

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | East Donyland Parish Council | General | Glossary of terms and initials should be included – ie ‘RA’ not explained (Regeneration Area) | Agreed – glossary will be provided in submission document. |
| 1 | East Donyland Parish Council | 1 | Energy standards should ‘exceed’ rather than just ‘meet’ minimum standards. Use of ‘satisfactory’ needs more explanation. | Wording in this area will be guided by Government policy. Developers would need to submit evidence to allow specific judgements to be made on extent of impacts and levels of quality. |
| 1 | East Donyland Parish Council | 2 | ‘Satisfactory’ and ‘acceptable’ are subjective terms. Cumulative impact should be reflected in criteria for Health Impact Assessments | Standards would be evaluated in relation to evidence provided on how a proposal met agreed criteria. Selective application of requirements for below-threshold projects would be problematic, but cumulative impact could be addressed through context appraisals and evidence required to be submitted through other application requirements. |
| 1 | East Donyland Parish Council | 5 | Flexible approach to town centre uses preferred to avoid empty shops | Core Strategy and Development Policies provide flexibility for mixed use areas surrounding the Town Centre, but it is considered that it is important to retain a predominance of retail uses in the core Town Centre areas. . |
| 1 | East Donyland Parish Council | 15 | Policy should acknowledge that urban and rural communities have different needs. | Differences between urban and rural areas would be addressed through the policy’s requirement that development proposals would be considered to ensure minimal impact on the existing transport network. Additionally, Core Strategy policies on appropriate rural development (SD1, ENV1 and 2) and more specifically, DP7 on rural employment sites |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | would also address rural transport impacts. |
| 1 | East Donyland Parish Council | 23 and 24 | Use of subjective terms needs clarification – ‘satisfactorily met’, ‘no significant adverse impacts’. | As above in response to DP1 |
| 2 | Indigo Planning on behalf of Sainsbury’s | 2 | More detailed guidance and justification should be provided for Health Impact Assessments – only relevant for new residential development. | The principle and thresholds are derived from County-level guidance. The need for Supplementary Planning Document will be reviewed |
| 2 | Indigo Planning on behalf of Wharf Land Investments | 2 | Thresholds for Health Impact Assessments are too low. More detailed guidance for HIAs needed if required. | The principle and thresholds are derived from County-level guidance. The need for Supplementary Planning Document will be reviewed. |
| 2 | Indigo Planning on behalf of Wharf Land Investments | 4 | Agreed with need to protect employment land, however Rowhedge Port site is no longer suitable for employment use. | Principle of redevelopment for non-employment uses at Rowhedge Port has been acknowledged in Supplementary Planning Document for the site. |
| 2 | Indigo Planning on behalf of Sainsbury’s | 4 | Land to the North of London Road at Tollgate should not be protected for employment use and should be allocated for retail use – this has been accepted by Council’s granting of outline permission for a replacement involving a ‘land swap’ providing employment use in the former retail site. | Noted |
| 2 | Indigo Planning on behalf of Wharf Land Investments and Sainsbury’s | 16 | The Council should take a more flexible approach to parking standards for retail development and look at each site individually. | Variations in site provision will be expected to occur, but any variation from standards would need to be justified by particular circumstances. |
| 3 | Environment | 1 | Support this policy and endorse parts (vi), | Noted. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | Agency | | (x) and (xi). We particularly welcome the incorporation of sustainable design and construction techniques as outlined under part (vi) and favour sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for handling surface water runoff. | |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 1 | Support. Particularly welcome the incorporation of sustainable design and construction techniques under part vi. | Noted |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 8 | Support | Noted |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 14 | Provision of open space at new developments is supported. Open space can perform a double function by providing opportunities for SuDS schemes for surface water runoff management. It may be useful to mention opportunities for the creation of SuDS schemes under the supporting text. | Policy will be reviewed to include reference to opportunities for the provision of SuDs in the supporting text. |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 14 | Support provision of open space at new developments. Opportunities for creating SuDS schemes could be noted in supporting text. | Noted |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 17 | Not convinced that Policy DP17 is strong enough. Our preference is for 'recommendation' to be replaced by 'requirements'. We are not entirely convinced of the effectiveness of the wording of Policy DP17 and would be happy to discuss this further with the | Policy will be reviewed to ensure its appropriateness and effectiveness, in conjunction with the Environment Agency. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | Council. Point (ii) if the policy uses the term 'Local Drainage Plans' which is not universally used. It is unclear in what context the term is being used and clarification is needed. | |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 17 | 'Recommendations' that Strategic Flood Risk Assessment findings should be followed should be replaced by 'required'. Clarification needed on the meaning of the term 'Local Drainage Plans'. | |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 18 | Support. | Noted. |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 21 | Support. Assume the policy reflects the Government's aims for an integrated approach to coastal management, as set out in Defra guidance. Clarification on this should be provided perhaps by direct reference in the supporting text. | Include a reference to an integrated approach to coastal management and the associated Defra guidance in the supporting text. |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 21 | Support. Clarification in supporting text needed to show policy reflects DEFRA's coastal management policy. | Noted |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 23 | Welcome the thrust of this policy. Water conservation is an important theme in the East of England. And is echoed in the Haven Gateway Water Cycle draft stage 2 report. | Noted. |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 24 | Support the thrust of this policy. There would be considerable merit in expanding the themes of Policies DP23 and DP24 in a supplementary planning document. | Core Strategy Policy ER1 sets out how carbon emissions in housing development will be reduced in time with national requirements. The Council has an adopted SPD in place providing |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | Requiring developments to be carbon neutral should follow a stepped approach in line with central Government objectives. This would equate to a requirement for all developments to achieve, under the Code for Sustainable Homes, at least a three star rating up until 2013, at least a four star rating until 2016 and a six star rating after this date. ODPM 'The Planning Response to Climate Change' provides good guidance and could be incorporated within supplementary planning guidance. | guidance on Sustainable Construction which will need to be reviewed as necessary. |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 23 and 24 | Support. Themes could be expanded in a Supplementary Planning Document. | Noted |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 1 | Add 'historic environment' in to list of features which should be incorporated into development. | Agreed |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 2 | Policy should also make reference to the need for Environmental Impact Assessments where appropriate. | Environment Impact Assessments are mentioned in the Appendix listing other impact assessments needed to be provided as part of the planning application process. Including a mention within the policy would duplicate national guidance. |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 3 | Policy to retain community facilities would make the designation of school sites as Open Space unnecessary. | Open space merits consideration in its own right, rather than as a generic community facility. |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 8 | Hotels are defined in national policy as a category of town centre development requiring sequential site selection process – the policy appears to be materially in | Policy notes hotels would only be supported in 'suitable locations'. For hotels, this would entail showing the sequential test is met. The process for this is defined elsewhere in national policy |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | | conflict with national policy. | and does not need to be repeated in local policy. |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 9 | Policy could be better structured to avoid overlap/duplication. Reference to tourist accommodation already covered by DP8. Policy should point user to relevant evidence base documents on housing needs of particular sectors. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity, links to evidence base, and avoidance of duplication. |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 12 | Specific mention of Heritage Statements and archaeological evaluation should be made. 'Scheduled Ancient Monuments' are now called 'Scheduled Monuments'. | Suggestion will be evaluated in light of need to balance detail with avoidance of duplication. Wording change agreed. |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 13 | Policy should be split and reconsidered to avoid any overlap with DP3. | Open space merits consideration in its own right, rather than as a generic community facility |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 6 and 7 | Policy should require schemes involving the re-use of historic farm buildings to maintain and enhance the historic environment. Additional wording on transport access suggested. | Agreed |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 15 | Policy does not make clear the need to consider the refusal of developments that are proposed in locations that are inaccessible to community facilities. Infrastructure should also be included with Travel Plans as a way of maintaining and improving levels of accessibility. Further additional wording changes suggested to clarify Park and Ride and to delete 'particularly through encouraging the | |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | provision and use of renewable energy' under Alternative Options.. | |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 16 | As well as type and intensity of use, the policy should refer to location. | |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 18 | Support | |
| 4 | Essex County Council | 21 | Support – consider changing the words 'cultural heritage' to historic environment assets' to make it consistent with the terminology used elsewhere in the document. | Need for consistency agreed. |
| 5 | Essex and Suffolk Water | General | Specific policy needed on affordable housing exception sites for rural areas. | General principle established in Core Strategy ENV2 supporting provision of rural exception sites outside but contiguous to village boundaries. Further guidance will be provided in Affordable Housing SPD scheduled for adoption in autumn 2009. |
| 6 | CABE | General | General comments provided on opportunities in LDFs to support good design | Noted |
| 7 | GO-East | 1 | Aspects of the policy could be made more locally distinctive or may repeat policy elsewhere: Criteria I, ii and vii may duplicate elements of CS Policy UR2, RSS Policy ENV7; PPS1 and PPS3 iii might be better expressed through specific guidance iv may duplicate CS PR2 and RSS Policy ENV7 | Policy will be reviewed to ensure duplication is avoided and local distinctiveness is highlighted. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | Criterion vi duplicates CS ER1 and RSS Policy ENV7 Criterion viii duplicates CS PR2 and TA1, RSS Policy T1 and PPG13 | |
| 7 | GO-East | 2 | Better approach could be to include guidance on application requirements in an appendix or on the 'Making a Planning Application' Page on the website. Criteria I and ii appear to repeat elements of CS TA1 and PPG13. Sources on advice and best practice for Health Impact Assessments should be indicated. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure that its content is presented in the most suitable format. |
| 7 | GO-East | 4 | Questioned if policy backed by up-to-date assessment of employment land which indicates that the uses indicated will need to be safeguarded. | LDF policies are validated by a 2007 Employment Land Survey and ongoing monitoring by the Enterprise team. |
| 7 | GO-East | 7 | Some criteria repeat policy elsewhere. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication. |
| 7 | GO-East | 9 | Repeats policies found elsewhere in CS H3, PPS3 and RSS H2. A better approach could be to provide a more spatially differentiated policy approach which sets out indicative housing and tenure mix for particular developments. Criterion v appears superfluous. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and its content is presented in the most suitable format. |
| 7 | GO-East | 10 | Repeats policy found elsewhere and contains a level of detail more appropriate to an SPD or masterplan. More tailored approach to Lifetime homes may be | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and its content is presented in the most suitable format. Approach to Lifetime Homes is intended to be consistent with other |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | needed. | Essex and sub-regional authorities. |
| 7 | GO-East | 11 | Much of the detail of the policy may be more appropriate to SPD or a single amenity policy. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure its content is presented in the most suitable format. |
| 7 | GO-East | 13 | The first part of the policy cross refers to other Council strategies but does not explain which elements of these strategies will be taken into account when considering planning applications. The remainder of the policy duplicates national policy. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication |
| 7 | GO-East | 14 | Policy contains detailed amenity standards that may be better expressed through SPD. The final paragraph repeats Policy DP1 iii and viii. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and its content is presented in the most suitable format. |
| 7 | GO-East | 15 | The policy duplicates elements of PPG13, RSS T1-T4, CS Policies TA1 and TA3 and Policy DP2. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication |
| 7 | GO-East | 17 | Duplication of national guidance in PPS25 and CS Policy ENV1. Alternative option would be to combine elements with Policy DP23. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and its content is presented in the most suitable format. |
| 7 | GO-East | 20 | Clarity needed on uses permitted in AONB. | Document will be reviewed to ensure clarity on this point. |
| 7 | GO-East | 23 | The policy appears to duplicate policy DP1 vi and xi. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication |
| 7 | GO-East | 24 | The policy appears to duplicate guidance in PPS22. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication |
| 8 | Will Bramhill | General | Notes Core Strategy commitment to creating people-friendly street and | Policy DP15 along with Core Strategy policies are considered to provide sufficient support for |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | encourage walking and cycling should be clarified in Development Policies to show that walking and cycling are not just confined to people-friendly streets. Adding policy to remove barriers to walking and cycling also needed. | pedestrians and cyclists. |
| 9 | Tendring District Council | 7 | Definition of 'Rural Employment Site' needed in Development Policies to support Site Allocations designations. | Policies will be reviewed to ensure consistency with Site Allocations designations. |
| 9 | Tendring District Council | 10 | Requirement for minimum amounts of storage space would be difficult to enforce. Could be stated that it only applies to flats. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate, but it would be used in conjunction with other criteria to ensure adequate space standards and high quality design. Not considered necessary to limit it to flats. |
| 10 | Andrew Martin on behalf of RMPA | 14 | Amend to provide that private amenity space figures are to be used as a guide only | Policy already provides for adequate flexibility – important to ensure high standards of overall provision. |
| 11 | Kilmartin on behalf of Hanover Housing Association | 9 | Separate development policy needed for older people's housing. | Core Strategy Policy H3 and Development Policy address the need to ensure housing diversity for a number of specific groups including older people. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment contains detailed evidence to support the need for older person's housing which could support planning applications for new developments targeted to this group. |
| 12 | West Bergholt Parish Council | 2 | More support needed for Parish Plans and Village Design Statements. New policy amplifying the need to consider the appropriateness or impact of a development on Parish plans should be | Policy ENV2 provides support for villages to put forward Parish Plans and VDSs for adoption as guidance, which is considered to be the appropriate means of ensuring that non-statutory documents are given weight in the |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | included or failing that, DP2 could be expanded. Backlands development should be covered by a policy rather than just Supplementary Planning Document | consideration of planning applications. |
| 13 | Highways Agency | Saved Local Plan Policy ME1 | Retention welcome as it will mitigate against adverse impacts on the existing Colchester A12 junctions. | Noted. |
| 13 | Highways Agency | Saved Local Plan Policy T8 | Policy has not been saved, but clarification needed to avoid the risk of the Highways Agency becoming embroiled in detailed consideration of haulage depots. | Noted. |
| 13 | Highways Agency | 1 | Support commitment to give priority to pedestrian, cycling and public transport access. | Noted |
| 13 | Highways Agency | 2 | Threshold of 30 car movements for Transport Assessments consistent with policy, but lower threshold would have been welcomed. Nil detriment could be specifically mentioned in relation to the need to reduce transport impacts. | Policy is considered to accord with guidance – lower threshold would require specific evidence. As the HA notes, Circular 02/2007 already requires ‘nil detriment’ putting it in policy would result in duplication. |
| 13 | Highways Agency | 5 | Supports – retention of a strong town centre minimises the number and range of facilities accessible by non-car means of travel. | Noted. |
| 13 | Highways Agency | 3 and 4 | Support – retention of community facilities and employment will minimise travel demand. | Noted. |
| 13 | Highways Agency | 6 and 7 | Supports – commitment to enhance sustainable means of transport welcome, albeit marginal impact in rural areas. | Noted. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|---|
| 13 | Highways Agency | 15 | Supports – policy is of critical interest in promoting sustainable travel. In particular, criteria for Park and Ride and freight facilities welcomed. | Noted. |
| 13 | Highways Agency | 16 | Could be scope for the Borough Council to positively encourage the development of low- or –no-car ownership zones | Noted. |
| 13 | Highways Agency | 20 | Noted that A12 passes through AONB and any schemes for it would need to have regard to preservation of AONB amenity. | Noted. |
| 14 | Bidwells on behalf of Glanmore Investments (Turner Rise Retail Park) | 5 | Policy should be amended as suggested to provide scope for intensification of development in the North Station Regeneration Area and Urban District Centres providing this would not prejudice the Town Centre. | Current wording is considered to be most appropriate in the context of national guidance supporting town centres and the sequential approach to new retail development. |
| 15 | Painters Corner Residents Association | 1, 2 and 3 | Support. For DP2, would like to see deletion of ‘significant’ in relation to transport assessments – should be for any development that generates traffic. | Noted. Threshold is consistent with national guidance. |
| 15 | Painters Corner Residents Association | 12 , 13, 14, 15 and 18 | Support, with the addition of specific inclusion of mention of Irvine Road Orchard and Roman Circus sites in DP12. | The Development Policies are intended to provide general criteria rather than site specific information. |
| 16 | Irvine Road Area Residents Association | 13, 14 and 18 | Support – DP13 is needed to protect what little open space there is. DP14 would ensure satisfactory levels of open space. DP18 would protect natural habitats. | Noted. |
| 17 | David Lock Associates on behalf of | 2 | The policy should recognise the importance and role of the validation process but defer the detailed guidance to | Policy will be reviewed to ensure that its content is presented in the most suitable format. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|---|
| | Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties | | a SPD or planning application validation guidelines. | |
| 17 | David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties | 3 | The need to meet cumulative criteria is too onerous. Meeting one criterion alone should be sufficient. | Policy wording is considered appropriate given the importance of retaining community facilities. |
| 17 | David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties | 9 | Support general thrust but are concerned at the implication that applicants need to be armed with up-to-date local housing condition reports. | Policy is intended to ensure link between evidence base on housing need and the housing proposals that are brought forward – wording can be reviewed for clarity. |
| 17 | David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties | 13 | Support – policy broadly corresponds with PPG17 and offers flexibility by recognising that existing facilities can be used to meet demand. | Noted. |
| 17 | David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and | 14 | Concerned as to the practical implications of inflexible requirements on garden size. A more responsive approach might be to relate garden size to floorspace volume by use of a ratio. Evidence for derivation of | Policy reflects guidance in Essex Design Guide and Urban Place Supplement. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | Countryside Properties | | the flat-rate requirement needed. Support the emphasis given to the need for provision of open space in new development, but all forms of open space should be included in the guideline figure. | |
| 17 | David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties | 15 | Too much emphasis is being placed on securing highways capacity. An amended version of the first paragraph which would relate to a clause requiring the highway authority's agreement might prove to be more flexible. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it reflects commitment to developing sustainable transport. |
| 17 | David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties | 17 | Definition of and justification for Local Drainage Plans needed. | Noted. |
| 17 | David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties | 19 | Reference should be made to the circumstances pertaining to allocated sites to make it clear that allocated sites are not subject to the separation requirements. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity. |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | Saved Local Plan Policy ME1 | Services are not yet provided to serve the new development between Turner Rise and Nayland Road because the roads on the plans approved by the Borough | Noted |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Council are too narrow for buses. Assurances sought that the connecting road and express bus way will be undertaken at the same time as the new junction to relieve the pressure on local roads. | |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 1 | <p>Include reference to parking and garden size even though these are referred to elsewhere.</p> <p>Provision of non-polluting lighting should be included and a maximum term for adoption by ECC Highways</p> <p>Development of greenfield site west of Mile End Road will not meet objectives of landscape enhancement and sense of place.</p> <p>Support layouts that take into account public transport.</p> <p>Rubbish and recycling facilities should be provided prior to first occupation of any site.</p> | <p>Guidance requires that duplication be avoided.</p> <p>Lighting could be given a specific mention. Highways adoption is a matter for the County Council.</p> <p>Broad principle of site allocation already agreed through Core Strategy process.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 2 | <p>All transport assessments should be made within six months of submission and should include the impact of all anticipated future development.</p> <p>Parking requirements should reflect realistic assumptions.</p> <p>Policy should include a proviso regarding reparation for damage to local roads by developers.</p> | <p>Transport assessments need to be carried out in line with national guidance and ECC requirements.</p> <p>Policy DP16 provides for residential parking standards to reflect the type and intensity of use.</p> <p>This issues lies outside the scope of a planning development policy.</p> |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 3 | <p>Wording should be strengthened to take the form of a promise that community facilities will be provided.</p> <p>Emphasis should be on the provision of new and refurbished community facilities. There should be a guideline table of required facilities for each parish over 10-15 years.</p> <p>Parish Council not aware of Community Facilities Audit or its findings.</p> <p>Separate policy needed for planning gain to ensure developers always contribute to community facilities.</p> | <p>Current policy wording is considered appropriate given the need to provide community facilities appropriate to specific circumstances.</p> <p>The Community Facilities Audit has been completed and provides a profile of existing facilities. Further technical work needs to be completed to allow it to be put on the mapping facility of the Colchester website (C-maps). The identification of required facilities for parishes is intended to be linked to the development of Parish Plans.</p> <p>Developer contributions and community facilities are covered by Core Strategy Policies SD2 and SD3 which are considered to provide the appropriate means for ensuring a coordinated approach to planning contributions and the delivery of community facilities.</p> |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 4 | Retailing should not be limited. Small local retailers would enhance the community. | The policy is directed at ensuring that retailing uses do not predominate in areas safeguarded for business uses. It would not preclude the development of small local retailers, and their importance is highlighted by CS Policy CE2c which safeguards local shops. |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 8 | The policy should be more pro-active to support new tourism opportunities | Agreed that the Council has a role to play in promoting tourism, but this is largely the responsibility of the Tourism team, while planning policy's role is to provide a supportive policy context. |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 10 | i: Should read 'dedicated <i>external</i> useable storage space'. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | vi: Support provision of secure cycle storage in flats. | |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 11 | Conversion and extension provisos are adequately covered by national planning regulations. | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 12 | Mile End Village should be added as an Area of Special Character. Include Proposals Map within document | Special Character Areas will be reviewed to ensure that the concept is justified by policy and evidence. The Proposals Map is published in the Site Allocations DPD – its size may preclude publishing it additionally in the Development Policies DPD |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 13 | The policy as worded is a charter for developers. There should be a clearly stated assumption that open space will be retained unless truly exceptional circumstances arise. | The policy is considered to provide an appropriate set of criteria for assessing proposals that involve loss of open space in the context of national policy and local evidence. |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 14 | Para 4 on private amenity space should be reworded to improve clarity. Para 5 should be reworded to provide that 'all new residential development will be expected to provide a minimum of 10% of the gross site area for new areas of accessible open space within the development. This open space is required to be of usable proportions not spread out as grass verges or small areas unable to be used by residents'. A specific provision should be made for Myland that 25% open space be provided to compensate for | The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is clearly worded. In general, the development policies seek to avoid rigid requirements as they do not allow for flexibility to respond to local evidence or site specific circumstances. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | previous under-provision. | |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 16 | General thrust of policy supported, but against any proposal to adopt a lower standard in the North Station area. Minimum level of free public parking should be provided at community hubs. Defined standards needed for commercial premises, transport nodes, employment zones and areas with known parking problems such as the General Hospital, PCT and Community Stadium. | Station Travel Plan and North Station Masterplan work will inform parking provision and policy around North Station. The parking standards being developed by the County Council will include a full range of standards for all types of development. |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 18 | On the whole support, question how the biodiversity value of the greenfield allocation west of Mile End Road will be conserved and enhanced. | |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 21 | Support, but would wish to see reference to the creation of a coastal path to link with the Essex Way at Harwich. The Essex Way skims Myland's northern boundary. | |
| 18 | Myland Parish Council | 5,6,7,9, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24 | Support | Noted |
| 19 | Rydon Homes | 19 | The policy makes the assumption that any area of land between the urban edge and the nearest village should be treated as a 'green break' which is not always the case. The policy should be reworded so that each development proposal can be considered against its own specific circumstances and is not subject to a | The recently completed Green Breaks study provides the evidence base to support the application of this policy. The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| | | | blanket approach which could be unduly restrictive in situations where coalescence would not result from the proposed development. | |
| 20 | Laver de la Haye Parish Council | 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 19 | Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents. | Noted. |
| 21 | Holmes Antill | 4 | The policy acknowledges that a range of employment uses are acceptable which is supported. The range should include also employment generating uses such as hotels (especially business hotels). Mixed uses should be further embraced. | Colchester's adopted Core Strategy recognises the employment generating benefits of hotel uses and identifies them as uses suited to mixed use centres. The policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity. |
| 21 | Holmes Antill | 8 | Business hotels and budget hotels/ motels are not given due consideration. A separate policy may be needed given that business hotels are not generally connected with tourism. | Appropriate locations for hotel developments are covered by the Core Strategy Centres and Employment Policies. It is not considered appropriate to include reference to business hotels in the tourism policy. The Core Strategy policy, other Development Policies, and national guidance provide adequate consideration of this issue. |
| 22 | Langham Parish Council | General | Councillors broadly speaking support the document and its principles. | Noted. |
| 23 | Defence Estates | Saved Local Plan Policy G1 | The Policy should be amended to encompass other MOD facilities within Colchester, in particular the MCTC and the range facilities at Middlewick and Fingringhoe. | The level of change at the Garrison is not occurring on other MOD sites and therefore it is considered that detailed policies are not required. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| 23 | Defence Estates | 4 | New employment opportunities should be provided by redeveloping brownfield sites. | Noted. Promoting the use of previously development land is a key component of Colchester's Core Strategy. The Centres and Employment Policies in particular seek to direct employment development to sustainable locations. |
| 23 | Defence Estates | 13 | Due to their use as ranges and training areas many MOD establishments have to be in open countryside. Some development must take place in rural locations, such as for defence purposes. Policies should recognise the special needs of the military. | Policy DP13 general deals with the retention of Open Space that has a recreational role or which is used by the public. Development within the countryside more generally is covered by Core Strategy Policy ENV1. This sets out the criteria which must be met where development requires a rural location. |
| 23 | Defence Estates | 18 | Positive management of the military estate should not prevent the MOD from developing establishments to meet changing military requirements. The policy should recognise the special needs of the military where development may be required in the national interest. | Policy DP18 provides criteria by which proposals that would cause direct or indirect adverse harm to nature conservation will be assessed. These criteria allow for consideration of the availability of alternative sites, the need for / benefits of the development, and the provision of compensatory measures. |
| 23 | Defence Estates | 21 | The special needs of the military should be recognised. | Issues of over-whelming public or community benefit are covered by the final paragraph of the policy. |
| 24 | Mr Neil Osborn | Appendix 2 | Appendix 2 refers to the retention of existing saved Local Plan policies until such time as they are superseded by policies in DPDs other than the Core Strategy. Policy CO3 is indicated as being saved but during the Core Strategy examination the Inspector found the | Appendix 2 is intended to provide a guide as to which Local Plan policies have already been superseded by the Adopted Core Strategy. The Local Plan policies which will be superseded by the Development Policies DPD will be identified in the submission version. Local Plan policy CO3 remains saved as it has not been |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | proposed ALCI policy (which was to replace CO3) unsound and required it to be removed. The DPD needs to set out a clear criteria based approach to landscape appraisal based on evidence or it needs to make clear it will not apply arbitrary judgements about the landscape impact of development in DC decisions. Above all the DPD needs to make clear that Policy CO3 is no longer valid as it is not a criteria based policy and is not founded on any form of evidence base. | superseded by other policies. Saved policies will be reviewed to ensure their retention is supported by Core Strategy policies. Saved policy CO3 is intended to be replaced by DP19 which will also be reviewed to ensure its appropriateness. |
| 24 | Mr Neil Osborn | 8 | The policy needs to demonstrate a more positive approach by supporting tourist development where a need can be shown to exist. It should also state that the Council will support the provision of new visitor accommodation. | Policy DP8 seeks to address needs or shortfalls for tourist development whilst also recognising the need to protect the character of the Borough. New visitor accommodation, whilst providing positive economic benefits, may also impact upon the character and environment of the Borough and therefore it is considered appropriate to require a proven need or shortfall to be demonstrated. |
| 24 | Mr Neil Osborn | 19 | Policy DP19 goes well beyond a criteria based policy by referring to 'green breaks' in a way which strongly implies they are a specific entity which has been defined rather than determining criteria which would enable proper judgements to be made regarding sites that might be considered to erode the separation of settlements. | The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| 25 | PPML Consulting Ltd | 13 | Policy DP13 is not sufficiently flexible to allow for circumstances where it may be appropriate to allow a change of use or limited development of land that is designated as open space. Criteria should be provided to set out when change of use or redevelopment should be allowed. | The criteria provided within Policy DP13 allow for an assessment to be made of the importance of areas of open space and of any alternative provision that is to be provided. This provides sufficient flexibility within the policy to cover such circumstances. Open space is a valuable recreational resource within the Borough. |
| 26 | DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Williamson Developments | 15 | Despite reference under DP15 to a North and East Park and Ride, CBC has no clear committed plans for a Park and Ride in the North of Colchester. The North Park and Ride is dependant on national funding and if it is successful a site is still needed in the short term. CBC has not put enough emphasis on the importance of Park and Ride and the need to secure alternative sites. A site in Langham would provide a appropriate and suitable location for a Park and Ride. | The examination process on the Core Strategy considered the appropriateness of a Park and Ride in North Colchester. This was found to be the most appropriate strategy by the Inspector and forms part of the Adopted Core Strategy. The Council is seeking to accelerate delivery of the A12 through a bid to the Community Infrastructure Fund. Given the commitment in the Core Strategy to a North Park and Ride there is no evidence to suggest a need for a second Park and Ride to the North of Colchester at Langham. Policy DP15 includes a section on Park and Ride and states that further sites to the East will be sought to continue to develop Park and Ride in Colchester. |
| 27 | Andrew Martin Associates | 10 | Criteria (i) of Policy DP10 is considered unreasonable and the policy contains no justification for it. Potential purchases will make their own decisions about whether to buy a property. The requirement is overly prescriptive and should be deleted. | Potential purchases are constrained by what is available within the local housing market and this policy aims to ensure that development in Colchester is designed to a high stand Policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate and. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 27 | Andrew Martin Associates | 14 | The policy is overly prescriptive and needs to be more flexible to take into account the particular circumstances relating to individual sites. The policy also fails to address the importance of urban design within developments. The quality of the open space provided should take precedent over the quantity of space achievable. | The open space standards are intended to ensure that all development provides adequate amenity space. To have these standards merely as a guide may compromise their delivery. Consideration will be given to the degree of flexibility appropriate. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 1 | The contents of the policy stray too far into the field of design which in many respects is a quite separate matter to issues of sustainability. For example limb (iv). We wish to see the policy streamlined by solely addressing sustainability issues. We nevertheless support the generality of the approach rather than setting out prescriptive standards. | To adequately consider the social, environmental and economic elements of sustainability it is necessary to address a range of issues in the policy criteria. Creating a safe and secure environment, for example, positively affects quality of life and community cohesion, and therefore helps improve social sustainability. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 2 | The nature of this policy is more appropriate to that of a lower case justification or supporting text rather than a policy in its own right. We consider this policy needs to be redrafted to provide guidance on material planning considerations relating to the impact of new development rather than referring to the technical reports necessary to identify such impacts. | It would be inappropriate to attempt to identify all the material planning considerations that may be relevant. The policy will be reviewed to ensure its content is presented in the most suitable format. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 3 | Support – Policy is relevant and clear. | Noted. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 4 | The word 'an' is superfluous in the sentence starting "any use that may have an adverse impact on <i>an</i> employment generation..." | Removing the word 'an' would aid clarity. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 5 | Suggest it should re-titled to make clear it relates to Colchester Town Centre only, or could it be expanded to cover the Borough's other town centres in West Mersea and Wivenhoe? | Consideration will be given to the need to clarify that this policy concerns Colchester Town Centre. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 6 | The duplication of numbering in the limbs will be a source of confusion when cross-referencing. The meaning of 'vulnerable to further expansion' is unclear. This limb should be deleted and any proposals of this type be left for determination on their own particular merits. | Numbering of the policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity. Whilst farm diversification is intended to support the rural economy there remains a need to avoid new residential development in inappropriate countryside locations. This section of the policy intends to make clear that proposals should be of a scale that does not require inappropriate supporting development. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 7 | Numbering will be a cause for confusion. In the first limb (iii) the key issue is the bona fides of the original building and not its age. Reference should be made to the need to ensure that the original building was erected from genuine purposes. Apart from these points the policy is clear and comprehensive. | Numbering of the policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity. The reference to the purposes of the original building will be considered. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 8 | With reference to the Youth Hostel, the wording should clarify the preferred location is <i>Colchester</i> Town Centre. | Noted. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins | 9 | Under limb (vii) we consider there should | Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | and Associates | | be specific reference to the retired population to read "Seniors and the Retired". We do not consider tourism accommodation sits comfortably in this list. | duplication. Sheltered Housing, Seniors, and Nursing Homes are all listed within the policy as sectors with specific needs. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 10 | This is the appropriate time for design to be addressed rather than DP1. Have reservations about the need to refer to 'storage space' under (i). The wording seems to impose pressures for storage buildings in front gardens which may have negative design and environmental quality implications. With regard to limb (v), we wonder if the first word should be encourage. | Criteria (i) is intended to address storage space issues and is particularly targeted at flats. The reference to 'within each dwelling unit' attempts to clarify that the policy is not seeking storage units within front gardens. These comments will be considered when revising the policy. Criteria (v) sets out the need for flexibility in all dwellings. The use of the word <i>encourage</i> is therefore not appropriate. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 11 | Do not consider the term 'defined urban areas' to be clear as this does not seem to have any basis in relation to the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy. Under (b) (i) there is possible confusion over the meaning of the word 'habitable'. The policy should be amended to make clear it only applies to the replacement of dwellings which have not been abandoned or demolished and can be regarded as dwellings without the need for rebuilding which would be tantamount to a new dwelling. With regard to (c) (iii), it is not clear what facilities the policy has in mind. Each case should be considered on its own particular | Noted. The use of the term 'settlement boundaries' would be likely to aid clarity. Comments regarding the term 'habitable' are noted and will be considered when revising the policy in order to aid clarity. Controlling new dwellings in the countryside is obviously an issue of key concern for the planning process. The second sentence of Policy DP11 makes clear that these criteria apply outside the defined settlements. Criteria (iv) attempts to clarify that the rural context will influence types of design that will be suitable. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | merits and this limb of the Policy should be deleted. Under limb (iv) reference is made to surrounding rural area, we believe this will apply in both urban and rural areas and therefore rural should be removed. | |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 12 | Consider title should be simply 'The Historic Environment'. | Noted. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 13 | The last paragraph of the policy should be reworded as the meaning is incomprehensible. Much work needs to be done to provide an appropriate policy basis for the retention of open space. | Potential improvements to clarity will be considered. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 14 | Policy title should be changed to 'Private Amenity Space and Open Space Provision for New Residential Development'. | Potential improvements to clarity will be considered. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 15 | First sentence is meaningless and unattainable. Duplication of limbs will be a source of confusion. "It's" should read "its". Sustainable transport should appear in the title of the policy. | Potential improvements to clarity will be considered. The policy attempts to address all issues associated with transport infrastructure and accessibility and does not focus only on the sustainable modes. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 18 | Support. | Noted. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 19 | Support the need for such a policy. Broadly, we consider countryside protection policies provide the stringent protection needed to achieve this objective. We note a reference to "Green | The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Breaks” but these are not shown on the draft proposals map or the site allocations consultation document. | |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 20 | There should be a wider landscape protection policy for the countryside to complement this Policy for the AONB. | The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate and consistent with the approach taken to DP19, |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 21 | Support. | Noted. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 22 | The policy and supporting text are very negative. Equestrian activities are an important part of the rural economy. Proposals should be considered on their particular merits and should not be refused simply to avoid any increase in the rural housing stock. We do see merit in associating equestrian uses with existing buildings and dwellings wherever possible. We do not support any particular protection being afforded to the urban fringe as it is precisely this area, accessible to the urban population, that one would hope to find such facilities. | The proposed policy seeks to allow equestrian related development where this is necessary and provides criteria as to the circumstances in which equestrian related development will be permitted. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 23 | Support. The ‘SuDS’ acronym may not be commonly understood and should be set out in its full form in the first instance. | Noted. Improvements to clarity will be considered. |
| 28 | Edward Gittins and Associates | 24 | Support. | Noted. |
| 29 | Anglian Water | 1 | Support the inclusion of water efficiency and water management and the reference to the use of Sustainable Drainage | Noted. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Systems where appropriate. | |
| 29 | Anglian Water | 23 | Support. | Noted. |
| 30 | Theatres Trust | 3 | Support. Good quality community and cultural facilities are essential components in the development of sustainable communities. | Noted. |
| 30 | Theatres Trust | 5 | Support. Good quality community and cultural facilities are essential components in the development of sustainable communities. | Noted. |
| 31 | Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd. | Proposals Map | The Proposals Map should be properly included in the Development Policies document with an appropriate key and a clear reference on that key to the policies for which the items in the key are properly referenced to. | Noted. The proposals map and key will be refined to better clarify the policies to which the allocations on the proposals map relate. |
| 31 | Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd. | Saved Policies | The policies should either be Development Plan Policy, which it seems they are not, or they ought to be saved if the Authority wish them to be saved in a fundamentally different form like Supplementary Planning Guidance formally adopted by the Authority. We suggest that this section of the DPD is removed for the sake of clarity, reference and legality. | This section was intended to detail which saved Local Plan policies would continue to be saved alongside the Development Policies DPD. The policies that would continue to be saved are generally area specific policies needed to complete delivery on a number of sites. |
| 31 | Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments | Tests of Soundness | There are aspects of the Plan which in our view fail the Tests of Coherence, Consistency and Effectiveness and should be reconsidered in part or in whole. | Noted. The Development Policies DPD is an evolving document and any consultation responses will be considered when refining the document to produce a sound plan. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|---|
| | Ltd. | | | |
| 31 | Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd. | 12 | It is not clear from this Policy or the Proposals Map where the 4 Areas of Special Character are identified. | The key and proposals map are to be further clarified. The proposals map identifies areas of special character. |
| 31 | Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd. | 14 | The policy cannot reasonable related to C2 uses such as Nursing Homes and “extra-care” housing for the elderly where there ought to be a different approach and a different formula or methodology. | The policy recognises that accommodation for the elderly may be one circumstance where a commuted sum may be accepted for local and/or strategic open space (alongside compensating increase in private amenity space). |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 1 | Clause (vi) should be amended to say “if possible exceed” and minimise both vulnerability and contribution to climate change. Clause (ix) should require good access rather than satisfactory. Recent court rulings suggest Councils may impose standards that exceed government targets. | Amendments to wording will be considered when redrafting the policy. The wording of the policy will need to be justified and founded on robust evidence. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 2 | Clause (i) – Wording suggested to clarify that Passenger Car Units should be determined by the normal minimum number of parking spaces specified by DP16, or the number of planned parking spaces, whichever is the greater. Clause (iii) should indicate that a significantly lower threshold for Health | Details on the application of the policy may be more appropriately dealt with in the explanatory text. The incorporation of such wording will be considered when redrafting the policy. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | Impact Assessment would be appropriate in cases where a pre-existing adverse health impact has been identified. | |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 3 | Support. | Noted. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 4 | Support. | Noted. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 5 | It would seem appropriate to have a policy protecting retail areas in the three Rural District Centres, not just Colchester itself. | Noted. Policy DP5 is intended to apply only to town centres. Retail provision in District Centres is currently covered by Core Strategy policy CE2b. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 8 | General support. | Noted. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 9 | Proposal for consideration of housing mix is welcomed, as is the specific mention of housing for the elderly (seniors). Policy would be stronger if it gave an indication of how such overall mix is to be enforced. | Consideration will be given to providing further details on implementation within the explanatory text. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 11 | Reference is needed to the need for good housing mix to avoid the loss of smaller more affordable units, for example, and also to a presumption against back-lot development. Could include cross reference to DP14 to discourage developments that lead to an unacceptable loss of private community space. The policy should require that alterations and extensions do not result in open space below the level required for new | Consideration will be given to the incorporation of requirements relating to housing mix. The Council is producing a Backland Development SPD to clarify how applications for such schemes will be considered. A general presumption would likely be inappropriate. The proposed wording of policy DP11 already seeks to prevent cramped appearances or adverse impacts on residential amenity. Consideration will be given as to whether additional wording is necessary concerning levels of amenity space. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | development and consider the application of commuted sums to provide additional open space. The policy should indicate how applications that result in a loss of ground drainage are to be considered. | Policy DP17 (Flood risk) currently seeks to address issues of run-off and drainage. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 12 | This policy could be generalised to include characteristic geographical features ('geodiversity'). The character of the setting of all such assets merits protection, not just the assets themselves. | The policy as currently worded considered all development that would adversely affect the features listed. This would include adverse affects on character. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 13 | Support. | Noted. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 6 and 7 | Support. May be a need to clarify that developments that would lead to a significant increase in road traffic will not normally be supported. The wording could be strengthened. | Consideration will be given to including further details under DP6 (vi) (access) and within the wording of policy DP7. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 14 | Definition of unacceptable reductions in existing private amenity space could be clarified. | Comments noted. There is a need to avoid being overly prescriptive and to allow necessary flexibility in the policy to address all circumstances. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 15 | Policy could promote the development of desegregated transport infrastructure in appropriate locations. The clause on Park and Ride should indicate that any potentially adverse impacts will also be taken into consideration. | The policy seeks to ensure that sustainable transport infrastructure is incorporated into all developments. Proposals for park and ride, like proposals for other types of development, will need to be considered against all relevant development plan policies. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 16 | Concerned at the increase in the minimum | The policy recognises that attempts to restrict |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | | level of parking provision. This seems at odds with strategic policies to reduce the number of parking spaces in urban areas. | residential parking have not had a significant impact on car ownership and have led to design and parking problems. As currently worded the policy attempts to provide for minimum levels of parking on residential developments, to overcome poor design and parking problems. Travel destinations such as workplaces are likely to continue to have maximum parking standards to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 17 | Prefer the policy to presume against any new residential or non-martine business development in Zone 2 and (especially) Zone 3. | The sequential test required by PPS25 applies to all new development. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 18 | Support but should be strengthened. Particularly, all proposals should seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity rather than use of the word 'or'. | Consideration will be given to amendments to the wording. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 19 | Support. Clarification of 'amenity character' should be provided. | Noted. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 20 | Support general principles behind this policy. | Noted. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 21 | Support. | Noted. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 23 | Support. | Noted. |
| 32 | Cllr. Chris Fox | 24 | Support. Prefer the wording to indicate stronger support for viable schemes. | Noted. |
| 33 | Mr. Nicholas | General | Insufficient space to light industry and | The Core Strategy sets targets for employment |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|---|
| | Chilvers | | employment (Fewer commuting to London). | growth within the Borough. The site allocations DPD will be seeking to allocate land for employment purposes. Development Policy DP4 aims to protect employment land and includes B1(c) light industry as an appropriate use for such land. |
| 33 | Mr. Nicholas Chilvers | 5 | Indoor shopping precinct should be developed to match the offer by nearby towns. | Retail uses will be directed towards the town centre in accordance with the Core Strategy and Development Policies Policy DP5. These policies aim to promote the vitality and vibrancy of Colchester town centre. |
| 33 | Mr. Nicholas Chilvers | 9 | Higher ratio of housing encouraged. | Noted. |
| 33 | Mr. Nicholas Chilvers | 15 | Mini Park and Ride establish to South near to Mersea Rd. | Noted. |
| 34 | Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts | 7 | Support. Park Resorts consider that the policy is permissive towards rural economic development in line with draft National Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4). | Noted. |
| 34 | Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts | 8 | Object. Park Resorts supports the general policy intention and wording of the policy. The supporting text is not flexible enough as it provides greater support to the siting of holiday lodges rather than static caravans. More emphasis is needed on the LPA's support for tourism development in locations that would help support existing local community services and facilities as | Consideration will be given to ensuring the policy contains sufficient flexibility. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | well as local businesses. | |
| 34 | Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts | 15 | Object. The policy should note that there are generally no feasible alternative options available other than the private car for reaching more remote rural areas and tourist facilities, particularly family holiday makers who may be brining too much to use public transport. DP15 should be worded to promote non car modes of transport where possible, but recognise the reality of car based accessibility particularly for tourism accommodation, arrival and departure. | Consideration will be given to ensuring the policy contains sufficient flexibility. |
| 34 | Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts | 21 | Object. Needs to be greater recognition that further development of the coastal zone would be beneficial in terms of economic development. The policy should be removed as being contrary to the principles in para 24 of PPS7. If the policy is retained, we believe the last paragraph of the supporting text should be more explicit in explaining the need to allow for development in the coastal zone to allow existing businesses to expand and prosper. | The Coastal Protection Belt is identified in Core Strategy Policy ENV1 and on the Core Strategy Key Diagram. The inclusion of the Coastal Protection Belt was required by the Planning Inspector in the interests of soundness. Preferred Policy DP21 provides more detail on development within this area. The policy already includes an allowance for community benefits. Consideration to be given to ensuring the policy contains sufficient flexibility. |
| 35 | The Coal Authority | General | No specific comments. | Noted. |
| 36 | Sport England | 2 | Object. Sport and Recreation should be added to the list of assessments provided in Appendix 3. This should include a | Assessments related to Sport and Recreation should be included within Appendix 3. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | section on the information that should be submitted with planning applications that may affect playing fields. | |
| 36 | Sport England | 3 | Object. Principle of the policy is supported. Need to make detailed aspects of the policy more robust. Would be helpful if the policy referred to the evidence base along with cross-referencing to other policies in the Core Strategy. Appropriate wording should be included in the explanatory text which confirms Sport England will be consulted on any assessment regarding existing and future sporting needs of the community. | Consideration to be given to including better reference to the evidence base with regards to Sport and Recreation, and to including wording confirming Sport England will be consulted on assessments. Significant cross-referencing, however, has been avoided in the Development Policies DPD as to do so would make the LDF inflexible and complex. |
| 36 | Sport England | 6 | Support. Would appear to allow for farm diversification into sport and recreation. | Noted. |
| 36 | Sport England | 13 | Object. Policy is broadly supported by should be more robust. The explanatory text should refer to the specific criteria for assessing developments affecting playing fields (PPG17, Sport England Playing Field Policy) which are only partly reproduced in the policy. The reference to the Council's PPG17 Audit and Assessment should make reference to this document being used to help inform the Council's assessment as it provides information on surpluses and deficiencies. | Consideration will be given to clarifying these matters in the explanatory text. |
| 36 | Sport England | 14 | Object. The policy states that the council | Policy on planning contributions in general will |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | will accept commuted sums in certain circumstances and further guidance is available in SPD. We request the Council to confirm this SPD will be updated. | be reviewed to accord with evolving national guidance. |
| 36 | Sport England | 15 | Object. Within the supporting text accompanying the policy a reference should be made to consideration of the guidance in Active Design where appropriate. | Consider the inclusion of a reference to active design in the explanatory text and highlight its potential role in creating sustainable developments. |
| 36 | Sport England | 22 | Support the recognition and inclusion of a policy on equestrian activities. Support the statement that permission will not normally be granted for the conversion or change of use of existing equestrian establishments into a non-equestrian use. | Noted. |
| 37 | East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) | General | <p>The consultation document does not raise any issues of general conformity in relation to the East of England Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the Council's approach to sustainable development is supported, the DPD should incorporate proactive measures for sustainable construction. Although there are requirements for high quality design, the DPD should include policy requiring new development to aim above minimum level of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards unless further national guidance supersedes local policy.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy ER1 sets out the Council's approach to sustainable construction and BREEAM standards. Consideration to be given to further incorporation of this issue into the Development Policies DPD.</p> |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| 37 | East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) | 1 | Policy DP1 makes no reference to regional energy policies. Policy DP1 should include a locally-set renewable target similar to policy ENG1, or refer to national policy. | Significant cross-referencing, however, has been avoided in the Development Policies DPD as to do so would make the LDF inflexible and complex. Core Strategy Policy ER1 states that new developments will be encouraged to provide over 15% of energy demand through local renewable and low carbon technology (LCT) sources. Consideration to be given to further incorporation of this issue into the Development Policies DPD. |
| 38 | Little Horkesley Parish Council | 8, 18, 19, 20, Appendix 2 | Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important. Appendix 2 is also welcomed showing the protection offered to rural areas has been extended to the Development Policies document. | Noted. |
| 39 | Dedham Vale Society (DVS) | 6 | The comment in the explanation that the "Council will resist proposals that would harm the rural area" is most welcome and will serve to ensure development are in keeping with their environment. Vehicular access via a totally inadequate infrastructure is a major problem in the rural areas of the borough. | Noted. |
| 39 | Dedham Vale Society (DVS) | 8 | If tourism, and particularly rural tourism, is to make a meaningful contribution to the local economy, investment is essential. In | Noted. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | | the explanatory notes it would be beneficial to see comment on the need of CBC/ECC to invest in infrastructure projects within rural areas. | |
| 39 | Dedham Vale Society (DVS) | 11 | Support. The policy provides firm guidance on what is acceptable. | Noted. |
| 39 | Dedham Vale Society (DVS) | 18 | The protection provided by this policy is most welcome and serves to protect important areas within the countryside. It is noted that the provisions of the 2004 Colchester Plan which placed emphasis on restricting the growth of vehicular traffic in Protected Lanes has been dropped – this is regrettable and warrants inclusion in the Policy / Explanation. | Noted. The last sentence of the preferred policy states that protected lanes will be protected from proposals that would give rise to a material increase in the amount of traffic using them. |
| 39 | Dedham Vale Society (DVS) | 19 | The DVS believes this is a most important policy. | Noted. |
| 39 | Dedham Vale Society (DVS) | 20 | The DVS welcomes the inclusion of a specific policy to cover the AONB. The phrase “in or near” probably requires further definition. This could be clarified in the explanatory text. The policy makes reference to “special landscape character” in the AONB but there are manmade elements that are also equally important in creating the landscape and should be commented on in the policy. It is felt due to the areas connection with John Constable the area is not only of national importance as stated in the | Consider revision of the phrase “in or near” or better clarify its meaning. Clarify that built or man-made parts of the AONB can be equally important to its character. Consider noting the areas international significance in the explanatory text. Consider whether point (ii) sufficiently covers adverse impact as a result of vehicle movements. |

| Respondent Number | Respondent / Organisation | Dev Policy Number | Comment | CBC Response |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | | <p>explanation but of international importance.</p> <p>Policy comment on vehicle movements would be useful.</p> | |