

Colchester's Submission Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD)

Statement of Consultation, Publication Stage (Regulation 27)

Spatial Policy
Strategic Policy and Regeneration
Colchester Borough Council
PO Box 995
Town Hall
Colchester
Essex CO1 1ZE
01206 282473
planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

Introduction

The Development Policies Development Policy Document (DPD) is one of the planning documents that make up Colchester's Local Development Framework. The overarching Core Strategy DPD was the first document to be produced, in line with Government guidance on priorities for the LDF. The Core Strategy sets out the spatial vision, strategic objectives and policies for the Borough up to 2021. The Core Strategy was declared 'sound' by a Government-appointed Planning Inspector and was adopted by the Council on 11 December 2008. The policy direction set in the Core Strategy has been used as the cornerstone for the production of the Development Policy submission document.

In preparing Colchester's Development Policies DPD for submission to the Secretary of State, we are required to comply with the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and 2008 amendments. Regulation 27 of the 2008 amendments provide that the Council should publish its proposed submission documents, including a statement setting out:

- who was invited to be involved in the plan preparation
- how they were invited to be involved in the plan preparation
- a summary of the main issues raised and how they have been addressed

The following statement addresses these points and also is in accordance with Colchester's Adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The SCI stipulates the level of consultation to be undertaken, which includes a wide range of media and publicity to engage the general public, hard-to-reach-groups, community groups, councillors, businesses and governmental bodies.

Development Policy DPD Consultations

Issues and Options Consultation

The Development Policies Issues and Options Report was one of three documents the Council consulted on for a six week period from 19th November 2007 to 4th January 2008 along with the final version of the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations Issues and Options Report.

The purpose of the Issues and Options stage was to explore how general principles could be fleshed out and reworked into detailed Development Policies sufficient to guide specific development and projects. At that stage no detailed policy wording had been written. The Council wanted to gather people's views about the general direction of proposed policy and the level of detail needed to ensure that new policies addressed local needs while avoiding the repetition of national/regional policy. In some cases, such as affordable housing or planning gain, the option was raised of providing a

further level of detail in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Consultation included three workshops held at the Town Hall to which stakeholders, councillors and town and parish councils were invited. The workshops included a presentation by the Council on the consultation documents and provided the 67 attendees with an opportunity to ask questions and debate the issues involved.

Copies of the Development Policies Issues and Options Report were available on the website, along with supporting explanatory information, and circulated to all Borough Councillors and the required statutory organisations. Letters and/or emails were also sent to more than 450 individuals recorded on the Local Development Framework List of Consultees compiled by Colchester Borough Council. The list was drawn up in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 and therefore included all statutory consultation bodies such as GO EAST, The Regional Assembly, and Government agencies like Natural England and the Highways Agency. In addition, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, a large number of non statutory consultation bodies and other stakeholders were consulted representing voluntary groups, ethnic minorities, religious groups, disabled persons and business community representatives. The list of all stakeholders is attached as Appendix 1 and the letter to stakeholders is attached as Appendix 2A.

In accordance with regulations, a statutory advert was posted in the Borough's weekly newspaper (The Essex County Standard) notifying people of the consultation details. The text of the advert is attached as Appendix 3A.

An article was published in the Council's newsletter 'The Courier' which is delivered to every household, notifying people about the joint consultation on the submission Core Strategy and the Development Policies and Site Allocations Issues and Options Report.

29 responses were received to the Development Policies consultation. An analysis is attached as Table 1 which is structured around the 9 themes of the consultation document and draws together the views of all who responded. This analysis was reported to the Local Development Framework Committee on 17 March 2008. It provides a general review of the responses received about each of the policy stances which the Council considered would enable the Core Strategy to be delivered. Not surprisingly, replies varied widely according to the interests and responsibilities of the individuals and organisations concerned. As noted above, the questions posed were quite general, and the responses received were accordingly used to inform the areas covered by the policies to be developed to supplement the Core Strategy rather than to set the precise form of words chosen.

Main Issues Raised

- Varying views on whether standards should be flexible or rigidly applied

- Appropriate balance needed between ensuring high standards and delivering housing targets – high densities could be detrimental to high neighbourhood quality
- Some felt few policies were needed given that national, regional and Core Strategy policies already covered many issues

National guidance clearly pointed to the development of a streamlined set of criteria-based policies, and the feedback received was compatible with this approach. The next stage of policy development accordingly focussed on formulating the minimum number of policies necessary to support Core Strategy objectives and to provide adequate guidance for the determination of planning applications

Table 1
Consultation results to the Development Policies Issues and Options
Document

Questions posed	Comments received
A 1. Which pollution and nuisance impacts should be covered by detailed policies?	All pollutants – 2 Water – 1 Use the list provided on page 14 – 1
A 2. Should there be separate policies for residential and commercial areas?	Yes – 1 No - 3
A 3. Should standard charges be applied to all developments?	Yes – 7 No - 9 - There were concerns with the rigidity of the wordage “applied to <u>ALL</u> developments”.
A 4. Should priorities for distributing planning gain contributions be set at a borough-wide level?	Yes – 5 No - 5 Individual sites – 1 Borough - 1
A 5. What community facilities should be safeguarded?	All – 5 Village Shop – 1 Community Halls – 1 Medical Facilities – 1 Sports – 1 Water – 1 Air – 1 Soil – 1 Allotments – 2 Open spaces – 1 Natural Areas – 1
A 6. Should planning policy be used to protect such facilities?	Yes – 10
A 7. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy to require development to provide new community facilities in Colchester?	Yes – 11 No – 2 - National policy already required such contributions
A 8. Is there a need for a policy to address the impact of new development on existing community facilities?	Yes – 9
A 9. Should Health Impact Assessments be required?	Yes – 3 No – 2 Adopt the HIA Policy – 1
B 1. Should policy be used to retain	Yes – 8

employment uses?	No – 1
B 2. Is a policy required controlling the amount of retail uses in the Town Centre?	Yes – 1 No – 1
B 3. Should contributions be made towards employment and training schemes where existing employment land/premises are lost?	Yes – 3 No - 1
B 4. Do you believe there is a need for specific guidance on visitor facilities?	Yes - 7
B 5. If so, should there be separate guidance for urban and rural areas?	Yes – 4
C 1. Should there be a policy to control the size (number of bedrooms) and type of dwellings (flats or houses) built?	Yes – 4 No – 6 - Would hinder the ability of developers to provide housing at the densities required.
C 2. Should the Council set a target for meeting the Lifetime Homes standard?	Yes – 5 No – 3 - Target setting was an unworkable and unrealistic way of achieving the needs of the community.
C 3. Do you believe in the need for further guidance on how we meet our affordable housing target?	Yes – 8
C 4. Is there a need for shared ownership housing?	Yes – 7
C 5. Should there be a specific policy on housing density?	Yes – 11 No – 1 - High density is not appropriate anywhere in the borough.
C 6. Is high density appropriate in certain areas?	Yes – 10 No – 1 - High density is not appropriate anywhere in the borough.
C 7. Is there a need for guidance on building home extensions?	Yes – 2
C 8. Is there a need for guidance on replacement dwellings?	Yes - 2
C 9. Is there a need for guidance on backland and infill development?	Yes – 2
C 10. Is there a need for a policy	Yes – 10

covering home-based businesses?	
D 1. Do you agree with the need for a specific policy on urban design?	Yes – 11
D 2. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy on historic conservation issues?	Yes – 7 No – 1 - National policy already covered historic conservation.
D 3. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy on archaeological assets?	Yes – 7
E 1. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy on streets as shared public spaces?	Yes – 5 No – 1 - This issue should be covered in other wider ranging policies.
E 2. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy on public open space?	Yes – 12 No – 1 - The issue could be incorporated into other wider-ranging policies.
E 3. Do you believe there is a need for a policy setting out minimum garden sizes?	Yes – 5 No – 3 - Due to housing density restrictions and the structure of towns in general makes a minimum garden size a moot point
E 4. Should the policy be applied flexibly if public open space is provided?	Yes – 4 No – 1 -Needs a strict policy to be implemented.
E 5. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy on green links?	Yes – 8
F 1. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy on assessing developments to ensure they have good public transport, pedestrian and cycling links?	Yes – 10
F 2. Do you believe there is a need for specific guidance on providing facilities and routes to support cycling and walking networks?	Yes – 8 No – 2
F 3. Do you believe there is a need for specific guidance on providing services and infrastructure to support public	Yes – 5 No – 4

transport?	
F 4. Would guidance be helpful to encourage new approaches to street design?	Yes – 3 No – 1
F 5. Are policies needed setting out the local highway authority requirements?	Yes – 3 No – 1
F 6. Is there a need for local car parking standards?	Yes – 6 Minimum – 2 -Should be minimum standards and applied flexibly.
F 7. If so, should it set a maximum or minimum number of spaces?	Yes – 2 Minimum – 3 Maximum – 2 Flexible – 1 - Should be totally flexible and determined on a site by site basis.
F 8. Should we develop further local guidance on transport?	Yes – 4
F 9. If so, should it cover the whole borough or focus on development areas?	Yes – 1 Borough – 1
G 1. you believe there is a need for a specific policy on assessing and mitigating the effects of development on the environment?	Yes – 6 No – 1 - There is sufficient national guidance to safeguard the environment.
G 2. Is there a need for further policy guidance on nature conservation and coastal protection?	Yes – 8 No – 1 - There is sufficient national guidance to safeguard the areas in question.
G 3. Should guidance be based on designations or on criteria for assessing development impact?	Yes – 3 Both – 1 Criteria – 4 Designation – 1
G 4. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy on residential development in the countryside?	Yes – 6
G 5. If so, what should it cover, ie extensions, replacements, new houses, farm dwellings?	All – 2 Affordable Housing – 1
G 6. Do you believe there is a need for specific guidance on employment in the countryside and rural diversification?	Yes – 7
H 1. Do you believe there is a need for a specific policy on:	
H 1a. Energy production?	Yes – 8

H 1b. Energy conservation?	Yes – 8
H1c. Telecommunications?	Yes – 7
H 2. Do you believe in the need for a specific policy on the provision of recycling facilities?	Yes -4
H 3. Do you believe in the need for a specific policy on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems?	<p>Yes – 5 No – 1</p> <p>- The issue was covered in higher level guidance and therefore does not need to be regurgitated.</p>
H 4. Should there be a strict policy requirement for sustainable construction?	<p>Yes – 6 No – 3</p> <p>- While there is a possible need for some guidance a 'strict' application of such policies could hurt the housing industry's ability to provide the number of houses wanted by the national government.</p>
H 5. Is more guidance on sustainable construction required in addition to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)?	<p>Yes – 4 No – 3</p> <p>- Any additional layers of guidance would be detrimental to the delivery of housing in the area.</p>
AOQs	An edge of centre development policy needs to be developed

Regulation 25 Consultation

The new regulations which came into effect in June 2008 meant that the old system where an Issues and Options consultation stage was followed by a Preferred Option stage was replaced by a consolidated approach which provided for one statutory consultation period (Regulation 25) at the end of the consultation process. The timing of the changes meant that the Issues and Options stage of the Development Policies DPD in late 2007 was followed by a consolidated Regulation 25 consultation in early 2009. At the Regulation 25 stage, the Council set out its preferred option for 24 Development Policies to guide consideration of planning applications and to assist the delivery of the Core Strategy.

The process of formulating appropriate Development Policies to supplement Core Strategy policies involved extensive cross-departmental working within the Council, notably with the Planning Policy and Development Management teams, in addition to public consultation and meetings with stakeholders and town and parish councils.

During the development of the Regulation 25 stage of the Development Policies document the Council invited all 31 Parish councils to meetings to develop a better understanding of their individual views about proposed policies as well as to site allocations and settlement boundaries. In total 22 parish councils responded positively and meetings were arranged and held during September and October 2008. These meetings informed the formal comments parish and council town councils made to the Regulation 25 document.

As with the Issues and Options consultation, copies of the Development Policies consultation document were made available on the website, along with supporting explanatory information, and were circulated to a wide range of organisations and individuals, including all Borough Councillors, the required statutory organisations and Town/Parish Councils. The Council sent letters and/or emails to more than 450 individuals recorded on our Local Development Framework List of Consultees separated into specific and general consultation bodies. This approach was in accordance with the amended Regulations which required the Council to consult with specific consultation bodies and general consultation bodies. The consultation period ran from January 16 – February 27 2009 and included both the Development Policies and the Site Allocations DPDs. The revised Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the document was made available on the Council's website and circulated to statutory consultees. The list of stakeholders is attached as Appendix 1 and the letter to stakeholders is attached as Appendix 2B.

In accordance with regulations, a statutory advert was posted in the Borough's weekly newspaper (The Essex County Standard) notifying people of the consultation details. The text of the advert is included as Appendix 3B.

The Council held three workshops at the Town Hall to which stakeholders, councillors and town and parish councils were invited. The workshops included a presentation by the Council on the Development Policies and Site Allocations documents and provided the 54 attendees with an opportunity to ask questions and debate the issues involved.

41 organisations and individuals responded to the Development Policies consultation. Responses to the second consultation were more extensive than to the first, given that general topics had been replaced by specific policies. The views received reflect the wide ranging nature of responding consultees and are summarised below, with more detail provided in Table 2 which follows thereafter. This analysis was reported to the Local Development Framework Committee on 23 March 2009.

Main Issues

Policy Area	Summary of comments
SD Sustainable Development	Widespread support for high quality and sustainable design standards using a general approach rather than prescriptive standards Policies need to avoid duplication, particularly assessment requirements General support for policies providing for the provision and retention of community facilities
CE Employment	Widespread support for policies on employment retention, protecting retail town centre uses, promoting rural employment and tourism subject to wording changes to strengthen them and/or improve clarity Importance of up-to-date evidence base noted
H Housing	Policies on housing tenure/mix and dwelling standards should be reviewed to avoid overlap with other policies Specific mention of housing for seniors should be made Internal space standards shouldn't be included – too prescriptive
UR Urban Renaissance	Widespread support for policy on protecting and enhancing the historic environment, subject to minor wording changes
PR Public Realm	Varying views on policies to retain open space – some considered there was overlap with other policies, some argued for a stronger policy Mixed views on standards for garden sizes and the balance between flexibility/viability and ensuring high quality environments
T Transport	Policies largely supported subject to specific wording changes
ENV Environment	National policy in PPS25 could be sufficient to address flooding issue Widespread support for policies protecting the environment, subject to specific wording changes
ER	Energy policies supported in principle, but potential for

	duplication with national policy noted
--	--

Table 2
Summary of Responses

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
General Comments				
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.
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
8	Will Bramhill	General	Notes Core Strategy commitment to creating people-friendly street and encourage walking and cycling but it 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.	Policy DP15 along with Core Strategy policies are considered to provide sufficient support for pedestrians and cyclists.
22	Langham Parish Council	General	Councillors broadly speaking support the document and its principles.	Noted.
33	Mr. Nicholas Chilvers	General	Insufficient space for light industry and employment (Fewer commuting to London).	The Core Strategy sets targets for employment growth within the Borough. The site allocations DPD will be seeking to allocate land for

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
				employment purposes. Development Policy DP4 aims to protect employment land and includes B1(c) light industry as an appropriate use for such land. There is an oversupply of employment land to meet RSS targets.
35	The Coal Authority	General	No specific comments.	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. The Council also have an adopted SPD covering Sustainable Construction.</p>
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.
23	Defence Estates	Saved Local Plan Policy G1	The Policy should be amended to encompass other MOD facilities within	The level of change at the Garrison is not occurring on other

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			Colchester, in particular the MCTC and the range facilities at Middlewick and Fingringhoe.	MOD sites and therefore it is considered that detailed policies are not required.
13	Highways Agency	Saved Local Plan Policy ME1	Retention welcome as it will mitigate against adverse impacts on the existing Colchester A12 junctions.	Noted.
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 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.	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.
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. SPDs cannot contain new policies.
31	Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton	Tests of Soundness	There are aspects of the Plan which in our view fail the Tests of Coherence,	Noted. The Development Policies DPD is an

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
	Manor Developments Ltd.		Consistency and Effectiveness and should be reconsidered in part or in whole.	evolving document and any consultation responses will be considered when refining the document to produce a sound plan.
Preferred Policy DP1: Sustainable Development				
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.
3	Environment Agency	1	Support this policy and endorse parts (vi), (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.	Noted.
4	Essex County Council	1	Add 'historic environment' in to list of features which should be incorporated into development.	Agreed
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 Criterion vi duplicates CS ER1 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 viii duplicates CS PR2 and TA1, RSS Policy T1 and PPG13	
13	Highways Agency	1	Support commitment to give priority to pedestrian, cycling and public transport access.	Noted
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	1	Support.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	1	<p>Include reference to parking and garden size even though these are referred to elsewhere. 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. Support layouts that take into account public transport. 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. Broad principle of site allocation already agreed through Core Strategy process.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
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.
29	Anglian Water	1	Support the inclusion of water efficiency and water	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			management and the reference to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems where appropriate.	
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	1	<p>Clause (vi) should be amended to say “if possible exceed” and minimise both vulnerability and contribution to climate change.</p> <p>Clause (ix) should require good access rather than satisfactory.</p> <p>Recent court rulings suggest Councils may impose standards that exceed government targets.</p>	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.
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 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.
Preferred Policy DP2: Assessing the Impact of New Development				
1	East Donyland Parish Council	2	<p>‘Satisfactory’ and ‘acceptable’ are subjective terms.</p> <p>Cumulative impact should be reflected in criteria for Health Impact</p>	Standards would be evaluated in relation to evidence provided on how a proposal met agreed criteria. Selective application

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			Assessments	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.
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 a 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 a Supplementary Planning Document will be reviewed.
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.
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	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
			PPG13. Sources on advice and best practice for Health Impact Assessments should be indicated.	
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 included or failing that, DP2 could be expanded. Backlands development should be covered by a policy rather than just Supplementary Planning Document	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 consideration of planning applications. Backland development is covered by general policies on design of new development. The SPD will provide an extra level of detail which is not suitable for the Development Policies DPD.
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. Policy will be reviewed, but it will be important to avoid duplication with HA policy requiring nil detriment.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	2	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.
17	David Lock Associates on	2	The policy should recognise the importance	Policy will be reviewed to ensure

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
	behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties		and role of the validation process but defer the detailed guidance to a SPD or planning application validation guidelines.	that its content is presented in the most suitable format.
18	Myland Parish Council	2	All transport assessments should be made within six months of submission and should include the impact of all anticipated future development. Parking requirements should reflect realistic assumptions. Policy should include a proviso regarding reparation for damage to local roads by developers.	Transport assessments need to be carried out in line with national guidance and ECC requirements. Policy DP16 provides for residential parking standards to reflect the type and intensity of use. This issues lies outside the scope of a planning development policy.
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.
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	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
			threshold for Health Impact Assessment would be appropriate in cases where a pre-existing adverse health impact has been identified.	
36	Sport England	2	Object. Sport and Recreation should be added to the list of assessments provided in Appendix 3. This should include a section on the information that should be submitted with planning applications that may affect playing fields.	Agreed - assessments related to Sport and Recreation should be included within Appendix 3.
Preferred Policy DP3: Community Facilities				
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.
13	Highways Agency	3	Support – retention of community facilities and employment will minimise travel demand.	Noted.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	3	Support.	Noted.
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.
18	Myland Parish Council	3	Wording should be strengthened to take the form of a promise that community facilities will be provided. 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. Parish Council not aware of Community Facilities Audit or its findings.	Current policy wording is considered appropriate given the need to provide community facilities appropriate to specific circumstances. The Community Facilities Audit has been completed and provides a profile of existing facilities. Further technical

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			Separate policy needed for planning gain to ensure developers always contribute to community facilities.	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. 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.
20	Layer de la Haye Parish Council	3	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	3	Support – Policy is relevant and clear.	Noted.
30	Theatres Trust	3	Support. Good quality community and cultural facilities are essential components in the development of sustainable communities.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	3	Support.	Noted.
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	Consideration to be given to including better reference to the evidence base with regards to Sport and Recreation, and to including wording

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			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.	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.

Preferred Policy DP4: Appropriate Employment Uses and Protection of Employment Land and Existing Businesses

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. The Proposals Map will reflect this.
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 – the submission Proposals Map will reflect the correct current use.
7	GO-East	4	Questioned if policy backed up 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.
13	Highways Agency	4	Support – retention of community facilities and employment will minimise travel demand.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish	4	Retailing should not be	The policy is

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
	Council		limited. Small local retailers would enhance the community.	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.
20	Laver de la Haye Parish Council	4	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 also include 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 and secondary land uses in employment zones. The policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity.
23	Defence Estates	4	New employment opportunities should be provided by redeveloping brownfield sites.	Noted. Promoting the use of previously developed 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.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	4	The word 'an' is superfluous in the sentence starting "any	Agreed - removing the word 'an' would aid clarity.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			use that may have an adverse impact on <i>an</i> employment generation...”	
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	4	Support.	Noted.
Preferred Policy DP5: Town Centre Uses				
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 .
13	Highways Agency	5	Supports – retention of a strong town centre maximises the number and range of facilities accessible by non-car means of travel.	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.
18	Myland Parish Council	5	Support	Noted
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. Retail provision in District Centres is currently covered by CS policy CE2b
30	Theatres Trust	5	Support. Good quality community and cultural facilities are essential	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			components in the development of sustainable communities.	
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.
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. The retail attractiveness of the town will be enhanced by the regeneration of Vineyard Gate.

Preferred Policy DP6: Agricultural Diversification

4	Essex County Council	6	Policy should require schemes involving the re-use of historic farm buildings to maintain and enhance the historic environment.	Agreed – policy will be worded accordingly.
13	Highways Agency	6	Supports – commitment to enhance sustainable means of transport welcome, albeit marginal impact in rural areas.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	6	Support	Noted
20	Laver de la Haye Parish Council	6	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
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.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	6	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.
36	Sport England	6	Support. Would appear to allow for farm diversification into sport and recreation.	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 developments 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.
Preferred Policy DP7: Employment Uses in the Countryside				
4	Essex County	7	Additional wording on	Agreed – policy will

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
	Council		transport access suggested.	be worded accordingly.
7	GO-East	7	Some criteria repeat policy elsewhere.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication.
13	Highways Agency	7	Supports – commitment to enhance sustainable means of transport welcome, albeit marginal impact in rural areas.	Noted.
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.
18	Myland Parish Council	7	Support	Noted
20	Layer de la Haye Parish Council	7	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
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 for 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.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	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.
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	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4).	
Preferred Policy DP8: Tourism Development				
3	Environment Agency	8	Support	Noted
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 conflict with national policy.	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 and does not need to be repeated in local policy.
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.
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.
24	Mr Neil Osborn	8	The policy needs to	Policy DP8 seeks to

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			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.	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.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	8	With reference to the Youth Hostel, the wording should clarify the preferred location is <i>Colchester Town Centre</i> .	Agreed – policy will be amended accordingly.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	8	General support.	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 well as local businesses.	Consideration will be given to ensuring the policy contains sufficient flexibility.
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	8	Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important.	
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 the explanatory notes it would be beneficial to see comment on the need of CBC/ECC to invest in infrastructure projects within rural areas.	Noted.

Preferred Policy DP9: Housing Tenure and Mix

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.
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.
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 DP9 address the need to ensure housing diversity for a number of specific groups including older people. The Strategic Housing

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
				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. The text will be amended to refer to evidence base documents.
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.
18	Myland Parish Council	9	Support	Noted
20	Laver de la Haye Parish Council	9	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	9	Under limb (vii) we consider there should be specific reference to the retired population to read "Seniors and the Retired". We do not consider tourism accommodation sits comfortably in this list.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication. Sheltered Housing, Seniors, and Nursing Homes are all listed within the policy as sectors with specific needs.
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.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
33	Mr. Nicholas Chilvers	9	Higher ratio of housing encouraged.	Noted.
Preferred Policy DP10: Dwelling Standards				
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 needed.	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 Essex and sub-regional authorities.
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.
18	Myland Parish Council	10	i: Should read 'dedicated <i>external</i> useable storage space'. vi: Support provision of secure cycle storage in flats.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate.
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.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	10	This is the appropriate time for design to be addressed rather than	Criteria (i) is intended to address storage space

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			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.	issues and is particularly targeted at flats, although it would be overly restrictive to limit it exclusively to 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.
40	Cllr. Gerard Oxford	10	Level access properties are important and send a clear message to developers/architects to design out steps and ramps.	Noted.

Preferred Policy DP11: Dwelling Alterations, Extensions and Replacement Dwellings

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.
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
20	Laver de la Haye Parish Council	11	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	11	Do not consider the term 'defined urban areas' to be clear as this does not	Noted. The use of the term 'settlement boundaries' would

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			<p>seem to have any basis in relation to the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 merits and this limb of the Policy should be deleted.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>be likely to aid clarity.</p> <p>Comments regarding the term 'habitable' are noted and will be considered when revising the policy in order to aid clarity.</p> <p>Controlling new dwellings in the countryside is obviously an issue of key concern for the planning process.</p> <p>The second sentence of Policy DP11 makes clear that these criteria apply outside the defined settlements.</p> <p>Criteria (iv) attempts to clarify that the rural context will influence types of design that will be suitable.</p>
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	11	<p>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-land development.</p> <p>Could include cross reference to DP14 to discourage developments that lead to an unacceptable loss of private community space.</p> <p>The policy should require that alterations and extensions do not result in open space below the</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed wording of policy</p>

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			level required for new 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.	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. Policy DP17 (Flood risk) currently seeks to address issues of run-off and drainage.
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	11	Support. The policy provides firm guidance on what is acceptable.	Noted.
Preferred Policy DP12: Historic Environment Assets				
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.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	12	Support, with the addition of specific 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.
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
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	12	Consider title should be simply 'The Historic Environment'.	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
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 proposals map identifies areas of special character. The key and proposals map are to be further clarified.
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.

Preferred Policy DP13: Retention of Open Space

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
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 and clarifies references to other strategies.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	13	Support.	Noted.
16	Irvine Road Area Residents Association	13	Support – DP13 is needed to protect what little open space there is.	Noted.
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.
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	The policy is considered to provide an appropriate set of criteria for assessing

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			retained unless truly exceptional circumstances arise.	proposals that involve loss of open space in the context of national policy and local evidence.
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.
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.
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.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	13	Support.	Noted.
36	Sport England	13	Object. Policy is broadly	Consideration will be

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			supported but 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.	given to clarifying these matters in the explanatory text.

Preferred Policy DP14: Open Space for New Residential Development

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.
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.
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.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	14	Support.	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
16	Irvine Road Area Residents Association	14	Support – DP14 would ensure satisfactory levels of open space.	Noted.
17	David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	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 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.	Policy reflects guidance in Essex Design Guide and Urban Place Supplement.
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 previous under-provision.	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. Open Space levels will partially be identified for North Colchester through the ongoing Master planning for North Colchester
20	Layer de la Haye Parish Council	14	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			representations received from residents.	
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.
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.
31	Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd.	14	The policy cannot reasonably be 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	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.
36	Sport England	14	Object. The policy states that the council will accept commuted sums in certain circumstances and further guidance is available in SPD. We request the Council to	Policy on planning contributions in general will be reviewed to accord with evolving national guidance.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			confirm this SPD will be updated.	
40	Cllr. Gerard Oxford	14	It is very important as part of sustainable communities to have adequate open space where children can play safely.	Noted.

Preferred Policy DP15: Transport Infrastructure and Accessibility

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 would also address rural transport impacts.
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. Hard infrastructure should also be included along with Travel Plans as a way of maintaining and improving levels of accessibility. Further additional wording changes suggested to avoid specific mention of an east Park and Ride site as the County	Policy will be reviewed, but would need to be worded positively rather than negatively to support the location of development in locations accessible to community facilities. Noted. Policy will be reviewed in conjunction with the County Council.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			Council will be seeking further sites in general to complement the northern site. In last para, support the deletion of 'particularly through encouraging the provision and use of renewable energy' under Alternative Options..	Agreed.
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
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.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	15	Support.	Noted.
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.
18	Myland Parish Council	15	Support	Noted
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	The examination process on the Core Strategy considered the appropriateness of a Park and Ride in North Colchester. With Essex County Council we are committed to deliver a Park and Ride site to the north of the A12 at Cuckoo Farm. This was found to be the most appropriate strategy by the Inspector and

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			site in Langham would provide a appropriate and suitable location for a Park and Ride.	<p>forms part of the Adopted Core Strategy. A site to the north of the A12 has been allocated in the Site Allocations Document. Funding submissions have been made to allow Park and Ride at Cuckoo Farm to be delivered. Given the commitment in the Core Strategy to a North Park and Ride there is no evidence to suggest a need for an alternative Park and Ride site at Langham.</p> <p>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.</p>
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.	<p>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.</p>
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	<p>The policy seeks to ensure that sustainable transport infrastructure is incorporated into all developments. Proposals for park and ride, like</p>

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			impacts will also be taken into consideration.	proposals for other types of development, will need to be considered against all relevant development plan policies.
33	Mr. Nicholas Chilvers	15	Mini Park and Ride should be established to the South near to Mersea Rd.	The Council and ECC as the Local Transport Authority are clear, based on evidence, that priority will be given to a Park and Ride site in the north. Provision of additional Park and Ride sites will be agreed through further joint working with the County Council.
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 bringing 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.
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

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
				developments. Health Impact Assessments should for major developments provide guidance on this.
Preferred Policy DP16: Parking Standards				
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.	Travel destinations such as retail centres are likely to continue to have maximum parking standards to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Additionally, developments will be expected to introduce travel plans.
4	Essex County Council	16	As well as type and intensity of use, the policy should refer to location. Under explanation, it would be better to refer to car ownership rather than purchase.	It is considered that the policy does do this. Agreed.
13	Highways Agency	16	Could be scope for the Borough Council to positively encourage the development of low or no-car ownership zones	Noted.
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 levels 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.	The parking standards being developed by the Essex Planning Officers Association will include a full range of standards for all types of development. Station Travel Plan and North Station Masterplan work will inform parking provision and policy around North Station.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	16	Concerned at the increase in the minimum level of parking provision. This seems at odds with strategic policies to reduce the number of parking spaces in urban areas.	The policy recognises that attempts to restrict 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. Additionally, developments will be expected to introduce travel plans
40	Cllr Gerard Oxford	16	The change to maximum standards some years ago has been an abysmal failure.	The new residential standards are considered to address the shortcomings of previous maximum standards.
Preferred Policy DP17: Flood Risk				
3	Environment Agency	17	<p>'Recommendations' that Strategic Flood Risk Assessment findings should be followed should be replaced by 'required'.</p> <p>Clarification needed on the meaning of the term 'Local Drainage Plans'.</p>	Policy will be reviewed to ensure its appropriateness and effectiveness, in conjunction with the Environment Agency and to ensure compliance with PPS25 and

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
				<p>emerging national guidance on flood risk and Surface Water Management Plans.</p> <p>Policy wording to be reviewed to include universally recognised flood risk terms In this instance reference to Local Drainage Plans should have read Surface Water Drainage Plans (if these are needed/prepared for large Green filed developments. Policy terminology will be reviewed during the preparation of the next Development t Policies DPD</p>
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.
17	David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	17	Definition of and justification for Local Drainage Plans needed.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	17	Support	Noted
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	17	Prefer the policy to presume against any new residential or non-maritime business development in Zone 2 and (especially) Zone 3.	The sequential test required by PPS25 applies to all new development.
Preferred Policy DP18: Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes				
3	Environment Agency	18	Support.	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
4	Essex County Council	18	Support	
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	18	Support.	Noted.
16	Irvine Road Area Residents Association	18	Support – DP18 would protect natural habitats.	Noted.
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.	Noted. Site specific issues will be picked up in the SPD for the area.
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.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	18	Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	18	Support but policy 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.
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	18	Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important.	Noted.
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	18	The protection provided by this policy is most	Noted. The last sentence of the

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			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.	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.
Preferred Policy DP19: Maintaining Settlement Separation				
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	19	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 blanket approach which could be unduly restrictive in situations where coalescence would not result from the proposed development.	The Green Breaks study will provide evidence base to support the application of this policy as it will identify clearly where there is a risk of coalescence between urban Colchester and surrounding land.
20	Layer de la Haye Parish Council	19	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			from residents.	
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. The Green Breaks study will provide evidence for the policy and for allocations.
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 Breaks" but these are not shown on the draft proposals map or the site allocations consultation document.	The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate. The Green Breaks study will provide evidence for the policy and for allocations.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	19	Support. Clarification of 'amenity character' should be provided.	Noted.
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	19	Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important.	Noted.
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	19	The DVS believes this is a most important policy.	Noted.
Preferred Policy DP20: Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty				
7	GO-East	20	Clarity needed on uses permitted in AONB.	Document will be reviewed to ensure clarity on this point.
13	Highways Agency	20	Noted that A12 passes through AONB and any	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			schemes for it would need to have regard to preservation of AONB amenity.	
18	Myland Parish Council	20	Support	Noted
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.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	20	Support general principles behind this policy.	Noted.
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	20	Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important.	Noted.
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	20	<p>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.</p> <p>It is felt due to the areas connection with John Constable the area is not only of national importance as stated in the explanation but of international importance. Policy comment on vehicle movements would</p>	<p>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.</p>

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			be useful.	
Preferred Policy DP21: Coastal Areas				
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.	Agreed – policy will be reworded to Include a reference to an integrated approach to coastal management and the associated Defra guidance in the supporting text
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.
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.	Defra are currently pursuing proposals for a new coastal path around the English coastline. Creation of new Public Rights of Way is the responsibility of Essex County Council who along with Natural England will lead on this issue. Discussions will be required with Essex County Council regarding this issue.
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.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	21	Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	21	Support.	Noted.
34	Humberts Leisure	21	Object. Needs to be	The Coastal

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
	on behalf of Park Resorts		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.	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. Consideration to be given to ensuring the policy contains sufficient flexibility.

Preferred Policy DP22: Equestrian Activities

18	Myland Parish Council	22	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.
36	Sport England	22	Support the recognition	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			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.	

Preferred Policy DP23: Water Conservation

1	East Donyland Parish Council	23	Use of subjective terms needs clarification – ‘satisfactorily met’, ‘no significant adverse impacts’.	Developers would need to submit evidence to allow specific judgements to be made on extent of impacts and levels of quality.
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.
7	GO-East	23	The policy appears to duplicate policy DP1 vi and xi.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication
18	Myland Parish Council	23	Support	Noted
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.
29	Anglian Water	23	Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	23	Support.	Noted.

Preferred Policy DP24: Conserving Energy and Promoting Renewable Energy Sources

1	East Donyland Parish Council	24	Use of subjective terms needs clarification – ‘satisfactorily met’, ‘no significant adverse impacts’.	Developers would need to submit evidence to allow specific judgements to be made on extent of impacts and levels of quality.
3	Environment	24	Support the thrust of this	Core Strategy Policy

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
	Agency		policy. There would be considerable merit in expanding the themes of Policies DP23 and DP24 in a supplementary planning document. 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.	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 guidance on Sustainable Construction which will need to be reviewed as necessary.
7	GO-East	24	The policy appears to duplicate guidance in PPS22.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication
18	Myland Parish Council	24	Support	Noted
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	24	Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	24	Support. Prefer the wording to indicate stronger support for viable schemes.	Noted.
Appendices				
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 proposed Areas	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

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			of Landscape Character Interest (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.	identified in the submission version. Local Plan policy CO3 remains saved as it has not been 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.
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	Appendix 2	Appendix 2 is welcomed showing the protection offered to rural areas has been extended to the Development Policies document.	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
General Comments				
41	Boxted Parish Council	General	Any conditions applied to planning consent should be checked and enforced by the planning authority in much the same way as building regulations are monitored and adhered to. A regular five yearly review should also occur. This would involve employment of dedicated personnel but may be cost effective in the long term.	Noted.
41	Boxted Parish Council	4	Policy should only apply to Hill Farm Industrial Estate but if not then it is of concern and counter to DP7 in relation to the	Consideration of employment uses would include the effect on existing village businesses.

			existing businesses in the village.	
41	Boxted Parish Council	6	Policy is considered to have limited relevance to the unique characteristics of their parish and its large number of smallholdings.	Noted.
41	Boxted Parish Council	7	The scale of conversion and re-use of rural buildings could become an issue.	Noted. The extent and scale of other new employment uses in the area would be a relevant consideration in the determination of applications.
41	Boxted Parish Council	22	Boxted has seen a significant amount of equestrian activity both on the smallholdings and on arable land that has been sold off in smaller parcels. Some existing activities are not in keeping with aspects of the policies.	Noted.
41	Boxted Parish Council	Local Plan unsaved policy EMP6	While policies DP4, 6, 7 and 22 are considered to be acceptable in general planning terms, they are not considered adequate to deal with the scale of the situation in Boxted arising from the large number of smallholdings and resulting piecemeal and untidy developments. Local Plan EMP6 should be reviewed and retained in order to protect the appearance of the countryside, retain the rural character of the village and ensure that any existing and future developments are subject to control.	A policy applying only to one village is considered to be too detailed for a Development Policy. It is considered that the desired objectives of EMP6 can be met through the Development Policies referred to along with CS policy ENV2 and national policy in PPS7. Boxted's Village Design Statement will also be used to guide the consideration of planning applications in the village when adopted.

Regulation 27 consultation

A submission version of the Development Policies document has now been produced and is published for public consultation as required by the regulations before being submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. The work undertaken during previous stages of consultation has been important in the development of this document. In response to consultation comments and following further analysis of Government guidance and best practice elsewhere, the Council modified the final submission version of the Development Policies DPD to improve clarity, avoid duplication with other policies, ensure a consistent policy approach and address policy gaps. Key changes in the submission version include:

- Giving a tighter focus to DP1: Sustainable Development by changing its title to Design and Amenity and eliminating those areas which were duplicated by other policies. This resulted in a policy which covered six areas tied to design and amenity rather than thirteen areas related to a wider range of sustainable development issues.
- The list of assessments in DP2 was considered to be adequately covered by other policies and the planning application process. The only element not covered elsewhere was considered to be Health Impact Assessments, so the policy now covers them alone.
- A new policy on the Community Infrastructure Levy was added to ensure the Council can effectively implement Government guidance in this area.
- Minor wording and layout changes were made to Employment policies DP 6 and 7 (new 7 and 8) to improve clarity.
- The Tourism policy was widened to include culture and leisure uses and to highlight the need to focus new larger scale development on urban areas.
- The Housing Tenure and Mix policy was deleted to avoid duplication with other policies.
- The requirement for useable storage space was removed from policy DP10 (now DP12) due to concerns over its deliverability
- A new policy on flat conversions was added in response to an identification of a policy gap in that area.
- The policy on DP14 (now DP16) has had its title changed from 'Open Space Provision for New Residential Development' to 'Private Amenity Space and Open Space Provision for New Residential Development' and has been edited to ensure greater clarity.
- DP15: Transport Infrastructure and Accessibility' was considered to cover two slightly different issues: accessibility and the criteria for locating new transport infrastructure, so it has been split into two policies DP17: Accessibility and Access and DP18: Transport Infrastructure.
- DP17: Flood Risk was merged with DP23: Water Conservation to provide a consolidated approach to water management in a new

policy, DP 20: Flood Risk and Management of Surface Water Drainage.

The editing process increased the number of policies by one, but the overall process is considered to have improved the quality of the Development Policies DPD by ensuring adequate policy coverage whilst improving clarity and eliminating duplication with other policies.

As with previous consultations, copies of the Development Policies consultation document will be made available on the website, along with supporting explanatory information, and will be circulated to a wide range of organisations and individuals, including all Borough Councillors and the required consultation bodies. The consultation period extends from 18 September - 30 October 2009 and includes both the Development Policies and the Site Allocations DPDs. The Council has sent letters and/or emails to more than 450 individuals recorded on our Local Development Framework List of Consultees. The revised Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the document has been made available on the Council's website and circulated to statutory consultees. The statutory advert issued to promote the Development Policies DPD Submission consultation is included in Appendix 3C at the end of this document

Consultation at the submission stage is required to be related to issues of soundness which will form the basis of the Examination in Public scheduled for spring 2010. A full report on the responses to the Regulation 27 consultation will be published and submitted to the Government along with the Development DPD and associated documents as required by the regulations.

Appendix 1 - List of Consultees

Specific Consultation Bodies	
East of England Regional Assembly	Go-East
The Environment Agency	Natural England
The Coal Authority	The Secretary of State for Transport
The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England	The Highways Agency
East of England Development Agency	The Homes and Communities Agency
Essex County Council	Essex Police Authority
Suffolk County Council	Suffolk Police Authority
North East Essex PCT	Anglian Water
Essex and Suffolk Water	Tendring Hundred Water Services Ltd
Abberton & Langenhoe Parish Council Aldham Parish Council Birch Parish Council Boxted Parish Council Chappel Parish Council Copford with Easthorpe Parish Council Dedham Parish Council East Donyland Parish Council East Mersea Parish Council Eight Ash Green Parish Council Fingringhoe Parish Council Fordham Parish Council Great Horkesley Parish Council Great Tey Parish Council Langham Parish Council Layer de la Haye Parish Council	Layer Marney Parish Meeting Little Horkesley Parish Council Marks Tey Parish Council Messing cum Inworth Parish Council Myland Parish Council Stanway Parish Council Tiptree Parish Council Wakes Colne Parish Council West Bergholt Parish Council West Mersea Town Council Winstred Hundred Parish Council Wivenhoe Town Council Wormingford Parish Council Mount Bures Parish Council Layer Breton Parish Council
Babergh District Council	Maldon District Council
Tendring District Council	Braintree District Council
Alresford Parish Council	Ardleigh Parish Council
Bures St Mary Parish Council	Feering Parish Council
Stoke By Nayland Parish Council	Brightlingsea Town Council
Stratford St Mary Parish Council	Nayland with Wissington Parish Council
Tollesbury Parish Council	Tolleshunt Nights Parish Council
Tolleshunt D'Arcy Parish Council	Great Braxted Parish Council
Tolleshunt Major Parish Council	Kelvedon Parish Council
Eircom UK Ltd	Thames Water Utilities Ltd
Energis Communications	T-Mobile (UK) Ltd
Easynet Telecommunications Ltd	Neos Networks Ltd
Bradford Cable Communications Ltd	Network Rail
EDF Energy	SSE Telecommunications Ltd
Lancaster University Network Services Ltd	NTL Group Ltd
British Gas Connections Ltd	NWP Spectrum Ltd
British Telecom	Omne Telecommunications Ltd
South East Water Plc	Opal Telecom Ltd
Colchester STW	Orange Personal Communications Ltd
Colt Telecommunications	Regional Communications Team O2 Airwave
Doncaster Cable Communications Ltd	Sheffield Canal Company Ltd

Fibernet Ltd	Telia Sonera International Carrier Ltd
Gamma Telecom Holding Ltd	Vtesse Networkds Ltd
Gemini Submarine Cable System Ltd	Wireless World Forum Headquarters
Global Crossing	Kingston Communications (Hull) Plc
Hutchison Network Services UK Ltd	The National Grid

General Consultation Bodies	
1st Church of Christ, Scientist, Colchester	Orchard Baptist Church
Age Concern Colchester	Childrens Day Care Centre Charity
Bob Russell MP for Colchester	Colchester & District Jewish Community
Bernard Jenkin MP for North Essex	Colchester & Tendring Women's Refuge
Colchester Access Group	Colchester Area Community Church
Colchester Chamber of Commerce	Colchester Buddhist Centre
Army Welfare Services	Colchester CVS
Diocese of Chelmsford Colchester Area Team	East of England Tourism
Disability East (EDPA)	St Anne's Church
St Johns Church	Essex County Youth Service
St Mary's Church	The Gypsy Council
Federation of Small Businesses	The Royal Association For Deaf People
Help the Aged	Ormiston Trust
Colchester Mind	

Other Consultation Bodies/Stakeholders	
The Planning Inspectorate	Januarys
Sport England (East Region)	Jaygate Homes Ltd
Haven Gateway Partnership	John Grooms H.A Ltd
Addendum Ltd	Keith Mitchell Building Consultancy Ltd
ADP	Kendall C E Primary School
AERC	Kent Blaxill & Co Ltd
Essex University	Knowles Associates Ltd
Essex Wildlife Trust	La Farge Aggregates Ltd
Allegro Music	The National Trust
Allen & Son, St Botolph's Butchery	Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd
A S Planning Ltd	Layer Road Surgery
Andrew Martin Associates	LCO Consulting Ltd
Anglian Pumping Services Ltd	Balkerne Gardens Trust
Ashwell Property Group Plc	Learning & Skills Council
ASM Logistics	Leith Planning
Atisreal UK	Levvel Ltd
Atkins Telecom	Lexden Restorations Ltd
Bags o Fun	Lind Automotive Group
Banner Homes	Living Streets, Colchester
BAP Transport Ltd	Long Tall Sally
Barratt Eastern Counties	Loofers Food & Coffee Place
Barton Willmore	Malcolm Judd & Partners
Barton Willmore	Malting Green Surgery
Bavestocks Chartered Accountants	Man B & W Diesel Ltd
BDG Design (South) Ltd	Marguerite Livingstone Associates

BDO Stoy Hayward LLP	Bowhill Planning Partnership
Beaumont Seymour & Co	Mayfair Investments
Bidwells	McDonald's Colchester
Mite Property Services Ltd	McLean Design Services Ltd
Broadfield Planning	Merchant Projects
Birkett Long	Merrills Electrical
bloc Kilmartin/Hanover bloc LLP	Mersea Island Society
Boxted Village Hall	MOD - Estates
Boydens	MOD (Colchester Garrison)
Braiswick Resident Association	Morley Richards & Ablewhite
Britannia Storage Systems Ltd	Motorcycle Action Group
Brown & Co	Cadman Contracts
C H Lindsey & Sons Ltd	Mumford & Wood Ltd
C2 Fire Protection	Owen Partnerships
CABE	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
CAPITA	National Playing Fields Assoc.
Catten College	Naylor Property Ltd
CF Anderson & Son Ltd	NCP Ltd
Chairman Mersea Island Trust	Newman Commercials
J Sainsbury Veterans Colchester Local Association Voluntary	Nicholas Percival
Chartered Surveyors	Old Heath County Primary School
Colchester and North East Essex Building Preservation Trust	P Tuckwell Ltd
Planning Potential	Painters Corner Residents Association
Colchester Archaeological Group	Paragon Legal Services Ltd
Colchester Archaeological Trust	Parliamentary Spokesman for Colchester
Colchester Cycling Campaign	Parsons Heath Residents Association
Colchester Arts Centre	Paul & Company
Planware	Peacock & Smith
Colchester Bus Users Support Group	Peldon Village Hall Management Committee
Purcell Miller Tritton	Pertwee Estate Ltd
Colchester Civic Society	Peyton Tyler Mears
Colchester Conservative Club	Philip Morant School
Colchester Credit Union Ltd	Planning and Regeneration Consultant
Colchester Croquet Club	Planning Design Building Consultant
Colchester Dental Care	Plater Claiborne Architecture & Design & Royal Institute of British Architects Colchester Charter of chartered Architects
Colchester Friends of the Earth	PMR Electrical Ltd
Colchester Furniture Project (The Shake Trust)	Post Office Property Holdings
Colchester Institute	Prettygate Dental Practice
Colchester Learning Shop	Prettygate Library
	Priory Residents Association
Robinson and Hall	Queen Elizabeth Hall
Royal London	R & P Taylor Carpets
Rydon Homes Ltd	R G Carter Colchester
Colchester Quaker Housing	R H M Joinery
Colchester Rural Age Concern	Ramblers Association - Colchester
Colchester United FC	Rapid Electronics Ltd
Colchester Zoo	Rennison Consultants

Colne Harbour Project Group	Richard Fordham Tree Surgeons
Colne Housing Society	Ringway Group Ltd
Commission for New Towns and English Partnerships	Riverside Residents Association
Consensus Planning Ltd	Road Haulage Association
Corporate Associates Ltd	Rollerworld
Countryside Properties	Rose of Colchester Ltd
CPREssex	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
CRCL	Royal Yachting Association (Eastern Region)
D F Clark Contractors Ltd	Rural Community Council of Essex
David Wilson Estates	RWCL
Dedham Vale AONB Project	Scott Wilson
Dedham Village Design Group	Saxon House Ltd
Defence Estates	Seatrade
Dentistry	Secretary, The Strood WI
Shea Properties	Sexton Construction Ltd
DPDS Consulting Group	Shelter
Dr D Bateman & Partners	Sloppy Joes
Driver Jonas	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Dudley Anderson Ltd	Smythies Avenue Residents Association
East Anglian Chambers	Soroptimist International
St James C of E V A Primary School	St Georges New Town Junior School
Edward Gittins & Associates	St Johns & Highwoods Community Association Ltd
Emmaus Colchester	St Johns Residents Association
Equality Estates	St Mary Residents Association
Essex & Suffolk Gliding Club	Stanley Bragg Partnership
Strutt & Parker	Stanway Library
Essex Army Cadet Force	St Johns Ambulance
Essex Chambers of Commerce	Stanway Residents Association
Essex County Cricket Club	Stephen Egerton Associates
Essex Strategic Health Authority	Stephen Hayhurst Chartered Town Planner
Essex Fire & Rescue Services	Sustainable Environment Consultants Ltd
Essex Rivers Healthcare NHS Trust, Colchester General Hospital	T J Evers Ltd
Essex Roofing Company Ltd	Taylor Wimpey
Estuary Housing Ltd	Tesco Stores Ltd
Etiss Ltd	The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
Evening Gazette/Essex County Standard	The British Wind Energy Association
F & C Commercial Property Holdings Ltd	The C M Cadman Group Ltd
Five Poets Residents Association	The Craftsman
The Inland Waterways Association	The Food Company
Fenn Wright	The Guinness Trust
First Essex Buses Ltd	The JTS Partnership
Fisher Jones Greenwood	The Philip Morant School
Fitness First	The Planning Bureau Ltd
Flagship Housing Group	The Rose and Crown Hotel
Flakt Woods Ltd	The Stanway School
FMA Ltd	The Sixth Form College, Colchester
Forestry Commission	The Theatres Trust
Freight Transport Association, HR Department	The Thomas Lord Audley School & Language College

Friends of the Minories	The Wine Centre
Godden & Rudling Building Services	Thompson Smith & Puxon
George Wimpey UK Ltd	Thurstable School
Gilberd School	Tiptree Library
Gladedale Group	Transport for London
Hazlemere Infants School & Nursery	Turley Associates
Greenstead & St Andrews Nursery & Infants	Turners for Men & Women Ltd
Greenstead Library	Underwoods of Colchester
Gypsy & Traveller Law Reform Coalition	University of Essex
Hall Duncan Associates	University of Essex Dept of Biological Sciences
Hamilton Lodge Trust	University of Essex Students Union
Harwich International Port	Vaughan & Blythe (Construction) Ltd
Health & Safety Exec	W A Hills
Higgins Construction Plc	Warden Housing
Hills Residential Ltd	Warren Insulation
HLL Humberts Leisure	Welshwood Park Residents Association
Holiday Inn	Jamesons Residential Care Home Ltd
Holmwood House School	West Bergholt Parish Planning Group
Hornburys	West Mersea Library
Hutton Construction Ltd	Whybrow Chartered Surveyors
Hythe Community Centre Association	Wildlife and Countryside Link
Hythe Residents Association	Wilkin & Sons Ltd
Ian R Matthers B.S & D	Wivenhoe Dental Practice
Iceni Homes	Wivenhoe Sailing Club
Indasa Abrasives (UK)Ltd	Womens National Commission
Indigo Planning	Wordwrite Associates
Inntel	Iceni Projects Ltd
Jacks Famous Supplies Ltd	Young Essex Assembly
James & Lindsay Life & Pensions Ltd	Youth Enquiry Service

Appendix 2A

Colchester Borough Council

PO Box 885, Town Hall, Colchester, CO1 1ZE
Telephone (01206) 282222 DX 729040 Colchester 15
*Textphone users dial 18001 followed by the full number
that you wish to call*

Phone (01206) 506477 Fax (01206)282711

E-mail karen.syrett@colchester.gov.uk

Your ref

Our ref KS/Consultation

Date Date as postmark

Dear Sir/Madam

Local Development Framework

I am writing to inform you that the Council has published three documents as part of its Local Development Framework. All three are subject to a six week period of public consultation running from Monday 19th November 2007 until Friday 4th January 2008.

Please find below a brief description of each document;

Colchester's Submission Draft Core Strategy, November 2007

The Draft Core Strategy has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination. The Core Strategy is a Development Plan Document that sets out the long-term vision for Colchester and the strategic policies required to deliver that vision. It has been prepared using comments received from stakeholders and members of the public during previous consultations and the sustainability appraisal undertaken at each stage.

Development Policies Issues & Options

The Development Policies DPD is intended to promote debate on the detailed development policies needed to support policies in the Core Strategy. When finalised, the policies will be used to determine planning applications.

Site Allocations Issues and Options

This DPD will allocate land on a Proposals Map for a range of specific uses from housing and employment to open space. This Issues and Options report is intended to promote debate on the specific sites required and invites the submission of sites.

How to Respond

Response forms for each document are available on the Councils website. We encourage you to complete the forms on line if possible.

Copies of all documents and an on-line response form can be downloaded from our website at www.colchester.gov.uk by accessing the 'Planning' web page or alternatively are available for inspection at the following locations.

- Colchester Borough Council Customer Service Centre, High Street, Colchester, between 8.30am and 5.30pm (Monday to Friday); and
- Colchester Central Library.

Representations on the documents should be made on the response form provided and returned to the above address or by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk. The deadline for responding is 5.00pm on Friday 4th January 2008.

Thank you in advance for your contributions. If you have any queries or would like more information, please contact the Spatial Policy Team on (01206) 282473/76.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K Syrett', enclosed within a faint circular outline.

Karen Syrett
Spatial Policy Manager

Appendix 2B

Colchester Borough Council

PO Box 885, Town Hall, Colchester, CO1 1ZE
Telephone (01206) 282222 DX 729040 Colchester 15

Address here

Strategic Policy & Regeneration

Phone (01206) 506477 Fax (01206) 282711

E-mail Karen.syrett@colchester.gov.uk

Your ref

Our ref KS/CA

Date 16 January 2009

Dear Sir or Madam

Local Development Framework

I am writing to inform you that the Council has published two Development Plan Documents along with the accompanying Sustainability Appraisals Revised Scoping Reports as part of its Local Development Framework. Both are subject to a six week period of public consultation running from **Friday 16 January 2009** until **Friday 27 February 2009**.

Please find below a brief description of each document;

- **Colchester's Development Policies Consultation**

The Development Policies document is intended to promote debate on the detailed development policies needed to support policies in the Core Strategy. The document outlines a series of preferred policies which are intended to replace some of the outdated Local Plan policies. When finalised, the policies will be used to determine planning applications.

- **Colchester's Site Allocations Consultation**

The Site Allocations document will allocate land on a Proposals Map for a range of specific uses from housing and employment to open space. This document outlines a series of sites which the Council considers appropriate for a change of allocation. The existing Local Plan allocations are also considered and questions are posed regarding the future of the current allocations across the Borough.

How to Respond

For this consultation each document has a specific representation forms which are to be found attached to the documents. Representation forms for

each document are also available on the Councils website. We encourage you to complete the forms on line if possible.

Comments on the Sustainability Appraisals Scoping Reports which accompany both documents are also welcomed as part of this consultation and should be submitted by letter or email.

Copies of all documents and an on-line representation form can be downloaded from our website at www.colchester.gov.uk/ldf by accessing the 'Planning' web page or alternatively are available for inspection at the following locations.

- Colchester Borough Council Customer Service Centre, High Street, Colchester, between 8.30am and 5.30pm (Monday to Friday); and
- Colchester District Libraries.

Representations on the documents should be made on the appropriate representation form provided and returned by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk or posted to the following address:


**Planning Policy
Colchester Borough Council
FREEPOST NAT4433
PO Box 885
Colchester
CO1 1ZE**

The deadline for responding is **5.00pm on Friday 27 February 2009**.

In addition to this we will be holding 3 meetings to outline the proposals for each document. These are being held in the Town Hall on 17 February and 19 February 2009 starting at 2pm and 23 February 2009 starting at 6pm. Please advise Charlotte Allen if you would like to attend one of the session either by telephone (01206) 507833 or via e-mail charlotte.allen@colchester.gov.uk. The meetings will last no longer than 2 hours.

Thank you in advance for your contributions. If you have any queries or would like more information, please do not hesitate to contact me or another member of the Planning Policy Team.

Yours faithfully



Karen Syrett
Spatial Policy Manager

Appendix 3A

COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL

**NOTICE OF SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF
COLCHESTER'S SUBMISSION DRAFT CORE STRATEGY, NOVEMBER
2007, UNDER REGULATION 28 OF 'THE TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING
(LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS, 2004.'**

AND

**NOTICE OF CONSULTATION ON DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS
(DPDS) AT ISSUES & OPTIONS STAGE:**

(A) COLCHESTER'S DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

(B) COLCHESTER'S SITE ALLOCATIONS

**UNDER REGULATION 25 OF 'THE TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING
(LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS, 2004.'**

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

Colchester's Submission Draft Core Strategy, November 2007

The Draft Core Strategy has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination and is being published for 6 weeks public consultation. The Core Strategy is a Development Plan Document that sets out the long-term vision for Colchester and the strategic policies required to deliver that vision.

(A) Colchester's Development Policies Issues & Options

The Development Policies DPD is intended to promote debate on the detailed development policies needed to support policies in the Core Strategy. When finalised, the policies will be used to determine planning applications.

(B) Colchester's Site Allocations Issues & Options

The Site Allocations DPD will allocate land on a Proposals Map for a range of specific uses from housing and employment to open space. This Issues and Options report is intended to promote debate on the specific sites required and invites the submission of sites.

The consultation period for all three documents will run from 19 November 2007 until Friday 4 January 2008.

Copies of all three documents, along with their supporting papers and response forms are available at Colchester Borough Council Customer Service Centre, High Street, Colchester, between 8.30am and 5.30pm (Monday to Friday) and Colchester Central Library during normal opening hours, including evenings and weekends.

All three sets of documentation and response forms can also be downloaded from the Colchester Borough Council website at www.colchester.gov.uk/ldf

Representations should be made on the response forms provided only and sent to the Spatial Policy Team, at Environmental Policy, PO BOX 885, Town Hall, Colchester, CO1 1ZE or by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk. The deadline for responding is **5.00pm on Friday 4 January 2008**. The Council may not be able to consider your views if your representations are received later than this time.

Further information can be obtained from the Spatial Policy team on (01206) 282473/282476.

Appendix 3B

COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL

NOTICE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THE PREPARATION OF 'SITE ALLOCATIONS' AND 'DEVELOPMENT POLICIES' DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS (DPDs) UNDER REGULATION 25 OF 'THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2008'

Colchester Borough Council is inviting representations on 'Site Allocations' and 'Development Policies' Development Plan Documents (DPDs). When finished, these documents will form part of Colchester's Local Development Framework and support the recently adopted Core Strategy.

The **Development Policies DPD** will provide detailed development policies that will be used to determine planning applications. The current draft of the document includes the Council's preferred options for these policies.

The **Site Allocations DPD** will allocate land on a Proposals Map for a range of specific uses such as housing, employment and open space. The current draft of the document details where allocations are proposed to be changed from the 2004 Local Plan and gives the Council's preferred option for any sites that have been put forward.

The consultation period for both documents will run from Friday 16th January 2009 until Friday 27th February 2009. The deadline for responding is **5.00pm**. The Council may not be able to consider your views if your representations are received later than this time.

Copies of the documents, along with their supporting papers and response forms are available at Colchester Borough Council Customer Service Centre, High Street, Colchester, between 8.30am and 5.30pm (Monday to Friday) and all Colchester District Libraries' during normal opening hours, including evenings and weekends.

All of the documents and response forms can also be downloaded from the Colchester Borough Council website at www.colchester.gov.uk/ldf

Representations should be made on the response forms provided only and sent to the Spatial Policy Team, at FREEPOST NAT4433, PO BOX 885, Colchester, Essex, CO1 1ZE or by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

Further information can be obtained from the Spatial Policy team on (01206) 282473/282476.

Appendix 3C

**PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004
COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (LDF)
NOTICE OF PUBLICATION OF THE SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES
SUBMISSION DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS (DPD's) AND INVITATION TO MAKE
REPRESENTATIONS**

Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008. Colchester Borough Council is preparing a Local Development Framework (LDF) which will replace the existing Local Plan which was adopted in 2004. The Council is now issuing two parts of the LDF for consultation:

- **The Site Allocations Submission DPD** will allocate land on a Proposals Map for a range of specific uses such as housing, employment and open space;
- **The Development Policies Submission DPD** contains the Council's detailed policies for deciding planning applications and delivering the vision, objectives and core policies of the Core Strategy.

The DPD's are accompanied by a Submission Proposals Map which is a Local Development Document (LDD) that shows how the adopted Proposals Map would be amended if the two submitted DPD's were adopted.

Following this consultation the Council will submit these documents, along with other supporting documents and the representations received, to the Secretary of State for an Independent Examination. Sustainability Appraisals of each document have also been prepared for consultation. These evaluate how social, environmental and economic issues have been taken into account in the preparation of each document. The Sustainability Appraisals are background material which you can refer to in making your representation. Please note that representations can only be made on the DPDs themselves not just on any supporting documentation.

The consultation period for the documents will run from Friday 18 September 2009 until Friday 30 October 2009.

Copies of the documents, along with their supporting papers and response forms are available at Colchester Borough Council Customer Service Centre, High Street, Colchester, between 8.30am and 5.30pm (Monday to Friday) and Colchester Central Library during normal opening hours, including evenings and weekends.

All the documentation and response forms can be downloaded from the Council's website at www.colchester.gov.uk/ldf and representations can also be submitted here via an online form.

Representations should be made on the response forms provided only and sent to the Spatial Policy Team, Strategic Policy and Regeneration, Colchester Borough Council, Freepost NAT4433, PO BOX 885, Town Hall, Colchester, CO1 1ZE or by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

The deadline for responding is **5.00pm on Friday 30 October 2009**. Representations must be made before this deadline and on the official representation forms provided otherwise they may not be considered.

Further information can be obtained from the Spatial Policy team on (01206) 282473/282476.