



Local Development Framework

Site Allocations

Regulation 30 (1)(e) Statement

November 2009



COLCHESTER LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

REGULATION 30(1)(e) STATEMENT

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Site Allocations Submission Document	3
3.	Statement of the Total number of Representations	3
4.	Summary of Main Issues	5
	• Representations that the document is Sound	5
	• Representations that the document is Unsound	6
5.	Unduly Made Representations	25
	Appendix 1 – Summary of Comments by Individual/Organisation	26

1 Introduction

This statement provides the information on the representations received about the Site Allocations Submission Development Plan Document. It has been prepared under Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2008, which requires that a local planning authority must send to the Secretary of State:

- (i) A statement of the total number of representations made,
- (ii) Copies of the representations,
- (iii) A summary of the main issues raised in the representations, or
- (iv) A statement that no representations have been made.

A copy of this document is being made available on the Council's website (www.colchester.gov.uk) and at the Council's offices and the local libraries.

2 Site Allocations Submission Document

The Site Allocations Submission Document was subject to a public consultation period from 18th September until 30th October 2009 (a period of 6 weeks). Consultation also included the Development Policies which is a separate Development Plan Document and contains a series of policies to guide future planning applications as part of the Colchester Local Development Framework. During the 6 week period copies of the Site Allocations Submission Document and the Submission Proposals Maps were made available for inspection at the Council's offices and the local libraries. In addition the documents were available for viewing and downloading on the Council's website.

A public notice advertising the consultation for the Site Allocations and the Development Policies Submission documents was published in the Essex County Standard on the 18th September 2009. A further notice for the Submission to the Planning Inspectorate of the Site Allocations and Dev Policies will be published in the Colchester Daily Gazette on the 30th November 2009.

3 Statement of the total number of representations made as required under Regulation 30 (e) (i)

In total 280 representations were made relating to the Site Allocations Submission Document. Out of the 280 representations, 227 considered the document or elements of it to be 'unsound' and 24 considered the document or elements of it to be 'sound' as the following table shows. A further 29 representations were not duly made. To simplify the table, representations made on explanatory text or a table in the Site Allocations document have been included within a chapter or policy reference.

Part of Site Allocations	Sound	Unsound	Total Responses
Whole Document	8	2	10
Executive Summary	0	3	3
Chapter 3 Centres & Employment	1	2	3
Table of Local Employment Sites following Para 3.14	1	21	22
SA CE1 Mixed Use Sites	0	1	1
Chapter 4 Housing	1	30	31
SA H1 Housing Allocations	1	6	7
SA H2 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation		10	10
Chapter 5 Urban Renaissance	0	2	2
SA TC1 Appropriate Uses for Town Centre and North Station Regeneration Area		3	3
SA EC1 Residential development in East Colchester	1	1	2
SA EC2 Development in East Colchester	1	0	1
SA EC3 Area 1: Former Timber Dock	0	0	0
SA EC4 Area 2: King Edward Quay	0	1	1
SA EC5 Area 3: Magdalen Street	0	0	0
SA EC6 Area 4: Hawkins Road	0	0	0
SA EC7 University of Essex Expansion	0	4	4
SA EC8 Transportation in East Colchester	0	3	3
SA GAR1 Development in the Garrison Area	0	1	1
SA NGA1 Appropriate Uses within the North Growth Area	2	10	12
SA NGA2 Greenfield Sites in the North Growth Area	1	9	10
SA NGA3 Employment Uses in the North Growth Area	0	2	2
SA NGA4 Transport measures in North Growth Area	0	3	3
SA NGA5 Transport Infrastructure related to the NGAUE	0	3	3
SA STA1 Appropriate Uses within the Stanway Growth Area	3	12	15
SA STA2 Phasing of Greenfield sites in Stanway Growth Area	0	18	18
SA STA3 Employment and Retail Uses in Stanway Growth Area	0	2	2

SA STA4 Transportation in Stanway Growth Area	0	21	21
SA STA5 Open Space in Stanway Growth Area	0	22	22
SA TIP1 Residential Sites in Tiptree and paragraphs on employment	4	25	29
SA TIP2 Transport in Tiptree	0	2	2
Chapter 6 – Public Realm	0	3	3
Chapter 7 – Transport and Accessibility	0	2	2
Local Wildlife Sites – Paragraphs 8.14 and 8.15	0	1	1
Holiday Parks – Paragraphs 8.17 and 8.18 and table	1	1	2
Chapter 9 Monitoring and Implementation	0	1	1
TOTALS	25	226	251
Unduly Made			29

4 Summary of the main issues raised in the representations as required under Regulation 30 (e) (i)

The following paragraphs are a summary of the main issues raised in representations about the soundness and legal compliance of the Site Allocations Submission Development Plan Document. At the end of each section a paragraph entitled ‘CBC Initial Comments’ is intended to provide a short and initial response by the Council.

4.1 Representations that the Site Allocations DPD is sound.

The Site Allocations Submission DPD received broad support as a sound document from the following stakeholders;

- East of England Development Agency
- East of England Regional Assembly
- Essex County Council
- Go-East (subject to agreed changes in respect of Policy H2)
- Coal Authority
- Tendring District Council
- Little Horkeley Parish Council
- Highways Agency
- Sport England in respect of Policy SA NGA2
- Boyer Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey in respect of Policy SA STA1
- Layer-de-la-Haye Parish Council in respect of Chapter 3
- Wivenhoe Town Council in respect of Policy SA EC1 and SA EC2

- Boxted Parish Council in respect of the allocation of land at Tin Bins as a Local Employment Zone and paragraph 5.114
- Humberts Leisure in respect of land adjacent to Coopers Beach Holiday Park
- Tribal on behalf of Royal London with respect to Policy SA NGA1
- Fenn Wright considered the DPD to be sound in respect of the Local Employment Zone in Peldon
- Three residents considered the DPD to be sound.

All comments are summarised at the rear of this document.

4.2 Representations that the Site Allocations DPD is unsound.

Chapter 1 - Executive Summary

In general objections raised to the Site Allocations Submission Document considered that it was unsound in its present form but could be made broadly sound by amending some of the Town, District Centre, and Village Settlement boundaries. Far from encouraging an over provision of housing, this approach would allow for a limited number of further sites to come forward to provide the necessary flexibility and certainty in terms of housing land supply without materially conflicting with the Adopted Core Strategy. The main concerns are related to villages and the review of Village Envelopes, the new Settlement Boundary in Tiptree, and Colchester and the opportunity to identify sustainable smaller sites on the edge of the town.

CBC Initial Comments – A comprehensive Settlement Boundary Review has informed the Council's approach and is part of the comprehensive evidence base. Land has been made available for a variety of uses in accordance with the broad aims and objectives of the Core Strategy and ensures housing and job targets can be met whilst also providing a level of flexibility to ensure delivery over the plan period.

Chapter 3 – Centres and Employment

- The DPD does not provide certainty on the deliverability of appropriate employment land and needs to be more flexible and allocate sites for development that support local rural employment and are well related to existing settlements and transport networks.
- Support for new additional employment allocations at;
 - The Mullions, Nayland Road, Great Horkesley
 - Land at the rear of Wilkins factory, Tiptree
 - Haycocks Farm, West Mersea
 - Park Road, Langham
- Objections to employment allocations at;
 - The Pot Emporium, Boxted

- Wilkins factory site, Tiptree
- Coast Road, West Mersea
- B&Q, Lightship Way, Colchester.
- The table of Local Employment Zones includes land that may or may not be deliverable including the Whitehall extension. Unless such land is deliverable and comes forward for development the Plan cannot be considered effective. The evidence base and sustainability appraisal relating to this allocation is suspect and further investigation is required. A full and proper assessment of the site would conclude that the site should be included as a Mixed Use site rather than being classed as a Local Employment Zone.
- There is strong support for the concept of Local Employment Zones but the approach to their selection is somewhat random and there is a need to standardise the approach. Applying a restrictive approach to the extent of many of the proposed Local Employment Zone boundaries will limit the numbers of rural based jobs and is not consistent with the stated aim of Core Policy CE3. Inconsistency between the positive wording of Core Policy CE3 and the generally restrictive approach being adopted to the definition of Local Employment Zone boundaries / allocations. The restrictive approach is not justified and would not be effective in the promotion of rural employment.

CBC Initial Comments – Sites included within the table of Employment Zones have either been rolled forward from the Local Plan, are subject to current permissions or have been suggested for consideration following previous rounds of public consultation. All sites have been subject to the Sustainability Appraisal and are considered appropriate to provide a range of employment opportunities across the Borough during the plan period. Should it be demonstrated that a site is not deliverable it will be removed from the table. The site in question would not affect the ability to deliver the overall job targets. A number of new sites have been put forward at this late stage which were not submitted to the Council earlier in the formulation of the document and so have not been considered or assessed. There is more than sufficient land allocated for employment purposes to meet targets set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Core Strategy. If sites are not deliverable they should not be allocated for employment purposes and the Proposals Map will be amended accordingly.

Policy SA CE1 – Mixed Use Sites

The Policy is unsound because it fails to include Gosbecks Phase 2 land as a site for mixed use development. This land was not donated to the Council as part of the Gosbecks Archaeological Park and its small size and poor quality makes it unsuitable to modern farming. In contrast its location would make a logical extension to the built-up area. The triangular site between Gosbecks View and Cunobelin Way should not be shown as open space

CBC Initial Response – the site is outside of the proposed Colchester Settlement Boundary and is currently vacant therefore considered to be a greenfield site. Other sites proposed as Mixed Use Redevelopment are

previously developed land and therefore more appropriate for allocation in line with PPS1.

Chapter 4 – Housing

Policy SA H1 – Housing Allocations

- The DPD lacks clarity and transparency on the number of housing units that will be delivered by the sites in Policy SA H1 and how this relates to the overall requirement set out in the CS H1.
- The Sustainability Appraisal is flawed in its assessment of sites and the conclusions reached for the Chitts Hill site are inconsistent with those on the adjoining Railway Sidings site.
- The SHLAA is not a credible evidence base as it was not prepared in accordance with the Practice Guide.
- The DPD is overly reliant on large PDL sites in the short/medium term particularly as the larger greenfield sites in the growth areas are not due to be released until 2016. With the economic recession, the DPD is not sufficiently flexible to provide an effective and deliverable supply of housing to meet Core Strategy requirements.
- Support for new additional residential allocations at
 - London Road, Copford (for the purpose of developing a retirement village for the Borough)
 - Hallfields Farm, Dedham (to meet the need for local housing needs, for over-55s in particular)
 -
- Housing provision in villages is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. There is uncertainty surrounding the village housing distribution figures and there is not sufficient flexibility. The submission document is also inconsistent with PPS3 in relation to housing availability figures. A systematic and comprehensive review of village settlement boundaries is required and numerous sites in various villages have been suggested for amendments to the settlement boundaries.
- There is a compelling case for Colchester fringe sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Examination Inspectors Report and to reflect the emphasis in the East of England Plan for growth to be directed towards key centres. The review of the Colchester Settlement Boundary has concentrated on the Housing Growth Areas whilst smaller peripheral sites have been summarily rejected.
- The proposed approach to allocating general 'predominantly residential' areas is not effective. Whilst it is understood that the designation does incorporate sites to deliver the 15 year housing supply, it is not clear from the current consultation document and the proposals map exactly where the identified housing development sites are located. These sites should be allocated specifically for residential development with clear boundaries.
- In light of the current recession, all greenfield sites identified in the Site Allocations DPD should begin housing development as soon as

possible to maintain the Council's annual housing target. Minor changes should remove any phasing requirements

CBC Initial Response – The Housing Allocations outlined in Policy SA H1 provide flexibility to ensure the delivery of the RSS Housing Targets and the objectives of the Core Strategy. The Council's Settlement Boundary Review details the justification for all the Settlement Boundaries. Specialised housing schemes outside of the existing village envelopes have not been allocated because there is no justification to treat them any differently to other residential development in the countryside.

Housing sites have been shown as predominately residential to simplify the Proposals Map and to reduce the number of allocations. The exact site boundaries will be determined through the planning application process. This does not differ significantly from the Local Plan.

Policy SA H2 – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

- This Policy is unsound because site 11 (Orchard Place, Vernons Road, Chappel) has been refused planning permission. The site was not identified in the Reg 25 consultation and the inclusion of this site appears reactionary to meet the numbers required by the RSS revision of July 2009.
- Another scenario should be considered which examines a far wider spectrum of potential sites and the most sustainable and deliverable of these allocated on proper weighted criteria.
- Policy SAH2 is not consistent with RSS policy H3 or Circular 01/2006 for the provision of pitches for Gypsies & Travellers.
- There is a lack of certainty and guidance for development management decisions. Local opposition is likely to be high with the risk that members will bow to local pressure to refuse planning applications. It needs to be clear that capacity figures in the policy and paragraph 4.17 are guidelines and not mandatory. It also needs to be clear that this policy, its explanatory text and the criteria set out in Core Strategy policy H5 set the whole criteria for determining planning applications. Suggested that this policy should be the only material policy guidance for determining applications on allocated sites. Applications on other sites for extensions or increases in capacity should be subject to the appropriate Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD.
- Policy does not make it clear that pitch provision in Colchester as set out in the RSS is a minimum. Sections of 4.12 are now irrelevant as the approved RSS policy is now a material consideration. An additional paragraph is need to explain that not all pitches are available as at 2009. If some of the proposed sites do not come forward or not enough pitches are secured additional pitches will be needed to address the shortfall to meet RSS minimum requirements.

CBC Initial Comments – Further details with regards to site selection and capacity are included within the Core Strategy, the Gypsy and Traveller Topic Paper and other documents such as the Sustainability Appraisal which form

part of the Council's comprehensive evidence base. The recent application at Vernons Road was refused on capacity and amenity issues as opposed to the principle. Essex County Council have confirmed that the site at Severalls Lane could commence construction at the end of 2009/10 or early 2010/11. They have undertaken the cost and estimate stage and are looking to discharge conditions.

Changes are proposed to Policy H2 and the supporting text to reflect the need to allocate additional sites to provide a post-2011 3% compound increase in pitch provision as required by East of England Plan Policy H3 (requiring Colchester to provide a total of 40 pitches in 2021.)

Chapter 5 – Urban Renaissance

Town Centre and North Station

Policy SA TC1 – Appropriate Uses within the Town Centre and North Station Regeneration Area

- Policy SA TC1 is not justified and not consistent with PPS6. The scope of the policy as currently drafted gives insufficient consideration to the potential of the Turner Rise District Centre. Core Strategy policy sets out that Urban District Centres should provide a more diverse mix of uses and suggests that intensification of centres will be supported. Policy SA TC1 should be amended to states that a more diverse mix of retails and other uses will be acceptable.
- Site Allocations DPD is not consistent with the Development Policies DPD and with the evidence base (2009 Hotel Study) in terms of the requirement for additional hotel bedrooms and is an inadequate response to the importance attached to immediate and future hotel needs identified in the Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD. Suitable sites need to be identified to ensure that the required number of beds outlined in the evidence base is deliverable.
- The DPD is unsound as it appears to have been written using the draft Hotel Study and not the 2009 study. The Royal Mail Site on St Peter's Street has not been included in the DPD despite on going pre-application discussions to develop it as a Premier Inn.

CBC Initial Comments – The appropriate uses outlined in Policy SA TC1 have been informed and are consistent with the Core Strategy. The respondent acknowledges that the publication of the Hotel Study (after the completion of the DPD) may explain inconsistencies between the two documents.

East Colchester

Policy SA EC1 – Residential Development in East Colchester

Policy EC1 is unsound because it identifies land north of Magdalen Street for residential development based on the findings in the SHLAA, but the DPD and proposals map does not specifically allocate the site for residential

development. A precise boundary for housing development should be included on the proposals map.

CBC Initial Comments – The Council have shown all future residential sites as predominately residential to reduce the number of allocations on the Proposals Maps and to reflect the general character of an area over the lifetime of the plan. The precise site boundaries are to be determined through the planning application process in line with the relevant policies within adopted within the Colchester LDF.

Policy SA EC4 – Area 2: King Edward Quay

Objection to wording in paragraph 5.59 which states that ‘residential development will be restricted to upper levels in flood zones (FZ) 2, 3a & 3b.’ FZ 3b is the functional floodplain where national policy does not recognise residential development as an appropriate use. Despite King Edward Quay (SAEC4) being a regeneration area, this does not justify overruling national policy

CBC Initial Comments – The reference to residential development in Flood Zone 3b is incorrect and will be removed. Deletion to be included within the schedule of minor changes.

Policy SA EC7 – University of Essex Expansion

- Allocation is unsound as it conflicts with Development Policies Policy DP23. The evidence to support this Policy is not readily accessible and development could take place elsewhere on the campus. The allocation also conflicts with Policy ENV1 in the Core Strategy as it will drive a wedge into the green corridor and will adversely impact on the backdrop to the estuary. The Council should consider permitting development in the Deer Park or further away from the river.
- The Policy is unsound as it lacks sufficient detail to ensure open countryside is retained between the University and Wivenhoe and to secure an effective strategic green corridor along the river.
- Object to development on local wildlife sites within the East Colchester and Stanway Growth Areas. Development would destruct local wildlife sites, result in the loss of connectivity to the wider environment and result in the loss of accessible natural green space.
- The plan is not considered to be legally compliant. There is no credible evidence base to show that all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted.
- The policy providing University of Essex expansion is generally supported; however, there is no justification to alter settlement boundaries to provide additional sports pitches, a golf course, residential units, and community uses.

CBC Initial Comments – The allocation for expansion of the University of Essex is intended to ensure that the academic needs of the University can be met over the plan period whilst concentrating University uses in one location which is highly sustainable. Natural England were consulted prior to inclusion of the site and they stated that there ‘are no significant environmental reasons

for the site not to be included within the Site Allocations DPD. They do however point out that any planning application will need to be subject to its own environmental assessment in view of the proximity to an SSSI and Local Nature Reserve. Previous representations sought further development between the University and Wivenhoe which has not been supported by the Council. Wivenhoe Town Council has consistently opposed such development reflecting overwhelming local support for retaining the separation between settlements which is included in the adopted Town Plan. The limited area proposed for development will ensure there are no settlement coalescence issues.

Policy SA EC8 – Transportation in East Colchester

- The Policy is unsound because it is aspirational and does not reflect the evidence base available.
- Proposals for the Eastern Transit Corridor route have not been the subject of appropriate levels of consultation and as a result are not sound or legally compliant. The Sustainability Appraisal submitted with the document does not discuss potential route alternative options or assess the sustainability of the route proposed. The proposals map does not identify an area of safeguarded land adjacent to the specified proposed line, contrary to PPS12 which states that proposals maps must set out the areas where policy applies. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the Eastern Transit Corridor is deliverable.
- The definition and precise wording concerning transit corridors is inconsistent and should be clarified. It is unclear for what purpose a strip of land alongside the railway is to be safeguarded – either a transit road for buses, or an extra rail track. Bus priority routes have been identified on the Proposals Map, but there is no mention of them in the Map Key, nor are they defined.
- The East Park and Ride was deleted from the Core Strategy on the basis that it was unsupported by evidence. The Bus Users Group supports a rail-based P&R system rather than a bus-based one because bus-based systems tend to be available only to car users.
- The Wivenhoe Trail is not marked on Colchester Inset Map or mentioned in SA EC8.

CBC Initial Comments – The Core Strategy identified the need for the East Colchester Transit Corridor. Investigations have been undertaken to identify and safeguard land for future delivery. The proposals map set out the corridors. Further development work is required but safeguarding land at this time is to allow future delivery of a public transport solution which supports growth and provides sustainable connection from the growth areas to employment, retail, education and leisure opportunities. These routes set out to avoid the congested road network in East Colchester.

In line with the Core Strategy we have not included East Park and Ride in a policy. Paragraph 5.83 sets out the CBC intention following the opening of the Northern Park and Ride site and service.

The Wivenhoe Trail through the development areas is covered under Policy SA EC2 Development in East Colchester paragraph 3. It is proposed as a minor change that paragraph 5.62 be inserted after para 5.52 as this section cover the whole of the East Colchester Growth Area.

The Garrison

Policy SA GAR1 – Development in the Garrison Area

The policy should be amended to improve the clarity of the plan and the extent of the statutory protection for the Circus and the precinct of St John's Abbey.

CBC Initial Comments – National policies provide protection for Scheduled Ancient Monuments and good practice guidance encourages local authorities to not repeat these policies/guidance within their LDF's.

North Colchester

Policy SA NGA1 – Appropriate Uses within the North Growth Area

- The Policy is unsound because large parts of the growth area provide habitats for UK 'red' listed birds and this conflicts with the Council's Local Wildlife Survey statement 5
- Sites with planning permission should be completed before new sites are permitted.
- The DPD is unsound as it provides insufficient Green Links across the North Colchester Growth Area and as such fails to have regard to policies contained in the Core Strategy.
- The Growth Area boundary should include adjoining land to ensure a more effective form of development and assist with the delivery of housing and other infrastructure.
- Policy does not set out a clear mechanism for implementation since the relationship between individual components of growth and the infrastructure required to serve it is unclear.
- The absence of provision for strategic and other open space may require lowering of capacity within Housing Growth Areas and for this provision to be made up elsewhere. Concern is expressed at the very substantial tracks of land allocated for Open Space and recreational uses in the Local Plan which are now within the North Growth Area.
- The Colchester Inset should demonstrate adequate provision for Open Space to meet the needs of pre-and-post 2021 growth.
- Smaller sites on the edge of Colchester and edge of village sites could be released to provide a wider choice as intended by the Core Strategy Examination Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1.
- Oppose the proposed 2,200 new homes - the land has been identified in the Green Infrastructure policy as an important green wedge to be protected.

- Development will place an intolerable burden on the local highway infrastructure.
- Paragraphs 5.117 & 5.118 in relation to Severalls Hospital are out of date and the statement about the new A12 junction is factually inaccurate.
- Support the principle of the growth area but policy is inflexible in limiting the uses to residential and employment. Alternative uses at an appropriate scale may be acceptable and should be considered on their merits.

CBC Initial Comments – The principle of development in the area was tested at the Core Strategy examination and found to be the most sustainable location for growth. A Transport Assessment was prepared to support the allocation and statements of common ground signed between the Council, the Highways Agency, Highways Authority (ECC) and the developers. The Inspector did not support smaller sites on the edge of Colchester or villages. At paragraph 7.23 of her report she states ‘I find that the strategy of focussing new development on the Regeneration and Growth Areas of Colchester meets national and regional policy and is the most appropriate in all the circumstances. There is evidence that the Growth Areas have the capacity to accommodate the proposed levels of development...’

The Colchester Local Wildlife Site Review forms part of the evidence base and will be used as a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications. Natural England and Essex Wildlife Trust have not objected to the allocation of the North Growth Area. Strategic green links have been shown on the Proposals Map in accordance with Policy PR1 of the Core Strategy. It is expected that further links will be identified through the Supplementary Planning Document for the area and planning applications.

The relationship between growth in the borough and the required infrastructure is set out in Table 6d of the adopted Core Strategy. Land proposed to be used for open space in the Local Plan was aspirational, the land has always been in private ownership. The principle of developing the area was established by the Core Strategy and the details of what open space is expected as part of the new development are set out in policy SA NGA2 of the Site Allocations DPD. Further detail at this stage would be prejudicial to master plans and planning applications that will need to conform to policy. The Council is not familiar with a Green Infrastructure policy or any green wedge protection.

Paragraphs 5.117 and 5.118 are not inaccurate but could be updated to reflect that work has commenced on the junction.

Policy SA NGA2 – Greenfield Sites in the North Growth Area

- Opposed to a ‘minimum’ of 2200 dwellings. ‘Net developable area available for housing’ should be defined much better. Two neighbourhood centres should be required, as set out in the Core Strategy and the policy should reflect the recently agreed land requirement (at least 70,000m²) for a secondary school.
- Suggest the plan should cover a different period - 1.9.09 to 31.3.25.
- New wording suggested to paragraph 5.118.

- Phasing restriction on greenfield sites should be lifted.
- Delivery of the A12 junction is committed and will commence in November 2009.
- Unsound baseline evidence to assess water supply resources and sewer capacity. Evidence should have been taken from Stage 2 of the Water Cycle Study.

CBC Initial Comments – The use of the term ‘minimum’ was a change made by the Inspector at the Core Strategy examination to ensure conformity with PPS3 and the East of England Plan. It is not necessary to define ‘net developable area for housing’ The Site allocations define the boundaries and the Master Plan SPD will provide detail on neighbourhood centres etc, taking into account demand, viability and competing uses. The Core Strategy refers to ‘community hall improvements and new community centre (p. 27 and 76.) The Council is not aware of any ‘recently agreed land requirement for a secondary school.’

The plan period set out in the Core Strategy and agreed by the Planning Inspector is 2001 – 2023 (in relation to housing) to reflect the requirement for a 15 year housing land supply. The update to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) covers the 15 year period to 2024.

Greenfield releases will be carefully monitored via the AMR and the SHLAA to ensure delivery in accordance with the East of England Plan.

Minor rewording could be appropriate to reflect that work has commenced on the new A12 junction.

All evidence used is the most up to date that is available at the time and the draft of Stage 2 of the Water Cycle Study was taken into account. The final published version has now been added to the evidence base. However this is a living document and continually evolving. It may be subject to further change in light of Environment Agency requirements.

Policy SA NGA3 – Employment Uses in the North Growth Area

- Paragraph 5.126 is not in accordance with the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 or Employment Studies. Internet based, care, craft, private education, non-intrusive office and direct services employment opportunities within the west Mile End community should be permitted and encouraged.
- The thrust of the policy is wrong in that it only seeks to protect Employment Zones and concentrate all commercial development in the Town Centre. Amendments to paragraph 5.126 are proposed to allow greater provision of a specified range of B1 uses in North Colchester.

CBC Initial Comments – Core Strategy policies CE1 to CE3 outline the Councils strategic position with regards to employment provision across the borough up to 2021. Employment proposals will be considered in relation to these policies and policy DP5 of the Development Policies DPD, as well as specific growth area policies. Policy NGA3 does not specifically preclude

applications but no further major employment allocations are required. Severalls Business Park and Cuckoo Farm constitute a Strategic Employment Zone and provide significant existing and proposed employment opportunities. Certain of the specific uses suggested could take place as permitted development if the scale was appropriate.

Policy SA NGA4 – Transport measures in North Growth Area

- Policy SA NGA5 should be deleted and the NGAUE-specific items identified in an amended version of NGA4. At present no differentiation is drawn between projects which are already committed to be delivered, and those for which further investment might be required. Policy SA NGA4 should be reworded.
- Paragraphs 5.133 & 5.134 are insufficiently strong in promoting commuter cycling routes which makes it less effective. They also state that paragraph 5.134 is inaccurate as it should recognise Severalls Lane as an important bus route in the area. Proposed amendments to paragraph 5.133 to promote Commuter cycling routes and paragraph 5.134 to recognise Severalls Lane as an important bus route locally.

CBC Initial Comments – The infrastructure identified in Policy SA NGA5 was identified in the Statement of Common Ground (ref cbc/eb/103) between Mersea Homes & Countryside Properties, Essex County Council and CBC. The principle findings of the Transport Assessment provide a broad indication of those elements that will be required to allow delivery of the Northern Growth Area Urban Extension. Therefore we do not see the benefit merging together the two policies.

Policies SA NGA4 and NGA5 both require the delivery of cycle network and measures. The cycle networks in the area will provide for commuter trips. Severalls Lane is one of a number of roads in the area which buses use - the explanatory text in para. 5.134 was not supposed to be an exhaustive list of bus routes.

Policy SA NGA5 – Transport Infrastructure related to the NGAUE

- Policy SA NGA5 does not relate the overall infrastructure requirements of the NGA to the NGAUE, and therefore fails to be justified or effective. A number of projects identified in SA NGA5 are already subject to existing legal and/or financial commitment for which no contribution from the NGAUE is appropriate under the terms of circular 05/2005. A combined Policy NGA4 and NGA5 would offer an effective and justified policy and would be sound on that basis.
- SA NGA 5 does not adequately promote green links around Mile End which should be shown on the Proposals Map and further wording added to paragraph 5.137

CBC Initial Comments – The infrastructure identified in Policy SA NGA5 was identified in the Statement of Common Ground (ref cbc/eb/103) between Mersea Homes & Countryside Properties, Essex County Council and CBC. The principle findings of the Transport Assessment provide a broad indication of those elements that will be required to allow delivery of the Northern

Growth Area Urban Extension. Therefore we do not see the benefit merging together the two policies.

Green Links are shown on the Proposals Map as stated in paragraph 5.137 states and that exact locations will be determined by SPD or planning application.

Stanway

Policy SA STA1 – Appropriate Uses within the Stanway Growth Area

- Further mixed-use development will reduce quality of life in Stanway. The area around Dyers Road is near to an Ancient Dyke and should be kept as a green area.
- The Policy is not sound because the road network in the vicinity of Fiveways Fruit Farm cannot cope with the additional traffic.
- The Policy is unsound because it does not reflect the potential of the Tollgate Urban District Centre within this growth area. In particular, retail development should be included in the Policy as an appropriate use.
- Anglian Water has no plans to increase the process capacity at Copford or to apply for an increase in consent, but is looking to redistribute some of the catchment into the Colchester catchment to relieve the load on Copford. Minor amendments are suggested to the wording of the Policy and paragraph 5.154.
- Constraint imposed upon development is not justified by the evidence and fails to state that reasonable alternatives are available which places unnecessary doubt on the implementation of the allocation. This should be addressed by minor changes to the wording in relation to the disposal of sewage. The wording in paragraph 5.153 should acknowledge that the Stanway Master Plan SPD should have regard to detailed boundaries, boundary treatment and to provide some flexibility for further growth once further need is justified.
- Object to the inclusion of development on local wildlife sites within the East Colchester and Stanway Growth Areas. Development would destruct local wildlife sites, result in the loss of connectivity to the wider environment and result in the loss of accessible natural green space.
- Policy SA STA1 should recognise the existing employment commitment at Lakelands. The Proposals Map and Settlement Boundary should be amended to include the employment area as shown on the submitted drawings.
- SA STA1 is supported in principle, but there is a lack of clarity in the policy as to the extent to which planning applications can be submitted on individual parcels of land within the Growth Area. Changes should be made to the policy to make it sound by clarifying the anticipated housing capacity of each of the sites.
- Policy SA STA1 fails to recognise existing planning permission involving a land swap to provide retail use on land to the north of London Road and to provide employment uses on the existing Sainsbury's site (south of London Road). The proposed Sainsburys site should be allocated for retail

use and the adjacent Urban District Centre should be extended to incorporate the new store site.

CBC Initial Comments - The principle of development in the Stanway area was tested at the Core Strategy examination and found to be a sustainable location for growth. The Inspector stated at paragraph 7.23 of her report that 'I find that the strategy of focussing new development on the Regeneration and Growth Areas of Colchester meets national and regional policy and is the most appropriate in all the circumstances. There is evidence that the Growth Areas have the capacity to accommodate the proposed levels of development...'

The principle of the Growth Area and the ability of the infrastructure to accommodate it has been established by the Core Strategy. Transport Assessments have been undertaken for each of the major sites and joint work continues with the developers, Highways Agency and Essex County Council, the Highway Authority.

Minor rewording has been included in the submitted Schedule of Minor Changes in accordance with the most recent information provided by Anglian Water. A change has also been included related to the additional committed employment land at Lakelands. The change also involves amending the Proposals Map.

PPS6/new PPS4 will provide overall guidance for any retail development, and proposals will need to address the requirement to follow a sequential approach focused on town centres in the first instance. Core Strategy Policy CE2b is considered to provide sufficient flexibility and detail to address the particular circumstances needed to increase the sustainability, attractiveness and viability of Urban District Centres. There are particular circumstances relating to the Sainsbury's relocation to an area allocated for employment. The extant permission has not been implemented and therefore it would be inappropriate to allocate the land for retail purposes whilst the retail use continues on the existing site.

Greenfield releases will be carefully monitored via the AMR and the SHLAA to ensure delivery in accordance with the East of England Plan. It is not considered appropriate to include housing capacity figures as there needs to be flexibility within individual sites. Indicative figures are included in the SHLAA.

The Colchester Local Wildlife Site Review forms part of the evidence base and will be used as a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications.

Policy SA STA2 – Phasing of Greenfield sites in Stanway Growth Area

- The Policy is unsound because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites.
- The Policy is not effective because the sites at Dyers Road/Warren Lane and Fiveways Fruit Farm are affected by plans to extend quarrying

operations and it is not certain if they can be delivered within the Plan period.

- The inclusion of the site between Dyers Road and Warren Lane is supported, but the phasing is too prescriptive. Potential changes in land ownership and the identification of a safeguard zone based upon the Minerals DPD Issues and Options, which is at an early stage and not due for adoption until 2012, mean it is inappropriate to impose phasing restrictions. The reference to Tree Preservation Orders should be omitted as these are protected by other Regulations and is a matter to be determined by the development control process.
- In light of the current recession, all greenfield sites identified in the Site Allocations DPD should begin housing development as soon as possible to maintain the Council's annual housing target. Minor changes should remove any phasing requirements

CBC Initial Comments – The Council is actively encouraging the development of previously developed land first and the Annual Monitoring Report shows that in recent years national targets regarding brownfield developments have been exceeded. The Core Strategy outlines that greenfield allocations are expected to come forward post 2016. Should monitoring indicate that housing delivery is lower than expected greenfield sites may be released earlier than expected. The most recent Strategic Housing Land Availability Update is based on discussions with developers and indicates that although housing completions will fall over the next few years, they are optimistic about the future with many developments expected to commence next year. The Council is working in partnership with Essex County Council to ensure consistency between its documents even though it is acknowledged that the timing is not identical. Land within the 'stand off' is not required within the plan period to meet housing targets.

Policy SA STA3 – Employment and Retail Uses in Stanway Growth Area

- The content of Policy SA STA3 is generally supported but it is considered there are aspects which should be amended to make it 'sound' in terms of effectiveness. The policy should be amended to clarify that Stanway should accommodate 36,500sqm of office floor space as identified in Core Strategy table CE1c. The statement "no additional services and facilities will be required" is not explained or justified. Hotel uses should be included in the list of appropriate uses. In sub-paragraph (d), the words "including land within Stane Park", after business incubation space, should be deleted – there is no special characteristic of Stane Park which requires it to be provided on this site.
- The boundary of the Tollgate Urban District Centre shown on the Proposals Map should be amended to include the approved site for a new Sainsbury store to bring the allocation into line with PPS6.
- The penultimate paragraph of SA STA3 does not accurately reflect Core Strategy policy and is contrary to national policy guidance in PPS6. It provides no framework against which the council will consider applications for retail uses in Stanway and does not provide a criteria based approach. Alternative wording suggested to allow new retail development provided

that it meets an identified need and does not have a detrimental impact on the Town Centre, and to support intensification where the quality of the public realm and the built character is improved.

- Policy SA STA1 fails to recognise existing planning permission involving a land swap to provide retail use on land to the north of London Road and to provide employment uses on the existing Sainsbury's site (south of London Road). The proposed Sainsburys site should be allocated for retail use and the adjacent Urban District Centre should be extended to incorporate the new store site.

CBC Initial Comments – Table CE1b sets out appropriate land uses within Employment Zones. Minor rewording will be considered to ensure consistency.

PPS6/new PPS4 will provide overall guidance for any retail development, and proposals will need to address the requirement to follow a sequential approach focused on town centres in the first instance. Core Strategy Policy CE2b is considered to provide sufficient flexibility and detail to address the particular circumstances needed to increase the sustainability, attractiveness and viability of Urban District Centres. There are particular circumstances relating to the Sainsbury's relocation to an area allocated for employment. The extant permission has not been implemented and therefore it would be inappropriate to allocate the land for retail purposes whilst the retail use continues on the existing site.

Policy SA STA4 – Transportation in Stanway Growth Area

- The Plan is unsound because it relies upon the provision of the Western bypass, which is years overdue, and there is no guarantee it will be provided in the plan period. The proposed bypass will carry traffic north/south whereas the main congestion is caused by traffic travelling east/west.
- The Policy is unsound because it will not deal with the major transport problems that will be created on existing roads by the scale of the proposed housing development.
- The Schools reorganisation by Essex CC will put further pressure on existing overloaded local network in Stanway.
- The assumptions on which any future traffic forecasting or modelling are made are strongly disputed. Failing radical redevelopment of the existing road network, alternative sites away from Stanway have to be identified. Evidence from local residents must be considered.

CBC Initial Comments – The provision of new development in the Stanway area is included in the adopted Core Strategy. The plan is sound. The inclusion of Policy SA STA4 seeks to ensure that development must provide a package of sustainable transport measures which includes a mix of "smarter choices" and new infrastructure. Development Policies DP17 covers the need for development to provide a Transport Assessment and Travel Plans. Development of the second phase at Lakelands is expected to deliver the remainder of the western bypass. The relationship between growth in the borough and the required infrastructure is set out in Table 6d of the adopted

Core Strategy. The table includes a range of infrastructure projects for Stanway including expansion of the secondary school.

Policy SA STA5 – Open Space in Stanway Growth Area

- The proposed eastern boundary of the pit runs very close to Grymes Dyke and could cause damage.
- The plan is unsound and undeliverable in respect of its proposals for Strategic Open Space. Land shown as proposed open space on the proposals map is in fact working quarry land or land with consent for a major waste management facility. The Borough Council has no control over mineral sites and their restoration. The land has no amenity value to residents and should be discounted as open space
- The hedgerows along Dyers Road currently provide a wildlife refuge and block the view of Fiveways Fruit Farm. Any extension would impact on the hedgerow and be contrary to national policy preserving them.
- While Fiveways Fruit Farm is not available to the public as open space, it is nevertheless a valuable 'green lung'. There is inadequate open space to support the proposed housing.

CBC Initial Comments – Current mineral extraction permissions have conditions upon them requiring land used for quarry purposes to be restored to open space once all the extraction has been completed. CBC will work closely with ECC Minerals and Waste team to ensure the conditions are delivered at the appropriate times. In terms of the open space on the Cory site, the Council is advised that areas may well be sufficiently restored to start handing over in 2 to 3 years and thereafter it would be a progressive release of areas over the coming years. These permissions are certainly likely to be released during the plan period so the Proposals Map accurately shows the long term strategic aim of providing open space in Stanway as outlined in the Core Strategy.

Tiptree

Policy SA TIP1 – Residential Sites in Tiptree

- The Policy is unsound because the proposed development in Grange Road will create immense highway problems, noise pollution for local residents and it will not be available until 2016, which does not meet the urgent need for new homes.
- Land should be allocated at Park Lane, off Newbridge Road, which has no inherent highway issues and is immediately adjacent to the village envelope.
- There is no need for more housing in Tiptree. Paragraph 5.183 should be changed from a minimum of 680 housing units to a maximum. The Parish Council calculate 639 units have planning permission, leaving only 41 more units to be approved in the life of the Plan
- The developer of Grange Road has made it clear that the 1 community pitch will only be available to selected teams, not for community use.

- The comparative analysis of various sites culminates in an arbitrary decision to allocate land off Grange Road. Alternative sites are readily available, including those which have scored more highly in the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Delivery at Grange Road remains uncertain in view of access difficulties to this land which has bedevilled its release for employment purposes.
- Site in Bull Lane should be included in the Tiptree Settlement Boundary.
- The builder's yard on Hall Road is a non-conforming use site that should be incorporated within the Settlement Boundary and would accommodate one or two dwellings.
- The Grange Road site is divorced from the existing edge of the settlement and bears no logical relationship with the existing built-up area. It is over the recommended 800 metre sustainability benchmark distance from the village centre and pedestrian road access to the centre is considered unsafe. Tiptree has a poor transport structure and no clear commitments to improved public transport have been made.
- Land at Peakes Farm is put forward as a sound peripheral site which represents a logical extension to the built-up area of the settlement.
- Additional infrastructure including a doctors surgery, street lighting and footpaths should be delivered in advance of any further residential development.
- There are no major employers in Tiptree likely to provide employment for the occupants of 70 new dwellings.
- The public open space depends on residential development on land south of Grange Road and is not 'significant' at 0.6 ha.
- The Site Allocation DPD is sound in principle, subject to some amendments which will not undermine the Council's Housing Strategy and will allow continued investment and secure jobs in a long established and successful local firm. The representation seeks to amend policy TIP1 and the Tiptree Proposals Map to include a further small housing and public open space allocation in Tiptree.
- The settlement boundary should include land north of the north west Grange Road boundary to the junction of Oak Road and Kelvedon Road.

CBC Initial Comments – The number of residential units and sites outlined in Policy SA TIP1 have been guided by a range of different options and alternatives available to the Council. The housing numbers have been taken from the latest monitoring figures the Council has and also provide some flexibility to ensure that the Core Strategy minimum housing target is met during the plan period. The residential allocation off Grange Road is in accordance with PPS3 which encourages local authorities to reallocate employment land which has not been taken up or is unlikely to be taken up in the plan period. The site was identified as such in the Colchester Employment Land Review. The principles of access and infrastructure measures which are needed to be support future residential development in Tiptree have been agreed with the highway authority (Essex County Council) as part of the Core Strategy.

Policy SA TIP2 – Transport in Tiptree

The Policy is unsound because the proposed improvements to the infrastructure are required now, before any future development is considered. Evidence base does not indicate how the Grange Road site will be accessed. Paragraph 5.197 states the strategic access to the A12 from Tiptree is via Kelvedon and Feering; however, when travelling towards Chelmsford it is via the Braxted Road and this junction is in need of improvement.

CBC Initial Comments – The principles of access and infrastructure measures which are needed to be support future residential development in Tiptree have been agreed as part of the Core Strategy. The allocations have been made in light of information about access.

Chapter 6 – Public Realm

The Plan is unsound because part of St James School Field is allocated for residential purposes which is inconsistent with the way other school sites have been treated. The Strategic Open Space Allocation in the North Growth Area should be formally allocated on the Proposals Map.

CBC Initial Comments – The Council has strived to be consistent and allocate school playing fields as open space. St James School Playing Field should be allocated as open space and is to be included within the schedule of minor changes.

The Council consider it more appropriate for specific details such as site layout, community hubs and amenity areas to be set out within the subsequent North Colchester Master Plan. If areas of Strategic Open Space are allocated on the Proposals Maps at this stage it could be detrimental to the delivery and implementation of the Master Plan during the later stages of the plan period.

Chapter 7 – Transport and Accessibility

The successful CIF2 financial bid which will deliver the new A12 junction was predicated on ensuring that sufficient highways capacity would be delivered to support the North Growth Area Urban Extension (NGAUE). Paragraph 7.6 should be changed to reflect this evidence and state that the design of the new A12 junction has made prudent provision for the increased transport demands of the adopted Core Strategy. The delivery of the new A12 junction is subject to a known programme. Paragraph 7.5 should reflect this evidence and state that it will be delivered by March 2011.

CBC Initial Comments -

Any planning application for the NGAUE will be expected to submit a transport assessment which must include a capacity analysis of the new junction which will be evaluated to establish if any further works to the junction are required.

Chapter 8 – Environment and Rural Communities

The introduction of Locally Designated Sites has been undertaken without the opportunity for proper public consultation or examination of the evidence. The designation of sites as Local Wildlife Sites appears not legally compliant and unsound. The proposed designations and text should be withdrawn pending further consultation.

Objection to the proposed extension of Coopers Holiday Resort due to the crime figures generated by the site and strain on the infrastructure including traffic impacts.

CBC Initial Comments – The study into the Local Wildlife Sites was commissioned as part of the Council's comprehensive evidence base and involved a wide range of stakeholders including landowners and ecologists.

Holiday Park allocations have been made as a result of site representations received at earlier stages of the Site Allocations consultation and are considered to reflect the current on site arrangements and support the tourism objectives found within the Core Strategy.

Chapter 9 – Monitoring and Implementation

The DPD lacks clarity and transparency on the number of housing units that will be delivered by the sites in Policy SA H1 and how this relates to the overall requirement set out in the CS H1. This omission means that monitoring will neither be transparent or easily accessible and is not consistent with paragraph 4.47 of PPS12.

CBC Initial Comments - Monitoring is a fundamental part of the Colchester Local Development Framework and the housing completions will be monitored annually to ensure that the Council is progressing in accordance with the adopted Housing Trajectory. Results will appear in the Annual Monitoring Report which will be informed by the annual update to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. This contains a forward look at housing delivery.

5. Unduly Made Representations

A total of 29 representations were considered unduly made. All will be submitted to the Inspector. 22 of these were from residents in Tiptree whose responses could not be evaluated since they had ticked the box that the document was sound but then also submitted comments indicating that they thought the site allocations proposed for Tiptree were unsound but did not specify which policy or paragraph their comments referred to. The Council e-mailed the 27 respondents who had completed the form in this manner to clarify their views. Six replied that they considered the Tiptree policy unsound and these have accordingly been logged as duly made. The remaining 22 have been logged as comments only. A further letter from a Tiptree resident has been logged as a comment only as it did not clearly indicate views on the soundness of the plan. Another Tiptree rep. related to the Core Strategy.

Four representations from Stanway residents did not include any details as to why the document was considered unsound.

The representation from Braintree District Council was not considered to be duly made as it was received after the deadline. They indicated they had no comments in a letter. This letter was logged and treated as a comment rather than an official representation on the plan.

Appendix A

Regulation 30

Summary of comments by individuals/organisations

Sound Representations

East of England Regional Assembly

Whole DPD - Sound - Site Allocations DPD is in general conformity with the East of England Plan.

Go- East

Whole DPD - Sound – original objection about Policy SAH2 has been withdrawn following agreed proposed wording changes to SAH2 between Go-East & CBC. The revised wording will form part of the schedule to be submitted.

Highways Agency

Whole document - Various comments provided on sites that may have an impact on the A12 trunk road. Comments are provided on Strategic Employment sites, Local Employment Zones, Mixed Use Sites, Housing, Gypsies and Traveller sites, and the North Growth area. Some concern is expressed that further transport evidence will be required to support the proposed site allocations and identify the further transport measures required. The Highways Agency are working closely with Colchester Borough Council and Essex County Council, utilising the Colchester Transport Model in particular, and is confident that by the time the documentation is submitted the Highways Agency concerns will be addressed. In identifying mitigation measures, the Highways Agency is fully supportive of the Colchester Borough approach to sustainable transport measures and would expect the identified mitigation measures to embrace Travel Plans and other transport measures encouraging modal shift from the car.

English Heritage

Section 5 – Urban Renaissance – Suggested minor changes put forward to improve consistency with national policy. The comments are not objections to the soundness of the plan. Specific references to STA1, GAR1 and paragraphs 5.7 – 5.13.

Sport England

NGA2 - Policy supported as it seeks to maintain Mile End playing fields as well as make new provision for outdoor sport.

Essex County Council

Whole Document - Headline issues are expressed as the need to amend wording of the East Colchester Transport and Accessibility section; the need to reference a range of educational facilities rather than focusing on primary school facilities; improving reference to County Council Plans and Strategies that may inform Colchester's LDF; and that the DPD should focus on maintaining access to sites and ensuring appropriate contributions are sought for transportation infrastructure and enhancement (on site and off site). Minor amendments are suggested to improve the clarity and consistency of the document. Amendments are also requested to the minerals and waste sites shown on the proposals map.

Tendring District Council

All Policies - Sound

Braintree District Council (unduly made)

Whole Document - Sound

EEDA

All Policies - Sound

Coal Authority

Whole DPD - Sound - No comments or objections raised

Layer de la Haye Parish Council

3.14 & Layer de la Haye map

The Parish Council are generally supportive of the development of local businesses however they do not consider that transport implications of developing Queensmeade, The Folley, have been considered sufficiently. The PC re-iterated its concerns about access to the site and any increase in the number and size of vehicle movements that any future development proposals would create.

Wivenhoe Town Council

SA EC1 - Sound

Policy SA EC2 - Support and emphasise the creation of an urban park.

Cllr Stephen Ford

Whole DPD

Support for reps submitted by Dr Chris Fox on behalf of Wivenhoe Town Council.

Boxted Parish Council

Paragraph 5.114 - The Parish Council wholly endorse the last two sentences of this paragraph.

Paragraph 3.14 – Tin Bins - The site allocation for Tin Bins is supported in terms of the allocation being limited to the existing permitted development area and buildings, but the Parish Council ask that these be fully archived for clarity and, that indigenous hedging be used for screening to reflect the rural setting.

Little Horkesley Parish Council

Whole Document - Representation form indicates all sections of the document are supported as sound.

Mr and Mrs Clayton

Paragraph 5.188 - The Tiptree Site Allocation policies are considered sound. However, if changes are made to the position of the Council regarding sites S25/301, 302, 303 and 304, the DPD would not be sound.

Mr D. Trotter

SATIP1 & Tiptree Inset - Respondent supports the proposed Settlement Boundary on the Submission Tiptree Inset. This now includes Sparrow Cottage within the Settlement Boundary and would enable a small number of further dwellings to be provided on associated land.

Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts

8.17 & 8.18 - The respondents are supportive of the preferred allocation of land adjacent to Coopers Beach Holiday Resort. The proposed allocation is considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy policy ENV2, PPS7 (paragraph 3.7) and the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism. The proposed extension will support the local rural economy and respond positively to the growing demand for better quality holiday accommodation.

D Cookson on behalf of Mr McCarthy

SAH2 & Chappel & Wakes Colne Inset map

Respondent supports the allocation at Orchards Place for a gypsy site.

Tribal/Royal London

SA NGA1 - The allocation of land at Axial Way for residential development is sound, in accordance with adopted policy and is immediately available.

Phillip Crofts

Paragraphs 5.183-5.200 - Tiptree section is supported – development in Tiptree should be kept to a minimum, including rejection of overdevelopment on the Wilkins fields.

Boyer Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey

STA1 - The representation supports STA1 in principle but is submitted without prejudice to a separate objection on detailed aspects of the policy.

Fenn Wright

Para 3.14 - The representation supports allocation of a site to the south of Peldon for local employment use.

Unsound representations by organisation or individuals

Tribal on behalf of Hills Residential

Policy H1 and para 4.11

The Dedham Village envelope, para 4.11 and table of sites supporting Policy H1 should be amended to make the policy sound to include Hallfields Farm to meet the need for local housing needs, for over-55s in particular.

Tribal Property & Planning on behalf of London Asset Management

SA NGA2, 5.14

The document is unsound as the reliance of the current monitoring system is not effective and does not provide sufficient flexibility to ensure the achievement of the delivery of the necessary housing strategy for the Borough in accordance with national and regional policy. The current 5 year housing delivery plan is not based on a viable and realistic monitoring system.

The issues relate to the basis of measurement of 'provision' and the time delay of monitoring. The most recent AMR which covers the period between April 07–March 08 is 19 months out of date. The housing slump which was acknowledged in the AMR has deepened over this time period and now makes the delivery of the targets questionable without the flexibility of greenfield land coming forward in the short term. While the HLAA suggests that there is an adequate amount of brownfield land with planning permission or allocated to meet pre 2106 targets, the issue of grant of consent cannot be relied upon to deliver the necessary targets, particularly where brownfield sites are constrained by infrastructure requirements which will impact on their viability under the current economic climate.

Extant planning permission may need to be re-negotiated in response to the current economic climate or are at risk from prohibitive infrastructure costs.

Monitoring based on up to date assessments need to identify such issues rather than reliance on historic data. To be effective the Site Allocations monitoring process needs to be up to date and viable if targets are to be met.

Land at Axial Way which has been identified as a greenfield residential allocation is available, has no constraints and is deliverable in the short term to help meet RSS targets. The SA recognised this site as being appropriate.

The respondent has proposed changes to 5.124 to identify the need for more effective monitoring and Policy SANGA2 to reflect the need for effectiveness in deliverability to meet RSS targets, to include greenfield sites prior to 2016.

Blue Sky Planning

SA STA1

The Policy is unsound because it does not reflect the potential of the Tollgate Urban District Centre within the growth area. In particular, retail development should be included in the Policy as an appropriate use.

STA3

The penultimate paragraph of STA3 does not accurately reflect Core Strategy policy and is contrary to national policy guidance in PPS6. It provides no framework against which the council will consider applications for retail uses in Stanway and does not provide a criteria based approach. Alternative wording suggested to allow new retail development provided that it meets an identified need and does not have a detrimental impact on the Town Centre, and to support intensification where the quality of the public realm and the built character is improved.

Rapleys on behalf of BRB Residuary

EC1

Policy EC1 is unsound because it identifies land North of Magdalen Street for residential development based on the findings in the SHLAA, but the DPD and proposals map does not specifically allocate the site for residential development. A precise boundary for housing development should be included on the proposals map.

EC8 and paragraphs 5.65-68, 7.79-7.87

The Council's proposals for the Eastern Transit Corridor route have not been the subject of appropriate levels of consultation and as a result are not sound or legally compliant. The Sustainability Appraisal submitted with the document does not discuss potential route, alternative options or assess the sustainability of the route proposed. The proposals map does not identify an area of safeguarded land adjacent to the specified proposed line, contrary to PPS12 which states that proposals maps must set out the areas where policy applies. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the Eastern Transit Corridor is deliverable.

H1 and paragraphs 4.1- 4.11

The approach to allocating general 'predominantly residential' areas is not effective. Whilst it is understood that the designation does incorporate sites to deliver the 15 year housing supply, it is not clear from the current consultation document and the proposals map exactly where the identified housing development sites are located. Sites should be allocated specifically for residential development with clear boundaries.

Boyer Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey

STA1 and paragraphs 5.155-5.159

STA1 is supported in principle, but there is a lack of clarity in the policy as to the extent to which planning applications can be submitted on individual parcels of land within the Growth Area. While there are references to a masterplan and a joint Design Brief for two of the sites, STA1 identifies distinct considerations relating to each of the four allocation sites. Furthermore the sites are in separate ownership and it will be necessary to allow the submission of separate planning applications. Changes should be made to the policy to make it sound by clarifying the anticipated housing capacity of each of the sites, the nature of any further work (eg Masterplan or Design Brief) and the scope for planning applications to be submitted for individual parcels within the allocation.

STA2

The policy is unsound as drafted because of its reference to Stanway Quarry. The proposal for a phased release is related to the Essex County Council Minerals DPD Issues and Options document which is at an early stage. The reliance on a document that has yet to be adopted calls into question the weight that can be given to the precise position of this buffer zone on the proposals map and the consequences which it has for restricting the release of land for housing on the Stanway allocations.

Paragraphs 5.155-5.159

The inclusion of the site between Dyers Road and Warren Lane is supported, but the guidance within these paragraphs is unsound because the phasing is too prescriptive. Potential changes in land ownership and the identification of a safeguard zone based upon the Minerals DPD, which is not due for adoption until 2012, mean it is inappropriate to impose phasing restrictions. The reference to Tree Preservation Orders should be omitted as these are protected by other Regulations and is a matter to be determined by the development control process.

Boyer Planning Ltd on behalf of Colchester Golf Club

SA NGA1, Colchester Inset map

The DPD is unsound as it provides insufficient Green Links across the North Colchester Growth Area and as such fails to have regard to policies contained in the Adopted Core Strategy. The document is not effective or justified in that the Growth Area boundary fails to include adjoining land that will ensure a more effective form of development and will assist with the delivery of housing

and other infrastructure. The DPD can be made sound by amending the Proposals Map to include a Green Link along the western side of the North Growth Area and amending the North Growth Area allocation to include part of the Golf Club land.

Boyer Planning on behalf of AJC Contractors

Paragraph 3.14

The DPD does not provide certainty on the deliverability of appropriate employment land and needs to be more flexible and allocate sites for development that support local rural employment and are well related to existing settlements and transport networks. The DPD could be made sound by allocation the site at The Mullions, Nayland Road, Great Horkesley as a Local Employment Zone.

Boyer Planning on behalf of Mr A Sexton

SAH1

The respondent has submitted a request to amend the Boxted Cross Settlement boundary to include a 0.12 ha site which is located on the edge of the current Boxted Cross settlement close to the primary school and emerging employment area. The respondent is suggesting that the current settlement boundary does not have regard to the site context as the site in question is surrounded on 3 sides by built development and is currently vacant. The respondent is proposing including the site for small scale residential development.

Boyer Planning on behalf of Dishland Ltd

SAH1

DPD is not justified or effective as it fails to make provision for housing development within north east Colchester where there is good infrastructure capacity. The DPD is not an appropriate strategy and it lacks flexibility.

Representation seeks the allocation of 3.8ha of land at the Sports Ground, Bromley Road, Colchester for residential development (2.3 ha) with open space(1.6 ha) .

The site is currently partly used as playing fields however part of the site is also vacant private open space. A consultancy report undertaken by consultants on behalf of the landowners shows that there is an overprovision of playing pitches in the north east part of the Borough as well as a surplus of public open space but it did identify a deficiency in children's play areas. This proposal could help deliver this facility.

Developing the site would help improve open space provision and it is well located to existing retail, community facilities including schools and Town Centre bus routes.

This allocation for housing development is consistent with adopted Core Strategy objectives. There are few other reasonable size sites available in this part of Colchester that could be developed without encroaching into areas of open countryside.

Proposed change involves the deletion of the open space designation with a re-allocation for residential development.

Fenn Wright

H1

The Site Allocations document is unsound because it does not allow for the growth of Peldon. The representation supports allocation of a site at Mersea Road, Peldon for residential development.

H1

The Site Allocations document is unsound because it does not allow for the logical expansion of Langenhoe. The representation supports allocation of a site at Park View, Abberton Road for residential development.

H1

The Site Allocations document is unsound because it does not allow sufficient allocation in West Mersea to allow for natural growth of the town. The representation supports allocation of land to the rear of Brierley Hall, East Road, West Mersea for residential development.

3.14

The document is unsound because it does not recognise the existing uses and local need for Haycocks Farm to be recognised as a Local Employment Zone.

RPS Planning and Development

Para 3.14

Object to inclusion of B&Q (Lightship Way) as site allocated as a Local Employment Zone. The B&Q store represents recent investment in the area in the form of a modern and comprehensive DIY store. To restrict the use of that land to pure employment uses ignores the existing business use of the site and the employment allocation would potentially prevent the existing occupier from improving its business.

Colchester Bus Users

Section 5

The definition and precise wording concerning transit corridors is inconsistent and should be clarified. It is unclear for what purpose a strip of land alongside the railway is to be safeguarded. Bus priority routes have been identified on the Proposals Map, but there is no mention of them in the Map Key, nor are they defined in para 5.82. The East Park and Ride was deleted from the Core Strategy on the basis that it was unsupported by evidence and could be in

conflict with a Tendring P&R. The Bus Users Group supports a rail-based P&R system rather than a bus-based one. Para 5.83 appears to be written to suggest bus-based East P&R is LDF approved. Objections to road schemes at Greenstead Roundabout, Colne Causeway and North Station. Hythe Station improvements are of no relevance for Tendring and Colchester journeys and only serve London commuters. No site for a replacement bus station is shown

Indigo Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's

STA3

Sainsbury's object to the allocation of the London Road Stanway site as set out under Policy STA3. The accompanying Proposals Maps are unclear as to where this allocation refers to, and the final paragraph in the policy text is also unclear. The policy is currently unsound and does not take account of the council's previous decisions on this site to approve a supermarket, nor allow for the necessary degree of flexibility. The site should be allocated for retail use and the adjacent Urban District Centre should be extended to incorporate the new store site.

STA1

Sainsbury's strongly object to the allocation for new employment development in area d – Land off London Road under STA1. It is unclear on the accompanying Proposals Maps where the site is. The current consultation document is also inconsistent with the Sustainability Appraisal which recommends that the site is allocated as a District Centre and the existing Sainsbury's site is allocated as employment land. Sainsbury's agreed a land swap as part of the planning permission process to provide retail use on the new Sainsbury's site at land to the north of London Road and to provide employment uses on the existing Sainsbury's site. This should be reflected in all LDF documents. The site should be allocated for retail use and the adjacent Urban District Centre should be extended to incorporate the new store site. STA1 is currently unsound and does not take account of the council's previous decisions and recommendations on this site to approve a supermarket, nor allow for the necessary degree of flexibility.

Indigo Planning on behalf of Care Aspirations

NGA 1

Support the principle of the growth area but policy is inflexible in limiting the uses to residential and employment. Alternative uses at an appropriate scale may be acceptable and should be considered on their merits.

Andrew Martin on behalf of Wilkin and Sons

TIP1 – 5.188 and 191

The Site Allocation DPD is sound in principle, subject to some amendments which will not undermine the Council's Housing Strategy and will allow continued investment and secure jobs in a long established and successful local firm. The representation seeks to amend policy TIP1 and the Tiptree

Proposals Map to include a further small housing and public open space allocation in Tiptree.

Andrew Martin on behalf of Wivenhoe Consortium

EC7

The policy providing University of Essex expansion is generally supported, however, there is justification to alter settlement boundaries to provide additional sports pitches, a golf course, residential units, and community uses.

Andrew Martin on behalf of Mr R West

SA STA1 & paragraphs 5.147, 5.153 & 5.154

This Policy criterion 7 and the supporting paragraphs is unsound because the constraint imposed upon development is not justified by the evidence and fails to state that reasonable alternatives are available. This places unnecessary doubt on the implementation of the allocation and requires minor changes to the wording in relation to the disposal of sewage. The wording in paragraph 5.153 should acknowledge that the Master Plan SPD should have regard to detailed boundaries, boundary treatment and to provide some flexibility for further growth once further need is justified.

Essex Wildlife Trust

SASTA1 and SAEC7

Essex Wildlife Trust strongly objects to the inclusion of development on the local wildlife sites within the East Colchester and Stanway Growth Areas. Development would destruct local wildlife sites, result in the loss of connectivity to the wider environment and result in the loss of accessible natural green space. Development proposals will directly impact wildlife due to major loss of habitat, indirectly impact wildlife in and around the allocated sites due to a loss of connectivity corridors between habitats, and directly impact the quality of life of people living in the vicinity due to a loss of accessible natural green space.

DLP Planning (on behalf of Williamson Developments)

3.14 & Langham map

DLP Planning Ltd have proposed the allocation of a new 4ha site in Langham off Park Road for use as a Business Park to be allocated as a Local Employment Zone (LEZ) as an alternative to the School Farm buildings site which has been also been proposed as an LEZ in another representation submitted. The DLP representation proposes the relocation of businesses currently operating at the established Business Park in the School Farm buildings off School Road, Langham to the newly proposed Business Park. As part of the representation, the School Farm building site is being proposed for phased residential development for a total of 114 houses including the provision of 60 affordable housing. The redevelopment of the School Farm site would be contingent on the prior relocation of the existing businesses to the site adjacent to the A12.

The representation argues that the proposed business park is better located in transport terms as it is close to the A12, offers scope for businesses to expand and the relocation of businesses away from Langham village addresses existing traffic and amenity issues.

Environment Agency

5.116

The respondent is critical that the Site Allocation DPD was developed using unsound baseline evidence to assess water supply resources and sewer capacity. Evidence should have been taken from Stage 2 of the Water Cycle Study which has used detailed modelling about capacity of individual water supply areas and sewage treatment works across Colchester Borough.

It is recommended that an additional paragraph is added under section 5.116. Specific wording is to be agreed with Anglia Water but the paragraph should highlight that there is insufficient capacity at Colchester STW and the sewer network to cope with the projected growth. Discussions with Anglia Water are needed to identify a strategic solution to improvements to the STW and sewer network. Also need to tie in confirmation of AMP5 investment plans for Colchester.

5.59

Respondent objecting to wording in paragraph 5.59 which states that residential development will be restricted to upper levels in flood zones (FZ) 2, 3a & 3b. FZ 3b is the functional floodplain and national policy does not recognise residential development as an appropriate use in FZ3b. Despite King Edward Quay (SAEC4) being a regeneration area, this does not justify overruling national policy

Anglian Water

Paragraph 5.154

The document is sound but minor amendments are suggested to the wording of the Policy and paragraph 5.154.

STA1

The document is sound but minor amendments are suggested to the wording of the Policy and paragraph 5.154.

CgMS Ltd. on behalf of Mr. J. Warren

SASTA3, Colchester Inset map

The objector represents the owners of Stane Park. The content of Policy SA STA3 is generally supported but it is considered there are aspects which should be amended to make it 'sound' in terms of effectiveness. The policy should be amended to clarify that Stanway should accommodate 36,500sqm of office floor space as identified in Core Strategy table CE1c. The statement "no additional services and facilities will be required" is not explained or justified. Hotel uses should be included in the list of appropriate uses. In sub-

paragraph (d), the words “including land within Stane Park”, after business incubation space, should be deleted – there is no special characteristic of Stane Park which requires it to be provided on this site. The boundary of the Tollgate Urban District Centre shown on the Proposals Map should be amended to include the approved site for a new Sainsbury store to bring the allocation into line with PPS6.

Terence O’Rourke Ltd on behalf of O & H Properties Ltd.

SA STA1, Colchester Inset map

Policy SA STA1 fails to recognise the employment commitments within the Stanway Growth Area. Extant planning permission exists for B1, B2, B8 and car showrooms. In failing to identify the committed employment area at Lakelands, the Site Allocations DPD and Colchester Inset Proposals Map are both flawed and cannot be regarded as being sound. Policy SA STA1 should recognise the existing employment commitment at Lakelands. The Proposals Map and Settlement Boundary should be amended to include the employment area as shown on the submitted drawings.

Nigel Turp

STA4

The policy is unsound because the housing proposed for Fiveways Farm and Dyers Road will cause traffic problems and essential transport infrastructure for the area should be provided in advance of any housing. No plans have been put forward to ease the traffic situation.

Mr Middleton

SA STA1

The Policy is unsound because the road network in the vicinity of Fiveways Fruit Farm cannot cope with the additional traffic.

Caroline Sokhi

SA STA2

The Policy is not effective because the sites at Dyers Road/Warren Lane and Fiveways Fruit Farm are affected by plans to extend quarrying operations and it is not certain if they can be delivered within the Plan period. The Policy is also contradictory because the flexibility introduced to meet housing targets will enable developers to build on greenfield sites in preference to brownfield.

SA STA4

The Plan is unsound because it is reliant on the completion of the Western Bypass but there are no guarantees to ensure its delivery within the plan period. The Schools reorganisation by Essex CC will put further pressure on existing overloaded local network.

SASTA5

Plan unsound because it is undeliverable in terms of proposals for Strategic Open Space provision in Stanway. Proposed Open Space sites shown on the Proposals Map are active quarry sites with long term consents up to 2022. To date no sites used for quarrying have been restored for beneficial uses so no guarantee that any open space sites will become available during plan period. The respondent also highlighted Colchester Council's lack of control over mineral sites thereby reducing their ability to ensure deliverability.

Councillor Scott – Boutell

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound and contradicts itself because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites, as a consequence of development costs of brownfield land and meeting housing targets. The stand-off area for the quarry extension will not be available during the Plan period.

SA STA4

The Plan is unsound because it is reliant on the completion of the Western Bypass but there are no guarantees to ensure its delivery within the plan period. Even if completed, its north/south orientation will do little to assist the local road network, which predominantly carries east/west traffic. The schools reorganisation by Essex CC will put further pressure on existing overloaded local network.

SA STA5 & Colchester Inset map – Stanway

Plan is unsound and undeliverable in terms of strategic open space. Suggested that areas currently shown as Open Space on the Proposals Map are errors as they are working quarries up to 2022. Residents waiting for beneficial land restoration schemes from previous planning permissions for quarrying in Stanway therefore respondent questioning the likelihood of any open space coming on stream during plan period. The Waste processing at the proposed MBT plant is likely to be in operation beyond plan period and as it is not operational yet and the respondent has stated that likelihood of land being available as open space is logically zero. Respondent also raised CBC's lack of control over mineral sites which limits our ability to ensure delivery. The land has no amenity value to residents and should not be included as open space

Debbie Offord

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because the flexibility will enable the development of greenfield sites first in preference to brownfield.

SA STA4

The Plan is unsound because the existing local road network is overstretched and cannot cope with further large developments. The Western by-pass,

even if constructed, would not assist as this will serve north/south traffic, whereas the majority of traffic is going east/west.

SA STA5

Plan is unsound as open space promised in past has never been provided. Many open spaces (along Winstree Road) have been lost to residential development without open space being provided e.g. sand/gravel pits at Tollgate. Areas shown on Proposals Map as Open Space are active mineral sites fenced off to prevent access – the land is industrial due to proposals to extend quarry proposals and not open space.

Michael Offord

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because all brownfield land should be used and the Western By-pass completed, before greenfield sites are developed.

SA STA4

The Policy is unsound because even if the Western By-pass is completed it will not cure existing traffic problems. Further development will exacerbate this situation.

SA STA5

This Policy is unsound as the site is in use as a quarry/landfill site. The existing population should be provided with some open space before any further development is permitted.

Mrs C E Goody

SASTA4

The Policy is unsound because the Fiveways Junction, Blackberry Road and Dyers Road cannot cope with additional volumes of traffic.

Mr and Mrs Hyam

SA STA4

Unduly made – no details provided as to why the Policy is considered unsound.

Mrs Stella Brand

SA STA1-STA5

Further mixed-use development will reduce quality of life in Stanway even further. The area around Dyers Road is near to an Ancient Dyke and should be kept as a green area.

Mrs Affolter

Policy SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites.

SA STA4

The Plan is unsound because it relies upon the provision of the Western bypass and there is no guarantee this will be provided in the plan period. The existing road network cannot cope with existing levels of traffic.

SA STA5

The Policy is unsound because the existing use is a quarry/landfill site and the Borough Council has no control over mineral sites and their restoration. The land has no amenity value to residents and should be discounted as open space.

Mr R Marter

Policy SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites and, is likely in order to meet house building targets. Also, the stand-off area for the proposed extension to the quarry will not become available for residential use within the plan period.

Policy SA STA4

The Plan is unsound because it relies upon the provision of the Western bypass, which is years overdue, and there is no guarantee this will be provided in the plan period. The existing road network cannot cope with existing levels of traffic. The proposed bypass will carry traffic north/south whereas the main congestion is caused by traffic travelling east/west.

SA STA5

This Policy is unsound and not deliverable within the plan period as the site is in use as a quarry/landfill site, with planning permission to continue until 2022, and a 25 year period permission on adjoining site for waste management.

Mr K. Davis

SA STA2

The plan is unsound as Policy SASTA2 contradicts itself, and phasing of the site will be developer led. If they choose not to develop brownfield sites, the Stanway site will have to be released to meet targets. The stand-off area allowed for the proposed extension to the quarry would not be available during the plan period.

SA STA4

The plan is unsound as it is dependent on the provision of the western bypass. Nothing in the LDF can ensure its delivery. Existing proposals will have a dramatic impact on the already overstretched local road network. The

western by-pass would only carry north / south traffic whereas the main congestion is caused by traffic travelling east / west.

SA STA5

The plan is unsound and undeliverable in respect of its proposals for Strategic Open Space in the Stanway Area. Land shown as proposed open space on the proposals map is in fact working quarry land or land with consent for a major waste management facility. The possibility of the land being available as 'Strategic Open Space' is realistically nil. The Borough Council has no control over mineral sites and cannot ensure delivery. The land has no amenity value to residents and should therefore be discounted as Open Space.

Mr A. Thompson

SA STA4

Policy STA4 is unsound as it is completely dependent on the western bypass and does not ensure that this much needed relief road will be completed before any more development in Stanway is allowed.

SA STA5

STA5 Open Space is unsound because a large section of the open space shown on the map is working quarries or landfill sites.

Mrs I. Ilnicka

SA STA5 & Colchester Inset map

The hedgerow to Fiveways Fruit Farm currently provides a wildlife refuge and blocks the view of the farm. Any extension would impact on the hedgerow and be contrary to national policy preserving them.

Mr A. Humphreys

SASTA2

The plan is unsound as Policy SASTA2 contradicts itself, and phasing of the site will be developer led. If they choose not to develop brownfield sites, the Stanway site will have to be released to meet targets. The stand-off area allowed for the proposed extension to the quarry would not be available during the plan period.

SASTA4

The plan is unsound as it is dependent on the provision of the western by-pass. Nothing in the LDF can ensure its delivery. Existing proposals will have a dramatic impact on the already overstretched local road network. The western by-pass would only carry north / south traffic whereas the main congestion is caused by traffic travelling east / west.

SASTA5

The plan is unsound and undeliverable in respect of its proposals for Strategic Open Space in the Stanway Area. Land shown as proposed open space on

the proposals map is in fact working quarry land or land with consent for a major waste management facility. The possibility of the land being available as 'Strategic Open Space' is realistically nil. The Borough Council has no control over mineral sites and cannot ensure delivery. The land has no amenity value to residents and should therefore be discounted as Open Space.

Mr C Noy

Policy SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites. This will make it even more unlikely that the roads will be able to cope.

Policy SA STA4

The Policy is unsound because Fiveways, Dyers Road, Blackberry Road and Peartree Road are already congested and the proposed school extension will make it worse. There is nowhere for an east/west road to go.

SA STA5

The Policy is unsound as the site is in use as a quarry and will not be available for many years.

Mr and Mrs Bloomfield

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites. Stanway is getting overcrowded and more schools will bring more chaos.

SA STA4

The Policy is unsound because without prior infrastructure, expansion is not viable. Priority should be given to the local area, Fiveways Junction and Winstree Road.

SA STA5

The Policy is unsound because open space is being taken up by other developments.

Mr Went

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites. Also, the stand-off area for the proposed extension to the quarry will not become available for residential use within the plan period.

SA STA4

The Policy is unsound because the western bypass, should it ever be constructed, will carry traffic north/south whereas the main congestion is

caused by traffic travelling east/west. All the development planned for Stanway will increase traffic pressures.

SA STA5

The Policy is unsound because the existing use is a quarry/landfill site and will not have any amenity value to residents in the plan period. The proposed eastern boundary of the pit runs very close to Grymes Dyke and could cause damage.

Mrs Templeman

SA STA2, STA4, STA5

Three representations unduly made. No details provided as to why the Policies are considered unsound.

Mrs L Hall

SA STA4

The Policy is unsound because the local road infrastructure cannot cope with traffic volumes. There is no scope for an east/west road because it is an area of English heritage.

SA STA5

This Policy is unsound and not deliverable within the plan period as the site is in use as a quarry/landfill site, with planning permission to continue until 2022, and an adjoining site for waste management. The Borough Council has no control over mineral sites and their restoration. The land has no amenity value to residents and should be discounted as open space.

Paragraph 5.156

An extension of the mineral workings will cause problems relating to pollution, noise, dust and the water table.

Miss Heather Lloyd

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites. The land should be retained for its natural beauty.

SA STA4

The Plan is unsound because it relies upon the provision of the Western bypass, which is years overdue, and there is no guarantee this will be provided in the plan period. The existing road network cannot cope with existing levels of traffic.

SA STA5

This Policy is unsound and not deliverable within the plan period as the site is in use as a quarry/landfill site.

Mrs Marjorie Skoumal

SA STA1

The Policy is unsound because Stanway is already overcrowded, with poor roads and too much pollution. The loss of Fiveways Fruit Farm fruit production is not appropriate and houses should not be built in close proximity to an extended quarry.

Mr John Harvey

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound and contradicts itself because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites, as a consequence of development costs of brownfield land and meeting housing targets. The stand-off area for the quarry extension will not be available during the Plan period.

SA STA4

The Plan is unsound because it relies upon the provision of the Western bypass, which is years overdue, and there is no guarantee this will be provided in the plan period. The existing road network cannot cope with existing levels of traffic. The proposed bypass will carry traffic north/south whereas the main congestion is caused by traffic travelling east/west.

SA STA5

This Policy is unsound and not deliverable within the plan period as the site is in use as a quarry/landfill site, with planning permission to continue until 2022, and a 25 year period permission on adjoining site for waste management. The Borough Council has no control over mineral sites and their restoration. The land has no amenity value to residents and should be discounted as open space.

Dr. C Joscelyne

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites. The stand-off area and the public open space will not become available during the plan period.

SA STA4

The Policy is unsound because it will not deal with the major transport problems that will be created on existing roads by the scale of the proposed housing development. The proposed bypass will not help traffic in east/west direction. There is no land available to help ameliorate this situation.

SA STA5

This Policy is unsound and not deliverable within the plan period as the site is in use as a quarry/landfill site, with planning permission to continue until 2022, and a 25 year period permission on adjoining site for waste management.

Mr. P. A. Thompson

SA STA4

The assumptions on which any future traffic forecasting or modelling are made are strongly disputed. Existing traffic flows are already heavier than local residents accept. Insufficient account has been taken of the plans for secondary education in the Borough. Failing radical redevelopment of the existing road network alternative sites away from Stanway have to be identified. Evidence from local residents must be considered.

SA STA5

While Fiveways Fruit Farm is not available to the public as open space, it is nevertheless a valuable 'green lung'. There is inadequate open space to support the proposed housing. Space shown on the maps is in use for quarrying, waste disposal or a proposed waste plant. Alternative sites away from Stanway have to be identified for housing. Stanway residents must be consulted.

Stanway Parish Council

SA STA2 & Colchester Inset

The plan is unsound as Policy SASTA2 contradicts itself, and phasing of the site will be developer led. If they choose not to develop brownfield sites, the Stanway site will have to be released to meet targets. The stand-off area allowed for the proposed extension to the quarry would not be available during the plan period.

SASTA4 & Colchester Inset

The plan is unsound as it is dependent on the provision of the western by-pass. Nothing in the LDF can ensure its delivery. Existing proposals will have a dramatic impact on the already overstretched local road network. The western by-pass would only carry north / south traffic whereas the main congestion is caused by traffic travelling east / west.

SA STA5

Plan unsound and undeliverable in terms of strategic open space. Stated that the areas currently shown as Open Space on the Proposals Map are working quarries up to 2022. Residents waiting for beneficial land restoration schemes from planning permissions for quarrying in Stanway permitted 40 years ago therefore respondent questioning the likelihood of any open space coming on stream during plan period. The waste processing at the proposed MBT plant is likely to be in operation beyond plan period (permission granted for 25 years of waste processing) and as it is not operational yet the respondent has stated that the likelihood of land being available as open space is realistically nil. Respondent also raised CBC's lack of control over mineral sites which limits our ability to ensure delivery. The land has no amenity value to residents and should not be discounted as open space.

Mrs Janette Purser

SA STA2

The Policy is unsound and contradicts itself because it will enable greenfield sites to be used in preference to brownfield sites, as a consequence of development costs of brownfield land and meeting housing targets. The stand-off area for the quarry extension will not be available during the Plan period.

SA STA4

The Plan is unsound because it relies upon the provision of the Western bypass, which is years overdue, and there is no guarantee this will be provided in the plan period. The existing road network cannot cope with existing levels of traffic. The proposed bypass will carry traffic north/south whereas the main congestion is caused by traffic travelling east/west.

SA STA5

This Policy is unsound and not deliverable within the plan period as the site is in use as a quarry/landfill site, with planning permission to continue until 2022, and a 25 year period permission on adjoining site for waste management. The Borough Council has no control over mineral sites and their restoration. The land has no amenity value to residents and should be discounted as open space.

Myland Parish Council

SA NGA1, para's. 5.116, 5.117, 5.118, 5.1121, 5.125,& 5.137

Myland Parish Council are opposed to the 2,200 new homes on greenfield land to west of Mile End Road. The proposed development land has been identified in the Green Infrastructure policy as an important green wedge to be protected. Myland PC state that the proposed development will place an intolerable burden on the local highway infrastructure and as an alternative propose sharing the development evenly across the rest of Colchester thereby reducing the site area and number of dwellings required in Myland.

The PC believe SA NGA1 is confusing by referring to Royal London Sports facility. Paragraph 5.116 needs to be amended for consistency and clarity with paragraph 5.109 in terms of housing numbers to be delivered.

Paragraphs 5.117 & 5.118 in relation to Severalls Hospital are out of date - amendments have been proposed which reflect the current situation.

The respondent states that paragraph 5.121 (SDP) is evidentially wrong and confuses two Turner Road sites; Turner Rise and Turner Village.

Paragraph 5.125 is legally inaccurate and ineffective. There is inconsistency in terms of the number of neighbourhood centres to be provided as identified in the Core Strategy and section 5.125. The PC is arguing that details are still being worked out through the masterplan process therefore this issue cannot

be included in the policy at this stage. They have also suggested that the statement about new A12 junction is factually inaccurate.

The PC has proposed a number of changes to paragraph's 5.116, 5.118, 5.121 and 5.125 to address the issues raised in their representation.

SA NGA2, para. 5.126 & Colchester Inset map

Overarching comments as above.

The PC believes that parts of the policy statement are inaccurate, ineffective and they are strongly opposed to the use of the statement 'A minimum of 2200 new dwellings'. The PC is suggesting that the net developable area for housing is less than the general calculations of 100ha suggested – there is a need to define the net developable area much more clearly. There is a need to define 2 neighbourhood centres in accordance with Core Strategy and paragraph 5.117. Policy currently does not reflect recently agreed land requirement of 70 000m² for a secondary school.

The PC proposed a number of changes to policy SANGA 2 in relation to the new developable area of available for housing, neighbourhood centres and the provision of a secondary school

SA NGA3, para. 5.126

Overarching comments as above.

Myland PC state that SANGA3 is not in accordance with the Sustainable Community Act 2007, or the Haven Gateway Employment Land Study, updated 2009. The Colchester Employment Land Survey, 2009, recognises that 55% of employment in the Borough takes place outside Employment Zones. The PC suggest that the thrust of the policy is wrong in that it only seeks to protect Employment Zones and concentrate all commercial development in the Town Centre. The PC identify 5 current failures in this policy in relation to the West Mile End development proposals a) the need to provide employment for 3,500-4,000 adults in this area, b) the need to minimise travel outside the development to help address current congestion problems, c) the aging population which will create the need for care facilities with high associated high employment rates, d) need to supplement section 106 tariff contributions with neighbourhood public facilities and e) greater flexibility needed to adjust lapsed B1 approvals to reflect particular circumstances of the West Mile End development.

The PC have proposed amendments to paragraph 5.126 to allow greater provision of a specified range of B1 uses in North Colchester to help the Council meet its sustainable communities/travel planning and community development policies and respect the particular needs of West Mile End .

SA NGA4, para's 5.133 & 5.134

Overarching comments as above.

The PC is critical that NGA 4 paragraphs 5.133 & 5.134 are insufficiently strong in promoting commuter cycling routes which makes them less effective. They also state that paragraph 5.134 is inaccurate as it should recognise Severalls Lane as an important bus route in the area. The paragraphs should be amended accordingly.

SA NGA5, para. 5.137 & Colchester inset map
Overarching comments as above.

The PC is critical that NGA 5 does not adequately promote green links. Green links around Mile End have not shown on the Proposals Map

The PC have asked for the green links around Mile End to be shown on the Proposals Map and requested the inclusion of additional wording to paragraph 5.137 to ensure that greenlinks in Mile End are retained, enhanced and extended as part of future planning applications for the area.

The PC have proposed amending paragraph 5.133 to promote commuter cycling routes and paragraph 5.134 to recognise Severalls Lane as an important bus route locally.

NGA; para's. 5.109, 5.112 & 5.114
Overarching comments as above.

The PC believes that paragraph 5.109 is legally unsound with regards to consistency of intentions, up to date data, and the plan period across the document. They are suggesting that there are inaccuracies in 5.109 in terms of the number of current and proposed dwellings and relevant date period. They have suggested that dates should be changed to 1.9.09 to 31.3.25

The PC state that paragraph 5.112 Sustainability Appraisal is ineffective, lacking in clarity in intention in that baseline approved development areas must be completed before new sites are permitted to proceed. They feel that the SA is too subjective and open to abuse by developers to activate long standing planning consents not in accordance with current construction/development policy.

The PC feel that paragraph 5.114 is ineffective due to significant omissions of facilities required in North Colchester and it lacks adequate force of intention due to the use of the verb 'considered'.

Myland Parish Council have proposed a number of changes to paragraphs 5.109, 5.112 & 5.114 to address the issues raised in their representation.

John Dickinson

Policy SA NGA1

The Mill Road site should be 'Land at The Myle Mill Road'.

Policy SA NGA2

Parts of this policy are inaccurate and ineffective. Strongly opposed to the reference to a 'minimum' of 2200 dwellings. 'Net developable area available for housing' should be defined better. Two neighbourhood centres should be required, as set out in the Core Strategy and the policy should reflect the recently agreed land requirement (at least 70,000m²) for a secondary school.

Para 5.109

There are contradictions for the number of proposed dwellings. Myland Parish Council suggest referring to the dates 1.9.09 and 31.3.25.

Para 5.112

Sites with planning permission should be completed before new sites are permitted. Wording is suggested to state that a minimum of 80% of 'possible construction development' is completed within locations which are accessible, previously developed or contribute to regeneration before 'construction of significant new developments may start'.

Para 5.114

There are significant omissions from the list of facilities required to be provided and the verb 'considered' lacks adequate force.

Para 5.116

There are contradictions for the number of proposed dwellings. Myland Parish Council suggest referring to the dates 1.9.09 and 31.3.25. Paragraph 5.116 should be amended to state: "Taking account of existing permissions, the outstanding number of units at 1.9.09, together with the new allocations, it is anticipated that the current 4900 dwellings may increase by approximately 4600 dwellings to a total of 9500 in the North Growth Area by 2025."

Para 5.117

The statement about the Severalls Hospital site is out of date. Additional sentence should be inserted. The Core Strategy refers to two neighbourhood centres, not one as referred to in this paragraph.

Para 5.118

This statement is grossly out of date – revised wording suggested.

Para 5.125

This paragraph is legally inaccurate and ineffective; the masterplan is currently under analysis and consultation and the outcome of this negotiation is not known and cannot be determined in any policy document at this time. The statement about the A12 junction is factually inaccurate.

Para 5.126

This paragraph is not in accordance with the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 or the Haven Gateway Colchester Employment Land Study (2009 update) and ignores the characteristics of the west Mile End development. The paragraph should be reworded (suggested text provided.)

Para 5.133

This paragraph is insufficiently strong in promoting commuter cycle routes and is less likely to be effective. New text suggested.

Para 5.134

This paragraph is insufficiently strong in promoting commuter cycle routes and is less likely to be effective. The objector has suggested changes to the paragraph.

Para 5.137

This paragraph is insufficiently strong in promoting green links routes. Furthermore, green links should be shown on the Proposals Map prior to adoption.

DLP on behalf of Strategic Land Planning Trust

SA TC1

Respondent proposing that the Site Allocations DPD is not consistent with the Development Policies DPD and with the evidence base (2009 Hotel Study) in terms of the requirement for additional hotel bedrooms.

The respondent regards the Site Allocations as an inadequate response to the importance attached to immediate and future hotel needs identified in the Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD. They suggest that suitable sites need to be identified to ensure that the required number of beds described in the evidence base are deliverable. A failure to do this equates to not properly interpreting the commitment in the Core Strategy to delivering new hotel bedrooms to support the economy and tourism potential. It also fails to complement Policy DC10 or respond to the evidence that developers are still keen to invest in the Colchester area and a demand exists. They are critical that the current figure of 270-390 of hotel beds needed up to 2021 set out in TC1 is based on an earlier 2007 study and has not used the most up to date 2009 study outputs.

Clive Richardson on behalf of Wm. Wyatt Ltd.

3.14 & West Mersea map

Respondent objecting to the draft allocation covering Coast Road, West Mersea, suggesting that the draft allocation is very specific and covers only a 0.4ha site. The site was used 10 years ago by a mechanical engineer with the rear area used as Peter Clark's Boatyard however there are structural problems with the building, a lack of demand for boating related businesses and high rebuild and repair costs therefore respondent is seeking a new build on the site.

There are unresolved parking/highway issues which would be a problem for a commercial business in light of recently amended parking standards.

A new lease has recently been signed to retain the current boat industry on the majority of the site but agreement excludes the main building fronting

Coast Road. The respondent has proposed redevelopment for residential use as the only financial viable option and claims that the draft policy is unsound as it fails to reflect existing uses in the Conservation Area, does not consider the need for financial viable redevelopment of former commercial uses for residential uses and is not based on sound market evidence for uses proposed by CBC.

Changes to the draft policy wording has been proposed to permit a wider range of uses typical of the Coast Road West Mersea Conservation Area that are financially viable including residential.

Colchester Natural History Society

SA EC8 & Colchester Inset map - East Colchester

The Wivenhoe Trail is not marked on Colchester Inset Map as a green link or mentioned in SAEC8. As part of trail falls within the East Colchester Regeneration Area it needs extra protection. Additional wording proposed to secure and protect Trail from adverse development.

East Mersea Parish Council

Para. 8.18 & Colchester Borough map

East Mersea Parish Council feels that the Site Allocations is unsound. They question how CBC can support the proposed extension of Coopers Holiday Resort due to the crime figures generated by the site and the strain on infrastructure, including traffic impacts. The Parish Council feel other caravan parks on East Mersea are more appropriate for expansion as they employ local labour.

Irene Brunning

Para. 5.187 & Tiptree map

Respondent stated that the Site Allocation DPD is unsound as it does not make the best use of available land and requires an adjustment to the boundary in Tiptree. The respondent has proposed extending the settlement boundary to include land north of the north-west Grange Road boundary to the junction of Oak Road and Kelvedon Road. The respondent feels that the allocation of one large site is more likely to deliver a range of housing types and supports the re-allocation of the land at the corner of Kelvedon Road for residential.

Walsingham Planning

SA TC1 & para. 5.28

The DPD is unsound as it appears to have been written using the draft Hotel Study and not the 2009 study. The respondent acknowledges that the publication of the Hotel study after the completion of the DPD may explain inconsistencies between the two documents.

The Royal Mail Site on St Peter's Street has not been included in the DPD despite on going pre-application discussions to develop it as a Premier Inn. The respondents have disputed the availability of the Sheepen Road site.

The DPD can be made sound and compliant by referring to the Royal Mail site as suitable for hotel development Reference should also be made about the proximity to the Town Centre as the site, due to its location, should be regarded as being within the Town Centre as it can offer the same advantages as other identified Town Centre sites.

Councillor Chillingworth

SA H2

The respondent has proposed deleting Site 11 Orchard Place, Vernon's Road, Chappel from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation policy suggesting that it is unsound to include a site that has been refused planning permission and which may be subject to appeal.

Great Tey Parish Council

SA H2

Great Tey Parish Council have objected to the inclusion of the Vernons Road Chappel site for 3 pitches in policy SAH2 due to objections raised to the planning application (July 09) which was recently refused.

Mr Angus Forrest

SA H2

This Policy is unsound because at the time of publication of this DPD, site 11 (Orchard Place, Vernons Road, Chappel) had been refused planning permission and it does not therefore comply with the requirements for inclusion listed in paragraph 4.14. The site is not suitable as it does not comply with the criteria listed in H5 in the Core Strategy. The Council has not demonstrated that they have actively sought to identify suitable sites through a comparative exercise. This site was not identified in the Reg 25 consultation and the inclusion of this site appears reactionary to meet the numbers required by the RSS revision of July 2009.

Chappel Parish Council

SA H2

This Policy is unsound because at the time of publication of this DPD, site 11 (Orchard Place, Vernons Road, Chappel) had been refused planning permission and it does not therefore comply with the requirements for inclusion listed in paragraph 4.14. The site has never previously been mentioned for inclusion and there is no history of the Council considering suitable sites through due process.

Protect Rural Chappel & Wakes Colne

Policy SA H2

This Policy is unsound because at the time of publication of this DPD, site 11 (Orchard Place, Vernons Road, Chappel) had been refused planning permission. The application 090891 was unanimously refused by the Planning Committee and no reference was made to 3 pitches being acceptable.

Mrs N Brett

SA H2

This Policy is unsound because at the time of publication of this DPD, site 11 (Orchard Place, Vernons Road, Chappel) had been refused planning permission. The site is unsuitable for the proposed allocation in terms of highway safety, lack of appropriate village facilities, and impact upon the countryside.

Mr. E. Morgan

SA H2, 4.12-4.19

Objection relates to the soundness and legal compliance of the Policy and also to specific issues relating to the allocation of the site in Vernons Road, Chappel. It is unclear whether the policy and its allocation have had sufficient regard to national policy such as the advice on site location and selection in Circular 01/2006. The Local Planning Authority appear to have only considered certain types of site. Another scenario should be considered which examines a far wider spectrum of potential sites and the most sustainable and deliverable of these allocated on proper weighted criteria. The fact that sites have been proposed as part of planning applications does not mean they are appropriate for the use. There was a strong weight of objection to the recent planning application at Vernons Road. There appears to be variance between the statement of 'general' conformity of the site with the provisions of Policy H5 of the Core Strategy and the assessment of the site in the Site Allocations Sustainability Appraisal. The site should be deleted from the allocation and a proper site identification process put in train that concentrates on delivering as sustainable site as possible.

Wakes Colne Parish Council

Policy H2 & paragraphs 4.12-4.19

The inclusion of Orchard Place, Vernons Road, Chappel on the list of suitable sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation makes the policy unsound. The site was refused planning permission on 17th September 2009 for 6 pitches on the size of the site and highways issues. The site is accordingly not suitable for three pitches

D Cookson on behalf of Mr McCarthy

SA H2 & Chappel & Wakes Colne map

Policy H2 regarded as unsound as the Fordham Report 2009 has been superseded by the RSS, and paragraph 4.14 needs to express the number of pitches required as a minimum to avoid a shortfall should the selected sites not come forward. Minor rewording required – sites provided by 2021 (not ‘in’ 2021.) Wording changes needed to make the policy sound have been proposed to address these issues.

Para. 4.9 & Chappel & Wakes Colne map

Paragraph is unsound as it needs to clarify that the affordable housing targets do not apply to Gypsy and Traveller sites. Gypsy and Traveller accommodation meets a specialist need therefore it would be unreasonable and unviable to make them subject to overall affordable housing requirements. This will add clarity when determining planning applications. Changes proposed to paragraph 4.9 to clarify this issue.

Para. 4.12 & Chappel & Wakes Colne map

Paragraph is unsound as the policy does not make it clear that pitch provision in Colchester as set in the RSS is a minimum. Without this clarity the DPD is not in conformity with the RSS policy H3. Sections of 4.12 are now irrelevant as the approved RSS policy is the material consideration now.

An additional paragraph needed to explain that not all pitches will be available in 2009. If some of the proposed sites do not come forward or not enough pitches are secured additional pitches will be needed to address the shortfall and RSS minimum requirements. Without additional pitches the plan will not conform with the RSS. Changes were proposed to 4.12 to address these issues.

Para. 4.14 & Chappel & Wakes Colne map

First sentence of paragraph 4.14 is unsound as the wording has been superseded by the RSS. Second sentence repeats 4.12 and is not needed. Both sentences to be deleted.

Para. 4.18 & Chappel & Wakes Colne map

Paragraph 4.18 is unsound as it needs to reflect requirements in the RSS for consistency and clarity. Without it there is a lack of certainty and guidance for development management decisions. Local opposition is likely to be high with the risk that members will bow to local pressure to refuse planning applications.

It needs to be clear that capacity figures in the policy and paragraph 4.17 are guidelines and not mandatory. Some sites may be able to accommodate higher numbers subject to specific site conditions and lower design standards especially where there is public support and low impacts.

It also needs to be clear that this policy, its explanatory text and the criteria set out in Core Strategy policy H5 set the whole criteria for determining

planning applications. No proposal on allocated sites should be refused on the basis of policies in the Development Policies DPD. Suggested that this policy should be the only the only material policy guidance for determining applications on allocated sites. Applications on other sites for extensions or increases in capacity should be subject to the appropriate Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD. Two changes were proposed to SAH2 & paragraph 4.18

Barton Willmore on behalf of Gladedale

Paragraph 4.8

The DPD lacks clarity and transparency on the number of housing units that will be delivered by the sites in Policy SA H1 and how this relates to the overall requirement set out in CS H1. As such this paragraph and the related Policy SA H1 are unsound.

Barton Willmore/Gladedale

Paragraph 4.3 (Policy SA H1)

Enlarging the Railway Sidings, Halstead Road to incorporate Chitts Hill would assist the Council to meet its CS objectives set out in paragraph 4.3.

Paragraph 9.5

The DPD lacks clarity and transparency on the number of housing units that will be delivered by the sites in Policy SA H1 and how this relates to the overall requirement set out in the CS H1. This omission means that monitoring will neither be transparent or easily accessible and is not consistent with paragraph 4.47 of PPS12.

Policy SA H1

The Sustainability Appraisal is flawed in its assessment of sites and the conclusions reached for the Chitts Hill site are inconsistent with those on the adjoining Railway Sidings site. Also the SHLAA is not a credible evidence base as it was not prepared in accordance with the Practice Guide. The DPD is overly reliant on large PDL sites in the short/medium term particularly as the larger greenfield sites in the growth areas are not due to be released until 2016. With the economic recession, the DPD is not sufficiently flexible to provide an effective and deliverable supply of housing to meet Core Strategy requirements. In order for the DPD to be sound it needs to allocate the Chitts Hill site as an extension of the Railway Sidings, Halstead Road site.

Robert Needham

SAEC7 & Colchester Inset

The plan is not considered to be legally compliant. There is no credible evidence base to show that all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted e.g. land to the south west of the Undercroft is in effect a continuation of the valley feature. Development on the green field site is incongruous with the biodiversity of the area. Proposal also appears to breach Coastal Protection

Belt policy. Respondent does not agree that recommended biodiversity or landscape enhancements are effective mitigation

Tom Roberts

SA EC7

This allocation is unsound as it conflicts with Policy DP23 in the Development Policies DPD, which aims to protect the coastal protection belt. The evidence to support this allocation for the University is not readily accessible and development could take place elsewhere on the campus, such as over existing parking areas, which would not conflict with Policy DP23. The allocation also conflicts with Policy ENV1 in the Core Strategy as it will drive a wedge into the green corridor and will adversely impact on the backdrop to the estuary. The Council should consider permitting development in the Deer Park or further from the river.

Wivenhoe Town Council

SA EC7

The Policy is unsound because there is a lack of evidence to support an allocation for additional land within the plan period within the Coastal Protection Belt. The Policy also conflicts with Core Strategy Policies ENV1 and KD1 as it lacks sufficient detail to ensure open countryside is retained between the University and Wivenhoe and to secure an effective strategic green corridor along the river.

SA EC8

The Policy is unsound because it is aspirational and does not reflect the evidence base available.

Mr S R H Underwood

SA NGA1

The Policy is unsound because large parts of the growth area provide habitats for UK 'red' listed birds and this conflicts with the Council's Local Wildlife Survey statement 5.

Mr D Barbour

SA CE1

The Policy is unsound because it fails to include Gosbecks Phase 2 land as a site for mixed use development. This land was not donated to the Council as part of the Gosbecks Archaeological Park and its small size and poor quality makes it unsuitable to modern farming. In contrast its location would make a logical extension to the built-up area. The triangular site between Gosbecks View and Cunobelin Way should not be shown as open space.

Riverside Residents Association

6.16 of Sustainability Appraisal

The Plan is unsound because part of St James School Field is allocated for residential purposes. This is inconsistent with the way other school sites have been treated and no clear audit trail is provided for the change from open space to residential. Residential use would be inappropriate because of issues related to flooding, local amenities, traffic and the proximity of a public sewer.

Boxted Parish Council

Paragraph 3.14 – Pot Emporium

This allocation is unsound because the Council's Employment Land Study shows there is an adequate supply of employment land available in the Borough; there is an existing allocation at Hill Farm Industrial Estate where business could be relocated to; the site is relatively large and existing glasshouses could be replaced by large industrial buildings, which would harm the character of the countryside; it is contrary to the Village Design Statement; and, it is not accessible in public transport terms. The Local Plan Policy EMP6 should be reinstated.

Paragraph 3.14

The DPD is unsound because Policy EMP6 in the Local Plan (a special policy area for Boxted) has not been carried through to the LDF. This area comprises 60 smallholdings where isolated businesses have grown up, and a special policy is needed to protect the rural character of this area from adhoc consolidation and expansion. The old Local Plan Policy EMP6 should be reinstated.

Hanover Bloc

Section 4

The DPD is unsound because it fails to allocate land at London Road, Copford for the purpose of developing a retirement village for the Borough. Such a facility is needed to address a void in the underlying housing market for older people, and is consistent with the Council's Strategic Plan 2009-12, which contains a policy thrust designed to deliver quality housing and healthcare provision for older people.

Feering Parish Council

Paragraph 5.183 & 1.19

The DPD is unsound as paragraph 5.183 refers to 680 new housing units, whereas paragraph 1.19 only refers to 70 new units. The existing road infrastructure (the B1023) is unsuitable for all the new development proposed in Tiptree, particularly if 680 additional dwellings are proposed.

Mrs Hazel Moulton

SA TIP1

The Policy is unsound because the proposed development in Grange Road will create immense highway problems, noise pollution for local residents and it will not be available until 2016, which does not meet the urgent need for new homes. The Policy could be made sound by allocating 2.5 acres of land at Park Lane, off Newbridge Road which has no inherent highway issues and is immediately adjacent to the village envelope.

Mr Malcolm Lomer

Paragraphs 1.10 5.191 and Sustainability Report

Grange Road is not suitable site for housing development and should be separated from Vine Farm. At 1118m from Tiptree centre it is greater than the 800 sustainability benchmark. The housing allocation for Tiptree to 2021 does not take account of other sites in Tiptree which will deliver the houses required by 2021. The Site Allocations has identified other sites allocated as predominantly residential where housing would be appropriate. Grange Road is not needed.

Residential development would increase domestic traffic onto the classified rural road which has no footpaths, lighting and high traffic speeds. ECC have no plans to upgrade Grange Road. The Grange Road/ Vine Road junction upgrade will only include a footpath from Vine Road to Kelvedon. The respondent identified that the following infrastructure would be needed at Grange Road prior to any development including increased sewage capacity, doctors surgery, street lighting and footpaths to village centre. Respondent is doubtful that the Grange Road site will deliver employment. The site is not well served by public transport and there are few large employers in Tiptree. The Grange Road employment development on the edge of the village represents ribbon development.

Only a small part of Vine Farm is proposed as public open space therefore the Proposals Map for Tiptree is misleading by not clearly showing this. Recreational facilities are dependent on housing on Vine Road and Grange Road. The claim that recreational facilities will be provided by Grange Road employment/ recreational development is inaccurate.

Tiptree settlement boundary should not include the large Vine Farm site on the basis of a small area of public open space. The settlement boundary should only include segment of open space in the north east corner of the site.

Mr R Williams

SA TIP1

The proposed allocation to extend the employment land at the Wilkins factory site is inappropriate as a modern, efficient factory employing fewer people should not need to double its area. The Factory Hill/Tudwick Road junction is

a traffic hazard and needs re-designing. The decision not to build houses is supported.

Mr Andrew Bryant

SA TIP1

Grange Road is an unsuitable location for residential development due to the infrastructure and distance from the main amenities in the centre of the village. There have been significant levels of development recently but there is still capacity to develop infill sites e.g. Wilkins Site and Tiptree United ground which would benefit all of Tiptree. Grange Road is a rural road which has no footpaths and is poorly lit. Better sites are available which will be more cost effective to maintain if developed. Development should be kept to a minimum as there are limited employment opportunities (except Wilkins) in Tiptree therefore developing Grange Road would result in people having to drive which contravenes local and national objectives. Tiptree is at capacity in terms of sewage and water pressure and there are issues with accessing health facilities. This development is to be built in the open countryside and there are few open spaces in this part of Tiptree. Development at Grange Road would increase traffic on the only road to the site.

Mr & Mrs James Taylor

SA TIP1

Objections raised to developments at Vine Farm and Grange Road. Vine Farm is outside village envelope, is not located close to the village centre and would mean that health, education, sewerage and roadways would not be able to cope with increased development. The state of Grange Road as an access road also identified as an issue.

Mrs Anne Porte

SA TIP1

Objecting to proposed development at Grange Road, Tiptree arguing that it is not necessary. Suggesting that of the 680 houses allocated for Tiptree, 639 have already been built and these along with the 2004 TUFC proposal, Wilkins and other sites proposed means this number has already been reached.

The respondents recognise that the Wilkins development is needed to retain the company which is an important employer in Tiptree. Opposed to the Grange Road development due to its distance from the village centre and potential strain on already strained services. Grange Road is dangerous with no footpaths with limited space to build any. Junction with Vine Road is already very dangerous and increased traffic would make it more hazardous. Respondent doubtful that the CUFC training pitches/clubhouse proposal will provide employment of any value. Development of greenfield site opposed as it would lead to ribbon development and set precedent for further development.

Malcolm Easton

SA TIP1

Local infrastructure is not sufficient to support the development proposed for Tiptree.

Francis Morley

SA TIP1

Further development should not be supported in Tiptree, which should be treated as a village and not a overspill site for Colchester.

Kelvedon Parish Council

SA TIP1

Parish Council objecting to further development in Tiptree without improvements to road infrastructure

Cllr. Robert Long

Paragraphs 5.183-84, 188

Tiptree and Tolleshunt Knights are two separate settlements with a ¾ mile natural barrier between them which should be protected from the ribbon development that is being proposed at the Wilkins site. Land at the back of their factory should be utilised for any extensions.

Maldon District Council

Para 5.183, 5.188 & Tiptree Proposals Map

The allocation of land to the south of Wilkin & Sons Jam Factory for employment development is not fully justified. There is no explanation why the employment use would need to relocate outside Tiptree if the site is not expanded nor is there any explanation on the need for expansion. If the Inspector considers that the site is justified mitigation measures must be incorporated into the policy to ensure that development does not result in the coalescence of Tiptree and Tolleshunt Knights. Maldon District Council strongly opposes residential development of this site.

Joe Caffery

Paragraphs 5.183, 5.187, 5.191, 5.192, 5.194, 5.198 (TIP1) & summary in 1.19

The site allocations for Tiptree are considered unsound for a number of reasons. The proposed housing site at Grange Road is not considered sustainable. It is over the recommended 800 metre sustainability benchmark distance from the village centre and pedestrian road access to the centre is considered unsafe. Tiptree has a poor transport structure and no clear commitments to improved public transport have been made. A residential development would introduce additional traffic onto an unlit, unpaved rural

road. The site is not sequential and is not adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. Additional infrastructure including a doctor's surgery, street lighting and footpaths should be delivered in advance of any further residential development. There are no major employers in Tiptree likely to provide employment for the occupants of 70 new dwellings. Housing numbers in Tiptree have not been accurately recorded, so there is no shortfall requiring the allocation of a greenfield site. The public open space depends on residential development on land south of Grange Road and is not 'significant' at 0.6 ha.

Tiptree Parish Council

SA TIP1

The Policy is unsound as there is not a need for more housing in Tiptree and the Grange Road site should not be included in the village envelope. Paragraph 5.183 should be changed from a minimum of 680 housing units to a maximum. The Parish Council calculate 639 units have planning permission, leaving only 41 more units to be approved in the life of the Plan.

Policy SA TIP1 & paragraph 5.187

The Policy is unsound as paragraph 5.187 states that development of the Grange Road site will result in benefits for the community. However, the developer has made clear that the 1 community pitch will only be available to selected teams, not for community use: so there is no community gain.

SA TIP2

The Policy is unsound because the proposed improvements to the infrastructure are required now, before any future development is considered. Paragraph 5.197 states the strategic access to the A12 from Tiptree is via Kelvedon and Feering; however, when travelling towards Chelmsford it is via the Braxted Road and this junction is in need of improvement.

SA TIP2 & paragraph 5.199

The Policy is unsound as paragraph 5.199 lists amenities that will be needed to improve the infrastructure within the life of the Plan. However, all of these amenities are required now, before any future development is considered.

Edward Gittins & Associates

Para. 6.17 & Colchester Inset map

Email clarifies that the respondent considers the open space allocation for the North Growth Area to be a Strategic Allocation and that it should therefore be formally allocated on the Proposals Map as part of the Site Allocations DPD in line with paragraph 6.14 and not through a subsequent Master Plan.

Paragraphs 1.4 – 1.5

The Site Allocations Submission Document is unsound in its present form but could be made broadly sound by amending some of the Town, District Centre, and Village Settlement boundaries. Far from encouraging an over provision of housing, this approach would allow for a limited number of further sites to

come forward to provide the necessary flexibility and certainty in terms of housing land supply without materially conflicting with the Adopted Core Strategy. The main concerns are related to villages and the review of Village Envelopes, Tiptree and the new Settlement Boundary, and Colchester and the opportunity to identify sustainable smaller sites on the edge of the town.

SA TIP1, paragraphs 5.183 - 5.191 & Tiptree Inset map

The comparative analysis of various sites culminates in an arbitrary decision to allocate land off Grange Road by its inclusion within the new Settlement Boundary. The proposed housing allocation appears as a detached 'island' in relation to the existing built up area, is oddly shaped and happens to coincide with a single landownership boundary. Evidence base does not indicate how the site will be accessed. Alternative sites are readily available, including those which have scored more highly in the Sustainability Appraisal. Anomalies in the Settlement should also be removed to include established housing developed within the Settlement Boundary.

SA NGA1, para's 5.107 - 5.114 & Colchester Inset map

The DPD does not offer reasonable alternatives and adequate provision for smaller sites to come forward. The absence of provision for strategic and other open space may require lowering of capacity within Housing Growth Areas and for this provision to be made up elsewhere. It is not flexible and does not reflect Core Strategy Policy H3 (Housing Diversity). Concern is expressed at the very substantial tracks of land allocated for Open Space and recreational uses in the Local Plan which are now within the North Growth Area. The Colchester Inset should demonstrate adequate provision for Open Space to meet the needs of pre-and-post 2021 growth. Smaller sites on the edge of Colchester could be released to provide a wider choice.

SA NGA2, para's 5.115 - 5.125 & Colchester Inset map

The DPD does not offer reasonable alternatives and adequate provision for smaller sites to come forward. The absence of provision for strategic and other open space may require lowering of capacity within Housing Growth Areas and for this provision to be made up elsewhere. It is not flexible and does not reflect Core Strategy Policy H3 (Housing Diversity). Concern is expressed at the very substantial tracks of land allocated for Open Space and recreational uses in the Local Plan which are now within the North Growth Area. The Colchester Inset should demonstrate adequate provision for Open Space to meet the needs of pre-and-post 2021 growth. Smaller sites on the edge of Colchester could be released to provide a wider choice.

Paragraphs 3.7, 3.12 & 3.14

There is strong support for the concept of Local Employment Zones but at the present time the approach to their selection is somewhat random and there is a need to standardise the approach to the selection of sites. The Submission Document does not provide clear guidance on how the boundaries for Local Employment Zones have been identified. Applying a restrictive approach to the extent of many of the proposed Local Employment Zone boundaries will limit the numbers of rural based jobs and is not consistent with the stated aim of Core Policy CE3. We address these concerns in separate site specific

representations. There appears to be an inconsistency between the positive wording of Core Policy CE3 and the generally restrictive approach being adopted to the definition of Local Employment Zone boundaries / allocations. The restrictive approach is not justified and would not be effective in the promotion of rural employment.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Ivan Beales

Paragraph 4.7 & Colchester Inset map

There is a clear case for Colchester fringe sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations in determining the Colchester and Stanway Settlement Boundary. The inclusion of land at Berechurch Hall Road site would enable this site to contribute to wider housing needs, to the need for a range of alternative opportunities to complement the main Housing Growth Areas, and to the need for flexibility.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Poplar Nurseries

Paragraph 4.7 & Marks Tey Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is a grave omission. A review should enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the Plan period. The proposed amendment to the Marks Tey Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. A. Crowley

Paragraph 4.7 & Eight Ash Green Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is a grave omission. A review should enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed amendment to the Eight Ash Green Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. Robert Davidson

Paragraph 4.7 & Peldon Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is highly regrettable. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility

in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed site physically adjoins the existing Village Envelope and would provide a clear defensible line for the Settlement Boundary. The proposed amendment to the Peldon Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a systematic and comprehensive review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. K. Denison

Paragraph 4.7 & Abberton and Langenhoe Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is highly regrettable. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed site physically adjoins the existing Village Envelope, would provide a clear defensible line for the Settlement Boundary, and is sustainable with a wide range of community facilities and regular bus service connections. The proposed amendment to the Langenhoe Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Paragraph 4.7 & Peldon Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is highly regrettable. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed site physically adjoins the existing Village Envelope, would provide a clear defensible line for the Settlement Boundary, and the form of development would provide an attractive entrance into the village. The proposed amendment to the Peldon Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. R. Firth

Paragraph 4.7 & Fingringhoe Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is a grave omission. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed amendment to the Fingringhoe Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of NEEB Holdings Ltd.

Paragraph 4.7 & West Bergholt Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is a grave omission. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed amendment to the West Bergholt Settlement Boundary is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of M.& M. Parmenter

Paragraph 4.7 & Salcott Cum Virley Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is a grave omission. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed amendment to the Salcott Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Colchester Golf Club

Paragraph 4.7 & Colchester Inset map

There is a compelling case for Colchester fringe sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Examination Inspector and to reflect the emphasis in the East of England Plan for growth to be directed towards key centres. The definition of new Settlement Boundaries without detailed consideration of proposals on the edge of settlements is a grave omission. We request that this site at Braiswick is assessed as part of the Site Allocations DPD process and is included in the Colchester Settlement Boundary. The proposed amendment to the Core Settlement Boundary is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Settlement Boundaries in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. M. J. Sutton

Paragraph 4.7 & Messing Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is a grave omission. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. Messing is a medium

sized village which has been sustained by modest levels of further village housing in the past and is capable of absorbing a limited amount of further housing in the future. The proposed amendment of the Messing Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. C. Trollope

Paragraph 4.7 & Fingringhoe Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is a grave omission. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed amendment of the Abberton Road, Fingringhoe Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. D. White

Paragraph 4.7 & Chappel and Wakes Colne Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a systematic and comprehensive review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is highly regrettable. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period. The proposed amendment of the Wakes Colne Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. L. Whitnell

Paragraph 4.7 & Langham Inset map

There is a compelling case for edge of village sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The absence of a proper review of Village Envelopes as part of the Site Allocations stage is a grave omission. A review would enable sustainable sites to come forward to secure essential flexibility in the delivery of rural housing over the plan period, as well as undertaking any rationalisation of Village Envelopes which would secure long term defensible boundaries. There are opportunities to re-adjust the Village Envelope at School Road, Langham to better reflect housing or development potential close to the Envelope and to do so in association with a Local Employment Zone allocation. The proposed amendment of the Langham Village Envelope is consistent with the Core Strategy and justified as part of a review of Village Envelopes in order to make the Site Allocations Submission Document sound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. D. Clough

SA TIP1 & Tiptree Inset map

The Bull Lane site scored more highly in the Sustainability Assessment than the allocated site at Grange Road. The selection process and the logic of the Grange Road site is flawed and contrived. The delivery of capacity at Grange Road remains uncertain in view of access difficulties which has bedevilled its release for employment purposes. The Bull Lane site is well-related to the existing built-up area of Tiptree, will provide environmental benefits for the area, and would not result in material harm to the rural setting of Tiptree which has good defensible boundaries. The site should be included in the Tiptree Settlement Boundary as part of the process of addressing the claim that the Site Allocations Submission Document in its present form is unsound.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. D.Taylor

SA TIP1 & Tiptree Inset map

The definition of the new Tiptree Settlement Boundary has not been undertaken in a systematic and comprehensive way so as to provide a logical division between Tiptree's built-up area and its adjoining countryside in order to remove anomalies. The builder's yard which fronts onto Hall Road is a non-conforming use site that should logically be incorporated within the Settlement Boundary as it physically adjoins the established residential development. The site would accommodate one or two dwellings in close proximity to a primary school and the Colchester – Maldon bus service route along the B1022. The Settlement Boundary should be amended and provided for the detailed area at Maldon Road/West End Road. Attention is also drawn to a number of other anomalies which it is stated may be due to drafting errors.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. R. Martin

SA TIP1 & Tiptree Inset map

The approach adopted to delivering future housing at Tiptree has not been based on a robust evidence base. The selection of land at Grange Road for inclusion within the Tiptree Settlement Boundary has not been arrived at by means of a logical evaluation process. The Grange Road housing land is not part of a package associated with the provision of Open Space and there is no logic for the inclusion of the Open Space area within the proposed Settlement Boundary. The site is divorced from the existing edge of the settlement and bears no logical relationship with the existing built-up area. The boundary has been drawn to accommodate and reflect an individual land ownership rather than by applying normal planning guidelines. The sieving system used to identify potential new sites in the Sustainability Appraisal is arbitrary and incomplete. The land at Peakes Farm is put forward as a sound peripheral site which represents a logical extension to the built-up area of the settlement.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. D. Miller

Paragraph 4.7 & Colchester Inset map

There is a compelling case for Colchester fringe sites to be assessed as part of the Site Allocations process as intended by the Core Strategy Inspector and to reflect the emphasis in the East of England Plan for growth to be directed towards key centres. The review of the Colchester Settlement Boundary has concentrated on the Housing Growth Areas whilst smaller peripheral sites have been summarily rejected. In the case of the site at Ramparts Farm, Braiswick, the attributes of this site should be considered in the context of the contribution smaller urban fringe sites could make to providing greater flexibility and choice in terms of future housing provision. The site should be included in the adjoining predominantly residential notation.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. A. Stevens

Paragraph 3.14 & Langham Inset map

The Local Employment Zone allocation at The Depot, Ipswich Road, should be extended to include the whole of the site. An enlarged allocation would enable the borders of the site to be set aside from development to provide structural landscaping. It will be difficult to find suitable uses for the rear of the site if the frontage area only is allocated. Most traffic will access and leave the site using the A12 slip roads.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. C. Hart

Paragraph 3.14

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not sound but would be made sound by the allocation of a new Local Employment Zone for the Oak Farm site, Newbridge Road, Layer Marney. The current businesses based at Oak Farm are primarily Class B2 uses with associated storage. A Local Employment Zone allocation would safeguard existing local employment and provide opportunities for new or replacement commercial uses to occupy the premises. The site is directly comparable with other Local Employment Zones in terms of size and scale of operation.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Stadia Trustees

Paragraph 3.14

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not sound but would be made sound by the allocation of a new Local Employment Zone for the Holly Lodge site, Holly Lane, Great Horkesley. A Local Employment Zone allocation would safeguard existing local employment and provide opportunities for new or replacement commercial uses to occupy the premises. The site is directly comparable with other Local Employment Zones in terms of size and scale of operation.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. M. Culham

Paragraph 3.14

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not sound but would be made sound by the allocation of a new Local Employment Zone for the Patterns Yard site, Nayland Road, West Bergholt. A Local Employment Zone allocation would safeguard existing local employment and provide opportunities for new or replacement commercial uses to occupy the premises. The site is directly comparable with other Local Employment Zones in terms of size and scale of operation.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. M. Wheeler

Paragraph 3.14

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not sound but would be made sound by the allocation of a new Local Employment Zone for the Kingsford site, Colchester. A Local Employment Zone allocation would provide the additional confidence to proceed with the implementation of an existing planning permission for a Rural Business Centre. It would provide security for future businesses with the recognition of the appropriateness of employment uses on the site. The site is directly comparable with other Local Employment Zones in terms of size and scale of operation.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. P. Whitnell

Paragraph 3.14

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not sound but would be made sound by the allocation of a new Local Employment Zone for the Ruby's Barn site, Ipswich Road, Dedham. A Local Employment Zone allocation would safeguard existing local employment and provide opportunities for new or replacement commercial uses to occupy the premises. The site is already in use for Class B8 purposes. Local Employment Zone status could encourage more appropriate commercial uses falling within Class B1 and B2. The site is directly comparable with other Local Employment Zones in terms of size and scale of operation.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Powerplus Engineering Ltd and The Whitnell Group

Paragraph 3.14 & Langham Inset map

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not sound but would be made sound by the amendment of the Local Employment Zone boundary at School Road, Langham. An enlarged Local Employment Zone is required to offset the space deficiencies on the existing site and to enable the businesses to grow. It is considered reasonable to make planned provision for safeguarding and promoting the rural economy by defining Local Employment Zones which take account of known space requirements of existing rural businesses.

Paragraphs 3.14, 4.7 & Langham Inset map

Representation sets out the various strands of a package scheme for which support is being sought through the Site Allocations Submission Document. The proposals are presented in two parts but are dependent on one another; a new Business Park/Local Employment Zone served off the A12 (T); and an amended Settlement Boundary for Langham St. Margaret's Cross. Illustrative master plans and a Transport Assessment are provided. The proposed new Business Park/Local Employment Zone would extend to 4.24ha, it is strategically located, and would improve both A12(T) access and the available accommodation for firms currently based at School Farm Buildings. The amended Settlement Boundary at Langham St. Margaret's Cross would have a combined site area of 3.2ha and deliver approximately 114 market and affordable units. Overall the representations would provide a package of proposals which would secure commercial benefits for firms currently based at the School Farm Buildings and environmental benefits for local residents.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. Trevor Watling

Paragraph 3.14 & Boxted Inset map

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not sound but would be made sound by the amendment of the Local Employment Zone boundary at No. 63 Straight Road, Boxted, to incorporate the current operational area of the Tin Bins business. Local Employment Zone boundaries should not be solely based on the footprint of existing buildings but should reflect the boundaries where established or lawful uses can take place or otherwise strong physical boundaries. The revised boundaries would encompass the operational area of the business and enable access improvements.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of The Furniture Zone

Paragraph 3.14

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not sound but would be made sound by the allocation of a new Local Employment Zone for the Lampitts Farm site, Turkey Cock Lane, Eight Ash Green. A Local Employment Zone allocation would enable the business to plan with confidence and would provide security for the business with the recognition of the appropriateness of employment uses on this site. The site is directly comparable with other Local Employment Zones in terms of size and scale of operation.

Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr. P. Osborne

Paragraphs 3.14, 4.7 & Marks Tey Inset map

The Site Allocations Submission Document is not justified as it is not founded on a robust or credible evidence base, does not offer reasonable alternatives in terms of the distribution of housing in villages and has not provided adequate reasons for largely retaining the existing village settlement boundaries. It is not effective due to uncertainty surrounding the village housing distribution figures, the failure to consider reasonable alternatives to the retention of existing Village Settlement Boundaries, and cannot be monitored due to the uncertainty surrounding village housing distribution

figures. The Site Allocations Submission Document can be made sound through the promotion of a mixed use scheme at London Road, Marks Tey by the amendment of the Settlement Boundary to incorporate a further housing area and the definition of a Local Employment Zone on adjoining land.

Bidwells on behalf of Hallmark Developments

SA H1, paragraphs 4.7-4.9 & Dedham Inset map

The exclusion of land at Long Road East (south) Dedham Heath from the Settlement Boundary is unjustified and renders the strategic objectives of the LDF towards the area ineffective. Dedham Heath should be considered as a suitable village location for moderate growth. The extension of the Settlement Boundary offers the opportunity to provide a mix of dwellings for this village in the interests of the community. The intentions of Core Strategy Policies ENV1 and ENV2; and East of England Plan Policy S4, PPS7, and PPS3, all support the extension of the village envelope.

Bidwells on behalf of Glanmore Investments Ltd

SA TC1

Policy SA TC1 is not justified and not consistent with PPS6. The scope of the policy as currently drafted gives insufficient consideration to the potential of the Turner Rise District Centre. Core Strategy policy sets out that Urban District Centres should provide a more diverse mix of uses and suggests that intensification of centres will be supported. The location and characteristics of the Turner Rise District Centre ensures it is uniquely placed for a more positive and proactive policy approach to address the current vacancy rate of 30% which is reducing the centre's vitality and viability. Policy SA TC1 should be amended to states that a more diverse mix of retails and other uses will be acceptable.

Mrs Grant

Chapter 4, 4.7 & Langham Inset map

Housing provision in villages is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. There is uncertainty surrounding the village housing distribution figures and there is not sufficient flexibility. The submission document is also inconsistent with PPS3 in relation to housing availability figures. A systematic and comprehensive review of village settlement boundaries is required. The Langham village envelope should be amended to include land at the High St. and rear of Holmfield as identified on the supporting map.

Williamson Developments

Paragraph 4.7 & Langham Inset map

Housing provision in villages is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. There is uncertainty surrounding the village housing distribution figures and there is not sufficient flexibility. The submission document is also inconsistent with PPS3 in relation to housing availability figures. A systematic

and comprehensive review of village settlement boundaries is required. The Langham village envelope should be amended to include parcels A, B, and C shown on the supporting map.

Mr R. Cave

Chapter 4, 4.7 & Great Wigborough Inset map

A more thorough review is needed of village envelopes. Small village sites should be identified, such as land at Great Wigborough identified in red on the attached plan.

Mr R. Hayward

Chapter 8, 8.14-8.15 & Colchester Inset map

The introduction of Locally Designated Sites has been undertaken without the opportunity for proper public consultation or examination of the evidence. The designation of sites as Local Wildlife Sites appears not legally compliant and unsound. No consultation has taken place with the owner of the Whitehall extension site. The proposed designations and text should be withdrawn pending further consultation with the landowner and other interested bodies.

Chapter 3, 3.14 & Colchester Inset map

The table of Local Employment Zones includes land that may or may not be deliverable including the Whitehall extension. Unless such land is deliverable and comes forward for development the Plan cannot be considered effective. The evidence base and sustainability appraisal relating to this allocation is suspect and further investigation is required. A full and proper assessment of the site would conclude that the site should be included as a Mixed Use site rather than being classed as a Local Employment Zone.

Mersea Homes Ltd.

SA NGA2

The Core Strategy recognises that monitoring is required to ensure housing delivery is maintained. The suggested AMR mechanism will include a delay factor, since the lag between monitoring a fall in supply and the released delivery of housing is likely to be 3 to 4 years. Our assessments indicate that to support the delivery of 2,200 homes by 2023, development must commence after 2012 alongside completion of other sites in the North Growth Area and complementary to sites in the town centre. The current restriction must be lifted, since the AMR cannot act as an effective trigger and since no other basis can be demonstrated for holding back development of this area.

Paragraph 7.6

The successful CIF2 financial bid which will deliver the new A12 junction was predicated on ensuring that sufficient highways capacity would be delivered to support the North Growth Area Urban Extension (NGAUE). Paragraph 7.6 should be changed to reflect this evidence and state that the design of the new A12 junction has made prudent provision for the increased transport demands of the adopted Core Strategy.

SA NGA5

Policy SA NGA5 does not relate the overall infrastructure requirements of the NGA to the NGAUE, and therefore fails to be justified or effective. A number of projects identified in SA NGA5 are already subject to existing legal and/or financial commitment for which no contribution from the NGAUE is appropriate under the terms of circular 05/2005. We believe that a combined Policy NGA4 and NGA5 would offer an effective and justified policy and would be sound on that basis.

SA NGA4

Policy SA NGA5 should be deleted and the NGAUE-specific items identified in an amended version of NGA4. At present no differentiation is drawn between projects which are already committed to be delivered, and those for which further investment might be required. Policy SA NGA4 should be reworded as set out on the attached page.

Mersea Homes Ltd, on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties

SA NGA1

Policy SA NGA1 does not set out a clear mechanism for implementation since the relationship between individual components of growth and the infrastructure required to serve it is unclear. It is not clear how committed infrastructure will be taken into account in determining the appropriate requirements for S106 agreements. The final paragraph of Policy NGA1 should be amended to remove the need for all proposals to contribute to delivery of infrastructure since judgements on whether a contribution is necessary can only be made once the nature of proposals and their potential impacts on infrastructure are known.

Paragraph 7.5

The delivery of the new A12 junction is subject to a known programme. Paragraph 7.5 should reflect this evidence and state that it will be delivered by March 2011.

Paragraph 5.124

The economic circumstances which prevailed at the time of the publication of the Core Strategy have been superseded by unprecedented economic conditions. The Site Allocations document should recognise the need for greater flexibility and allow for the early and pre-emptive release of allocated sites to ensure that the overall trajectory of delivery is maintained.

Paragraph 5.119

Paragraph 5.119 relates the timing of development in the NGAUE to the delivery of the A12 junction. Delivery of the A12 junction is committed and will commence in November 2009, with completion of the Northern Approach Road also committed through legal agreements in place and due for completion in 2011/12. The timing of the NGAUE in the context of this policy

should therefore only relate to the timing of this infrastructure and not to other considerations which are addressed in other policies.

Paragraph 4.21

The current economic downturn is fundamentally changing the way in which housing delivery trajectories should be considered. Further text should be added to paragraph 4.21 to reflect this, and to allow an early explanation of the need for flexibility on this issue.

Paragraph 4.20

The current economic downturn is fundamentally changing the way in which housing delivery trajectories should be considered. Further text should be added to paragraph 4.20 to reflect this, and to allow an early explanation of the need for flexibility on this issue.

Paragraph 4.2

The current economic downturn is fundamentally changing the way in which housing delivery trajectories should be considered. Further text should be added to paragraph 4.2 to reflect this, and to allow an early explanation of the need for flexibility on this issue.

Paragraph 5.138

It is not considered that early release of the greenfield element of the North Growth Area will prejudice the Council's regeneration proposals on brownfield land and there is not evidence to justify this statement. An attached trajectory demonstrates the view that early release of the NGAUE is necessary to meet overall housing delivery requirements. Delivery of brownfield regeneration sites and greenfield sites can be complementary since they offer different products by virtue of their location and context. The viability of brownfield sites is also an absolute position, affected by the market rather than by competition. We do not consider that there is robust evidence to support the phasing statement set out in paragraph 5.138.

ADP on behalf of Hills Residential

NGA 2, STA2, Para 4.20, 4.21, 5.124, 5.138, 5.153, 5.165, 5.166, 5.181, 5.182 & 5.200

There are eight individual representations on the sections of the document referred to above. In light of the current recession, all greenfield sites identified in the Site Allocations DPD should be able to begin housing development as soon as possible to maintain the Council's annual housing target. Minor changes to all the sections to remove any phasing requirements would make the document sound.

Langham Parish Council

Paragraph 3.14

The proposal put forward by Edward Gittens on behalf of Powerplus and Whitnal Group does not accord with the Core Strategy and development of

this size should be directed to one of the Strategic Employment Zones. The sites are outside the current village envelope and currently shown as white land. No change has been proposed to the village envelope following the Settlement Boundary Review. Allocating the sites is not an efficient use of high quality agricultural land; suggesting that re - using existing farm buildings for farm diversification would be better. There are already a number of employment sites in Langham including a large Local Employment Zone, the Depot on Old Ipswich Road (Gun Hill), which already feature in the Site Allocation. As the site has not been included in the Site Allocations DPD. The respondent is critical that the proposal has not been commented on by the Highways Agency therefore A12 access issues may not have been considered.

Proposal does not meet Village Design Statement recommendations to protect village character and permitting small scale development in accordance with the Core Strategy. A previous proposal submitted by Edwards Gittins & Associates for a site adjacent to the A12 for Park & Ride has already received substantial objections including objections from DoT & EA.

Paragraph 3.14

Respondent is seeking the removal of text from 3.14 following the refusal of a planning application by Powerplus Engineering for retrospective permission for parking & storage at the Powerplus Engineering and Whitnell Contractors Site, School Road, Langham. Request to delete the following wording 'Order securing diversion of existing definitive Rights of Way to be agreed and new route constructed.'

Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd on behalf of Colchester United Football Club

SA TIP1, Paragraphs 1.19, 4.1- 4.22, 5.183-5.193

Separate representations. Proposal fails all three tests of soundness as it is drafted. It has been demonstrated that the CUFC proposal for mixed use development at Grange Road represents a suitable strategy for meeting minimum housing provision in Tiptree while also delivering open space, recreational, and community facilities above that required by national and local policy. The proposal will result in an appropriate and sustainable level and form of development over the plan period.

Request that the plan is amended prior to submission.

Lawson Planning Ltd on behalf of owner of Sundowne, Dedham

Paragraphs 1.7, 1.8, 4.11- 4.21

The DPD makes no firm allocations for housing in rural areas to deliver the 435 identified as being needed by the evidence base. Too dependent on commitments and past trend 'windfall' development to meet rural housing target. Respondent considers approach unsound as it conflicts with national policy and does not represent the most appropriate plan led approach for

delivering housing in the Borough. It may lead to a shortfall and the approach does not serve community interests.

Respondent is seeking the allocation of Sundowne, The Heath, Dedham to provide new residential development comprising mixed housing and tenure types that would positively enhance the area around Dedham Heath. Respondent suggesting that allocating this site represents amore appropriate strategy for meeting community needs for both market and affordable housing. There are few constraints on the site and it is well located to existing services and Dedham village.

Respondent has suggested that no residential sites within villages have been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process. Suggesting that the Council has refused to consider specific sites for residential development in smaller villages in the Borough thus failing in its duty to plan for the needs of all residents of Colchester.

Representation states that the evidence base does not accurately reflect the Borough's current housing situation. The evidence base is out of date as the SHMAA and SLAA cover up to 2008 The SHLAA only assesses 4 villages and fails to consider small sites. The evidence base is not credible or robust. This approach contradicts RSS policy SS4 on this matter.

Part of the site lies within the settlement boundary while the rest is contiguous to the settlement boundary of Dedham and complies with policy ENV2 in the Core Strategy therefore this negates the Council's rejection of the site as being suitable for residential development.

Currently the DPD does not show how the Council will meet its affordable housing needs in villages. The plan as currently drafted will not will not ensure the provision of open space and community facilities as required by policy.

The Council's strategy for delivering rural housing is not in accordance with PPS3. It also contradicts PPS7

Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of BRB (Residuary) Ltd

SA H1, 4.11 & 4.9

DPD legally compliant and sound in terms of national policy but respondent questioning Effective test of soundness. BRB (Residuary) Ltd are supportive of the inclusion of 17 Railway Sidings, Halstead Road for housing.

The site is subject to a development brief and the respondent has stated that this is onerous and could constrain the deliverability of housing on the site. This makes DPD is potentially unsound in terms of being effective particularly on deliverability grounds.

Development brief carries only limited weight as a material consideration. The rep includes a list of requirements to be met as part of the development brief

which the respondent is suggesting could affect the viability of developing the site for residential development.

BRB (Residuary) Ltd would like the site to come forward earlier than the 2017-2021 phase indicated in the SHLAA.

The current development brief is the only block to the developing this site and making the DPD sound. The respondent has requested that the development brief needs to be reviewed or the supporting paragraphs reworded to say that development of the site is not dependent on the development brief.

Andrew Martin Assoc on behalf of RMPA

SA CE1, SA GAR1

Sound – minor changes to SA CE1 and GAR1.