



Colchester's Local Development Framework
North Growth Area Urban Extension
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Statement of Consultation

Spatial Policy
Strategic Policy and Regeneration
Colchester Borough Council

planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

Introduction

The North Growth Area Urban Extension (NGAUE) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 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. Work then commenced on a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and Development Policies DPD. These were adopted in 2010 and add more detail to the Core Strategy. The Site Allocations DPD includes a chapter about North Colchester.

The policy direction set in the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD has been used as the cornerstone for the production of subsequent planning policy documents including this SPD.

These documents which were prepared under the Local Development Framework now form what is known as the Local Plan.

In preparing the SPD the Council are required to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and 2008 amendments. Regulations 18 and 19 of the 2008 amendments provide that the Council should not adopt a SPD until they have prepared and published 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 SPD is now required to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The following statement addresses these regulations and is also 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.

Consultation Process

In line with Government regulations, the Council first consulted on the draft SPD in February and March 2010. Stakeholders who had been involved in the early stages of the project were notified of the consultation and letters were sent to every household bordering the site (326). Email and letter notifications were also sent to 364 residents, organisations and businesses on the Council's LDF database. A statutory advert was placed in the newspaper and a number of articles published in the paper. Myland Community Council (MCC) (known as Myland Parish Council at the time) and local Councillors publicised the consultation in local documents. Hard copies of the consultation materials were made available to view in the Customer Service Centre, in Colchester Central Library and at Myland Community Council offices. The material was also made available on the Council's website.

Two public consultation events were held as agreed with the Community Council and ward Councillors. These took place on Thursday 11 February at Colchester Golf Club in the afternoon and evening and on Saturday 13 February at Myland Parish Hall between 10am and 3pm. Staff from Colchester Borough Council and Essex County Council along with developers and consultant's were available to answer any questions. The events were extremely well attended. A total of 372 responses were received during what is known as the Regulation 17 consultation. A full summary of the consultation was prepared and published. Several key messages emerged and as a result several pieces of work were identified as being required to enable the SPD to proceed. These included;

- An independent facilitated workshop with developers, consultants, Myland Parish Council and lovemyland group reps.
- Preparation of a masterplan providing more certainty for the local community
- Undertaking additional technical work including transport assessment.

The workshop evolved into a community engagement project which was facilitated by the University of Essex Interdisciplinary Centre for Environment and Society. This community engagement took place between the 11th and 18th of July 2011 and the University of Essex designed a fully inclusive participatory process to enable representative community participation. A team composed of a cross-section of i) local residents, ii) professionals who work in the area (local business people, grassroots workers, ward councillors) and iii) University of Essex facilitators, took this process out to the wider Mile End community. The community engagement process reached 435 local people.

Participants provided 437 comments describing a huge variety of aspects that they feel are special about living or working in Mile End, ranging from comments about the amount and quality of greenspaces in the area, how tranquil many places feel, the good facilities etc. through to the sense of community spirit. The responses clearly indicate however that residents value local green and open spaces (especially High Woods Country Park and Chesterwell.)

A total of 674 different issues and 383 different opportunities for change were identified on the map model of Mile End. These problems and the opportunities for improvement as identified by local residents, were grouped into key nine key areas: i) Transport and Roads; ii) Housing; iii) Education and Training; iv) Leisure and Recreation; v) Employment and Local Economy; vi) Crime and Security; vii) Environment and Conservation; viii) Community; and ix) Facilities and Services.

Regarding the transport and roads of the area, the main concern was about traffic – both generally in the area and particularly at North Station roundabout (188 comments), with concerns about parking (73) and bus services (36) also being raised. Respondents cited 124 issues about housing within Mile End with the majority of these to do with a general concern related to the building of more housing within the area or indeed pleas for no more new housing (77). The next most frequently mentioned concern was that of how the new houses would impact on local services and there were calls for more local infrastructure before house building commences (23). Respondents also listed 66 problems related to environment and conservation of the area including worries over the

development impact on greenspaces (23), concern over dogs fouling pavements (23) and concerns about litter (11).

Mirroring respondents' concerns, suggestions for improvements to the local area focused primarily on improvements to transport (139); the provision of more facilities and services (93) and community related ideas (38); although ideas for community and housing also feature.

The engagement process provided a valuable opportunity to obtain the views of a wide section of the population of Mile End and Braiswick. The findings from this process and the earlier consultation were taken into account in the preparation of the final draft Supplementary Planning Document alongside other material considerations.

The document was published for consultation to allow an opportunity for the wider public and interest groups to comment on the revised draft guidance. Consultation was held over 4 weeks between 20 January and 17 February 2012. As previously, publicity included letters, e-mails, a public exhibition, statutory advertisement and press releases.

Letters and/or emails were sent to properties bordering the site and individuals recorded on the Local Development Framework List of Consultees compiled by the Council. The list was drawn up in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 and therefore included "specific consultation bodies" such as 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 "general consultation bodies" were consulted representing voluntary groups, ethnic minorities, religious groups, disabled persons and business community representatives.

In accordance with regulations, a statutory advert was posted in the Daily Gazette on 20 January 2012 notifying people of the consultation details. A copy is attached is Appendix 3.

A total of 87 organisations and individuals responded to the NGAUE SPD consultation and provided 92 responses. The views received are summarised below.

Table 1
Response to Survey Questions

Some questions asked if people agreed or disagreed with the approach set out in the SPD, the results from those people completing the survey on line are detailed below by number of respondents and by percentage;

Question		Yes	%	No	%	Don't know	Total No.
Q1	Do you consider the Council's design approach as outlined on page 33 to be the most appropriate?	9	14%	46	73%	8	63
Q3	Access for vehicles to the proposed development will be created at the north of the site off the A134 Sudbury Road. The route of the northern section of Nayland Road will be changed and the existing road will be made a cul de sac as outlined in the Transport and Accessibility section. Do you support this approach?	16	25%	36	57%	11	63
Q4	The Transport and Accessibility section outlines that a comprehensive network of footpaths and cycleways will link all parts of the development across North Colchester with links to the Hospital, the station and the town centre as well as to the rural areas across the A12. Do you support this approach?	32	51%	26	41%	5	63
Q5	The proposed development is to be served by at least three new bus services as detailed in the Transport and Accessibility section. This will give access to the town centre, Severalls Hospital development, the General Hospital and the North Colchester Business Parks. Do you support this approach?	33	55%	20	33%	7	60
Q6	The Transport and Accessibility section proposes to widen some surrounding roads to allow two lanes around Colne Bank and Essex Hall roundabouts, alongside improved priority for buses and bus lanes in both directions along North Station Road and Station Way. Do you support this approach?	16	26%	37	61%	8	61
Q8	The Landscape and Open Space section describes a wide range of formal and informal open spaces and recreation	22	35%	33	53%	7	62

	spaces, which are shown on the master plan on page 40. Do you consider these appropriate for meeting the needs of future residents as well as improving facilities for existing residents?						
Q11	The SPD on page 45 outlines three areas where a variety of facilities will be provided for community development. These areas, referred to as community hubs in the SPD, will include shops, sport and leisure facilities. Are these hubs sufficient and in the most appropriate locations?	11	20%	18	33%	25	54
Q12	A primary and secondary school are proposed as part of the development on page 47. Are these facilities appropriate and in the right locations?						
Q12.a	Primary school required	23	43%	10	19%	20	53
Q12.b	Secondary school required	22	42%	10	19%	21	53
Q12.c	Primary school location	10	20%	11	22%	28	49
Q12.d	Secondary school location	5	10%	11	22%	33	49
Q13	The proposed development will deliver approximately 1800 homes, most of which will be houses with up to 10% flats in locations above shops for example. Do you support this approach?	14	23%	43	72%	3	60
Q14	The proposed development will incorporate a variety of building heights with the majority being 2 and 3 storeys as seen on page 48. Do you think this is the best approach? If not, please detail what you would change in relation to building heights?	14	26%	30	57%	9	53
Q15	It may be possible to include an element of self build housing in the scheme as outlined on page 60. Do you think this is a good idea?		50%	18	32%	10	56

Statutory Consultee's

In accordance with regulations and the Statement of Community Involvement, all the statutory consultee's were consulted as part of the wider engagement process. Responses were received from ten – those in the table and Myland Community Council whose detailed comments are summarised below the table.

Rep No	Respondent	Summary of comments	CBC response
032	Highways Agency	<p>No specific comments.</p> <p>Support considerable effect being made to encourage and design modal shift.</p> <p>No mention is made within the document to any requirements for travel planning. It is considered important that developers appreciate in conjunction with physical measures, there is a needed for systems to be in place to encourage, monitor and review people movements from those living, working and passing through the area. Without enforceable and effective travel planning targets then there is a risk that aspirations will not met. This is particularly important to the Highways Agency as it is noted that the North Colchester Travel Strategy states: "In capacity terms, it is generally acknowledged that an additional lane is required in each direction of the A12 in this area to cater for existing levels of demand."</p> <p>It is unlikely that the proposed developments will provide sufficient funds to provide additional capacity beyond demand management access and control and therefore robust measures should be incorporated to manage down demand wherever possible and necessary.</p>	<p>Details about importance of travel planning will be added to the document.</p>
033	Essex County Council	<p>The principle issues raised in the County Council's response include; <u>Accuracy of mapping</u> information needs to be improved – page 23 is misleading in relation to school facilities.</p> <p><u>Education, Early Years and Child Care Facility in the NGAUE</u> - information contained within the SPD should be justified where appropriate by evidence, and where mitigation measures are required the SPD should clearly explain the nature of the measures that will be taken to resolve issues. Proposed site is not recommended in Land Compliance Study. Concerns include topographic issues, noise, air pollution and vibration, a water course across the school site. A site</p>	<p>Rewording included where appropriate, diagram of community hub will be removed and factual updates to map. Much of the detail referred to is not appropriate for SPD but will be picked up in consideration of planning application ie access to schools. Some of the comments are out of date and do not reflect current national policy.</p>

		<p>south of the community hub would be preferred. There should be 2 points of access – indicative layout suggested.</p> <p><u>Access to Community/Social Infrastructure</u> – Access to community/social infrastructure is safe and effective.</p> <p><u>Heritage and Archaeology</u> – the SPD should include reference to need for appropriate evaluation and mitigation for archaeology and heritage. Opportunities should be sought to retain ditches for SUDS. Development must be in sympathy with historic park and garden and listed building at Severalls.</p> <p><u>Delivery</u> – The SPD should ensure that consideration is given to the timely delivery of social, physical, environmental and economic infrastructure. Funding mechanisms, phasing and responsibilities should be clearly expressed.</p> <p><u>Design</u> – suggest higher densities maybe facilitated and more sustainable. Further advice should be sought from ECC Design Team.</p> <p><u>Rewording</u> suggested in places.</p>	<p>Land compliance study will be taken into account along with all material considerations when planning application assessed.</p> <p>S106 and s278 works will be subject to consideration as part of planning application and priorities will be determined through Development Team and Planning Committee and will reflect national policy.</p> <p>CBC has own urban designer but offer of help is noted.</p> <p>High density development is not supported locally</p>
034	Boxted Parish Council	<p>Welcome the reduction in housing numbers but concerns about urban sprawl into the countryside remain.</p> <p>All road infrastructure should be completed before the development.</p>	Noted
035	West Bergholt Parish Council	<p>Concerned that draft Travel Strategy lacks evidence to support the assumptions made.</p> <p>Some info in SPD is out of date.</p> <p>No mention of impact development will have on rural communities.</p> <p>If gyratory system is found to be ineffectual impact will be significant leading to congestion issues for the rural villages.</p> <p>Consultation does not allow Parish Councils to meet and respond.</p> <p>Agree there should be no vehicular access onto Bergholt Road.</p> <p>Cycle routes along Bergholt Road are insufficient; support new proposals that improve situation.</p> <p>No evidence that there will be less traffic under north station bridge.</p> <p>Agree with bus priority and 15 minute frequency but more detail required to be assessed by Task and Finish Group.</p> <p>Good mix of open space but landscaping should be introduced into development.</p> <p>Primary and secondary schools are required but should be closer to</p>	<p>The North Colchester Travel Strategy is draft and we welcome comments on it through this process.</p> <p>Updates will be made to document.</p> <p>Landscaping will be incorporated.</p>

		North Station.	
036	Natural England	<p>Unlikely development will have an adverse impact on nearest SSSI (Bullock Wood) however environmental assessment will provide more detail.</p> <p>Site likely to support a number of protected and/or biodiversity species - detailed mitigation will be required.</p> <p>Welcome proposals to retain habitat such as Chesterwell Wood and hedgerows/trees.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Plan should be prepared as part of the development process.</p> <p>Development should seek to achieve 40% informal accessible open space as far as possible.</p> <p>Standards suggested for proximity to natural/open space.</p> <p>In addition to large areas of open space, multi-functional green corridors should be used.</p> <p>Welcome proposals for SUDs which should be multi-functional.</p> <p>Landscape mitigation should be used to minimise impact of development on areas of visual significance.</p> <p>Satisfied with Habitats screening; believe the Sustainability Appraisal provides full consideration of relevant aspects of the environment and fully support the mitigation and enhancement measures.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Text added to SPD reflecting need for green infrastructure study and reference to distance standards.</p> <p>CBC agree use of green corridors.</p>
037	Homes and Communities Agency	<p>Support general principles.</p> <p>35% affordable housing should be delivered with nil-grant.</p> <p>Support secure by design principles.</p>	Noted
007	Office for Nuclear Regulation	No comments	
008	Sport England	<p>Support extension to Fords Lane playing fields in principle but exact location, area and layout should reflect current/future local needs ie if need is for new senior cricket pitch it should be designed to accommodate it.</p> <p>New expanded or enhanced ancillary facilities should be provided.</p> <p>Colchester Rugby Club should be consulted to see if satellite club facilities could be created or financial contributions made towards improving/expanding existing facilities.</p> <p>If pitches are provided on triangle site they should provide for summer</p>	<p>Agreed about designing space to best meet identified needs. Rugby Club has been consulted.</p> <p>PPG17 Study recommends that CBC actively pursue dual/community use at the school sites but no certainty about secondary school at this time so facilities need to be considered in new community building. If dual use is</p>

		<p>and winter sports and include ancillary facilities (changing, parking, etc) This could be a significant cost. Access through residential area would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>Community facility that accommodates sports hall for badminton and other sport is welcomed. Providing it at Fords Lane is desirable.</p> <p>If new secondary school is provided dual use indoor sport, fitness and dance facilities could be provided to avoid duplication.</p>	<p>secured at a new secondary school this could provide additional facilities for mini and junior football and rugby as well as meeting the shortfall in badminton courts/sports hall. Although no shortfall was identified for cricket pitches by 2021, it was suggested that new cricket facilities could also be considered as part of sports provision at the new school. Hockey is adequately catered for.</p> <p>There is already parking provided at Fords Lane. Any new development will have to comply with parking standards.</p>
--	--	--	---

Myland Community Council

A very detailed response was received from Myland Community Council which warrants particular mention. The comments can be summarised as follows;

1. SPD is considerable improvement over predecessor.
2. Concern that document is couched in terms which engender doubt and ambiguity (especially where community facilities are concerned.)
3. Travel strategy is incomplete/not fit for purpose and renders a comprehensive response to the SPD virtually impossible.
4. Impact of this development, together with Severalls and other recent development sites should be recognised as having far-reaching implications for both the Town and Myland's neighbouring parishes and villages in respect of transport infrastructure.
5. Cycle paths and footpaths should remain segregated.
6. Bus frequency should be every 10 minutes (not 15)
7. Encourage living streets and shared road surfaces.
8. Strengthen requirement for access across A12 and ensure linkages between footpaths 233 (Tower Lane) and 38, 39 and 46 are incorporated.
9. Footpath maps are inaccurate.
10. A single vehicular access point risks gridlock – a solution would be therefore to reduce housing numbers.
11. MCC welcome the proportion of open space, retention of trees and hedgerows but there is still a serious loss of flora and fauna habitat and reduced open feel.
12. Bee orchid colony should be recovered and preserved.
13. The development represents a serious loss of flora and fauna habitat resulting in a profoundly reduced 'open feel' to the area. It will be vital therefore, that every effort is maintained to ensure as much green-corridor connectivity as possible and that this should embrace the provision of dedicated and protected wildlife supportable biodiversity areas e.g. the north and south wetland and green corridors. A corridor to Tower Lane through development sites and over the A134 via a pedestrian / wildlife bridge is desirable.
14. Need to take account of views to north and south.
15. There should be unfettered access to all green space.
16. Pleased to see reduction in house numbers but suggest it should be reduced further to less than 1000 as this would be more sustainable. 1800 should be the maximum number.
17. Welcome new community centre and ideas suggested for size and function.
18. Further community facilities required – integrated with schools.
19. Would prefer to see primary school more centrally located. Early years and childcare should be provided.
20. Design standards should reflect Myland Design Statement. Functional standards should be adopted for room areas and heights.
21. Design should support neighbourliness.
22. Car parking standards should be applied.
23. Bungalows should be built where land is higher than adjacent existing properties/gardens.
24. Constant wet areas on southern slopes may make building uneconomic.
25. Location and service needs for Myland communities need to be economically viable, accessible and complementary.

26. MCC commits to working collaboratively with all involved parties.
27. MCC welcomes design approach but does not wish to see housing or retail alongside the A134 – this should comprise of a wide tree lined verge which would maintain the rural – urban transition.
28. Consideration should be given to building in nesting boxes for birds.
29. Design codes should be rigorously applied.
30. S106 details suggested for community building at Fords Lane and Footbridge over A12.
31. Contents of Growth Area Framework are noted and include reference to “the Borough’s expectations” and “the Council’s aspirations for the site”. There is no commentary on the relationship between this framework and the CBC Core Strategy from which it is derived.
32. The comment “delivery of approximately 1,800 homes” MCC would wish to see amended to “a maximum of 1,800” . Related to this MCC requires solid guarantees that the number of dwellings approved can never be increased by later planning applications for a period >50 years after final completion of the development.
33. Travel Strategy does not address issues.
34. Absence of modelling data is a serious omission. 2008 data is out of date and may skew results.
35. No evidence that impacts on villages have been taken into account.
36. Strategy focuses on modal shift but does not confirm what extent of modal shift is required.
37. Strategy acknowledges proposals would create problems in the future, there are funding issues and it does not portray a reassuring picture that it is cohesive or deliverable.
38. MCC assume further detail will emerge on sustainability in other DPDs.
39. Detailed comments provided on the sustainability appraisal related to insufficient evidence about housing and employment demand. On balance the Chesterwell is unsustainable as a development site. The criteria used are limited at SPD level.

The Council has considered carefully the points made by Myland CC and changes have been incorporated in the text where appropriate. Further comments are detailed below;

1. Landscaping, biodiversity and views into the site will be taken into account in determining the application. Officers are working with the developers consultants to ensure adequate evidence is provided. Land will be safeguarded to provide for a bridge over the A12.
2. The Council welcomes collaborative working
3. The Council cannot prevent planning applications being submitted which seek to vary permissions already granted. Each will be looked at on its merits.
4. Additional time given to comment on Travel Strategy and modelling.
5. A legal agreement will be used at the application stage to secure public access to green spaces, along with their maintenance
6. Comments on community building will be taken into account
7. Provision will be made for early years and childcare. Sufficient land has been allocated to provide all levels of learning on one site
8. The SPD does not write policy so the design standards will be looked at as part of the planning application

9. The design will be subject to scrutiny; boundary treatment, relationship to existing dwellings and ground conditions will be looked at and car parking should comply with adopted standards.
10. The introduction section of the SPD provides details of the relationship with the Core Strategy.
11. The Council agrees with MCC about service needs being economically viable, accessible and complimentary
12. Comments on built in nesting boxes will be passed on to developer
13. Detailed comments about S106 will be passed to planning case officer, developer and solicitor for consideration.

Approach to Development – Transport and Accessibility

1. Welcome comments about the cycle/footpaths. It is likely that there will need to be a mix of segregated and unsegregated paths. With development the need and the use of the foot paths will change. We are not proposing that these rights of way are lost. Some of them maybe converted to bridle paths to create traffic free pedestrian and cycle routes.
2. In strategy development resources need to be focused on the areas where the greatest impact will be felt and there is the greatest opportunity for change. The LDF recognises that the greatest potential to change travel behaviour is in urban areas.
3. The proposed bus routes in the draft North Colchester Travel Strategy include east/west routes linking together the development and opportunities. Further discussions are needed about feasibility of these routes and the level of service.
4. The intention is that the development is 20mph and the design and layout of the road network will reflect this. Further detailed design is to be undertaken on the on the layout of the development. On parts of the main thorough fare vehicle traffic is likely to cede priority to pedestrians and cyclists, using some of the design approaches promoted in Manual for Streets.
5. See separate comments below appertaining to the draft NCTS. The Draft NCTS was made available as evidence base to the main consultation document – the North Colchester Growth Area SPD.
6. CBC has asked Sustrans to see whether the link across the A12 can be considered as part of the Connect2 programme. Please see 1 above.
7. Further checks will be undertaken against the definitive map.
8. There will be more access points for walking, cycling and public transport than for the general vehicle traffic. The single access point for general vehicular traffic and the proposed layout is to support sustainable travel and living. Those moving into the development will be made aware of the layout and access arrangements.

In respect of the Draft North Colchester Travel Strategy (NCTS) the Council makes the following comments in response to Myland CC comments;

Para 1 – It is recognised that there are trips which do not begin or terminate in Myland – the strategy does include parts of Highwoods and St John’s area. Park and Ride, to be delivered at Cuckoo Farm is part of the strategy and will cater for trips which start outside of Colchester. Prior to the work being undertaken the Government (at the time) had commissioned the A12 Corridor Towns Study as part of Delivering a Sustainable Transport Strategy. The Highways Agency proposed that this work be referred too. This

study recognised that there is a significant number of short local trips which have the potential to change.

The strategy takes a view up to 2023 and is in line with the Core Strategy. It is difficult to go beyond this date as there is no certainty on new land use and development beyond this date. The brief for the NCTS was shared with MCC and its consultant. The brief showed that the area to be focused upon would include much of the north Colchester urban area. MCC or its consultant did not raise at this time the need to include the rural areas to the north of Colchester.

The Draft Strategy considers the areas of growth in north Colchester, including NGAUE, Severalls, and Cuckoo Farm (around Axial Way). The strategy links these future opportunities to existing development and opportunities such as the Hospital, the North Colchester Business Park, the railway station and the town centre.

The strategy is predicated on providing sustainable transport, following the approach set out in the LDF Policies for Transport and Accessibility. To provide “sustainable life styles and address climate change” requires a different approach to transport provision and thinking for the future.

Para 2

The strategy is not reliant on traffic modelling. Modelling is resource intensive and is only used when necessary. Traffic modelling has a tendency to lead the user down a certain path. The County Council and its consultants have access to traffic movement data in the area in relation to a number of projects e.g Park and Ride, the A12 Junction 28, A133 Central Corridor Consultation, Colchester Travel Diary, Delivering a Sustainable Transport Strategy. The draft NCTS could have been more explicit about these pieces of work.

2008 was used as there is a comprehensive set of traffic data collected across Colchester. Where available more recent data could have been used in the strategy document to illustrate a change rather than rely solely on 2008 data but this may not have been as comprehensive. However it should be noted table 1 of the draft NCTS shows that traffic growth in Colchester has not occurred as expected, even though the population of the Borough has grown. The County has undertaken monitoring before and after the new A12 Junction opened.

The developer will be expected to undertake a comprehensive Transportation Assessment as part of their planning application for the site.

Para 3

In most cases strategies are developed against a background of change and commitments e.g. delivery of infrastructure improvements and the delivery of growth. The strategy does recognise the developments of New Braiswick Park (see section 1.4) and Junction 28 (see section 4.6)

Para 4

In strategy development resources need to be focused on the areas where the greatest impact will be felt and there is the greatest opportunity for change. The work follows the

approach of the LDF recognising that the greatest potential to change travel behaviour is in urban areas.

Para 5

It is acknowledged that modal shift is a challenge and the strategy has a number of measures which are designed to offer people choice and incentives to travel more sustainably. If you make a mode easier to use then it is more likely to be used. Modal shift does not preclude owning a car and comparisons with other locations of high levels of car ownership does not necessarily mean modal shift cannot be achieved.

Para 6

The strategy has to be realistic, affordable and deliverable. All the comments made through the consultation will be reviewed and used to inform the NCTS as it develops.

Sustainability Appraisal

Myland Community Council's (MCC's) representation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the North Colchester Growth Area Urban Extension Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that MCC's views are: "based on the need for the site to be sustainable from the point of view of earning its place in the CBC Core Strategy and related Site Allocations DPD and also sustainable within its own right based on its development design." The MCC also produced a supplementary evaluation of the Council's SA.

As stated in the SA Report government guidance on SAs for SPDs recognises that in most cases SAs will draw considerably from SA work undertaken for higher level plans and the need for new work may be limited. Considerable SA work as part of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs has looked at the likely impacts of the development of the North Colchester Growth Area Urban Extension compared to other options. The SPD sits in a hierarchy and must be in conformity with adopted DPDs. It would be inappropriate and unnecessary to repeat sustainability considerations in regards to the principle of the development of this site. The SA therefore does not focus on the site being sustainable from the point of view of 'earning its place' in the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs. It instead focuses on appraising the sustainability of the detailed site information included in the draft SPD. Indeed the appraisal of the 'no plan' option in the SA Report assumes that the site will be developed; the no plan option is having no SPD, not no development.

The Community Council made comments in relation to each of the nine sustainability objectives, which are listed in the table attached as an appendix together with a Council response.

David Lock Associates made comments on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties. Several suggested wording changes were made, some of which have been incorporated into revised SPD. Other comments included;

- Support for principles of the SPD.
- Detailed evidence base including Environmental Statement and Transport Assessment will be provided as part of application which contain more detail.
- Only through planning application can details about infrastructure be fully understood.

- Inconsistent approach to the status of the master plan – design requirements should not be expressed as absolute requirements.
- Support sustainable travel choices.
- Transport package includes requirements that are not as yet tested.
- Support overall approach to open space but some specific references are unfounded
- Illustrative master plan offers no evidence that 10% open space within development parcels has been adhered to.
- SPD should be flexible in relation to sustainability.
- Section on urban design, architecture and design codes seeks to define specific detail which is inappropriate. The SPD cannot create policy.
- Unnecessary to define an area for self build or require green roof to community building.

Other Responses

As referred to above a total of 87 respondents made comments about the SPD, these are all listed in the Appendix.

As well as the questions summarised at the start of this document, the survey also asked for peoples opinions on aspects of the SPD and various comments were received. These are summarised below by question;

Q1 Do you consider the Council's design approach as outlined on page 33 to be the most appropriate?

The traffic still ends up at the station, its horrendous already. It's quicker to get to London on the train than navigate Colchester town

I do not see why more houses need to be built when there are lots of original houses vacant and the ones that have been built have not be sold. All the traffic has to go through the two lanes under North Station. Where are all these cars going to go! Mill Road is ridiculous a slow train of cars going into/out of Colchester first thing in the morning and at rush hour. You cannot catch a bus to go to work at St Johns without having to go into town and out again which takes 2 hours and also drop children off school in Myland!

Object to new cycleways across private lanes (Studds and Braiswick Lanes) and across football pitches. Free passage must be retained to Braiswick Farm. A cycle route crossing the A12 over a bridge, assuming cyclists use it they would find themselves in a field with now where to go, how stupid that is.

Not in favour of new build on all that lovely green space.

The design has given no appropriate consideration to the problems associated with the transportation necessary to support a further 1800 homes in the North of Colchester The fundamental point is that the expansion is neither needed or in the interests of the development of Colchester. It represents the destruction of green space, the under-utlization of Brownfield sites, lack of regard for voice of electorate, no investment in trains (can not even get a seat today, why make it worse), inevitable increased congestion, no viable plans for any real jobs to match the increase, destruction of value for existing residents, reduced quality of life in general, increased pollution, encouraging longer and longer commute times the list goes on and on. This is a development that should NOT be allowed in Colchester, period.

Insufficient consideration given to existing infrastructure with little notice taken of residents concerns.

It is over development.

To add further pressure to the overloaded transport network would discourage people from living in the area as it is not easy to access and travel around.

The design approach refers to trying to retain valuable landscape features. At present, the

landscape is fields and trees, that are home to many different types of wildlife - there is no way this will be retained if 1800 houses are put on this land. The development will irreversibly destroy one of the last remaining green spaces in Mile End.

The design includes the surrounding of a piece of woodland with housing, which is not suitable to maintain it as a sustainable area for wildlife. Similarly Highwoods is surrounded by urban sprawl.

Making the use of public transport and non-car modes of transport attractive and realistic alternatives to the motor car is unrealistic and based solely on assumption. The amenities will only sustain the planned development and will have no benefit to the existing community.

The design approach appears to be littered with misleading statements, false assumptions and outright lies intended to mislead the reader. No thought has been made regarding the sustainability and support of this development, and the plans are based purely upon the desire to ram as much housing as possible onto the site. As is evident on existing developments in the area, any 'promised' infrastructure and facilities are quietly forgotten about by a council who only exist to help line the pockets of a few large property developers in exchange for some nice champagne lunches and quiet backhanders. No other development in the country has managed to force/convince motorists to abandon their cars in favour of non-car transport. Buses are expensive, unreliable, usually dirty and almost always empty. Any promised bus routes will be cancelled when they prove unprofitable. No one will use the bus or walk or cycle to go shopping as people will not carry 8 bags of shopping home when they have a car parked outside. Using this as justification for the development yet again shows the devious and malicious way in which this council treats its residents.

Chesterwell development should be two developments separated by Braiswick Lane. The current proposal of one bus route through the middle of the development with the southern residents having to travel north just to travel south down mile end road to get to the station or town is ludicrous. This approach would not encourage greater public transport as suggested as journey times would be greatly increased. Two developments, Two circular bus routes. Shorter bus journeys, and more public transport use.

Supportive in principle subject to realistic approach to the problems with car parking and possible conflicts between cars, bikes, joggers, dog walkers etc

The design appears to be well-intentioned but it is impossible to say if it is the most appropriate. The ultimate test is whether residents will be able to say that they like where they live, that they have a sense of community and that they do not feel overly pressured by inadequate parking, lack of community facilities, distance from schools and shops and too-narrow roads. The design concept addresses these issues but will it succeed?

Although not covered on page 33, the project would gain much credibility if the SPD were to give explicit undertakings about the early provision of community centres, other community facilities and a footbridge to take footpath 39 over the A12.

Housing density needs to be reduced as low as possible - it is still too high. More open space. More bins

A qualified yes, very good housing layout, open space, shared space roads, community park, retention & extension of Playing fields, 2 convenience services hubs, 2 + schools NO! traffic and transport strategy into and out of site severely flawed, negative impact on facilities in adjacent neighbourhoods No evidence of co-ordinated retail, sports and leisure provision rationalised across ward

There is a clear need to preserve what is left of the old Mile End and for any future development to blend in sympathetically with existing buildings.

I agree with the "not the traditional highway first approach" being adopted. However I do not consider adequate infrastructure is being provided for sustainable vehicular movement between north Colchester and the rest of the town.

The idea of planning the layout first is a better way of approaching development and it is good to see that the use of "interesting urban environments, stimulating possibilities for activity etc" are all included as a design principle. Where I take great issue is the paradoxical use of the words "working with the terrain, respecting key views and boosting diversity" – we currently look out upon green fields with a myriad of wildlife and a certain amount of serenity. So how the building of 1800 new dwellings with buses trundling through

it and the necessary street lighting required is going to somehow respect key views, boost diversity and overall create some new ecological urban environment really is just empty words in real terms.

Q2 The design of the new development intends to create interesting new neighbourhoods as outlined on page 33. How can these best be combined with the existing communities in Mile End and Braiswick?

I don't think they will as they are too big and even the traditional mile end area doesn't really marry up with the new area of myland as its too broad.

I am against all development.

Not interested

Neither the residents of Mile End or Braiswick want this ridiculous development as their petitions demonstrate.

Ease of access between all of them.

We do not need new neighbourhoods , the existing communities have suffered appallingly with the number of recent developments that have taken place without any improvements to the infrastructure, despite the protests that have been made through the consultation process the Council has never addressed these concerns, but instead continues to press ahead with these plans and attempts to divert attention from the main issues by seeking consultation on details of a design proposals that should be put on hold.

Current neighbourhood fine as it is. Do not need further developments.

Linking communities is very important, however these plans clearly show over development which will do little to "gel" communities together.

We have seen over the past few years the Mile End area being turned into a concrete jungle and Mill Road is now a mecca for cars lorries etc. Access onto it from the adjoining residential roads is a nightmare.As far as most of the residents are concerned enough is enough we do not want any more houses or developments thank you very much.

By builing fewer house and providing more space for leisure activity.

Small developments over a long period to provide housing that is needed rather than to just satisfy targets.

This proposed development is too much in that it will join Gt Horkesley, Mile End and Colchester

A new community could best be integrated with existing ones through careful planning of low impact low rise housing where the need is identified, by developing the existing community amenities such as the Mile End Co-Op area and addition of projects into the existing housing at Braiswick to ensure that the amenities are appropriately used. The maximum area of green land and existing hedgerows/woodland should be maintained as part of the only area of open greenland within the north Colchester area.

Using my prior experience of the new developments in Mile End, this will not happen. The Northern Approaches development, and the Northfields development that is still being built are not integrated into the existing communities, because they are too big. There is also a lot of turbulence, as families seem to move in and out on a regular basis, so don't get a chance to integrate. The sense of community in Mile End has been lost by the endless building and expansion of what was once a lovely, friendly village, and this can never be rediscovered unfortunately.

This is another meaningless statement. How can a housing development be 'interesting'? The plans put forward show a standard development as seen everywhere else blighted by similar projects. This one does stand out however by the lack of certain facilities and the insanely poor infrastructure. Perhaps it will be interesting to the local media when the single road in and out of the site causes gridlock and multiple accidents. Perhaps it will be interesting to the existing residents when the adolescents from the new estate indulge in petty crime and vandalism along Nayland Road (like Northern Approach youths destroying grave stones at Myland Church). Perhaps the irreversible damage caused to the local countryside will be interesting. Perhaps the traffic chaos and accidents caused on Bergholt Road by having buses pulling in and out of a tiny road will be interesting. Perhaps the smug satisfaction of our parasitic council and the leaches that work there will be interesting.

Things that are the same are not interesting. With two developers building 1800 homes, there are going to be a lot of repetition. If all the houses are the same, the neighbourhood will not be

interesting. I believe that a Welshwood Park approach of build your own is needed here. Floodlit Tennis courts are needed. What is there to do in Mile End after work? At the moment I have to play at West Bergholt? The government wants us to exercise more, and drive less....? We need Tennis Courts in Mile End for the current residents and the 3,000 – 4,500 new residents that you are proposing.

good access links

They won't be and the result will be a degradation in the existing communities as these are neglected and the emphasis is placed on the new developments.

This sounds like typical blue sky thinking mumbo jumbo. Do you consider Hakewill way or Gavin way interesting? An interesting development is a misnomer, an impossible task for any large developer. The only development I know in Colchester is Welshwood Park which allowed individuals to purchase building plots. Take a drive down there. It is quite interesting. The only interesting thing about Hakewill way is the terrible parking conditions caused by your ridiculous parking rules and regulations.

I support the creation of interesting neighbourhoods. They can best be combined with the existing communities of Mile End by providing good walking, cycling, bus and car routes between them.

Design of houses need to flow from the existing areas and we don't want any houses looking like those awful Ikea style houses at Northfields on Turner Road. Lots of footpaths and open space.

The design of the Chesterwell neighbourhoods is good, except in an orientation manner to maximise use of renewable energy. Open spaces and connectivity to countryside is very good. Connection into existing communities is very poor and unimaginative. We need strong, open, visible pedestrian/ cycle avenues linking to Myland village/ Church & Parish Halls, Severalls centre and New Braiswick Park. Current proposals rely on existing ROW which are inadequate, and do little to encourage connectivity between people and services

Through well designed footpath paths, cycle routes and open spaces and community facilities and local shops.

If this development does indeed go ahead then this whole scheme needs to not jar with the landscape. I don't want to look out my back window and see nothing but hundreds of buildings as far as the eye can see. That will only lead to resentment by existing neighbourhoods who will feel nothing but an intrusion into their lives by the new residents. If you really serious about interesting new neighbourhoods then most of it needs to be hidden as best as possible by trees and green planting. This will mean that you have to discover each neighbourhood rather than being able to see it all laid out in front of you. I'm sure new residents would feel the same as we've all had enough of the shoddy planned horrendous "modern" developments seen around Mile End, including Northfields and New Braiswick Park. It's time the developers and especially the council created something everyone would be really proud of for decades to come – I won't hold my breath on that one.

They will overwhelm them

Q3 Access for vehicles to the proposed development will be created at the north of the site off the A134 Sudbury Road. The route of the northern section of Nayland Road will be changed and the existing road will be made a cul de sac as outlined in the Transport and Accessibility section. Do you support this approach?

So more traffic down Bergholt road when is already a nightmare to get onto to go any where! Has any one really been and looked and see what the traffic is like at 8am and 6pm!

Regardless of what the local people say the development will go ahead, however it should be two separate developments one north of Braiswick lane and the other south of the lane.

To think that making only one access road in and out will discourage the use of private cars in and out of any new estate is naive in the extreme. Buses don't normally serve those sort of routes. The ridiculous bus gate should go as well.

Fords Lane roundabout inadequate but making Nayland Rd access only serves no purpose. Access and egress to the north will cause more collisions in breach of Essex traffic principles and health and safety legislation.

Nayland Road is already to all intents and purposes a cul-de-sac. Access to the new development from the A134 will continue to increase the traffic from the northern approaches. This route is already insufficient to handle the traffic that it currently carries and this is before the developments on the old Severalls Hospital site and the present Mersea Homes development at Horkesley are completed. It is irresponsible of Councils Officers to continue

with proposals to make the traffic congestion on the Northern approaches worse than it is already un yet they continue to turn a blind eye to this, presumably in the face of commercial pressures from the developers who have high stakes in being able to turn the green field they have purchased into high density residential development.

How will this resolve extra traffic problems as road already cul de sac ?

On the face of it, looking at the plans it appears that the "current" and "new" communities will be segregated by this road

It doesn't solve the traffic problems; just creates more.

Support approach to access only in the north.

Scheme gives opportunity to test R-gates (bus gates through which residents within 1km can use providing they subscribe)

Residents of West Bergholt and further villages are poorly served by access to the town and also to the northern areas of Colchester. For many living outside the villages, the alternatives of cycle and public transport are not an option, the car being the only choice. At present the only access is via Bergholt Road, or via Coach Road and Great Horkesley. The opportunity to create an alternative to travelling to North Station and back out to North Colchester has been sacrificed with the belief that we will then use the bus. For this category of residents this will not happen. The easy option is to allow vehicular traffic access from Braiswick to the new spine road and not limit this to buses. An alternative is to create a new by-pass running from Bergholt Road to Horkesley Road adjacent to and south of the A12. If consideration is not given to this traffic, then the traffic flow along Coach Road and through Horkesley will increase to intolerable levels as drivers have no other option to avoid delays. Coach Road already struggles to cope with the traffic of cars, vans, lorries and farm vehicles, with almost constant repairs to the road becoming necessary.

We are also against the proposed closure of Boxed Rd which will result in a long detour to get onto the NAR to get into town.

The consultation documents and associated maps do not make the changes clear enough, a possible study of how the traffic would mainly access the proposed development and the subsequent affect on the traffic flow. This does not appear to have been considered

A cul de sac would then become a glorified car park.

The mini roundabout/bus lane has already cut off from Mile End a significant part of the population of this area which does not help the local shops or integration of population, and adds to traffic problems in the area.

Absolutely not. Directing all exiting traffic from Northern Approach as well as all the new traffic created by 2000 homes (at least 4000 more cars!!!) in one entrance down one road through the new housing estate is ill-conceived. Blocking access to Horkesley Road and Boxted Road is ridiculous. There is nothing complicated about this road as it currently stands, this excuse is used by Mersea Homes because they know the traffic they will create with their development could not use this roundabout and prefer to suggest an 'unknown entity' of using their new road through the development where it will be too late to stop the chaos this will cause after it has already been built. Directing current local traffic from Fords Lane onto this busy road will be a nightmare for the residents who will have to sit in their small side street waiting for the opportunity to pull out onto the road where all traffic from Horkesley, Boxted and Nayland Road area are being forced to drive through the shutting off of this roundabout.

Petty tinkering with roads is the usual strategy of a council bereft of ideas. Spending tax-payers money on short-term ideas causes traffic chaos for months during the work and will be shown to have been a waste. A single road in and out of the development, including whatever school traffic and all traffic from Sudbury Road and Boxted Road is another poorly considered plan by our inept transport department. The fact that only one entrance is realistically possible shows that the site is unsuitable for a large development. Furthermore, the plans showed that residents from Fords Lane will have to enter this new super-road from a side road, instead of the existing roundabout. This is proof that the plans have not been considered, as the council clearly has no concept of the amount of traffic coming in and out of this road, especially at the weekend when the sport facilities are in use. There will be a large increase in accidents in the mornings when the many residents have to dodge traffic by racing onto this road, or in the evening when returning home.

Supportive subject to consideration of existing parking problems on Nayland Rd and Braiswick Lane which affect visibility for existing residents exiting onto road

So long as there is still pedestrian access down the Nayland road.

Unfortunately due to the location of the development it is impossible to disagree with the

access arrangements as it is the only one available. This doesn't mean that it is right! It's an interesting approach. What concerns me is the volume of school traffic which could snarl up traffic on the A134. Given the developer's understandable wish to bring passing trade close to the retail area, the A134 diversion seems reasonable. However, the weight of school traffic competing for much the same space suggests that the existing stretch of road should remain open, but heavily calmed, to offer non-resident, non-school, non-shopping traffic a somewhat laborious alternative route.

Good for residents and seems sensible. What about if an RTA happens though - only one route in and out?

The proposals to divert the A134 are severely flawed and is contrary to all national Highways Policy. The A134 may need to be widened and dualled, with possible controlled slip roads. Whilst I agree that Nayland Road should become a cul-de-sac I am against any development which will increase traffic on the Northern Approaches Road until a real solution has been found to the North Station Junction.

Provided provision is made to allow pedestrians to safely cross the Northern Approach Road from Boxted Road and Nayland Road. A traffic light operated zebra crossing should be installed.

Whilst I understand the logic to this, I believe that having access to the proposed development off the A134 Sudbury Road will make the use of the private car more attractive to residents who wish to access central/rest of Colchester. There will be an incentive to access the A12 via the new junction to get into Colchester. Vice versa, residents and businesses in the rest of the town who need to get to the north of the railway station will also use the A12. The impact of the development and the removal of 2 carriageways for use by vehicles under the railway bridge makes these proposals unsustainable.

This is a major development so it needs proper access from the north so as to avoid the return of heavy traffic on Mile End and Nayland Road. The amount of time and money spent on the A12 new junction and the continuing improvements to the NAR make this a sensible option in my opinion.

What about all the traffic going down the Sudbury Road to the station? The station roundabout will never cope it hardly does at present traffic levels

Q4 The Transport and Accessibility section outlines that a comprehensive network of footpaths and cycleways will link all parts of the development across North Colchester with links to the Hospital, the station and the town centre as well as to the rural areas across the A12. Do you support this approach?

Designers should engage an expert in cycling provision from the Netherlands or Denmark. Cycle routes should be separate to footways, direct and convenient and incorporate sufficient space.

Convenience of cyclists and pedestrians should be given more importance than anti-congestion measures.

20mph limits should be used

Detail is crucial and CCC should be consulted at each stage

Bus drivers should be given training if cyclists are to share bus lanes

Improvements needed to all cycle routes.

But not at the expense of drivers

More traffic on the roads.

Foot and cycle ways are fanciful idea as most trips will be made by car.

Parked cars will block routes for buses & pedestrians.

Even all the planning representatives at the halls arrived by car, so how do they expect others to go everywhere by bus or by cycle, what is good for them is apparently not good for new residents, again how daft is that.

The people proposing these ideas live in a false hope that people buying houses will not use their cars for the majority of journeys.

Do not support development we have plenty of footpaths and cycle ways today anyway.

Cycleways don't work. Majority people use cars.

Current pedestrian and cycle access to and from Cuckoo Farm Stadium is poor! On match days ECC, supported by CBC, close Boxted Road because they consider it a dangerous and unsafe road. In doing so they deny residents vehicle access. Any plans must address these issues so the road can be made safe without closing it.

I cycle to work and find it dangerous, wet, uncomfortable and impossible to carry all my documents and keep them safe and dry. The only reason I continue to cycle is that it takes 45 minutes due to traffic on occasion by car but only 15 minutes by bike (if you manage to avoid being crushed in the cycle lane by a bus).

The provision of footpaths and cycle ways only separated by a white line is dangerous. The path/cycle way between the new Tufnel Way development and North Station has had many near misses. Pedestrians regularly ignore the cycle way markings. Cyclists often travel much too fast. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious injury.

These should be provided for the community now and not as a softening up process to get a large scale development accepted by those living and affected in the area of the proposals

If this nightmare is approved I imagine that footpaths will be required

The comprehensive network is all very well and good but people will still continue to have at least one car per household (more likely two) and drive to the out of town shopping areas and to reach their places of work / schools etc. People will still have cars and will wish to use them where they wish.

The traffic congestion caused by this development will add to an already overcrowded and failed traffic and pedestrian system. The increased and increasing road safety issues will not be manageable or credibly mitigated.

Just because there are paths and cycleways, does not mean people will use them. It is very short sighted to expect people to walk and cycle instead of using cars, the other recent developments have a similar layout, and yet the traffic and North Station is horrendous, so surely this shows that they are not being used instead of cars.

The link to rural areas on the other side of the A12 will create pressures on these areas, or are they to be future areas for satellite developments, "Boxted Garden Village".

It will work on your planned development, but be un-workable in the surrounding area due to lack of space for cycle paths due to no off road parking etc.

Its a great idea in theory but practically in this day and age it is impossible to travel anywhere of significance by foot, cycle or even bus. You can go out for a stroll or for a cycle as recreation but for the main travel to work, shopping etc the need for a car is utmost in all households.

This is hardly a selling point, all developments and towns have footpaths and cycleways.

However, if the belief is that this will create a utopian neighbourhood where people skip along paths to go to work or the supermarket, it shows the council to be grossly out of touch with reality. People do not walk or cycle when it is pouring with rain, snowing or freezing cold. The only way to get people to use them instead of their cars would be to provide enclosed, heated walkways, perhaps with moving floors for the fatter and lazier resident. If this is not going to be provided, then any thought that this network will reduce the need for cars either shows the stupidity of the council or shows their outright disregard for reality.

Yes, cyclists need dedicated paths NOT small sections of shared pavement with faded lines that don't link up. Build dedicated routes, set away from the road where there is no danger of being hit by a car/bus/lorry and link them. The current map of cycle paths in Colchester shows On Road Cycle Routes..... That by definition is Road, occupied by fast moving metal objects that kill cyclists daily. Make cycling safer, separate bicycles and motor vehicles and people will use their bikes more.

Braiswick Lane is shown as a cycle route and a protected lane - we are supportive of this so long as it doesn't affect existing vehicular access rights onto the lane

So long as they are designed in a way that protects the security of people using them and do not become corridors of opportunity for muggers etc.

I agree that all the cycle paths in the North of Colchester should all link. Maybe you should address your already pathetic cycle network before trying to build another one.

I support the retention of footpaths and the creation of new ones, all to be in a green, non-tarmac, setting. I support the creation of cycle paths but only if main commuter routes are well separated from footpaths. I support the proposed links to off-site destinations. The plan for a cycle path across Mile End Playing Fields to Studds Lane is flawed. First it means cutting a wide swathe across the playing fields. I object strongly to this. Second, it envisages a cycle path along Studds Lane to Nayland Road. Studds Lane is an unadopted private road. The residents of all 26 or so houses are unlikely to agree on the grounds of loss of privacy.

The more the better.

The principle is good but the proposals still fail to understand the differences between recreational and commuter use for cyclists, and does not provide substantial enough pedestrian only links directly into the facilities in Bergholt Rd, Myland Village & Church, nor the

need for a wildlife/ footpath over the A134 to Tower Lane

The Northern Approaches Road effectively bisects Mile End and there is currently no direct bus route linking the 2 areas. The crossing points on the NAR are inadequate, especially those at the traffic lights where children and their families have to cross for the school, Nayland Road shops and recreation areas. Improvement to this should be included as part of the development. The plans show Turner Road as a recommended cycle route indicating that whoever came up with this idea has no local knowledge. Turner Road is a single lane road with very few safe overtaking points, takes all the hospital traffic including ambulances and has a variety of bus routes using it. It is the last place any sane council would direct cyclists. Hope that all cycle paths will be completely separate from the roads. Also, a permanent solution needs to be found to the cost of bus fares to make sure they are affordable for families, making them a truly viable alternative to the car.

But only if this provision does not affect businesses as the one in Crouch Street, Colchester has. They must be sensitive to the environment and surroundings and not hinder retail outlets. Wholehearted support. Realise that desire lines when people walk for transport must be straight as possible (except when avoid steep gradients). Make the A12 as permeable as possible - including routes to the NE of the P&R to link in with Langham and its paths - potential for the P&R to become a hub for people walking/cycling to it and catching buses to town.

Yes this is welcomed. Transport links (pedestrian, cyclist and private/commercial vehicles) between the north and south of the railway line are currently inadequate and no provision is being made for their improvement or the increase in their capacity, whilst significantly intensifying the demand for these facilities.

If there is a real determined policy that this new development should be as green as possible and new residents in particular will have to buy into that concept then footpaths and cycleways should be heavily featured throughout.

The transport plan is ill-conceived and illogical

Q5 The proposed development is to be served by at least three new bus services as detailed in the Transport and Accessibility section. This will give access to the town centre, Severalls Hospital development, the General Hospital and the North Colchester Business Parks. Do you support this approach?

Although could they avoid north station. otherwise it will clog it up even more

The bus stop and the congestion caused by the busses are what causes much of the traffic around North Station

No people can walk to the hospital. Not many people use the buses and I doubt they will because there are more services.

Never mind those destinations, how about going to shop at Asda, Tesco, Sainsburys or any other out of area destinations, how many changes will be required.

If you think you can get the bus companies to do it and if you think they will be used.

As indicated above this does not solve the problem. Existing bus services are underutilized.

Why? People want to travel by car not bus; the cost of bus services for families is prohibitive; bus services are unreliable; it is far more convenient to put children into cars than attempt to use the bus service; the elderly and infirm cannot use buses practically; buses do not serve all the destinations that people want to travel to. Further more despite constant promises of bus lanes and park and ride scheme to support the existing developments have failed to materialise due to procrastination on the part of the Council and withholding of section 106 funds.

Specifically, the proposals on access on Bergholt road will be objected to. I cannot believe you have proposed bus access over an existing public footpath this will be fought on legal grounds as well as practical reasons.

Support. However the planned bus route via Boxted Road and United Way should be reviewed. The barrier on United way was only introduced as an emergency vehicle access route to the stadium. It was never intended as a bus route because ECC and CBC consider Boxted road is unsafe for pedestrians (that's why they close it on match days) So any bus route planned must consider the poor sight line for drivers exiting United Way onto Boxted Road.

This route, if used, should also not be turned into a general "all traffic" route but should remain as buses only.

Buses are unreliable and far too expensive for an alternative option.

But not as a consequence of a large development.

As above if this is approved buses will most certainly be required to ease the obvious traffic problem you will create.

Support the provision of more bus routes and more regular buses on existing routes. However until traffic flow issues around North Station are sorted the addition of extra buses will only exacerbate the problem. The traffic issues should be given the top priority prior to any development in the North Colchester area.

Buses are a suggestion used by Mersea Homes as an excuse to get their plans through when in reality people can not and do not use the services as they cannot be relied upon and are too expensive. The current roads cannot cope with the buses driving on them all the time, Defoe Crescent is potholed and falling apart as an example

This will be great news to pensioners (of whom very few will be moving into the development) and students, as these are the two groups who predominantly use buses. Any idea that these buses will be heavily utilized by people commuting to work or the station is not based on fact or real world experience. As has been seen all over the country, as soon as a route is shown to be non-profitable, it is cancelled. Because of this, why not promise 100 bus routes running every 30 seconds, because at the end of the day the same result will be seen. In fact, I am surprised you did not grossly inflate the bus argument like you have lied and misled elsewhere in your incredibly poor document.

In general I am not against busses, but why do local governments think that they are the solution to congested roads? Buses cause a lot of the congestion and can be seen driving around empty all day long. Personal Transport is the future. Modern cars will produce little to no pollution. This needs to be invested in now, not buses! And if you are going to invest in buses, invest in a Park and Ride that will boost the economy in the town centre and ease congestion.

More buses more frequently particularly at peak times, going both north and south.

I believe that an excellent bus service is required during rush hour. However the empty buses during the day are pointless and cause more pollution per capita than my Landrover. I support your approach but I do not believe that it will be successful due to human nature and the love of personal mobility.

I support bus services although I use them rarely because they are insufficiently frequent. A bus every 15 minutes is not going to contribute in any significant way to modal shift.

I do, but the ridiculous idea of putting on bus access points in Fernlea, and the two proposed on Bergholt Road are utterly ridiculous and need to be removed from the scheme. Want a full community bus which takes in hospital, station, stadium and severalls.

The routes provided are unimaginative and again reflect the fact that no journey analyses have been undertaken especially the long stated requirement for E_W routes. The importance of the town centre and station as a destination is exaggerated. The need is for a far more flexible call up service, and a clockwise/ anticlockwise route from Chesterwell/ Myland to Highwoods, Cowdray Avenue, Leisure Centre, Businesses in the Hythe area and then into town and back. However, access should also be given to Colchester North station and the Town Centre.

Consideration should be given to fares, frequency, number of stops and timetable to really encourage commuters to give up their cars.

Three new services seems a little excessive, two would suffice especially given the fact that currently the buses are usually only a quarter full at most. If new services are to be introduced then I really would like to see only single decker buses. Firstly because passenger take up appears to be fairly small and from an environmental point the sight and sound of double deckers roaring through the site would be out of keeping with the supposed tranquil 20mph route.

Q6 The Transport and Accessibility section proposes to widen some surrounding roads to allow two lanes around Colne Bank and Essex Hall roundabouts, alongside improved priority for buses and bus lanes in both directions along North Station Road and Station Way. Do you support this approach?

Stop the traffic going through here and spend more money creating a bridge under or over the railway further up the line

Motorcycles over 50cc should be barred from bus facilities.

Support for North Station bus lanes

Detailed comments provided on elements of Travel Strategy

Cautious support for gyratory – there must be continuous cycle lanes.

Bypass suggested between Bergholt Road and Horkesley Road.

Consideration to be given to closing the road outside the hospital installing north and south car parks, to reduce through traffic on Turner Rd.

Causing more traffic jams. How is that going to help - the locals are not going to use the buses, if they did they would be using them now. Where are buses taking them which is different to before, town? People will still use their cars and with more buses on the road it will be a nightmare.

Please consider introducing pedestrian foot bridges just west of Colne Bank roundabout and just south of the North Station railway bridge. Surface crossings interrupt the flow of traffic and contribute hugely to congestion in the area

Yes and no, because I would prefer the money to go towards a new connection between NA road and Cowdray Avenue. Anything else is just tinkering that will have little or no effect as traffic still has to negotiate the roundabouts. Unless you change the railway bridge nothing will change on its funnel effect and the knock on effects at the junctions. Too many traffic lights and crossings back up traffic. We need more footbridges and subways.

I support this proposal only in as much as to start to address the problems we have with the current number of road users in the area. These improvements were in the main announced previously to support the developments that have already taken place but as mentioned above have failed to materialise due to procrastination on the part of the Council and withholding of section 106 funds. These improvements should be made now, in the meantime any suggestion of further development of the NGAUE should be put on hold.

Buses are part of the problem. The widening of 2 lanes and improvements to roundabout SHOULD GO AHEAD ... but this is because the job was not done properly in the first place with Turner rise, New Braiswick, Colchester, Highwoods, Hospital etc etc. Do NOT link this to be a sweetener attached to approving new development, this is the council responsibility for existing infrastructure that you clearly have not got funds from existing developers for. Should have been done earlier to accommodate current traffic and not to handle more ! Its now more expensive

Proposals should include measures to prevent drivers using Albert St and Serpentine Walk as cut through at peak times.

Note that there is a proposal to make North Station Road a Bus Lane in both directions.

As a resident of North Station Road, who has a vehicle parking space located in a car park linked to Victoria Chase, I am wondering what provisions will be made, if this proposal is implemented, for residents living on roads attached to North Station Road, that have no other access apart from North Station Road, to access their property by vehicle?

The current plans do not offer any benefits in reducing congestion. In fact if the 1800 homes are built plus the 1500 scheduled for the Severalls sight proceed it is bound to get worse.

Providing bus lanes under North Station will create even more traffic congestion. People will not give up their cars and no bus service offers the majority of people a real alternative to their cars.

This will cause yet more traffic chaos. Who is modelling these flows? Have they ever stood at North Station roundabout at 8.45am on a weekday morning, or, even worse, on a Saturday when there is a football match on and it is raining when the whole thing comes to a standstill.

There is no evidence that the proposals will cope with an extra 2000 cars from the proposed development. It may be reasonable to assume about a 1000 additional cars will try to use the North Station junctions in the peak hours in each direction. Improvements to Baker/Spring lane should be a condition of the planning proposal. If Bakers/Spring Lane was improved including a connection from the west end of Tufnel Way then it would form an alternative route for many vehicles from the Braiswick area thus relieving pressure on the North Station area.

However, not all the issues raised in item 2.1, Context Setting, have been addressed. The end of para 2 (of 2.1) states that 'S-bound traffic...is forced to give way to inbound traffic from the west, leading to queues'. In my observation this occurs daily, including week-ends. Items 2.5.1 and 2.5.3 do not address this, they only seem to focus on improvements for N-bound traffic. S-bound should also be included. The very least that should be provided for these flows are traffic lights on the Colne Bank Roundabout to give S-bound traffic a chance when flows from the west are heavy. A better (but perhaps longer term) solution would be to provide fly-overs for S-bound vehicles wishing to travel towards town and the A12 to the west

Yet another plan to ease our horrific travel jams you propose to make worse.

I support improvement of travel to and from the town centre and in the development area.

However if additional lanes are added there will still be a pinch point at the North Station

Bridge, until this is widened to three lanes each way or an additional bridge / tunnel built elsewhere to accommodate dedicated buses or usual traffic the addition of extra lanes elsewhere will have little impact on the improvement of travel.

The North Station Road bus lane should be reversed so that it only applies coming from town and not into town. This would help to alleviate the congestion under North Station Bridge and ease the flow of all traffic into town.

By giving priority to buses can only take lanes away from general traffic. I am aware of the plans to widen roads however there are no plans to widen the road/bridge at North Station which is a pinch point. Your planners are inept. This will massively increase delays in an area that is unable to cope with the current weight of traffic. It is absurd to suggest that the developers will pay for this! It will be paid for by the tax payer as has happened on other developments in this area.

Priority to buses just makes traffic worse because people DO NOT USE them, and makes it worse for the traffic. 'Proposed' does not mean that it will go ahead and it is wrong to agree a development on 'proposed' plans that never materialise once the houses are built, the part that makes the money, the infrastructure is conveniently forgotten

Most concerned about the proposals for bus movements in Bergholt Road and Braiswick: Where will proposed access be onto Bergholt Road - alongside "Beauty at The Bay" or further down by the old post office?

You state there will be four services an hour crossing Bergholt Road in each direction. Is it really necessary to install traffic lights at the junction of Braiswick Park for a mere eight movements an hour? Surely this will result in even more severe congestion in Bergholt Road. Due to its narrowness and proliferation of parked cars this road becomes near impassable at times.

How will my access be affected by the proposed bus route?

Providing dedicated bus lanes at the expense of normal traffic is another failed policy dragged up routinely as the solution to the problem of overcrowding and gridlock. Every time this is attempted, half-empty buses trundle along while the roads are gridlocked around them. The belief that this will force motorists onto buses shows two things. Firstly, it shows the lack of research performed, as this "modal shift" has never been seen to work anywhere else in the country. Secondly, it shows the contempt the council has for its residents, by wilfully making travelling as horrendous as possible. The bottleneck at North Station is the main thorn in the side of the council. The council believe that closing St Helena School and moving it to the new development will reduce traffic under the bridge. It is believed that the utopian footpath network and bus routes will mean most people will leave their cars behind, preferring to drag bags of shopping home in the rain. However, travel to North Station at any busy time of the week, or in fact pretty much any time of the day at the weekend, and you will find gridlock.

Widen the roads. Ease congestion... Improve links to A12. This is needed! If you really wanted to ease congestion through North Station you should have a PARK AND RIDE at Cants Rose Fields and a dedicated bus route running down the side of Northern Approach Road going straight into town. In addition to this you should have an A12 exit that feeds this Park and Ride. Ultimately the bottle neck at North Station is the lack of Foot Bridge on the town side of the tracks. The traffic lights are constantly in use stopping the flow of traffic. Who uses the foot bridge on Mile end side?! Put another foot bridge on the other side of the tracks and this will alleviate the current pressure.

I think the bridge at North Station was widened in 1997. Why didn't you have the foresight to widen all the roads at the same time? Bus lanes should be introduced for rush hour times only and then opened to general traffic during other times.

These changes could alleviate many of the congestion problems now prevailing. They do little to address the future although they should continue to benefit local traffic until the first few hundred houses are built at Severalls.

The whole set of proposals are totally inadequate, ridiculous and dangerous. No data, incorporated assumptions nor analysis has been provided. This issue makes the whole development unsustainable, and unless CBC/ECC find the funds themselves to design and pay for a much safer and higher capacity road system the whole of the Chesterwell development fails to comply with precondition required by the adopted the Core Strategy. The North Station area has always been a bottleneck, and any new developments will only make the situation worse - I was amused to be told by one of your staff that traffic surveys, based on 'national statistics', concluded a 15% reduction in traffic during school holidays - utter twaddle! Much of the traffic during weekdays is caused by parents taking their children across

town to the private & grammar schools, which will of course continue, whatever 'improvements' you attempt to make.

This proposal will seriously disadvantage the businesses in North Station Road, who depend upon short term parking and access for deliveries/dispatches and service provisions. We can see that NO alternatives can be provided to allow these businesses to maintain their livelihoods.

Q7 Do you think there is more that can be done to improve access around the proposed development?

Primary school

It is unrealistic to expect 30% modal shift.

The Travel Strategy and fourth rate bus station in the town centre will deter residents from using the bus.

Confidence in the Travel Strategy is undermined because costs are rough and ready and lack of detail about delivery.

A new crossing from north Colchester to south Colchester must be provided, the planners assume everyone will take the bus or cycle, well they will need to pass under the only bridge, it's already congested a another bus every 5 minutes and hundreds of cycles means gridlock.

Another access road in and out!

No development should even be considered until improvements have been made to the road network and transport infrastructure has been completed. A system of dual carriage ways should be designed that will take traffic from the Town and existing residential and commercial developments to the A12 and other major routes; the road under the North Station needs to be widened to improve traffic flow as well as dual carriage ways along the Cowdray Avenue and Avenue of Remembrance. Underpasses into the Town to serve the car parks and release to bottlenecks needs to be considered. At the same time a program of major improvements need to be made to the public transport system. Surely the Council employ traffic specialists who can design what is needed if only they were supported by the Senior Council Officers and not subjected to the irresponsible developments that are taking place ahead of these improvements being made.

The proposal to make the main spine road a shared space road for pedestrians and vehicles is flawed. Such a proposal is appropriate to estate side roads and town centre roads but is not suitable for a spine road a mile long. Inevitably a substantial minority of motorists will not abide by the 20mph speed limit leading to casualties and in the longer term remedial measures such as speed humps which damage vehicles. A car access from the new developments out via Braiswick and Bakers/Spring lane would also help to ease the pressure on the North Station area.

Build only small individual developments connected by a strategic access plan that can be put in place based on need over a long period of time.

I think that access onto the A134 straight from the proposed development would be the best option. The existing road network is already in place and the local residential areas should of Mile End, Defoe Crescent, Mill Road and Bergholt Road cannot cope with additional traffic including the works traffic.

One access to and from the development is poorly planned. Access should be off the A12 on the opposite side of the development, NOT into a small residential street/area.

This is a real opportunity to create a proper network of cycle paths that could be used as a show case for other areas. Colchester used to be the Capital of England, it would be good if we show the rest of the country how to encourage cycling and healthy living. The Dutch approach of separating Motor Vehicles and Bicycles has got to be implemented here. Don't waste this opportunity by focusing time and effort on buses which have proved to be a failed transport solution. We need a network of dedicated un-interrupted cycle paths and a Park and Ride.

There is no doubt that what is essentially a single main access to and from the site is a serious problem. An accident on the spine road could block movement in and out of the site leading to far reaching congestion across north Colchester, extending to the town centre and the A12. I do not believe that the single access, allied to 1,800 homes, is a sustainable concept. For a single access, house numbers must be greatly reduced. Access around the proposed development could be improved by a second main access but it would still need to be north of Fords Lane for want of any viable alternative.

Get rid of the Bergholt Road and Fernlea bus route access points - utterly ridiculous

There has to be, and the local community and their consultants will be pleased to show how.

However no design to meet the objectives can be undertaken on mainly the basis of a sole developer contribution

To the north of Axial Way, a Walk/Cycle Way replacing the pre A12 route of path 69 through Whitehouse Farm. (69 has moved three times). A footway along the full length of Severalls Lane might be an alternative.

Yes. Provide a commuter car park south of the railway line ie land at the Cowdray Centre. The railway bridge needs to be widened with an additional land north and south and land acquired from Wickes to get buses into the town centre. Promote Marks Tey railway station as a parkway station. Significantly improve the capacity of the A133 (east and west) to get traffic away from the railway station and out of the town. Provide a very large increase in cycle storage capacity at the railway station.

I'm fairly content with the access arrangements but would like the council to rigorously enforce the "bus gate" at the Bartholomew Close end as residents in the southern area will no doubt try to flout this rule as they will want to hop in their cars and get out of the nearest exit thereby adding to the Mile End Road traffic once again.

Q8 The Landscape and Open Space section describes a wide range of formal and informal open spaces and recreation spaces, which are shown on the master plan on page 40. Do you consider these appropriate for meeting the needs of future residents as well as improving facilities for existing residents?

I am a member of the golf club and as such will oppose using any of the land currently in the members ownership as will every other member I have spoken to.

Small areas of open space, as the ones planned, rarely improves recreation.

A swimming pool is required.

We like the space we have at the moment. If you don't build any more houses, we won't need any more space. This is just a planning ploy a bit like adopting the church yard at St Michael's to reduce the amount of open space the developers had to provide.

The provision of extra playing field is welcomed

Less dwellings and more open space for the enjoyment of all.

NO NO NO !!! By going ahead with the Chesterwell Wood development you will be depriving us of a very beautiful part of our countryside, the view of which that I enjoy from my home every day. I understand that some open space will be left down by the side of the A12, where no one will want to live. I expect some signs will be erected at the Ford lane junction saying, " This way to the countryside"

A large scale building project such as this planned development is unlikely to retain the existing green areas and open spaces and will cause much disruption to the wildlife and eco balance of the area, while the proposed green areas seem a token gesture to appease local residents I would prefer that some kind of formal agreement is made regarding the status of the existing trees and hedgerows which have been previously found to have a great benefit to the local ecosystem. I would support a lower impact building scheme were all the existing trees and hedgerows are maintained and lower density housing with larger green areas added in to support existing wildlife.

Unless they are well looked after, these areas will become dirty/dangerous places.

The loss of greenspace, can never be compensated by putting some sort of parkland in its place. People deserve to live in a town that respects the landscape it lies in, and not build over area last greenfield it has. If you look at Southend which has done this, and now needs to use land in Rochford District to meet its housing needs. Is this really what we want for Colchester.

This will not meet the needs of existing residents in any way.

Absolutely NOT. Natural open spaces are being completely destroyed to make way for housing development with small patches of grassed areas that do NOT support wildlife or provide attractive areas for residents to walk and enjoy. Artificial landscaped 'spaces' are not an alternative to the lovely natural areas that are already there. A few bits of greenery surrounded by houses with low maintenance shrubs can not be enjoyed by people and would not support the varied eco system that currently exists. Leaving a few established trees because they have a preservation order will do nothing to support the environment and fight pollution like the large forested area currently there.

The site currently hosts a very large area of open space which supports a variety of eco-systems. Any pretence that the new development will enhance or improve this must be a deliberate lie, otherwise it shows the council and members of the planning departments have a

very limited level of intelligence. There is mention of "retaining hedgerows" with the belief that this will retrain wildlife. A hedgerow without the surrounding eco-systems is largely dead, only supporting a few common bird species as they pass. The current level of flora and fauna will be lost forever. This development will produce more artificial and sterile landscaped areas, consisting of grass for the minority of people to kick a ball about on, and low maintenance plants and shrubs which support limited life as they are not native to the area. The only wildlife supported by the development will be the vast increase in vermin which you find around housing estates. Rats will be wonderfully catered for, having nicely manicured footpaths and grass linking the estate. For this the council must be applauded.

Tennis Courts. (Floodlit) By the way, if you put two tennis courts together, you have a football pitch with a hard standing which is ideal in the winter and for 7-a-side. I know you want Mile End to be a football area, so this should help you swallow the tennis court idea. Tennis Courts can also be used for Basketball, Roller Hockey, Netball, Dodgeball..... as it's a hard standing it can be used for a multitude of different sporting activities.

Some concerns on safety, if you have the paths/ cycle ways which are too isolated and in ribbons of green you potentially also have areas where people could be assaulted and no one would be aware. Therefore any such pathways etc should be designed with this in mind, take account of local police input how would they want these to be safe?

A wider range of sport facilities is needed in Mile End. If its good people will use it.

The proposals for open space seem reasonable but residents, present and future, need concrete assurances that all such space is fully accessible to them 24/7.

The more and larger the better

Excellent proposals provided a formal guarantee that the open space will never be allowed to be subject to more development approval is required

As long as they supplement the existing areas of the recreation ground and plying field. Also adequate provision needs to be made for teenagers who need and want a safe place to 'hang out' with friends and to kick a ball about.

If both sides of the A12 with several means of crossing, and possible extensions further in the A12 edges.

Open spaces are always well intentioned at the planning stage but they also need to spaces where especially after dark they do not become areas for youths to congregate and thereby become no-go areas that will also become litter havens. If this happens then the credentials of this development will be hugely undermined as a nice place to live and existing and new residents will only see the negative side of this development.

Q9 An extension to Fords Lane playing fields has been proposed on page 43 as part of the open spaces and recreation space to be provided alongside the proposed development. How do you think this space should be used?

Primary school

To best ensure continued use of the expanded space the council / developers should engage with existing local clubs, those already using Fords Lane and others that may wish to do so. Colchester & East Essex CC are a growing club that needs a second home as we aim to run four teams on a Saturday.

As a playing field but not with hundreds of new dogs fouling it, or cycle paths.

Fords Lane is a borough wide facility and community facilities are better placed in the centre.

Extension to playing fields should be used for team sports to address loss at Woods/Severalls/Royal London.

Skateboard park and facilities for kids and teens.

Should be done anyway .. BUT not linked to new building

Open countryside should stay as it is.

Indoor sporting facilities would be good

As open fields for dog walkers, runners, walkers and off road cyclists just as it is now.

It could be used to provide tennis courts.

For a community centre that includes outdoor activities such as bowls, pitch & putt, archery tennis etc. Somewhere is also needed for a weekly outdoor/indoor market where fresh produce can be purchased.

Perhaps for children to run around on?

I think the additional green space should take a similar usage to Highwoods country park which attempts to be as untouched as possible and encourages as much wildlife as possible,

removing any green land in this area would irrevocably damage the wildlife and ecosystem and this would assist some of the relocation of the wildlife.

It should be left as it is.

I think the extension should go ahead without the building work, as this can only be a good thing for existing residents.

The Recreation ground would need to be substantially increased and not just a token effort as in the plans. You may bluff the odd person. This is not acceptable.

Leave as open fields for people to enjoy. A park for walking and picnics would be pleasant.

Natural areas for people to walk and enjoy their local environment.

The existing playing fields are just that, playing fields. They are regularly littered with fast food rubbish or empty cans of beer, or they are in use at the weekend by football and cricket. Any extension to this field will just involve more impromptu youth gatherings or just more organised football. A radical idea would be to leave it as it is. However, this approach does not give any councillors the smug satisfaction of having their name associated with it, and does not give them the opportunity to attend any free luncheons at the taxpayers expense.

dog walkers / joggers / cyclists

Fords Lane playing fields could be better used.

Community sports facilities increased area for a children's play area, basket ball courts, skateboarding facilities, something to keep the local teenagers busy and occupied.

Partly for leisure, partly for sport, partly for local functions (like fetes), partly for the large community centre, with indoor sport, to be sited near the pavilion (which will require its own open space and generous parking).

New tennis courts and other sports facilities such as grass running track

The playing field extension needs to accommodate a -1500-2000m² sports/leisure/social centre, and associated external works including a bowling green and 6 all weather tennis courts. A 2 ha recreational park eg as upper castle park, adjacent to the social centre is also needed for local residents' full time enjoyment. No more football pitches should be provided on this site, but if more are really needed then changes to all weather surfaces, lighting existing pitches and joint use of school playing fields should be provided

A really exciting children's playground would be great, similar to the one in Highwoods where there can be a mixture of traditional slides, swings etc and rural type climbing equipment. The existing play area is pretty woeful at present.

Q10 The SPD seeks to introduce a Sustainable Urban Drainage System across the whole area and a neighbourhood centre with a green roof, which will reduce the environmental impact of the proposed development as outlined in the Sustainability section and on page 43. What other sustainable construction techniques would you like to see incorporated into the SPD?

Layout and design of buildings should take into consideration that solar PV, solar thermal and passive solar heating works best with a south facing aspect.

Solar panels on all buildings that are south facing

All the current ditches have not been maintained since if was farmed by our family, they will need to be reconstructed, in fact the corner of the playing fields near Borges gardens has in the pass been flooded because the ditches are silted.

By 'green' roof, do you mean solar panels? If so, I am in favour. Otherwise I would prefer a red roof.

You are joking! You can see right now that you have not sorted out existing drainage before you concrete over further drainage routes. I am stunned by the short sightness here.

Solar Energy housing

There should be no mass designs, photo voltaic cells and water butts should be provided.

Area is susceptible to shrinkage and heave – water courses and wells should be re-instated.

The most sustainable option is to build elsewhere on brownfield land rather than green fields.

Could the large open spaces be used for the ground coils for heat pump heating for some of the buildings?

Small scale developments are more environmentally sustainable.

By cutting down trees and concreting over the land you will be removing the natural lungs of the Earth.

Minimal use of cement and other non porous building material reducing run off and allowing water to return to the ecosystem. Reduced use of large plant to conduct the building works

reducing the disruption to the local residents and the local wildlife. Increased use of eco friendly building materials and provision for solar panels to allow residents to utilise ecofriendly techniques where possible. Low Density Housing reducing the impact on the environment
What a load of rubbish!!! The only way to reduce the environmental impact is not to build any more houses. More houses will bring more waste, more pollution, more usage of gas, electricity, water, not to mention the destruction of trees, plants and animal habitats.

I am a cynic and this question would suggest that Essex County Council cares? Is there not general direction on such developments from Government?

Giving a building a green roof is a lamentable and patronising nod towards 'sustainability'. You can not reduce the environmental impact of destroying a large area of natural countryside forever, and any claim to do so shows the willingness of the council to lie and mislead in the pursuit of pleasing local property developers, pandering to your government overloads in the hope of furthering careers, and the greedy expectation of more council tax rolling in. The "Code for Sustainable Homes" only pays lip service to ecology, and in fact states that there are "no minimum standards" for the pollution, health and well-being and ecology impacts of a development. It is just another piece of paper to be waved about in celebration once more of our natural landscape has been destroyed.

Where are these drains going to filter into? At the moment a lot of the ditches around the recreational ground feed the pond at the southern side of Braiswick Farm. If you tarmac over all the arable fields this will mean that the water will be re-directed/ distributed? Where is it going to be re-directed? Has the capacity of the pond been taken into consideration?

local materials

Green roofs on all public buildings (e.g. schools etc.) Ground sourced heating for the public buildings, solar panels etc. Do not permit CHP heating schemes which use pelleted biomass in the affordable flats, for the following reasons 1) you have to truck the biomass in which cancels the green savings, secondly the occupants rarely keep it up and resort to normal gas/electric. Potentially fit solar panels to the roofs of these buildings so that occupants gain environmentally in his way.

Natural rainwater recycling for all houses

Neighbourhood center with green roof will have no effect on sustainability whatsoever and is a ridiculous suggestion. The roof of a 1500-2000 m2 centre needs to be SE to SW orientated and capable of being fully covered with PV panels. the SUDS drainage proposals are fine but only up to a point in that 1 SUDS will not accommodate the known flooding which regularly occurs in the south of the site, and this the driest part of the UK needs extensive water harvesting/ storage/ dams to maintain the beautiful landscape and urban trees and spaces in times of drought(Like the last 3 years)

I think all new buildings should have proper cavity wall and loft insulation plus solar panels for water heating. Also power for the shopping areas could be provided by wind turbines.

Yes

I'm not an expert in this area but obvious things like solar panels would be something to incorporate into new dwellings. From an aesthetic point then cheap renderings on houses really should be avoided and solid traditional red brick would give a real sense of stability and quality. Building houses that will stand the test of time is where true sustainability prevails.

Q11 The SPD on page 45 outlines three areas where a variety of facilities will be provided for community development. These areas, referred to as community hubs in the SPD, will include shops, sport and leisure facilities. Are these hubs sufficient and in the most appropriate locations?

Scale and locations of community facilities looks OK but it is essential that the implemented facilities have a plan to ensure ongoing usage and, I believe, the best way to achieve this is through community ownership. Please engage with community groups that might be interested in developing and running facilities for the benefit of the wider community.

Let's not make it like Hawthorne avenue though

Can't find the locations.

Community Hub should include GP and post office.

Ample parking and secure cycle storage around these "community hubs" is essential. Without this use of the hubs will be restricted.

We don't need shops, this will just increase traffic flows. You can't let the ones in the town centre and the ones in Myland have gradually closed down and, yet again, been redeveloped

for yet more housing.

Mile End already has a community hub, so do not need more to only justify a large scale development.

If we need another school then build it, it should not be dependent on further houses.

The proposed building community facilities in the south may be better placed closer to Braiswick which currently benefits from no local shopping area. The development should try and focus on the improvement of existing facilities prior to the provision of new services. There seems to be no detail how existing services will be encouraged to grow and develop only that new services will be provided. There was no provision of services in the large Braiswick development which is further from the nearest shops / services where in Mile End there are already utilised and popular services which shows that the planning has not researched / considered the use of current services / amenities prior til planning for new ones.

Earlier in this document, there is suggestion that this 'new community' will integrate with the existing community. How will this happen if these new houses have their own facilities, there will be no need for integration, as you will be building things that already exist in and around Mile End.

Shops are likely to fail, as most people will be drawn to Asda and Tescos.

Neighbourhood shops for the local kids to hang out, because they have nowhere better to go.

As usual, the council 'promises' facilities with no concrete and firm commitment. We have seen in other local developments, that any promise of local or wider infra-structure improvements never occur, and are only mentioned to sweeten the bitter pill rammed down the local residents throats. As can be seen in Nayland Road, local facilities are usually over priced with a poorly limited stock and therefore underused. They are the preferred hang out for local youths resulting in general anti-social behaviour. Most people do not use them, preferring instead to DRIVE (IN THEIR CARS) to the nearest supermarket, a task which will be made all the more difficult by your inept and retarded transport strategy.

plans not clear enough for me to comment on this matter, neither were the plans proposed by Mersea Homes/ Countryside Properties. As a small business owner there is a lack of affordable shop frontage available so I would encourage more development of this.

It appears the southern local centre is the church? - is it intended to enhance this as a local centre with more facilities or to keep it as it is? - we would like some clarification on this and how it would affect local residents

It would be nice if they provided decent quality services rather than just the usual newsagents and take-away.

I am sure the shops will remain empty much like the ones on the Hythe development did until the rents and rates are made realistic.

A retail and meeting area is need in the north. A large community centre is badly needed near the pavilion at Fords Lane playing fields and a smaller community facility is required in the south.

Fully support this approach

Northern Hub is far too big and a major commercial threat to other local businesses in the area.

It is also too far to walk to from the neighbouring catchment area, including south Chesterwell.

It should be smaller and a retail impact assessment for the whole ward must be agreed before giving permission to this HUB. The southern convenience stores and personal services Hub is essential There is nothing in the SPD which makes more than a passing comment about sports, leisure and social facilities, a ward wide assessment and agreement with the communities must be undertaken

It may be providing they decrease the need to travel into town and under that bridge YES to provision : Don't know to locations We would not like to see any 'out of town' shopping centres/facilities/provisions. Small/local shops being the most appropriate to support sport/leisure/community requirements

They will detract from the heart of Myland and destroy the existing community feeling.

These facilities are welcomed.

Communities are built on people not buildings but if buildings where local people can shop, like the thriving Co-Op on Nayland Road can be recreated then as long as people respect and value them and use them then I'm in favour – time will tell whether these hubs are a success.

Q12. A primary and secondary school are proposed as part of the development on page 47. Are these facilities appropriate and in the right locations?

I really want to send my children to Myland school which is why I moved here. Not a new school with new teachers. Prefer at queen b is not good for this reason

Not sure how many schools are needed. Obviously they need to be where people live.

We have been promised schools in the past.

Land opposite Myland Primary school should have been bought for an extension rather than letting favoured developers build yet more housing. Myland school is already desperately overcrowded. Don't build more schools until transport issues resolved and, if you are going to build more schools we also need more doctor's surgeries, churches, etc as these are all becoming impossible to get into.

To determine school provision you need to look at population census statistics including the age profile of the various residential areas around the new development.

Such a large development requires additional provision of educational centres. To not include these in a plan would place increased pressure on already overfilled schools.

A primary and secondary school are desperately needed now to allow for existing residents to send their children to a local school, as they are all pretty much full. However, if the school is built along with 1800 houses, it will only serve those houses, which is a nonsense. I don't understand how Mile End can possibly expand any more when the basic facilities like schools and small shops are so lacking already. Any new houses will just make this situation worse not better.

It would be ridiculous to build 2000 houses and NOT include a primary and secondary school. Exactly how is the development of houses suppose to be supported?? Mersea Homes has no real interest in this area as this does not make enough money for them. I have also heard that St Helena would be closed and pupils moved to this proposed new school. A bad idea in that it means the new development is not supported by required infrastructure and will direct more traffic from outside the area into the new development causing even more traffic problems Location wise, the less distance the kids have to travel = less pollution, less congestion and a greater community feel. Kids need dedicated playing fields, it would be wrong to build these schools without providing adequate dedicated playing fields.

No secondary school location seems to be proposed so obviously it is a concern.

Yes fully support.

Primary facilities in North Colchester are insufficient and more places are urgently needed. I hope the school is built in advance of the properties otherwise the current situation would be exacerbated. As for secondary education more places are needed but it may be better to improve and extend the existing schools.

Q13 The proposed development will deliver approximately 1800 homes, most of which will be houses with up to 10% flats in locations above shops for example. Do you support this approach?

No more flats. Too many end up having foreigners and council tenants and there's tons in Colchester that cant be sold. We took a year to sell ours at the station and lost £45k. Partly recession and partly fact there was too much choice and newer ones with fancy kitchens etc. Shouldn't build more until existing ones are sold. Older properties and communities will suffer due to people preferring newer and more attractive properties due to greed

Would recommend 1500 max.

Should be none.

This development can only be described as "over development"

It depends on the density of the flats.

No more homes should be built until Northfields, Severall's and other developments are completed.

This area would most benefit from low density housing.

Flats above shops always end up looking tatty, even in a nice area like St Johns. Colchester already has too many flats.

Even the least intelligent members of the council must realise that 1800 homes will have at least 3000 cars, irrespective how you twist 20 year old census statistics or mislead people with utopian claims of public transport. As can be seen on the Northern Approach development, restricting the number of spaces per home just means people line the streets with cars, often parking on pavements because the roads are too narrow. This creates hazards for pedestrians and makes the life of residents worse. Shops and facilities cause a gridlock of cars too, as can be seen in Nayland Road by the Co-Op and Chip shop. I'm sure the

residents of the flats above the shops will be delighted that their daily lives are blighted with the constant drone of cars and vans coming and going.

Flats above shops doesn't work. Who wants to live above an abandoned boarded up shop?

Please just make sure it is never more than 1800

Although I think flats above shops are a good idea in principle, there seems to be an abundance of flats in Mile End already.

But only if these are supported by jobs/employment locally in Colchester rather than allowing this to be a commuter zone - using rail or A12 links.

Family homes would be most appropriate.

Flats really must be minimal and their height restricted to three stories(including shop level) at most. Please make sure that any building of flats is kept out of existing residents views at all costs as they are generally hideous to look at, whatever the design on the developers page.

Q14 The proposed development will incorporate a variety of building heights with the majority being 2 and 3 storeys as seen on page 48. Do you think this is the best approach? If not, please detail what you would change in relation to building heights?

Would be even better to limit all to 2 storey.

3 storeys just reduce natural light and privacy even further.

More bungalows should be provided

Low density and low rooflines.

IF you take the time to look you will see that I live in Nayland Court opposite Cants Rose fields. The view from my window is very beautiful as it is for my neighbours, approx` 20+ who live in the court. We are all devastated to read of your proposals to deprive us of our wonderful view and build houses directly opposite us. Not only will it mean that we will be deprived of the view of the landscape ,we all love, we will forever be deprived of our wonderful sunsets we enjoy together with thousands of other people who pass this way. Any one who moves in directly opposite us will be resented. They will not be welcomed and will be neighbours forced on us by you. They will know that they are not welcome, not their fault but yours and they will know it. You will be depriving us of our visual amenities !!!

Low level housing, this would not disrupt the tree line that is currently in existence allowing current and future residents to enjoy a better view than high rise buildings, especially on the hilly areas where additional height would be amplified.

As a resident of Braiswick Farm, I object strongly to any three story buildings being built around the farm, this building has been in a rural setting since its construction in the 15th Century not 17th/ 18th as stated in Council reports. The land that encompasses the farm should not be over looked. Single story properties would be preferable and popular.

Keep the building heights to no more than 3 storeys and do not allow 4-storey buildings of any type.

I know developers love the 'Townhouse' style building because of the plot size to square footage. In my opinion they are imposing and create an overlooked environment for all the neighbours concerned. St Johns is a nice looking 2 storey development. Maybe throw in a few bungalows....

Providing they are single homes and not flats.

Building height should be restricted to two storeys. This is in keeping with the majority of existing buildings.

Q15 It may be possible to include an element of self build housing in the scheme as outlined on page 60. Do you think this is a good idea?

I would definitely be interested in taking up such an option.

Although doubt its practical

Why? The fewer houses the better.

Strongly recommend. Self build will develop a community spirit long before any development has been completed and this lives on!

This will just end up looking a mess of different styles all with too big a footprint for the land.

More details need to be provided to show type of builds.

As a self builder who built the property in which we live, I fully support the provision of self build housing in the scheme. The most difficult area for self builders is finding a plot to build on, and the organisation and funding of the project. It is often said that the actual building is the easy bit

- the difficult bit is getting to a point where you can lay the first brick. Therefore, please include some plots, as for many people it is the only way they are able to afford a reasonable property. Self builders also generally build properties which are "greener" and better insulated than builders.

More space should be allocated for small or individual developments.

Self build housing would encourage a range of housing styles that would reflect the Mile End and Braiswick area which have had a number of building styles.

It could be, but again, money will talk, so who will this benefit in the longrun? I doubt it will be of interest to existing residents, and if someone has that much money, why would they want to live here where it takes them hours to get anywhere because of the traffic, which is only going to get worse if this development goes ahead.

It will create a piecemeal estate, with no overall style where they are located. What if the self builder runs out of funds, what a mess, from beautiful countryside to half finished slums.

A small amount of housing could be sustained.

By proposing this the council has shown little regard for residents.

Excellent Idea! Welshwood Park is a success. It should have been copied many times over.

Mersea Homes make good buildings but so can anyone if they have the motivation and opportunity. Self Build Housing is a great idea! How are you going to stop the big developers buying all the plots?

Would like clarification on what this involves and how the quality, style and timing is controlled - does this become a continuous building site? difficult to see but presumably access is not from Braiswick Lane?

Only if they are given a specific schedule in which the houses have to be built otherwise, based on personal experience you could have an area which is a building site for years whilst the inhabitants struggle to build the houses.

It would be best to give firm undertakings now about the size and locations for self-build areas. One hectare is much too small.

Designs need to be appropriate.

The self build area is far too small and in the wrong place as it is too highly prominent. Self build has by its very nature has to be less dense than developer building, can take a very long time to complete so a site 2 to 3 times the area in the north west of the development would be better. The high demand for plots of land in the UK would lead to an excellent situation of getting housing starts going much more quickly

Provided guidelines are implemented regarding the external look and feel of properties to ensure some consistency and quality.

Very supportive of this proposal.

Q16 What would you do differently with the plan you have seen today and is there anything we have missed?

Against all development

No houses/flats or shops or any development can't you leave greenland alone.

Cycle paths are daft, they cannot exit through Braiswick Lane, Studds Lane or over the A12.

The note on the Bruff Close gyratory says it replaces the North Station junction. In most cases you'd have to do through the junction to get to Bruff Close. I'd take most of the traffic lights away and let the roundabout be a roundabout again. It would hardly have to be changed. The bus lanes do not need to be 24hours!!! Remove bus lane between Essex Hall roundabout and the Albert roundabout altogether to help the traffic flow at Essex Hall, but if we must have it, traffic wanting to turn left at the Albert into Cowdray Avenue should be able to use it, at least outside of the rush hour. Although it could be argued that it would be more useful to use it during rush hour. Seriously, traffic that does not want to turn left would have no reason to use that route unless there was congestion at the Westway roundabout and in that eventuality, using it would ease congestion for everyone. Alternatively, making it a bus lane only at rush hour would be a sensible compromise. The rest of the time the buses wouldn't be held up to any degree. The North Station roundabout is a particular nightmare when a London train has recently arrived. With the combination of the traffic lights and the yellow boxes you can sit through 3 or 4 changes of lights before being able to get out of Mile End Road! Even to turn left into the Northern Approach Road, because of the bus lane, which could be dangerous if a bus comes along on the left of you when you are about to turn left across its path!

Despite the concerns raised by hundreds of local residents and their representatives the

Council is still failing to listen to the two key issues. Why is there any need for an additional 1800 homes in North Colchester. The existing transport infrastructure is woefully insufficient to handle the existing levels of traffic and promised transport developments used to justify existing developments have still not been implemented

North Station Bridge is the biggest local issue that will only get worse. A priority must be to provide an alternative route over/under North Station.

The agricultural land should be retained as we will need as much food production in the future to feed a larger population.

I believe we should do all we sensibly can to keep traffic away from the N Station Gyratory.

The Bergholt Road is hard hit in this regard because those travelling east and north along it for trips out of Colchester are forced to go towards N Station. An opportunity now clearly exists to create a new strategic route by converting the Tufnell Way/Bergholt Road junction into a cross-roads with a new link heading north through the new development to, say, Mill Road - and hence A12 Junction 28 via the new extension of the NAR. The Tufnell Way/Bergholt Road junction might then be better served by a mini roundabout as opposed to the traffic lights mentioned in item 3.1.1. The cost of purchasing and demolishing properties to facilitate the new road would be minimal and they could be re-provisioned alongside the new road(s).

I would increase the green areas and maintain ALL the existing trees / hedgerows / wooded areas that are currently in existence. I would increase the availability of low density housing as the current provision of flats in the Colchester area are not selling so there are too many flats in the area. I would deal with existing transport issues prior to building any further housing and putting additional pressure on the existing road network. I would focus on encouraging growth of existing services rather than provision of new services as there are a number of small and independent retailers / shops that would suffer from an increased competition where they are currently struggling to survive against the larger out of town stores.

Object very strongly to Braiswick lane being intersected by the proposed bus lane. The buses entering the northern section of Chesterwell should enter at Fords lane and have a circular route around the development. Buses entering the southern development should access through Bartholomew Court. Why is there no Park and Ride Colchester? There should be a Park and Ride at Cants Rose Farm and have access to town and station by using the dedicated bus route set to run along the northern approach road. It would ease congestion around North Station and also give shops in town more footfall. Without as many cars going into town you can create the inner town pedestrian zone idea which would make the town centre a more pleasant place to shop and visit.

Improve the roundabout and approaches to North Station. Perhaps a road access to the car park from Braiswick and an increased car parking capacity.

Footbridge over the A12 completing the footpath shown on your map intersecting the A12. The developer needs to be forced to do this. Remove the traffic lights on the south side of the railway bridge and build a footbridge for pedestrians thus improving vehicle flow and keeping people off the roads.

Get rid of bus lanes onto Bergholt Road and Fernlea and get rid of Traffic lights at Tufnell Way as proposed. Transport document is complete and utter crap and will not work. This development is therefore not sustainable. The transport needs a new entrance and exit at North Station through the Cowdray centre.

Make another major access/ egress into the site an Braiswick Lane/Mile End Rd. Relocate primary school to centre of site. Make links to and from adjacent neighbourhoods much more people friendly. Assess the impact of the development on all the adjacent neighbourhoods in terms of transport and facilities, existing businesses. Undertake alongside this SPD process a neighbourhood plan for the ward which will properly address shortcomings and negative consequences on all Mile End residents as a result of the 5000 dwellings + development on the area

Public Rights of Way base-data is a little out of date. Paths 69 & 71 are not as shown on the plans. The A12 is a barrier to all movements and needs to be made more permeable - take a look at the plan with a mile more land showing across the northern edge and it looks very different.

Obviously I'm dead against this whole plan in the first place as green land is so rare these days. That said if it does go ahead then make it something we can all take pride in and something that adds real beauty and value to the area. This development is a reflection of the council as well as the developers and if does not deliver its green credential then you have let yourselves and the whole community down(again). I don't want my children to grow up looking

at yet another eyesore of bad planning and poor design/building. Make this work for once !
The local opposition seems to have been missed

Q17 Do you have any further comments on the proposed development outlined in the SPD and the approach the Council has taken during its production?

The design is generally quite good and the council appear to have made good efforts to engage with local people over a long period. However, the initial assumption that Colchester needs more housing seems to be flawed. The area has experienced enormous growth in a short space of time and is feeling the pain in some respects (schools, community facilities, etc). All growth must come to an end somewhere and I believe that the recently commenced development at Severalls should be the last in North Colchester.

Where are all these people coming from? Elsewhere me thinks

My family will leave Myland.

No further work should take place with regards to the NGAUE until the developments already approved have been completed and improvements made to the transport infrastructure.

Getting people to respond to proposal without giving adequate opportunity to express that no building is actually supported is a highly misleading action of a survey, used to infer that there is more support than there really is. This is highly misleading and matter will be pursued further at appropriate stage ... this survey is not valid at all.

Generally the consultation has been good, however, most residents feel it is "consultation" for the sake of it. Few believe the concerns expressed by residents will be taken very seriously. We have seen the issues CBC created when they built the Stadium where they ignored residents concerns and now 4 years after the stadium opened residents are still affected by road closures on match days and neither CBC or ECC care about it or take positive steps to address the issues.

Yes - this is not a consultation; it is informing us that the development is going ahead presumably because the Council are given money by Central Government for every new house they build. The council seem to keep granting permission for more and more houses which is simply ruining the town. Why don't you try and let/sell all the empty homes before you build more.

There is a misconception that when the new Northern Approach link is complete it will solve the traffic problem in Mill Road. It does not take a genius to work out the vast percentage of this traffic is local and therefore will remain especially as work has now started on yet another development a few hundred yards from Squirrels Field

I agree with our elected MP, Sir Bob Russell, Anne Turrell, The whole of Mile End community council. some of the LDF and 99% of Mile End and Bergholt residents which you have the audacity to ignore. That this development should not go ahead.

This area and Highwoods Country Park represent the only substantial green areas left in the Colchester Town area, these provide immeasurable support to the local wildlife and destroying this wildlife rich area should not be taken lightly. Also the imposition of a large number of houses / residents in this area will remove the sense of community that is currently felt in the Mile End area as the area will become more like a small town in feel which is not what the community would benefit from.

There must be option route for North Colchester people wanting to go into Colchester or get to the A12, other than the current route under North Station Bridge. To make it easier to reach the A12 it would be far simpler to open Axial for its full extent from Boxted Road which could be closed during football matches to allow easy pedestrian access into and away from the Stadium. The traffic going under North Station Bridge is very bad and will only get worse if alternative access routes are not provided.

This questionnaire is very much loaded in the favour of the County Council and the developer and as such has little credibility. I am not opposed to progress, however, this development will destroy an already diluted community. My assumption would be that it will overwhelm the traffic system and add at least 20 mins to my 45 min journey home from work.

A suggestion has been made to put a foot bridge across the A12. This should proceed as this would at least give some access to some natural countryside if this development destroys the countryside on this side of the A12.

From the very beginning the council has lied to and mislead the local residents and all others involved with facts and figures based upon outdated census information to back your proposal. You have mislead with vacuous arguments regarding transport and infrastructure. You have shown that you do not care about the local residents, their opinions or their quality of life. You

have taken every step required, such as this consultation, purely as a box ticking exercise, a hurdle you have to get over, before you can greedily destroy one of the only areas of natural countryside left in Mile End. You have shown yourselves to be underhand, greedy and deceitful. In fact, completing this form has been a massive waste of everyone's time because minds have already been made up on this. The complaints of residents, the people who pay your wages, are just considered to be an irritating background noise to you. It is shameful that you can claim to represent us when you clearly only represent yourselves and the property developers who pull your strings.

A number of queries primarily concerning the Boxted Road. Firstly where is access to the current residential areas going to be? Primarily those at the lower end of the Boxted Road close to the current A134/Nayland Road Roundabout? The development plans show the Boxted Road being chopped in half approximately half way between the aforementioned roundabout and the A12 bridge crossing is this correct. In which case how do we access the football stadium? One final point how long will it take the County Council to adopt all of these new highways, as I do not believe they have yet adopted either Whitebeam or Walnut Drive which have been built for at least 5 or more years?

The draft SPD contains inadequate commitments about necessary facilities - community centre, A12 footbridge etc. The site backing on to houses in Mile End Road (roughly from no. 275 northwards) is up to one and a half meters higher than the residents' gardens. I note that new homes on the site will back on to the Mile End Rd houses, presumably back garden to back garden, but even so there could be a strong element of overlooking. I request single storey homes in this immediate area.

The spatial planning team has to be congratulated on presenting a much better thought through masterplan and SPD than that of 2010. The renewable energy and maintenance requirements for the long term needs of this site should attract an equal amount of attention at this time, as procurement and space to undertake these functions needs to be incorporated into the masterplan

I fail to understand why the real issue - that of the problems caused by the railway bridge are not confronted head on. I attended the consultation exercise held at Myland Parish Hall where the problem -the bridge- was so obvious as was the fact that the plans had been drawn up by people with little day to day knowledge of the area. I left the consultation with my main question unanswered; the developments planned for this area of Colchester, including the Severalls site will mean at least 3,000 new homes which means at least 3,000 more cars. Where is this traffic going to go? To say most of the traffic is heading for the A12 does not account for the fact that in school holidays the North Station problems are virtually non-existent indicating that most of the traffic is heading into town.

Why are there no plans for additional doctors' surgeries? I have to wait for weeks for an appointment with Mill Road Surgery as it is, due to the surge in population over the last few years.

Ensure heavy works vehicles use wheel cleaners.

Water supply may be inadequate.

Supporting studies not done – not convinced development is necessary.

I would like to know that the senior management of the Highways Agency (who manage the A12 Trunk Road) are aware of the development proposed, that vehicular access is at the top of Sudbury Road and what impact this will have upon the capacity of the A12.

My parents garden (only 20ft deep) backs straight on to the development. Their house will be blighted by this development - they will be completely overlooked and lose all their privacy.

The Council allowed large 2-3 storey houses to be built right opposite them at the front.

Acoustic barrier required to A12 to prevent noise pollution – developer should fund.

Provision of footbridge over A12 should be pre-requisite, funded by developer.

Would be good to retain open space that is visible from town centre.

CoBRA would not like to see removal of any parking incentives in the town centre as this may discourage people visiting the town.

General Response

- A TPO exists on the site and removal of trees will be minimised. Chesterwell Wood will be retained.

- The principle of the development has already been agreed.
- Open space will be provided throughout the development.
- Existing footpaths will be looked at carefully and consultation will take place before any changes are made.
- Design of individual dwellings and relationship to existing properties will be looked at as part of planning application process.
- Changes proposed at North Station are designed to assist traffic flow
- The PCT have been involved and continue to discuss requirements in the area.
- Anglian Water has been consulted at all stages of plan preparation.
- Vast evidence base has been produced and subject to independent examination.
- Development will be low density when compared to other new development and will meet car parking standards.
- Community Hub is expected to primarily serve the development and passing trade. It should compliment the existing centre.
- Further details will become available through planning application process.
- Conditions can be attached to planning permission controlling construction practices.
- Insufficient land for further new junction onto A12 and not desirable.
- The Travel Strategy is not set in stone and comments will be useful to inform further detailed work.
- Retail impact assessment will be needed if retail proposals exceed government limitations.
- Flats make up less than 20% of boroughs housing stock and serve a useful purpose for some households.
- Views into and out of the site will need to be considered as part of the determination of the planning application.
- The legal rights to use Braiswick Lane will be protected.
- Developer contributions will be assessed and secured through planning application, based on adopted policies.
- New car parking standards will help ensure cars do not block roads and footpaths.
- Council is not aware of 1200 vacant 2 bedroomed flats.
- The reference to “North Station Road Bus Lane in both directions” applies to the section between the Albert Roundabout and Essex Hall Roundabout. The draft strategy proposes that vehicle access for residents and businesses is maintained in this section. The draft strategy does not propose changes to the section of North Station Road between the Albert Roundabout and Middleborough. Residential and access will be maintained.
- Consultants looked at how the North Colchester area could be best served by public transport (and other transport) in the future considering new and existing development. The draft strategy considers how existing communities may also be able to benefit as well as the new ones.
- Bus access to Bergholt Road via Beauty at Bay will not be included in the final master plan.
- If services are to be provided in this area traffic lights are proposed to give buses priority – further detail assessment would be required
- If any options are taken forward we would seek to maintain access for residents along the track.

- Fernlea link – it is not essential to the strategy but does bring buses closer to another community, and is part of the overall approach to improve access to the public transport and help address congestion.
-

Appendices

1) Copy of Press Notice

2) Sustainability Appraisal Response to MCC

3) List of Respondents

Appendix 1

COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL

**NOTICE OF CONSULTATION ON COLCHESTER'S
DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS
UNDER REGULATION 17 OF THE TOWN & COUNTRY
PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2004 (AS AMENDED)**

Colchester Borough Council has prepared a consultation draft for two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

1. The draft North Colchester Urban Extension SPD provides guidance on the future development of land in Mile End, Colchester. The document will be used to help determine any planning application for the site. The consultation period will run from 20 January – 17 February 2012.
2. The draft Street Services SPD provides guidance for those involved in development in Colchester and sets the case for incorporating street services facilities and infrastructure within new development. The consultation period will run from 13 February – 12 March 2012.

Copies of both documents will be available for inspection during the above periods at the following locations during normal opening hours:

- Colchester Borough Council Customer Service Centre, High Street, Colchester.
- Colchester Central Library, Trinity Square, Colchester.

Copies of all consultation material can also be downloaded from www.colchester.gov.uk

Representations on both documents should be made online or by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk. Further information can be obtained from the Spatial Policy team on (01206) 282476/3 or planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

Colchester



Colchester Borough Council www.colchester.gov.uk

75

Colchester Borough Council's response to Myland Community Council's representation to the Sustainability Appraisal of the North Colchester Growth Area Urban Extension Supplementary Planning Document

Myland Community Council's (MCC's) representation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the North Colchester Growth Area Urban Extension Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that MCC's views are: "based on the need for the site to be sustainable from the point of view of earning its place in the CBC Core Strategy and related Site Allocations DPD and also sustainable within its own right based on its development design."

As stated in the SA Report government guidance on SAs for SPDs recognises that in most cases SAs will draw considerably from SA work undertaken for higher level plans and the need for new work may be limited. Considerable SA work as part of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs has looked at the likely impacts of the development of the North Colchester Growth Area Urban Extension compared to other options. The SPD sits in a hierarchy and must be in conformity with adopted DPDs. It would be inappropriate and unnecessary to repeat sustainability considerations in regards to the principle of the development of this site. The SA therefore does not focus on the site being sustainable from the point of view of 'earning its place' in the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs. It instead focuses on appraising the sustainability of the detailed site information included in the draft SPD. Indeed the appraisal of the 'no plan' option in the SA Report assumes that the site will be developed; the no plan option is having no SPD, not no development.

MCC has made comments in relation to each of the nine sustainability objectives, which are listed in the table below together with a response. However, the above explanation of the context of the SA is the key response to MCC's representation.

SA Objective	MCC comments	CBC response
Objective 1 To ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent and affordable home.	The affordable housing ratio for the site is 35% and outline proposals suggest a housing mix that should meet affordability and other criteria requirements across the spectrum of a community's housing needs. Design standards should ensure quality requirements are met as should Council policies and standards on sustainable homes. MCC would maintain its argument made in its paper <i>A Stark Reality</i> that there is no current demonstrable evidence that original employment growth/housing demand correlations remain sound. Nor has any alternative evidence source been	The comment about design standards and sustainable homes is agreed with and is reflected in the SA. Other comments made in relation to this objective relate to the principle of the allocation.

	provided.	
<p>Objective 2 To ensure that development is located sustainably and makes efficient use of land.</p>	<p>The CBC Core Strategy clearly defines the bedrock of regeneration as assumed employment growth feeding correlated housing demand. The first criterion asks if the development will promote regeneration. In doing so it reverses the Core Strategy principle. The development is itself being built on green-field land and there is no suggestion that in doing so it will reduce the risk of other green-field sites being built on. The proposed design in the SPD is careful to consider people's access needs within the overall site but the evaluation commentary provided suggests the site will provide good access to the town centre. This aspect is currently in serious doubt until a demonstrably workable travel strategy has been produced and agreed. The southern area of the site is prone to flooding issues. The development itself will exacerbate these and as this will need to be resolved prior to construction it can be argued that existing flooding problems would also be catered for. Design proposals suggest an efficient use of the land in meeting the multi-requirements of such a large development.</p>	<p>The SA comments that the site provides opportunities to improve transport connections that will support the North Colchester Regeneration Area. This SPD is in conformity with the Core Strategy and does not reverse any of its principles. The SA acknowledges that there will be a significant negative impact on the sub-objective 'will it reduce the need for development on greenfield land'. The SA comments that the site will provide good access to the Town Centre reflecting the requirement in the SPD that bus routes through the site to the Town Centre and pedestrian/cycle routes linking to existing Town Centre routes will be provided. The SA comments that the SPD requires SuDS to be integrated throughout development, which will reduce the risk of flooding and that as a greenfield site the use of SuDS is essential.</p>
<p>Objective 3 To achieve a prosperous and sustainable economy and improve the vitality of town centres.</p>	<p>The proposed facilities will provide new jobs but not as a bedrock for the overall housing numbers. Nor will the jobs created on-site be particularly in the higher-wage bracket. The SPD does not offer any commentary on generating small/micro businesses or any particular drive towards home-working. MCC's comments under Objective 2 above are equally applicable here concerning demonstrable employment growth and MCC is concerned that unless a viable travel strategy is produced, the development of this site, together with others, most notably Severalls may have an impact on the town's vitality and viability due to traffic congestion issues. A number of the criteria are not applicable to this site.</p>	<p>The SA comments that in addition to the creation of jobs as part of the development of the site future residents will have good access to jobs owing to the close proximity of the North Colchester Strategic Employment Zone and connections to the Town Centre. The SA does not comment on small/micro businesses and home working as this is not referred to in the SPD.</p>
<p>Objective 4 To achieve more sustainable travel behaviour and reduce the need to travel.</p>	<p>The site will not itself reduce the need to travel. This is dependent upon other factors such as local employment growth and employment location. Any sustainable travel strategies will require significant modal shift away from private car usage. The current North Colchester Travel Strategy uses out of date data and omits any traffic volume modelling to assess different scenarios on traffic flows and</p>	<p>The SA comments that the Accessibility Study carried out as part of the SA of the Core Strategy reported that the average distance from this site to key facilities is 2.1km; the Inspectors report into the Core Strategy recognised that north Colchester has a higher level of travel to work by non-car modes than other areas of the town and accessibility is potentially very good; and the SPD requires the development</p>

	<p>congestion points. The Strategy itself admits its proposals will introduce new problems in certain locations further down the line. The Strategy proposals also evidence the far-reaching repercussions of developing both Severalls and Chesterwell sites as changes reach south to the very door-step of the town centre. Similarly, the extent of the impact needs to embrace outlying parishes and villages that need to traverse north Colchester. There is little evidence of this consideration. It has to be acknowledged, however, that on-site travel plans centre upon public transport, cycle and foot paths as the main means of travel. The SPD cannot be progressed or properly assessed in the absence of a meaningful and robust travel strategy.</p>	<p>of a layout and spatial arrangement that maximises the potential for modal shift. Comments about the North Colchester Travel Strategy are addressed elsewhere.</p>
<p>Objective 5 To improve the education, skills and health of the Borough's population.</p>	<p>It has to be assumed that primary and secondary education within the site will provide appropriate access to education and this would endeavour to cater for vocational training. This, however, is a matter for education providers and not for the site per se. It is noted that three of the assessment criteria are not applicable or the site has a nil impact. Facilities for the community are embedded within the design proposals and are expected to be core to the development so that Myland's shortfall in this area can be re-balanced. MCC would argue that the site, as it stands, provides equitable access on health and recreation grounds and development of it actually diminishes these aspects of the criteria. Additionally and most importantly the narrative of this Sustainability Appraisal admits that no data is held on air quality levels for north Colchester. MCC would argue that development of the site can only worsen current air quality levels whatever those may be.</p>	<p>The existing site is private land and so it cannot be argued that the development of the site will diminish equitable access to health and recreation facilities. The existing population have access to the footpaths throughout the site and sports pitches and they will continue to do so when the site is developed. The SA recognises that environmental quality (which includes air quality) will be adversely affected.</p>
<p>Objective 6 To create safe and attractive public spaces and reduce crime.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the SPD contains reference to the need for safe design standards to be adopted for crime prevention reasons. It is also recognised that the SPD proposes a good proportion of public spaces with attractive design features in mind. It is noted that the Appraisal scoring system gives plus points on the questions of reducing crime and the fear of crime. This is slanted scoring as there is no crime currently as the site is green-field and Myland as a whole does not register as having any crime issues.</p>	<p>The SA comments that environmental factors have an impact on the perception of and actual crime and that open spaces, well maintained foliage, good lighting, etc will help reduce the incidence and fear of crime. However, it is accepted that at present as a greenfield site there is unlikely to be any crime.</p>
<p>Objective 7</p>	<p>The site in question provides a unique rural/agricultural</p>	<p>The SA acknowledges that there will be a negative impact on</p>

<p>To conserve and enhance the townscape character, historic environment and cultural assets of the Borough.</p>	<p>aspect which offers characteristics different from plain open grassland such as recreation fields or managed parkland such as High Woods Country Park. As a consequence it offers the community a different, more natural type of open space. It also offers a different type of habitat for flora and fauna. Development of the site will not protect locally distinct character and attractiveness. It will do the exact opposite. There are stunning views to the south taking in the iconic Water Tower skyline and to the north to outstanding natural beauty of the rural hinterland that should not be spoilt. MCC would argue that the site as it stands feeds into Colchester's desire to attract visitors for its rural, historic and cultural legacy. Whilst there are no currently known significant sites of archaeological interest it is recognised that north Colchester has not been examined to the same depth as other areas of the Town.</p>	<p>the character and attractiveness of the surrounding area and refers to the Landscape and Townscape Character Assessments. However, a positive impact is also recorded in the SA as the Landscape Capacity of Settlement Fringes Assessment identifies that land to the east of the site is currently a harsh abrupt edge to Colchester. There is the opportunity to soften this harsh edge and also the SPD includes a green buffer along the A12 boundary, which will help to protect the character of the town boundary. The Council does not agree that the site attracts visitors to Colchester for its rural, historic and cultural legacy; the site is privately owned and is predominantly agricultural land.</p>
<p>Objective 8 To conserve and enhance the natural environment, natural resources and the biodiversity of the Borough.</p>	<p>Whilst it is recognised that development proposals offer a decent degree of green space and refer to the need to provide biodiversity, it has to recognise that development of the site represents a serious loss of a particular landscape and associated habitats. Formal wildlife recording evidences that the site witnesses six birds on the RSPB red list, a bee on the biodiversity action plan list, a bee orchid colony, a badger set, rare fungi and numerous flora and fauna species. Restricting biodiversity protection to existing designated areas is a short-sighted measure and limits the effective development of a meaningful green infrastructure strategy. The comments offered under Objective 7 are reiterated here. See also concerns raised under Objective 5 above concerning air quality.</p>	<p>The SA does recognise that there will be negative impacts in terms of landscape and biodiversity. However, it also recognises that there is the potential for biodiversity enhancement and that this is reflected in the SPD. Biodiversity protection is not limited to statutory sites and as stated in the SA the Environmental Impact Assessment for the site will be required to look in detail (including surveys by qualified ecologists) at the effects that development will have on biodiversity and measures required to mitigate any adverse effects.</p>
<p>Objective 9 To make efficient use of energy and resources, and reduce waste and our contribution to climate change.</p>	<p>On the broader picture of north Colchester as a whole, the development of the site represents a serious loss of a natural 'green lung'. This natural pollution control mechanism will be replaced by new pollution sources. Although steps may be taken in the design of the site to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and keep to a minimum the extent of new waste disposal demands, this development nevertheless results in increased pressure on fuel supplies, waste disposal and emission control. On that basis it cannot be argued that the site helps towards the fight against climate change.</p>	<p>This comment relates to the principle of the development. The SA appraises the sustainability of the detailed site information and does not consider the principle of the development, which has already been subject to extensive SA work.</p>

Appendix 3

List of Respondents			
Mrs A Walsh	Wendy Gunthorpe	Philip Adcock	Michele Knowles
J H Chinnery	Janet Fulford	James Borges	Margaret
Jane Chinnery	P Andrew & L Borges	Liz Freemont	Simon Gilhooly
B Palmer	M Abdi	Kenneth Bruce Jackson	Eliza Chilvers
Mrs T Barrell	Miss C Brown	Ben Wilde	Jane Adcock
Denis Cockcroft	Mr William Rowley	Patrick Mills	Elaine Boekhoudt
Doreen Cockcroft	David Croger	Martin Goss	Simon Rapley
Boyer Planning for Colchester Golf Club	Janet Nuttall Natural England	Denise Humphris Boxted Parish Council	Zhanine Oates Essex County Council
Anne Atkins	T F Harrison	Heather Payne	Michael Watkins
F Jones	Miss P Freeth	Mrs J Roberts	Linda Camper
Dr A W R Lothian	Ken Aldred	Mr C Narrainen	Steven Knowles
Mrs Val Walsom - Parish Clerk West Bergholt PC	Michelle Reynolds - Colchester Retail Business Association (x2)	Roy Warren Sport England	Helen Harris Myland Community Council
Lindsey Allen Forestry Commission England	David Catty Office for Nuclear Regulation	Mags Hobby (Ramblers Assoc)	David Lock Associates for Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties
Mark Williams	John Gamage	Graham Macpherson	Malcolm Nicholson
Colin Stallwood	Richard Tatum	Robert Dore (x 2)	Mrs J Blake
Simon Rapley	Tracy Bowring	Mr John Wilde	Jean Dickinson
James Holland	Mrs C Harris	M F Borges	Paul Horwood
Mrs A Wilkinson	Chris Coe	Margaret Barrett	Mr J C Dickson
Richard Blake	Roland Buss MBE	Barry & Jeanette West	Mr K. Gray
GR and R COX	Wilfred Ring	Cathy Tatum	Ron Abbott

Brian Rowe	Paul Rickwood (x 4)	Don and Joan Manhire	Sama Jones
Will Bramhill Colchester Cycling Campaign	Eric Cooper Highways Agency	Mike Goulding Homes & Communities Agency	