, publicly accessible land. There is no intention from the landowners to make the site publicly accessible. The site can be seen from public rights of way but the site is not in formal, recreational use and is not available as a resource to the community. It should be noted that part of the Local Wildlife Site, adjoining the Kler Group land, has been fenced off and this is an approach which the landowners for the Kler Group land could similarly take. The NPPF refers to the need for “particular local significance” and in relation to recreational value refers to the example of a playing field. The Kler Group land falls significantly below this bar in terms of “particular local significance”. The site is no more than ordinary countryside adjoining the settlement limits to Tiptree.</p> <p>In landscape terms the Kler Group land is visually and physically well contained as a result of the adjoining residential built form and robust vegetation structure to its boundaries and within the immediate localised context to the west. The proximity of the existing settlement edge immediately to the north east, east and south east provides a settlement edge character and urbanising influence on the land.</p> <p>The Kler Group land nor its landscape context is covered by any statutory landscape designations and is not a “valued landscape” as defined by paragraph 174a of the NPPF. The land has been</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>identified as having a Medium landscape susceptibility, a Medium landscape value and a Medium landscape sensitivity with a potential in landscape and visual terms to support sensitively designed residential development.</p> <p>There are no supporting evidence base documents that conclude there are any overriding landscape reasons for settlement growth not to be considered in this location and the Council have previously accepted the principle that the land has 18 capacity in landscape terms to support some level of residential development and settlement growth.</p> <p>Finally, so far as tranquillity, the site has urban influences on its north eastern and eastern edges which reduces any perceived tranquillity or ruralness and is positioned adjacent to the strategic preferred direction of growth immediately to the south of the site. It clearly functions as settlement fringe land and is countryside which is not a valued landscape and is no more social than any other edge of settlement undeveloped land.</p> <p>Overall therefore, in respect of the Kler Group land we consider that a Local Green Space designation is not justified or properly evidenced. The designated should therefore be removed.</p>
Sarah Greenwood	Support	All local green spaces need to be protected.
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	These green spaces are really important for the emotional well-being of Tiptree's expanding population.
Ms Julie Warmington	Comment	Don't forget the importance of Tiptree Heath which is also an extremely valuable green space
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	It is crucial to the Tiptree community that open spaces such as Brook meadow are preserved
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	This is vitally important to the village as most of our open spaces are being allocated to housing. These sites are of significant importance and value and should be protected.
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Peter Middleditc	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	i do not believe there should ever be 'exceptional circumstances' to allow building on our green spaces. The use of this phrase leaves us open to appeal on rejected proposals - who decides what criteria amounts so exceptional circumstances??? The lawyers with the most money?????
Mr Luke Magnay	Support	Brook Meadow is SO important to keep as a green space. Not only does it hold rare and protected orchids but also it's got a diverse range of wildlife from birds to insects and to various tree species. On a wider level, this is the last decent sized walking area for dogwalkers and children to enjoy on this side of town. Without it we're all relegated to narrow pathways and pavements next to roads.
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Dean Clark	Support	I fully support this plan to protect these much needed and well loved green spaces for the local community.
Mrs Ruth Bowman	Support	The green spaces in the village are incredibly important especially Brook meadow. It is the only area that is safely accessible by foot for long country walks with family and/or dogs etc. Tiptree Heath or Pods wood require you to drive there. Although there are other green spaces in Tiptree Brook Meadow is a habitat for so much more wildlife than any other green area in the village with the grassland, hedges, tree and the lake! It must be protected from development for the sake of the whole village, those who enjoy the space and the wildlife who live there!
Mrs Julia Magnay	Support	These are such important and valued green spaces and must be kept as such. Brook Meadows is one that has a very special place in my heart and is one of the major reasons I moved to the village. It is so important to have open green areas that are within walking distance for people, and I know that many of the residents that walk around Brook Meadows cannot access any other green space on foot.
Mrs Vicky Cheung		I agree. Our existing green spaces need to be protected. They provide invaluable opportunities for health and well-being with access to open spaces providing recreation and interaction with nature. Furthermore these areas form important habitats supporting a range of notable and protected species.
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	Agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Lisa Pitcher	Support	[PLEASE SEE IMAGE ATTACHED] For the last 3 years there has been a planning application and appeals to build 221 houses on Brook Meadow. As once set aside land on the rural edge of Tiptree it has been left to become treasure trove of rare flora and fauna. This is within walking distance for village residents to walk cycle and horse ride. It has become a significant open space to promote wellbeing amongst bird song and rare orchids. Colchester council even acknowledged it was a public open space when they put a dog poo bin on the entrance to Brook Meadow 10 years ago.
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy. Brook Meadows must not be lost to development. It is the major location accessible on foot for many people. It is a wonderful green lung for Tiptree.
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP13, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Lisa Craig	Support	Brook Meadow needs to remain part of Tiptree's green spaces. Is important both as an area for residents to enjoy open space and as a wildlife habitat.
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Tracey Price	Support	Since moving to Tiptree some 15 years ago, we have seen an unbelievable amount of green land being built on. We moved from London to get away from situations like this, being 'suffocated' from buildings/houses popping up all around us (we did not buy a new build when we moved here). Tiptree and surrounding areas have taken on more than their fair share of new houses. It's time to

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		stop. It's not just the increased traffic and local services that suffer, but NO consideration is given at all to the wildlife that desperately need these green spaces, just to survive.
Mr Coli Bigg	Support	We need to protect these open spaces for future generations
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree. It is vital we protect these areas
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	All of these green spaces should be protected, if not our children who are growing up now will not know what a space looks like. I don't want to be looking at house after house, please protect our land, and our future.
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Local green spaces should be protected from future housing development - this is vitally important given the size of the village.
Policy TIP14 – Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I Agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	100 percent support in protecting our green spaces. They are invaluable to this village Agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	This financial contribution should be 95% of the mitigation measures not a paltry or insignificant contribution

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mrs Julia Magnay	Support	Important to reduce impact on all who live nearby - human and animal.
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP14, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Clarke	Support	Agree
Site Allocations		
Mrs Karen Armstrong	Object	This development does not help to maintain a "Village feel" in Tiptree this development is too large for this, there will be too much concrete in one small space, as there is in all of the villages recent

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		developments. There needs to be numerous smaller sites of 50 or so buildings to keep the village looking like a village and not a concrete jungle.
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Supprt	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Maxine Hughes	Support	Needs to be kept as a village
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support section 12, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Policy TIP15 – Highland Nursey		
ADP Architecture (on behalf of landowners and Mersea Homes)	Support	<p>[See attachment for full comments]</p> <p>The land at Highland Nursery and Elms Farm is available for development and there are no known constraints that would prevent the development of either site from being delivered. These sites will also help deliver important locally identified infrastructure in the form of: land for a health and wellbeing hub comprising medical and community facility; commercial workspace; multifunctional green infrastructure; allotments; and future highway enhancements.</p> <p>The landowners, together with Mersea Homes can also confirm that the development of these sites is both viable and deliverable. A planning application is expected to be submitted for the first phase of development soon after the adoption of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is clear that the Neighbourhood Plan process has fully considered all the reasonable alternative sites, and through this process, no other sites closely match the aim and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan or scored as highly in terms of the sustainability benefits compared with the Highland Nursery and Elms Farm sites.</p>
Anglian Water	Support	<p>[See Attachment for full comment]</p> <p>Anglian Water supports the policy requirements for this site allocation for 200 homes and welcomes the inclusion of criterion k setting out how infrastructure for our water recycling processes should be addressed, including referencing the Colchester Local Plan Policy SG7. We would welcome an amendment to the supporting text to reference the need for developers to seek early engagement with our pre-planning team, to ensure that we have sufficient prior notice of the proposed development prior to the application stage.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of multi-functional SuDS provision in criterion I. Encouragement of integrated water management such as, rainwater harvesting and reuse would be welcomed to support greater water efficiencies within the development.</p>
Essex County Council	Comment	<p>[See attachment for full comments from ECC]</p> <p>The proposed allocations were tested for any minerals and/or waste safeguarding implications. Whilst each allocation is at least partially within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		<p>gravel, in each case this is below the 5ha which would trigger the MLP safeguarding policy as it relates to mineral resources. There are no safeguarded existing, permitted or allocated minerals and/or waste developments located in Tiptree Parish. As such, the proposed allocations are not in either a Minerals Consultation Area or a Waste Consultation Area as designated through MLP Policy S8 and the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan Policy 2 respectively. Such consultation areas extend up to 250m from safeguarded facilities (400m for Water Recycling Centres), with the MWPA being a statutory consultee for all development proposed within such areas. For information, the map on page 3 sets out the extent of the MSA within the Plan area.</p>
Essex County Council	Support	<p>[See attachment for full comments from ECC] ECC welcomes reference to “The provision of an appropriate Residential Travel Plan” in both policies. To note, any adoptable roads should conform to the Essex Design Guide for residential streets and any layout should reflect the guidance set out in the Street Type Table contained within the guide. Parking for new developments should comply with the Essex Planning Officers’ Association (EPOA) parking standards, which ECC as the Highway Authority applies to development proposals.</p>
Colchester Borough Council	Support	<p>CBC fully supports this policy. As demonstrated by the deliverability statement within the Housing Topic Paper (Appendix C) and as a standalone document, which forms part of the evidence base for the Neighborhood Plan, the developer (Mersea Homes) has confirmed that the land for both allocations is available for development, there are no known constraints to development, development is viable and deliverable. A planning application is expected for the first phase of development upon adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan, late 2022/early 2023.</p> <p>As established in the Employment Topic Paper, 1.04ha of employment land has been lost in Tiptree following the granting of planning permission on appeal for 130 dwellings at Tower End in May 2022. The provision of 1.1ha of employment land at Highland Nursey is therefore considered appropriate and supported by CBC, as this presents an opportunity for an enhanced area of employment land to be delivered and there is no overall net loss.</p> <p>An additional criteria could be added to the policy regarding the historic environment. This could read as <i>“Development must conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the significance of heritage assets (including any contribution made by their settings). Designated heritage assets close to the allocated site include the Grade II Hill Farmhouse and Pan in the Woods”</i>.</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Cedra Planning on behalf of Kler Group	Object	It is further noted that one of the key reasons for identifying the two allocations was the locally identified benefit that arises from delivering a link road. The link road falls outside the neighbourhood plan area, an agreement has been reached with the neighbouring Parish but there is as yet no certainty that the link road can be delivered either in this plan period or beyond. Secondly the sites that have been chosen for allocation have been identified as having constraints and uncertainties in relation to deliverability.
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Agree
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Support	I agree and support Policy TIP15, Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	Agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Mrs Maxine Hughes	Support	Affordable housing needed.
Policy TIP16 – Elms Farm		
ADP Architecture (on behalf of	Support	[See attachment for full comments] The land at Highland Nursery and Elms Farm is available for development and there are no known constraints that would prevent the development of either site from being delivered. These sites will

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
landowners and Mersea Homes)		<p>also help deliver important locally identified infrastructure in the form of: land for a health and wellbeing hub comprising medical and community facility; commercial workspace; multifunctional green infrastructure; allotments; and future highway enhancements.</p> <p>The landowners, together with Mersea Homes can also confirm that the development of these sites is both viable and deliverable. A planning application is expected to be submitted for the first phase of development soon after the adoption of the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is clear that the Neighbourhood Plan process has fully considered all the reasonable alternative sites, and through this process, no other sites closely match the aim and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan or scored as highly in terms of the sustainability benefits compared with the Highland Nursery and Elms Farm sites.</p>
Anglian Water	Support	<p>[See Attachment for full comment]</p> <p>As previously stated for Policy TIP15, Anglian Water supports the policy requirements for this site allocation for 200 homes and welcomes the inclusion of criterion m. setting out how infrastructure for our water recycling processes should be addressed, including referencing the Colchester Local Plan Policy SG7.</p> <p>We would welcome an amendment to the supporting text to reference the need for developers to seek early engagement with our pre-planning team, to ensure that we have sufficient prior notice of the proposed development prior to the application stage.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of multi-functional SuDS provision in criterion n. Encouragement of integrated water management such as, rainwater harvesting and reuse, would be welcomed to support greater water efficiencies within the development.</p>
Essex County Council	Comment	<p>[See map supplied on full comments]</p> <p>The proposed allocations were tested for any minerals and/or waste safeguarding implications. Whilst each allocation is at least partially within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and gravel, in each case this is below the 5ha which would trigger the MLP safeguarding policy as it relates to mineral resources. There are no safeguarded existing, permitted or allocated minerals and/or waste developments located in Tiptree Parish. As such, the proposed allocations are not in either a Minerals Consultation Area or a Waste Consultation Area as designated through MLP Policy S8 and the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan Policy 2 respectively. Such consultation areas extend up to 250m from safeguarded facilities (400m for Water Recycling</p>

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
		Centres), with the MWPA being a statutory consultee for all development proposed within such areas. For information, the map on page 3 sets out the extent of the MSA within the Plan area.
Essex County Council	Support	[See attachment for full comments from ECC] ECC welcomes reference to “The provision of an appropriate Residential Travel Plan” in both policies. To note, any adoptable roads should conform to the Essex Design Guide for residential streets and any layout should reflect the guidance set out in the Street Type Table contained within the guide. Parking for new developments should comply with the Essex Planning Officers’ Association (EPOA) parking standards, which ECC as the Highway Authority applies to development proposals.
Colchester Borough Council	Support	[See attachment for full comments] CBC fully supports this policy. As demonstrated by the deliverability statement within the Housing Topic Paper (Appendix C) and as a standalone document , which forms part of the evidence base for the Neighborhood Plan, the developer (Mersea Homes) has confirmed that the land for both allocations is available for development, there are no known constraints to development, development is viable and deliverable. A planning application is expected for the first phase of development upon adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan, late 2022/early 2023. An additional criteria could be added to the policy regarding the historic environment. This could read as <i>“Development must conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the significance of heritage assets (including any contribution made by their settings). Designated heritage assets close to the allocated site include the Grade II Elms Farmhouse, barn and stable and the Maypole”</i> .
Cedra Planning on behalf of Kler Group	Object	It is further noted that one of the key reasons for identifying the two allocations was the locally identified benefit that arises from delivering a link road. The link road falls outside the neighbourhood plan area, an agreement has been reached with the neighbouring Parish but there is as yet no certainty that the link road can be delivered either in this plan period or beyond. Secondly the sites that have been chosen for allocation have been identified as having constraints and uncertainties in relation to deliverability.
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Diana Webb	Support	Agree
Friends of Tiptree Heath, Mrs Sue More, Hon Chairman	Support	Agree
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Although a smaller amount of land than at Highlands Nursery the same amount of housing??? with space allocated to a medical centre and community centre and allotments. Surely this will mean the houses are closer together or smaller??? Concerned about the entrance to this off the B1022 which is a narrow main road? What about adverse damage to the neighbouring woodland and habitats????
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mrs Danielle Riley	Object	New Road long the east side of Elms Farm towards Messing is unsuitable for the increase in traffic that this development would create.
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Elizabeth Mills	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this policy. The link road serving the development with a junction on Colchester Road will eliminate the need to use the existing difficult junction of Messing Road (erroneously shown as New Road on Google Maps) with Colchester Road. If this junction were to be a roundabout, this would also have the effect of slowing traffic entering Tiptree at this point. The warning signs shown on the bend of the road near the Maypole Pub/restaurant are often not observed resulting in traffic travelling at 60 mph in Maypole Road.
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree
Mr Colin Bigg	Support	Agree
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mr Mark Allen	Support	I agree
Non Policy Actions		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Anne Bellett	Support	I agree
Mr Nigel Tovey	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Nicola Moore	Support	Urgent need to consider access to A12 at Appleford bridge as evidenced by the difficulties experienced recently when it was closed for repair at the same time London road Kelvedon was closed due to an accident - there was no simple way to gain access to southbound A12. Encourage other things to do in Tiptree for teenagers other than just Football or dance.
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mrs Lynne Leather	Support	agree
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mr Steve Read	Support	Support
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Susan Allen-Shepherd	Support	I approve of this
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Comment	I support all the non-policy actions put forward in this section for Tiptree Parish Council to seek to influence for the betterment of the neighbourhood. In the section 'Traffic & Transport' I would also propose that traffic calming measures should be sought for Station Road, which seems to be of lesser import in the plan than Church Road, but is nevertheless, still a residential area which all types of vehicles speed through on their way out of the village. Maldon Road is much the same and a danger at any point for pedestrians to cross safely.
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Very much agree
Policies Maps		
Sarah Greenwood	Support	I agree
Jonathan Greenwood	Support	Excellent Maps!
Mrs Alison Staff	Support	I agree
Mrs Karen Benton	Support	I agree
Mr Peter Middleditch	Support	Agree
Mrs Susan Lucas	Support	I Agree
Mrs Mia Quinn	Object	This area is home to so much wildlife. It would be very sad to see the beautiful countryside taken over by new builds! Tiptree is simply too small for this many new properties and people.
Mr Simon Phillips	Support	I fully support this
Mr Owen Cass	Support	No comment
Miss Jessica Dawkins	Support	I agree
Mrs Tessa Perrin	Support	I agree
Mrs Linda Miller	Comment	I agree
Mrs Margaret Williams	Support	Agree
Mrs Ruth Watts	Comment	Agreed
Mrs Brenda Fairweather	Support	I agree

Respondent	Obj/Sup	Representation
Mrs Sandra Redgewell	Support	Agree
Mr Andrew Nigel Perrin	Support	Agree
Mrs Maxine Hughes	Support	Green spaces need to be protected

Habitats Regulations Assessment	
Respondent	Representation
Cedra Planning on behalf of Kler Group	<p>[See attachment for full representation]</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is accompanied by a 'Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report'. The report bears Colchester Borough Council's logos on the front page but it is unclear who has authored the report. There are a number of fundamental issues with the HRA Screening Report, as summarised below.</p> <p>In its consideration of likely significant effects alone, the Screening Report refers to potential adverse recreational effects arising from new housing development. The HRA refers to Green Infrastructure Policy TIP11 and associated Policies Map, which purports to show the location of the existing network of open spaces and associated connectivity. It is noted that Map 11.1 includes part of Inworth Grange Pits Local Wildlife Site, the subject of KGL's legal interest, identifying it as a 'green space'. The key box acknowledges that some of the LWS 'may not allow public access'. 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 development allocated within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The Screening Report rules out adverse recreational effects on the integrity of any Habitats Sites arising from the TNP alone, 'due to the provision of open space within the neighbourhood plan area, together with the requirement for new areas of open space, and there being no Habitats sites within a reasonable walking distance'. This statement is fundamentally flawed in three key respects. Firstly, it fails to consider potential adverse recreational effects on the relevant Habitats Sites in the absence of mitigation measures, such as provision of alternative open space and financial contributions to the Essex Recreational disturbance Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS), contrary to recent case law findings, including most notably the recent 'People over Wind' ruling from the Court of Justice for the European Union (CJEU). The recent 'People over Wind' judgment ruled that Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive should be interpreted as meaning that mitigation measures should be assessed as part of an Appropriate Assessment and should not be taken into account at the screening stage. The precise wording of the ruling is as follows: 'Article 6(3)must be interpreted as meaning that, in order to determine whether it is necessary to carry out, subsequently, an appropriate assessment of the implications, for a site concerned, of a plan or project, it is not appropriate, at the screening stage, to take account of measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of the plan or project on that site.'</p> <p>Secondly, no attempt appears to have been made to quantify whether sufficient, accessible, connected open space is available to accommodate the quantum of proposed residential development. In particular, no</p>

Habitats Regulations Assessment	
Respondent	Representation
	<p>assessment has been made as to whether the proposed housing allocations would be able to deliver sufficient on-site mitigation, including circular walks, dogs off leads areas, etc. Thirdly, the contention that no Habitats Sites are within a reasonable walking distance (of Tiptree) is irrelevant. The Essex Coast designations have a unique draw, which means they have extended zones of influence from which people will travel by car rather than simply on foot. In summary, the assessment of potential recreational effects arising from the Neighbourhood Plan is inadequate and contrary to current case law, and therefore the conclusion of no adverse effects on any Habitats Sites is unsound. Consequently, the subsequent assessment of in-combination effects is also unsound.</p> <p>With respect to the assessment of impacts on off-site functionally linked land for qualifying bird species associated with the relevant Habitats Sites, this is also inadequate. The Screening Report refers to an assessment of allocated sites in the Section 2 Local Plan having been carried out by CBC to consider the suitability of all allocated sites to provide offsite functional habitat. 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 16 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."</p> <p>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. Notwithstanding this significant omission, the Neighbourhood Plan Screening Report concludes that the loss of offsite functionally linked 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. Appendix 2 of the Screening Report flags that neighbourhood plan policies TIP01, TIP09, TIP13 and TIP14 are screened in for further assessment. No such further assessment appears to have been carried out.</p> <p>In summary, the TNP HRA Screening Report has not been prepared in accordance with current case law and is fundamentally flawed in a number of key respects. As such, there is currently insufficient information for a competent authority to determine whether the Neighbourhood Plan would be compliant with the relevant provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).</p>

Strategic Environmental Assessment	
Respondent	Representation
Historic England	I note the historic environment section of the SEA update highlights the potential for harm to the cluster of 4 GII listed buildings at the north end of Tiptree as a result of the development of 200 homes at Elms Farm. I concur with this assessment and its considerations but can confirm we do not object to the principle of the site allocation on the basis of the points raised. I consider that the potential harm can be avoided or minimised through appropriate high quality design assessed through the planning process, with any residual harm being taken into consideration in the planning balance.