



Local Development Framework

# Site Allocations

## Regulation 30(1)d Statement

Statement of Consultation carried out at the Issues and Options and Regulation 25 stages

November 2009



# **Colchester's Submission Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)**

## **Regulation 30(1)d Statement**

### **Statement of Consultation carried out at the Issues and Options and Regulation 25 stages**

Spatial Policy  
Strategic Policy and Regeneration  
Colchester Borough Council  
PO Box 885  
Town Hall  
Colchester  
Essex CO1 1ZE  
[planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk)

**November 2009**

## **Introduction**

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

As required by Regulation 30 at the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2008 amendments, this statement covers both the Issues and Options and Regulation 25 consultations undertaken when preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The statement sets out:

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

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

A summary of the main issues raised in the Publication stage Regulation 27 consultation can be found in a separate Regulation 30(1)(e) statement.

## **Site Allocations DPD Consultations**

### **Issues and Options Consultation**

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

The purpose of the Site Allocations Issues and Options document was to outline a number of general themes and start the debate surrounding the amount of land needed to be allocated and the different options available to the Council. The Issues and Options stage explored how the general principles set out in the Core Strategy could be fleshed out to provide sufficient detail to guide future site allocations. Within the document, questions were posed on issues affecting the formation of the criteria used to evaluate sites.

The document also promoted further discussion about the content of the document and helped the Council start to identify preferred options concerning sites which would eventually be allocated on the new Proposals Map. The sites included in the Site Allocations Issues and Options consultation document had been identified either through the 2006 Housing Land Availability Study (HLAA) (which updated a previous 2001 Housing Land Availability study), Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and from a call for sites from landowners and agents. At this stage the Council wanted to gather people's views about the suitability or otherwise of the sites included in the Issues and Options consultation document and also to provide an opportunity for additional sites to be put forward for consideration by the Council which would form the basis of the Preferred Options Report (Regulation 25 Consultation) in the future.

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

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

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

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

In response to the Site Allocations Issues and Options consultation the Council received a total of 320 representations. A breakdown of the responses received prior to the LDF committee is included in Tables 1 & 2. It shows that during the consultation 186 sites were put forward for further consideration from a range of consultees, 109 letters of objection and 6 letters of support were received along with another 7 letters from organisations like

House Building Federation, EERA and Sport England The objections raised to HLAA sites proposed during the Issues and Options consultation period are included in Table 2 below. Table 3 also includes a summary to the answers posed through the Issues and Options document. Not surprisingly, replies varied widely according to the interests and responsibilities of the individuals and organisations concerned.

Although the consultation period for the Site Allocations document officially ended on the 4<sup>th</sup> January 2008, the Council considered it appropriate to accept representations which were received after the close of the consultation period. A key part of the LDF is community involvement and the Council's SCI outlines that public consultation will be continuous and on going until the submission stage when the document is formally submitted to the Secretary of State.

As the Council neared the end of the Issues and Options stage, over 600 sites had been put forward for consideration. This included sites nominated during the consultation, suitable sites from the HLAA, SHLAA from sites already allocated in the 2004 Local Plan where no change was considered necessary to the allocation. The responses received were used to help the Council agree site selection criteria which were then to be used to identify the Council's preferred sites to be taken forward in the Regulation 25 consultation and also to identify those sites that would not help deliver Core Strategy objectives and targets.

Table 1 Site Allocations – Summary of representations received at 25/2/08 prior to LDF Committee March 2008.  
(Up to site S270)

#### **Site Proposals**

Residential use – 105 sites  
Mixed use – 27 sites  
Employment use – 13 sites  
Open Space (protection/retention/creation) – 10 sites  
Transport Infrastructure (improvements) – 5 sites  
Tourism related – 4 sites  
Residential care homes – 2 sites  
Park and Ride – 1 site.

The Council also received various other proposals such as:

- Future expansion plans for Abberton Reservoir.
- Myland Parish Council submitted a wide range of representations, some have been included in the proposals above but others include
  - Cinema
  - 20 mph speed limit in parish
  - Public art
  - Run-off lake
  - Increased street furniture
  - Funds for a community worker
  - Opportunities for adult education
  - Sports hall for badminton

- Indoor and outdoor bowls facility
- Pitch and putt course
- Community hubs with associated shops and services
- Retention of existing sports facilities
- Skateboard park
- Tennis courts near community hub
- Improvements to footbridge over A12
- Creation and protection of allotments
- Two primary schools
- Two community facilities in different parts of the growth area
- Protection of historic woodland
- Support for HLAA sites
  - HLAA site 19 – Area Q, Colchester Garrison, Berechurch Road, Berechurch
  - HLAA site 248 – Land off Elmstead Road, Wivenhoe Cross
  - HLAA site 250 – Land off Rectory Road, Wivenhoe Quay
  - HLAA site 1111 – Land at Ten Acres, The Avenue, Wivenhoe Quay
  - HLAA site 1112 – Builders Yard, Rectory Road, Wivenhoe Quay
  - HLAA site 1131 – 7 & 9 Belle Vue Road, Wivenhoe Quay

As part of the consultation the Council received six detailed letters from organisations such as Essex County Council, Sport England and the Home Builders Federation. The East of England Regional Assembly also submitted a letter stating that at this stage the document had no general conformity issues.

Table 2  
Objections received to HLAA site proposals in the Regulation 25 consultation.

HLAA site no	Location	Ward	No of Objections
367	Shed And Workshops Off King George Road Adjacent To Chapel Of Rest	Berechurch	1
28	Retail / Warehousing Clarendon Way	Castle	1
29	Long Stay Car Park Between Sheepen Road And Westway	Castle	2
30	Allotments Adjacent River Colne Off East Bay	Castle	1
33	Playing Field At St James C Of E Primary School Guildford Road	Castle	3
34	Allotment Gardens On South Side Cowdray Avenue	Castle	1
425	Allotments South Of 65 To 79 Sheepen Road	Castle	1
43	Allotment Gardens Between Maldon Road And Drury Road	Christ Church	1
45	Land West Of Irvine Road	Christ Church	3
199	Land Off Queensbury Avenue	Copford and West Stanway	1
53	Open Space Between Mersea Road Holt Drive	East Donyland	1
263	Land At Middlewick Ranges	Harbour	1
654	Land At End Of Bilsdale Close, Fronting Ipswich Road	Highwoods	1
4	Former Adco Building And Site, North Lane.	Marks Tey	1
11	Land South And West Of Marks Tey.	Marks Tey	1
83	Open Space Frontage To Colchester General Hospital, South Of Access Turner Road	Mile End	1

85	Rear Of 134 To 168 Bergholt Road Plus Garage At 124 And Properties 170, 170A And 172	Mile End	1
166	Land South Of A12, West Of Nayland Road	Mile End	2
167	Land Adjacent To And Northwest Of A12	Mile End	1
255	Land Between Bergholt Road and Train Station	Mile End	1
258	Land Off Mill Road	Mile End	1
259	Land Off Mill Road	Mile End	1
262	Land West of Mile End Road	Mile End	2
99	Part Scrapyard Site, Land Off Haven Road And Distillery Lane	New Town	1
111	Allotment Gardens Off Norman Way Rear Of Irvine Road	Prettygate	4
118	Open Space Fronting Layer Road Adjacent To Aisne Road	Shrub End	1
121	Open Space Fronting Layer Road At Messines Road	Shrub End	1
1	Open Space Playground Area On Corner Of Hickory Avenue And Hawthorne Avenue	St Andrew's	1
2	Open Space Rear Of Magnolia Drive And Hawthorne Avenue	St Andrew's	1
7	Allotment Gardens Rear Of 197 And 249 Harwich Road	St Anne's	2
9	Allotment Gardens Rear Of 26 To 78 Harwich Road	St Anne's	1
51	Sports ground Rear Of 13 To 21 Bromley Road	St Johns	1
1250	Bett's Factory, Ipswich Road - Note The Rear Of This Site Lies In Tendring District, Ardleigh And Little Bromley Ward	St Johns	3
17B	Land North Of Properties Fronting Heath Road And West Of Watsham Place	Wivenhoe Cross	1
17C	Land South Of University For Proposed Various Uses In Connection With University	Wivenhoe Cross	1
180	Land North Of Properties Fronting Heath Road And West Of Watsham Place	Wivenhoe Cross	1
181	Land South Of University For Proposed Various Uses In Connection With University	Wivenhoe Cross	2
246	Land at Bromegrove School	Wivenhoe Cross	2
247	Land off Colchester Road	Wivenhoe Cross	1
1105	Land At Properties 15 To 19 Henrietta Close	Wivenhoe Cross	1
147	Area Of Woodland To The Rear Of Properties At Northern End Of Elmgrove	Wivenhoe Quay	1
148	Warehouse And Station Car Park, Station Road	Wivenhoe Quay	1
150	Former Cooks Shipyard And Gasworks Site Surrounding Walter Radcliffe Way	Wivenhoe Quay	1
243	King George V Playing Field	Wivenhoe Quay	6
244	Land To The West of King George V Playing Field	Wivenhoe Quay	2
245	Land At Parkwood Avenue	Wivenhoe Quay	1
249	Land off Rectory Road	Wivenhoe Quay	1
1129	Gardens Area Between Colne Terrace And Denton Terrace	Wivenhoe Quay	33
1131	7 And 9 Belle Vue Road	Wivenhoe Quay	2
1133	Parking And Wasteland Off De Vere Lane, Rear	Wivenhoe Quay	1

	Of 21 To 23 Woodland Way		
1135	Area Of Open Space At Bowers Road Rear Of 2 To 14 Amberly Close	Wivenhoe Quay	1
1136	Open Space In Front Of 1 To 15 The Nook Off Bobbits Way	Wivenhoe Quay	1
1137	Sloping Area Of Open Space Land Fronting Bobbits Way Adjacent To Number 13	Wivenhoe Quay	1
1222	1/2 Marine Row	Wivenhoe Quay	1

**Table 3 – responses to questions posed within the Site Allocations Issues and Options Document**

<b>Questions posed</b>	<b>Comments received (Numbers with the S prefix indicate which person/organisation/agent has submitted the representation)</b>
<i>A1 – Should specific sites be identified for affordable housing?</i>	S037 – Affordable housing should be part of an overall mix where the site is of sufficient size S076 – Yes S251 – Yes
<i>A2 – Should any village/town development boundaries be modified?</i>	S037 – The boundaries of existing settlements should remain the same S076 – Where appropriate S241 – Pleased that heritage is among the considerations for housing options as this is an integral part of the Strategic Land Assessment process. Dismayed however that the Site Allocations shows a symbol for development in Stanway on top of a scheduled monument (Gosbecks & Stanway map) S251 – Only for affordable housing
<i>A3 – Should the type and mix of housing development be controlled?</i>	S037 – This should be dictated by market forces to enable commercially viable schemes to be brought forward S060 – Type and mix of housing should be done on a borough wide basis rather than by seeking to dictate a specific mix for individual schemes. S076 – Only where deemed appropriate within the context of PPS3: Housing 2006 S251 – Yes
<i>A4 – Should the Council allocate more previously developed land for housing and mixed use development?</i>	S037 – Council should re-assess existing allocations and their suitability for residential and mixed use development with the view to reallocating land such as employment land for residential use. S076 – Where appropriate, however a balance must be struck to ensure PPS3 is met and a wide choice of housing is provided to meet identified need. S251 – Yes
<i>A5 – Where in Colchester Borough should gypsy and travellers sites be allocated?</i>	S056 – Small sites properly adjacent to necessary services such as schools, doctors and transport. S240 – Within reasonable safe walking distance of schools and other facilities and distributed between a number of School Priority Admission Areas S251 – Close to good road access eg A12
<i>B1 – Should we encourage more mixed use development near areas of high accessibility?</i>	S052 – Council should encourage comprehensive mixed use development in areas of high accessibility S239 – The mix should be developed as a good match between employment and housing so as to maximise the likelihood that residents work in the nearby employment areas. S241 – Out-of-town retail parks should not be re-named district centres as further expansion, this will only promote further unsustainable travel. S251 – Yes
<i>B2 – How can we achieve a balanced mix of residential and business</i>	S052 – Council can ensure a balanced mix of uses by ensuring policy supports compatible uses S251 – Business premises with residential units above. Lower the business

<i>uses in both Town and District Centres?</i>	rates.
<i>B3 – Should we continue to protect retail frontages in the Town Centre?</i>	S052 – Protection of retail frontages is an important tool in directing retail development to appropriate locations and managing different types of retail development. S241 – Redevelopment of retail sheds for housing and properly designed neighbourhoods might offer some sustainability and townscape advantages S251 – Yes
<i>B4 – Should entertainment precincts be allocated in the Town Centre?</i>	S251 – Yes
<i>C1 – Where do you think offices should be located in the Borough?</i>	S037 – It is considered that offices should be predominately located in accessible and sustainable locations S239 – Concern with any option that generates high level of journey's to/from work close to the trunk road without effective public transport and travel planning measures. S251 – Town Centre and District Centres
<i>C2 – Where do you think industrial activity be located within the Borough?</i>	S037 – industrial activities should be located in accessible locations and close to existing industrial parks where similar activity is already being undertaken S239 – Concern with any option that generates high level of journey's to/from work close to the trunk road without effective public transport and travel planning measures. S251 – North Colchester and Stanway.
<i>C3 – Should the Council encourage employment activity on sites close to residential areas?</i>	S037 – Employment activity close to residential areas is entirely appropriate to sufficient screening and visual separation S251 – Yes, if small and medium enterprises appropriate to the area.
<i>C4 – Should the Council allow mixed use regeneration on sites which are surplus to employment needs across the Borough?</i>	S037 – Due to the Council's surplus employment land, there is an ideal opportunity for existing employment uses to be reused on beneficial ways such as mixed use/residential. S053 – Where existing employment sites are situated in accessible locations; they should remain for that purpose and not be redeveloped for housing. S251 – Yes
<i>D1 – Should we link transport improvements to housing and employment allocations?</i>	S052 – Transport improvements should be linked to housing and employment allocations S239 – Any proposal which is a traffic generator should be providing measures for dealing with that generation, with highways infrastructure provided as a last resort over and above demand management opportunities. S251 – Yes S266 – Yes
<i>D2 – Should we allocate green links through sites and across roads?</i>	S052 – Green links should be allocated through sites where appropriate S240 – Yes there is a need to identify and safeguard key gaps to provide connections S251 – Yes
<i>D3 – Where should new transport infrastructure be provided?</i>	S042 – consideration of a new direct route from Tiptree to the A12 to supplement the current B1023 S052 – In close proximity to major new employment, housing and regeneration sites S251 – Park and Ride at Stanway Tollgate, improvements in cycling access to Town Centre imperative. S266 – Throughout the Borough and to a consistent standard
<i>E1 – Where are the priority locations for new community facilities?</i>	S240 – Early years and Childcare facilities to be added to Community Facilities glossary

<i>What type of activities and services they should provide?</i>	
<i>E2 – Should the Council allocate land for both public and private community facilities?</i>	S240 – Early years and Childcare facilities to be added to Community Facilities glossary S251 – Yes
<i>E3 – Should community facilities be required to be suitable for a variety of uses?</i>	S240 – Early years and Childcare facilities to be added to Community Facilities glossary S251 – Yes
<i>F1 – Should sites of historic or cultural interest benefit from improvements to the visitor facilities?</i>	S240 – Sites of historic or cultural interest could benefit from visitor facility improvements S241 - PPG16: Archaeology & Planning and RSS Policy ENV6 should be brought to the readers attention under the policy context. S249 – PPG16: Archaeology & Planning should be brought to the readers attention as national guidance S251 – Roman heritage would benefit from linked access and visitor information.
<i>F2 – Could the setting of any heritage sites be enhanced?</i>	S240 – Many of the heritage sites could benefit from improvements to their setting, presentation and interpretation. An Integrated Conservation Management Strategy should be commissioned. S251 – Yes
<i>F3 – In which locations are facilities needed to encourage tourism within the Borough?</i>	S240 – Providing better visitor attractions will encourage tourism in the Borough to meet future needs. S251 – Eastern end of Colchester
<i>F4 – Should any Conservation Area boundaries be reviewed or new areas designated?</i>	S240 – Wilkins’s Jam Factory, Tiptree could be site worthy of Conservation Area status. S241 – Townscape Character Assessment and other information from Historic Environment Record should be used to identify initiatives for conservation and enhancement of buildings. We expect the DPD to require development briefs for major site allocations S251 – Yes
<i>F5 – What type of tourist facilities are needed within the Borough?</i>	S241 – Important that tourist areas outside the honeypot areas (such as country houses and archaeological sites) are made accessible by public transport. S251 – More hotels and better public transport
<i>G1 – Where should new open space and recreational facilities be located?</i>	S071 – New services should be located with travel considerations in mind. Appropriately located facilities, accessible by foot and cycle can be a significant part of the Borough. S240 – Location of open spaces should be determined by Master Planning informed by the evidence base S251 – In new developments S266 – Within all areas of new development and in existing areas where minimum standards are not met (e.g. 2.83 ha of open space per 1000 population).
<i>G2 – Should the Council locate new open spaces at the edge of new developments or in locations central to development?</i>	S240 – Location of new open spaces should be determined by Master Planning S251 – Both S266 – Both
<i>G3 – Which existing facilities need upgrading?</i>	S071 – The provision of well-planned open space is integral to high quality new development S071 – Needs of specific sectors of the population (young/old/specialist) should be identified. S216 – The Borough requires additional pitches for football, tennis, hockey,

	<p>rugby and bowls.</p> <p>S240 – Many of the heritage sites could benefit from improvements to their setting, presentation and interpretation. An Integrated Conservation Management Strategy should be commissioned.</p> <p>S251 – Waterside. Historic sites such as Roman Circus</p>
<p><i>G4 – How can the Council improve waterside facilities across the Borough taking into account the development pressures on these areas?</i></p>	<p>S240 – Close relationship between natural and historic environment. Particularly important that the historic environment is clearly recognised in the Borough's approach to integrate coastal zone management.</p> <p>S251 – Resist development pressure particularly along the flood plan areas of the Colne</p>
<p>H – Entire section</p>	<p>S241 – Historic buildings, archaeological sites, registered parks and gardens and undesignated landscape features should be recognised here. Policy context should also make reference to PPG15, PPG16 and RSS Policy ENV6.</p>

## **Regulation 25 Consultation**

New regulations which came into effect in June 2008 meant that the old system where an Issues and Options consultation stage was followed by a Preferred Option stage was replaced by a consolidated approach which provided for one statutory consultation period (Regulation 25) at the end of the consultation process. The timing of the changes meant that the Issues and Options stage of the Site Allocations DPD in late 2007 was followed by a consolidated Regulation 25 consultation in early 2009. At the start of the Regulation 25 stage the Council had over 600 sites to further consider. This included the sites nominated during the Issues and Options consultation, suitable sites from the HLAA, SHLAA and sites already allocated in the 2004 Local Plan where no change was considered necessary to the existing allocation.

Each site was considered against the 4 criteria included below:

- (a) conformity with the Core Strategy strategic objectives and policies (which accords with national and regional planning policies),
- (b) proximity to Regeneration /Growth Area
- (c) existing Local Plan designation
- (d) site constraints – e.g. nature conservation designations, land in high flood risk zone 3, Historic Park or Garden

Those sites which met the criteria were taken forward as part of the Regulation 25 stage. In total 344 sites were taken forward for further consideration at the Regulation 25 consultation stage. This included 26 preferred new sites and 318 sites which were carried forward from the 2004 Local Plan. Consultees were also asked to consider a number of questions on a diverse range of topics such as the best way to allocate public and private open space, designation of Urban District Centres and the protection of countryside between settlements. The Council also sought views about the newly proposed settlement boundaries for Colchester, Wivenhoe, Tiptree, West Mersea and Rowhedge.

The process of allocating appropriate Site Allocations to supplement Core Strategy aspirations involved extensive cross-departmental working within the Council, notably with the Planning Policy, Development Management and Leisure Services team, in addition to public consultation and meetings with stakeholders as well as town and parish councils.

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

As with the Issues and Options consultation, copies of the Site Allocations Regulation 25 consultation document were made available on the Council's website, along with supporting explanatory information, and were circulated to

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

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

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

The Site Allocations Regulation 25 document outlined a series of sites which the Council sought comments on to judge the suitability of each of these. Alongside the sites the Council also included a series of questions on the Representation form which focused on specific issues such as the retention of Car Parks, Allocation of Open Space and which employment sites are to be protected.

322 organisations and individuals responded to the Site Allocations Regulation 25 consultation. Responses to the second consultation were more extensive than to the first, given that the Council had identified their draft preferred sites in the Regulation 25 and had also identified sites that they felt did not satisfy the selection criteria and were therefore not considered suitable for further consideration in the next stage (Submission) of the Site Allocations DPD.

Of the 322 representations received during the Regulation 25 consultation, 153 related to the Council's preferred sites. Of these 153 representations, 27 were objection letters while the remaining representations were either letters of support or general comments about the sites. The remaining 122 representations received were either submitted to make general comments about sites that been rejected as suitable, new site proposals or general comments about issues such as the need for more open space, corrections about specific site details etc.

An analysis of the consultation responses as before was reported to the Local Development Framework Committee on 23 March 2009, a summary of the

site representation received at Regulation 25 stage is shown in Table 4 below. A small number of representations were also received after the LDF Committee which were accepted as a valid part of the Site Allocations consultation process and these were taken forward for assessment as part of the Regulation 27 (Submissions stage).

Although the Council posed a series of questions on the Site Allocations Regulation 25 Representation Form it was not possible to form any robust statistical evidence from these responses due to lack of comments. The Council took these answers into consideration but was unable to provide full statistical analysis and draw any conclusions from this data. The LDF Committee report identified this issue but also made it clear that the responses were available for public viewing on request. The responses to the specific questions have not been included in this Consultation Statement but are in the public domain and are available upon request.

Table 4

## Summary of Responses

**S136 –Land at Queensmead, The Folley (Birch and Winstree)****CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment Site**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in relation to environmental constraints on this site	Comments noted
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for rural employment use. It scored badly on sustainability grounds due its rural location and poor public transport links however likely impact on the A12 was regarded as minor as it is a small site.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	There is capacity at the nearest Sewage Treatment Works and there are no specific issues with this site.	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/307	Mark Jones, Layer-de-la-Haye Parish Council	Object	Layer-de-la-Haye Parish Council support rural enterprises in principle but have issues about this particular site. Bus service is totally inadequate for use by workers/commuters and any significant volume of traffic is not possible along the single track road as outlined in proposed policy DP6 and DP7. Any proposal	Comments noted.

			should be subject to a detailed traffic plan.	
--	--	--	---	--

**S127 – Cowdray Centre, Cowdray Avenue (Castle)**

**CBC Preferred Allocation – Mixed Use**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/002	Paula Baker	General	Found it difficult to interpret the red lines on the map and have concerns regarding the new roads and green links associated with this site. Need to improve the pedestrian links to the site and ensure that important habitats are not lost.	The Council does not intend any new road schemes in this area - the red lines on this map are shown to outline the North Station Regeneration Area. Officers have identified various issues with the maps and these will be rectified as the DPD develops. Comments Noted.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Support	Myland PC support the provision of high density housing on this brownfield site due to its proximity to the Town Centre and transport links. Providing high density housing at the Cowdray Centre reduces the need for 6200 houses on Greenfield land in North Colchester	The Council support the development of brownfield land as a priority set in the Core Strategy. Detailed proposals for the development of the Cowdray Centre will be included within the wider North Station Regeneration Area proposals. The re-development of this site will not reduce the minimum housing figures set in the Core Strategy.
S25069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers.	Comments noted and any future development of the site will be expected to take account of the EA comments and the Core

			In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	Strategy Policy ENV1. The Borough Council will continue to work with the EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for mixed use development. It was ranked good on sustainability rounds due to its proximity to Town Centre services and mainline transport links (railway). Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor due the considerable distance of the site from the junctions 27/29 of the A12.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	There is capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works and re-development of the site is unlikely to cause any future issues.	Comments noted.

**440 – Strip of Land off Ipswich Road, Old Coach Road and railway line (Castle)**  
**CBC Preferred Allocation - Residential**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in relation to environmental constraints on this site	Comments noted.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for residential development. It was ranked as good on sustainability grounds due its good connectivity with the Town Centre and surrounding services and facilities. Its potential impact on junction 27 of the A12 trunk road was regarded as minor as the site is small.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	There is capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works and re-development of this site is unlikely to cause any future issues	Comments noted.

**S298 – Arena Site, North Circular Road (Christchurch)**  
**CBC Preferred Allocation – Mixed Use**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/001	David Poole, Andrew Martin Assoc on behalf of RMPA Services	Support	Site offers a unique opportunity within Colchester to provide additional residential dwellings, employment and leisure opportunities whilst acknowledging the constraints such as the Roman Circus. Opportunities exist to provide a landmark building on the site which will enhance the	Comments noted and any future redevelopment of the site will have to accord with the adopted Garrison Master Plan as well as the Core Strategy and appropriate National guidance to ensure the appropriate mix and level of uses

			visual appearance of the area.	on the site satisfies all stakeholders.
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	Object	Sport England acknowledges that sports facilities only comprise some of the existing on site uses. In order to avoid a scenario where existing facilities are lost, any site allocation should make it explicit that sports facilities which meet a community need should be retained or replaced as part of any future redevelopment in line with the guidance in PPG17. The Council's evidence base should be used to help inform whether a facility should be retain/replaced.	Comments noted and any future redevelopment of the site will have to accord with the adopted Garrison Master Plan as well as the Core Strategy and appropriate National guidance
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	Comments noted and any future development of the site will be expected to take account of the EA comments and the Core Strategy Policy ENV1 and the adopted Garrison Master Plan. The Borough Council will continue to work with the EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked as good on sustainability grounds due its proximity to Town Centre and local services/facilities. Its potential impact on the A12 Trunk road was regarded as being minor due to remoteness of site from junctions 27/29 of the A12. .	Comments noted..
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian	General	There is capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works but as the exact ratio and	Comments noted.

	Water		mix of land uses has not yet been agreed it is not possible to provide full details at this stage.	
--	-------	--	--	--

#### 45 – Land to the west of Irvine Road (Christchurch)

##### CBC Preferred Allocation – Open Space

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/031	Mr P Egan	Support	Strongly support reallocation of site 45 as Open Space. Site has the potential to be a community asset and retention of habitats is important.	Comments noted. Reallocation of the site supported in the recently completed Local Wildlife Site Study which forms part of the LDF evidence base.
S25/045	Frances Kent, Irvine Road Area Residents' Association	Support	This old traditional orchard has lain undisturbed and undeveloped for many years and is important for local wildlife and biodiversity and forms part of the existing green link network.	Comments noted. Reallocation of the site supported in the recently completed Local Wildlife Site Study which forms part of the LDF evidence base.
S25/308	Richard Pettit, Painters Corner Residents Association	Support	Site is inappropriate for residential uses as it has no highway access and abuts existing open space. Site is important for wildlife and the Local Wildlife study confirms the site should be protected from development.	Comments noted. Reallocation of the site supported in the recently completed Local Wildlife Site Study which forms part of the LDF evidence base.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine	The Council acknowledge the comments of the EA but as the site is not being promoted for future development and is expected to remain in its

			the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	current condition reference to flood risk and ground water pollution may not be such an issue on this site.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	No score was given in relation to the sustainability of the site but its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as being minor.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Site being proposed for Open Space so any comments are not applicable.	Comments noted.

**S268 – Land south of A12 and to the rear of Wyvern Farm (Copford & West Stanway and part in Stanway)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Part of site to be included within Stanway Growth Area and part to remain white land.**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Object	Site should be allocated as employment rather than residential.	Comments noted. The Borough Council considered it appropriate to allocate the land as residential in line with the Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy targets.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	Comments noted. Any future development of the site will be expected to take account of the EA comments, Core Strategy Policy ENV1 and the future Stanway Master Plan (once produced and adopted). The Borough Council will continue to work with the EA to ensure any future

				development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	The Core Strategy recognises a potential need to allocate land for educational purposes around the Stanway Growth Area. Sites S268 and S070 represents a significant housing allocation which could trigger the need for a new primary school with commensurate Early Years and Childcare provision. The explanatory text should mention consideration and the identification of land where appropriate to meet these requirements.	The Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that are expected as part of future developments in the Stanway Growth Area. The Borough Council will continue to work with the County Council as the Site Allocations document is developed prior to the next round of consultation.
S25/097	Hills Residential	Object	The site is less well connected to established facilities and services and any new housing would be at risk from noise and light pollution from adjacent strategic highway network. Alternative option is for the site to be considered as an extension to the adjacent employment zone.	Comments noted, the Borough Council considered it appropriate to allocate the land as residential in line with the Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy targets.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked medium in terms of its sustainability due to its links to the A12 however its potential impact on the A12 trunk road was regarded as major.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/293	Mr Alan Beverley, Stanway Parish Council	General	Important to prevent the westward spread of proposed development between Stanway and Copford, but questions how this can be done.	CBC has commissioned Green Break study which will form part of the evidence base to identify areas where there is a risk of settlements surrounding Colchester joining up with it and assist with the defining of settlement boundaries.
S25/297	Robert	General	There are a number of inconsistencies,	Officers appreciate the

	<p>Pomery Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of RF West Limited</p>		<p>inaccuracies and illogical features shown on various plans within Site Allocations DPD e.g. Stanway Growth Area boundary goes beyond settlement boundary, key not clear.</p> <p>Objection to the 10ha size restriction which has not been adequately justified. The western boundary of the newly urban settlement boundary of Colchester and Stanway Growth Area are arbitrary and bear no relationship to natural characteristics of western Stanway. Current boundary also ignores existing employment premises and extant employment permissions on Wyvern Farm. The Proposals Map boundary has been drawn excessively tightly in response to Parish Councils request to prevent coalescence between Stanway and Copford instead of following defensible boundaries.</p> <p>CBC needs to consider future land needs beyond the plan period for housing and employment in light of current RSS review or in case there is a shortfall in current plan period. AMA suggested an alternative boundary which would increase the size of the site to 18ha (15ha residential land and 3ha employment). The revised boundary would be defined by new woodland planting which would retain a sufficient green wedge of open land between Copford and Stanway and also provide land for development to help meet greenfield housing requirements.</p>	<p>difficulties many people faced with regards to the key and the maps contained within the document. These issues will be rectified before the next round of consultation.</p> <p>Site boundary was drawn to provide enough land to meet the Core Strategy targets for residential in the Stanway Growth Area, with justification provided in the Sustainability Appraisal Revised Scoping Report.</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken with regards to settlement boundaries and this may well have an influence on this site. As the site allocations document is developed further prior to the next round of consultation the Borough Council will work with stakeholders to ensure appropriate land is made available during the plan period.</p>
--	---	--	---	--

			<p>This proposal presents an opportunity to reconsider the proposed redevelopment of Wyvern Farm. Overall the representation site for S268 would improve the form of development and make efficient use of land.</p> <p>CS Inspector considered green breaks as an unnecessary tier of protection for land and removed them from Policy ENV1 in the Core Strategy. CBC needs to assess proposals for development in 'green breaks' in line with national, regional and Core Strategy policy as directed by the planning inspector.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Inspector removed Green Breaks from the policy because the evidence base was lacking. As a result the Borough Council have commissioned a study looking at Green Breaks which will become part of the evidence base.</p>
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	<p>Insufficient capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works for the level of growth identified on this site. It would therefore require increases to Copford Sewerage Treatment Works which already has limited land available.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure are deliverable</p>

**S169 – Depot Site, Old Ipswich Road (Dedham & Langham)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment**

Rep No	Person	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
--------	--------	----------------	---------------------	------------------

	Submitting Rep			
S25/042	David Winter, Langham Parish Clerk	Support	Parish Council broadly supports the document and this site as outlined in Chapter 5.	Comments noted.
S25/084	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr A Stevens	Object	Whilst welcoming support for the partial allocation of the site for employment uses, the whole of the site has the benefit of a Certificate of Existing Lawful Use of Development. This certificate extends across the whole site so the future allocation should extend across the whole site as well. Redevelopment of the site would see the current sui generis uses being replaced with a lower key and more beneficial employment use (Class B uses).	Comments noted and the boundary will be re-considered. The proposed employment allocation was drawn around the existing buildings to restrict the level of built development on the site.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked medium in terms of its sustainability as access to the site is via the local road network. Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minimal as there are established employment uses already on the site.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull,	General	Proposed Rural Employment Allocation doesn't define	Comments noted.

	Anglian Water		any potential discharge, therefore Anglian Water is unable to comment at this stage.	
--	---------------	--	--	--

**S118 – Land to the rear of Bridge Farm (Marks Tey)**

**CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in terms of environmental constraints on site	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Objection	Essex County Council and the Highways Agency unlikely to support the intensification in the use of the A120/London Road junction on highway safety and capacity grounds	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked medium with respect to sustainability due to the site's proximity to the A12/A120 and Marks Tey railway station. As the site is so close to the A12/A120 the impact on the Trunk Road network is likely to be significant.	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Issues with capacity at Copford Sewerage Treatment Works but as this site is being considered for rural employment there is no indication of possible discharge so unable to provide further comments at this stage.	Comments noted.

**S120 – Andersons Site and adjoining land (Marks Tey)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/013	Gordon Parker	Support	Owners of the site are in the process of preparing further information regarding highway issues. Currently in negotiations with both Essex County Council and the Highways Agency relating to both the A12 and A120	Comments noted and the Borough Council is also continuing work with the Highways Agency and Essex County Council on all aspects of highways and sustainable transport issues in the LDF.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in terms of environmental constraints on site	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Objection	Essex County Council accept that it would be possible to gain access to the site from London Road, however the County Council and the Highways Agency unlikely to support the intensification in the use of the A120/London Road junction on highway safety and capacity grounds. Development at this location would also likely intensify the use of the remaining direct accesses between the A12 and London which is also unlikely to be supported by Highways Agency.	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked good/medium on sustainability grounds due to its proximity to the A12. Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant as the site is relatively large (8.15ha)	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council

				and the Highways Agency.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Issues with capacity at Copford Sewerage Treatment Works but as this site is being considered for rural employment there is no indication of possible discharge so unable to provide further comments at this stage.	Comments noted.

**S279 – Old London Road (Marks Tey)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/013	Gordon Parker	Support	Owners of the site are in the process of preparing further information regarding highway issues. Currently in negotiations with both Essex County Council and the Highways Agency relating to both the A12 and A120	Comments noted and the Borough Council is also continuing work with the Highways Agency and Essex County Council on all aspects of highways and sustainable transport issues in the LDF.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Objection	Essex County Council and the Highways Agency unlikely to support the intensification in the use of the A120/London Road junction on highway safety and capacity grounds.	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked good/medium of sustainability grounds due to its proximity to the A12 and even though the site is small because of its location close to the A12 its impact on	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site

			the A12 is regarded as significant.	in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Issues with capacity at Copford Sewerage Treatment Works but as this site is being considered for rural employment there is no indication of possible discharge so unable to provide further comments at this stage.	Comments noted.

### S037 – Land north of Axial Way (Mile End)

#### CBC Preferred Allocation - Residential

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/313	Shelagh Gray, Tribal MJP on behalf of Royal London Asset Management Ltd	Support	Site is appropriate for residential purposes due to its physical configuration and relationship with adjacent land uses. If the site was to be developed for employment uses it would be likely to result in negative visual impact as buildings would need to be located at the front of the site and create a tunnel effect. Evidence presented to show oversupply of available employment land in the Borough and the re-allocation of the land is unlikely to have a significant impact on the Borough's employment targets. The site is surrounded on two sides by residential development and extra landscaping and planting could enhance the site's separation from the Flaktwoods site adjacent.	Comments noted. As the site allocations document is developed further prior to the next round of consultation the Borough Council will work with stakeholders to ensure appropriate land is made available and deliverable during the plan period.
S25/024	Nicholas Chilvere	Object	In the future less people will be commuting to London and there is precious little employment land available.	The Employment Land Study indicated there is an adequate supply of employment

				land available in the Borough.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Object	<p>The Parish Council supports the alternative option to retain an employment allocation on the land north of Axial Way for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is valued as a future provider of local employment in Mile End</li> <li>• Mile End needs to retain employment land, as there is currently a lack of local employment in the area which increases the need to travel to work.</li> <li>• Thousands of homes with existing planning permissions are planned therefore the shortage of local employment opportunities will grow.</li> <li>• Local road and traffic conditions will worsen if the Axial Way site is developed for housing.</li> <li>• The PC strongly rejected the statement that the 'size and shape of the site makes it difficult it for employment uses'.</li> </ul> <p>The parish council cited various sources of information including the Local Plan, PPS1, RSS, draft emerging Development Policies and the Core Strategy as evidence to support their objections.</p>	<p>Comments noted and the Borough Council will continue to explore the future use of the site following the consultation period and other comments received to date. As the site allocations document is developed further prior to the next round of consultation the Borough Council will work with stakeholders to ensure appropriate land is made available and deliverable for both employment and residential uses during the plan period.</p>
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	<p>Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver</p>	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>

			biodiversity benefits.	
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked as good on sustainability grounds due to good public transport links and employment opportunities. Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant due to the size of the proposed development and proximity to the trunk road.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works. No connections can be made to sewers to the east of the development site but they can be made to the northern relief sewer should the development take place.	Comments noted.

**S044 – Land between Mile End Road, Bergholt Road, Nayland Road and Boxted Road (Mile End and part in Fordham and Stour)**

**CBC Preferred Allocation – Site to be included within North Growth Area and land to the north of the A12 to remain white land**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	Object	Objection is made on the lack of clarity that is provided at present that existing facilities will be retained or fully replaced. The current recreation ground provides a community sports facility and it is considered essential that the existing facilities are either retained or replaced with at least equivalent facilities as part of the wider development of this area. The current reference to facilities being “anticipated” is not considered to provide sufficient clarity to developers and the community. Sport England request that any site allocation makes it explicit that existing sports facilities should be retained or fully replaced as part of any major development which would then give a clear policy steer for the North Colchester SPD.	Comments noted and will also be fed into the North Colchester SPD which is anticipated for public consultation autumn 2009. Sport England indicate that a reference including facilities being enhanced as well as retained/replaced may be appropriate and

				<p>these comments will be included within the next Site Allocations consultation document.</p> <p>The Council own the existing community sports facility/recreation ground and the intention is to retain or replace these with at least equivalent facilities.</p>
S25/039	Arwel Owen, David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	Support	Support the allocation of site S044 in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy but request that some detail be amended. The North Growth Area will be subject to a SPD which offers the opportunity to amplify the LDF policies. Changes which are sought include change to boundary in north west corner of the site, removal of green links from the Draft Proposals Map so that their specific location does not prejudice the conclusions of the SPD and the existing open space allocations within the site should be subject to review in the SPD consultation process.	Comments noted and these will be fed into the North Colchester SPD which is anticipated for public consultation autumn 2009 as the Borough Council continues to work with the stakeholders in the North Growth Area.
S25/061	Catherine Pollard, Boyer Planning on behalf of Colchester	General comments / observation	Colchester Golf Club does not wish to object to the proposed allocation, but raised concerns on the future master plan design and the possible impacts on the Golf Club. It is necessary to provide a landscape buffer between the golf course and proposed development to reduce the need to erect high netting and/or removal of	Colchester Golf Club is involved in stakeholder meetings looking at the North Colchester Growth Area and their

	Golf Club		fairways and greens. Existing footpaths should for the basis of a green link which could be used as part of the landscape buffer which would provide the continued safeguarding of existing open space.	comments will be fed into the SPD which is currently at the preparation stage and is scheduled for public consultation in autumn 2009.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Object	Myland Parish Council dispute that completion of the A12 junction will result in the Transit Corridor passing close to the Chapman Farm Triangle and are challenging the accessibility of the area.	Comments noted and these will be fed into the North Colchester SPD which is anticipated for public consultation autumn 2009.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council supportive of the allocation of land north of the A12 as white land. The PC also supports the protection of the last remnants of Chesterwell Wood.	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. Drainage ditches at risk of overloading and there are water quality issues. Loss of part of drainage system	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	Suggestion that Broad Area For New Housing be changed to Broad Area for New Housing and Community Development to indicate that open space, schools and other community facilities will be provided as part of development proposals. ECC have also requested that Early Years and Childcare are mentioned in the supporting text as they fall within site boundary. The allocation to the west of Mile End Road will require a north-south bus	The Core Strategy outlines the key facilities and infrastructure which is expected to be delivered as part of the North Growth Area. The Borough

			corridor to enable bus services to be provided within 400m of the new houses.	Council will continue to work with Essex County Council in preparing the SPD for the area.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked medium in terms of its sustainability and its potential impact on the A12 trunk road was regarded as major. Site located adjacent to the proposed Junction 28 proposed which means site may be acceptable for development. However, because development of this site could have a major impact on the A12 it should be ensured that the design of the new junction layout takes full account of the proposed development and ideally the release of the site should be linked to the provision of the new junction. J28 would be first point of access to the site.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/305	Cllr Christopher Arnold	General observations	Enhanced planting to be introduced along parts of the A134 with green links (minimum 100m width) being created from the NAR phase 2 to the A12. High landscape value of the view from the A134 into the Black Brook Valley should be preserved and enhanced to create a landscaped recreational corridor and retained as informal open space. Essential that the site must meet the open space needs of the new population as well as the existing communities. Existing sports fields should be enlarged with improved facilities. Creation of new public rights of way is also supported and the developer should be required to provide a new recreational bridge across the A12 to improve the potential health benefits of the local footpath network. There is also a need to ensure that Great Horkesley remains defined as a separate settlement and the gap between Colchester is maintained.	Comments Noted. The area will be subject to a comprehensive master planning exercise which will involve a wide range of stakeholders. A comprehensive master plan will present the opportunity to look at the whole site and the open space/recreational needs as a whole

				instead of in a piece meal approach. These comments will be fed into the master planning process that is on-going.
S25/311	Miss D M Bottjer	Object	Inclusion of land either side of A134 will result in the merger of Mile End and Great Horkeley. There needs to be a much wider green break between the communities	Comments noted. The area will be subject to a comprehensive master plan and these comments will be fed into this on-going process.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Capacity is available to the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works but Anglian Water will need to limit pass forward rate. Increasing size of existing sewers is also recommended to cater for the level of growth identified.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable

**106 – Wilson Marriage Youth Centre and land to the rear off Barrack Street (New Town)**

**CBC Preferred Allocation - Residential**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange	Support	Support the Council's preferred allocation on this site	Comments noted.

	Marsh Properties Ltd			
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within 250m buffer zone for closed landfill sites. The EA highlighted the risk of landfill gas migrating off site through the strata below the proposed development. A site investigation should be carried out by a qualified engineer prior to submission of a planning application.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for residential development. It was ranked good on sustainability grounds as it is well located in relation to the Town Centre and local employment opportunities. Its potential impact on the A12 trunk road was regarded as minor due to the distance of the site from the A12 and the small scale of the development.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works and re-development of this site does not pose any specific issues.	Comments noted.

**S026 – Land adjacent to Coopers Beach Holiday Resort (Pyefleet)**

**CBC Preferred Allocation – Holiday Caravans**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/009	Martin Taylor, Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts	Support	Allocation of this site will allow for continued investment and improvement of the Coopers Beach Holiday Park. Proposed allocation will contribute to local employment and offers the opportunity to improve the appearance and biodiversity of the land. Park Resorts support the site allocation and wish to make no changes to the CBC Preferred Allocation	Comments noted. As the site allocations document is developed further prior to the next round of consultation the Borough Council will work with

				stakeholders to ensure appropriate land is made available and deliverable
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site falls partly within Flood Zones 2 & 3. For sites in Flood Zones 2 & 3 and where the site exceeds 1ha, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required in compliance with PPS25.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Proposal to extend an existing Holiday/Caravan Park. The site was ranked medium on sustainability grounds however its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor as it is located a considerable distance from the A12 although it may have several first points of access.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	West Mersea is a small Sewage Treatment Works but will need further details on the size and capacity of the proposed caravan site and how many months of the year these will be occupied.	Comments noted and further work will be undertaken regarding the capacity and usage of the site to inform the next stage of the Site Allocations.

**S109 – Land at Pantiles Farm (Pyefleet)****CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment and white land.**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/004	Sue Pullen, Winstred Hundred Parish Council	Support	Support the proposal to restrict the site development to the area around the existing buildings and to exclude storage and distribution activities. Parish Council welcome local employment opportunities but not to the detriment of neighbouring areas.	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in relation to environmental constraints on this site	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed as a Rural Employment site. It was ranked poor in terms of sustainability and its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Fingringhoe Sewerage Treatment Works is a small filter bed works. Any significant re-development or intensification of this site will have a major impact on capacity in this area. No indication is given of possible discharge but there is unlikely to be any specific issues.	Comments noted.

**S128 – Land at Picketts Farm (Pyefleet)**

**CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment site and white land**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in relation to environmental constraints on this site	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for residential development and for rural employment. It was ranked poor on sustainability grounds due to the site's poor public transport links. Its potential impact on the A12 network was regarded as minor due it considerable distance form the A12.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Fingringhoe Sewerage Treatment Works is a small filter bed works. Any significant re-development or intensification of this site will have a major impact on capacity in this area. No indication is given of possible discharge but there is unlikely to be any specific issues.	Comments noted.

**1250 – Land at Betts Factory, Ipswich Road (St Johns)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Mixed Use**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/011	Jonathon Davis, King Sturge LLP	Support	The Betts Factory has come to the end of its useful life and the company are looking to relocate locally. A residential led mixed use development of the site would be supported and help deliver the brownfield targets	Comments noted and the Council will continue to work with the landowners (and Tendring District Council) on a development brief for the site which will feed into the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/019	Cllr Ray Gamble	Support	No problem with mixed use on this site provided it is limited to a sensible business use. For example, would not wish to see noisy businesses and/or a fast food outlet on the site	Comments noted and the Council will continue to work with the landowners (and Tendring District Council) on a development brief for the site which will feed into the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/031	Mr P Egan	Support	If a development brief for the site is produced it might be worthwhile looking to see if the residential properties can front Ipswich Road	Comments noted.
S25/064	KJ Baines Welshwood Park	Support	Residents Group agrees that the Betts Site is ripe for development however they are concerned about local traffic increase impacts on Ipswich Road.	Comments noted and the Council will continue to work with

	Residents Association			the landowners (and Tendring District Council) on a development brief for the site which will feed into the Site Allocations DPD. See below for comments from Essex County Council Highways and Transportation Department.
S25/002	Paula Baker	Object	Generally not opposed to a mixed use development on this site but need to ensure that heavy restrictions are put in place to protect the environment in this area near Bullock Wood.	Comments noted and the Borough Council will work to ensure that the site is developed sustainably and has minimal impact on the surrounding environment.
S25/035	Malcolm Inkster, Tendring District Council	General comment	The map shown on page 44 is misleading and shows part of the site in Tendring.	Comments noted, an area was shown in Tendring without an allocation in order to show the true extent of the site and a potential development brief to be delivered in partnership with Tendring District Council. Mapping

				errors will be corrected.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	Improvements will be needed to public transport, cycling and walking facilities at this site. Contributions will also have to be secured for capacity and safety improvements along Ipswich Road particularly at key junctions and at each end of the road.	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked good on sustainability grounds as it has relatively good public transport links. Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant/major due the size of the site and its proximity to the trunk road network. Impact dependent upon the intensification of uses beyond existing employment uses.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Capacity available at the nearest Sewage Treatment Works and re-development of this site is unlikely to raise any specific issues.	Comments noted.

**S070- Land between Warren Lane and Dyers Road (Stanway)**

**CBC Preferred Allocation – Inclusion within Stanway Growth Area for residential**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/012	David Lander, Boyer Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Ltd	Support	Support the inclusion of site S070 within the Stanway Growth Area. Highlight the links to the Core Strategy and documents in the evidence base including statements of common ground. The Borough Council need to ensure timing flexibility is built into specific sites within Growth Areas.	The Council will continue to work with the landowners as the Site Allocations document develops. There will also be a need to update work that was done as part of the Core Strategy – such as Transport Assessments and Site Implementation. A master plan will be prepared for the Stanway Growth Area
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Support	Support residential development on this site because it is the most sustainable location.	Comments noted.
S25/067	Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Support	Support the preferred residential allocation of the site S070 (land between Warrens Lane and Dyers Road)	Comments noted
S25/069	Environment	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA	The Borough Council

	Agency		promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits. Site within 250m buffer of Bell House Pit and Warren Lane landfill sites. Phasing of development needed to avoid environmental effects arising from adjacent quarry operations. The EA highlighted the risk of landfill gas migrating off site through the strata below the proposed development. A site investigation should be carried out by a qualified engineer prior to submission of a planning application.	will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	The Core Strategy recognises a potential need to allocate land for educational purposes around the Stanway Growth Area. Sites S268 and S070 represents a significant housing allocation which could trigger the need for a new primary school with commensurate Early Years and Childcare provision. The explanatory text should mention consideration and the identification of land where appropriate to meet these requirements	The Core Strategy outlines the key facilities and infrastructure which is expected to be delivered as part of the Stanway Growth Area. The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to deliver development in the Stanway Growth Area.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for residential use. First point of access to site would be at J26 at Eight Ash Green. It was ranked as medium on sustainability grounds due to its relatively good public transport links and the potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant due to the size of the	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of

			proposed development and its proximity to the A12.	the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/293	Mr Alan Beverley Stanway Parish Council	General	Concern raised about an area of woodland adjacent to this site. Trees on the site are already protected as is part of a hedgerow in Dyers Road (protected under Preservation Order). Reference needs to be made about the protected trees in the Site Allocations DPD document.	Any future development will have to take account of the current site constraints such as Tree Preservation Orders and habitats. Further details regarding site constraints and opportunities will be included in the next consultation document and the future masterplan.
S25/295	Lesley Scott - Boutell	General	Supportive of comments raised by Stanway parish Council regarding this site	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Site has been investigated to some extent and Anglian Water would have to carry out some major improvements (which have not been budgeted for) to the existing sewer system to provide capacity should the site be re-developed for residential uses.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.

**S095- Land north of London Road (Stanway)  
CBC Preferred Allocations – District Centre**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/067	Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Support	Strongly support the allocation of this land north of London Road as part of the Tollgate District Centre for the development of the replacement supermarket. Also support proposed land swap between the existing Sainsbury Site and the proposed store on the site to the north of London Road	Comments noted and the Borough Council will continue to work with a wide range of stakeholders to assist with the development of the Site Allocations document.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits. Site within 250m buffer zone for closed landfill sites ay Old House Farm and Warren Lane. The EA highlighted the risk of landfill gas migrating off site through the strata below the proposed development. A site investigation should be carried out by a qualified engineer prior to submission of a planning application.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed as a District Centre. It was ranked as good in terms of its sustainability and the potential impact on the A12 trunk road was regarded as minor. Highway Agency supports the strengthening of established District Centres as a way to possibly reduce road trips reliant on the A12.	Tollgate District Centre provides an important function locally for residents and communities and the inclusion of the

				proposed superstore will ensure that local needs are met and safeguarded in the future. The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/293	Mr Alan Beverley, Stanway Parish Council	Support	Stanway Parish Council supportive of proposed land allocation swap.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Major issues with the sewers downstream of this development at the southern trunk sewer. Further investment will be needed in this area if the development on this site takes place.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.

**S242 & S243 – Land at Stane Park, Phases One and Two (Stanway)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Employment Zone**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/040	Julie Warwick, Holmes Antill	Support	Employment allocation at Stane Park is welcomed. A mix of employment uses is appropriate, including employment generating uses such as hotels. Comments also provided in response to the Development Policies DPD.	Comments noted.
S25/067	Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Support	Support the preferred employment allocation of site S242 (Stane Park) providing the existing retail use on the existing site is transferred to North of London Road	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for Employment use. It was ranked good on sustainability grounds due to its relatively good transport links but its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant due to the size of the proposed development and proximity to the A12.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/293	Mr Alan Beverley	Support	Supports proposed employment land allocation.	Comments noted and the Borough Council

	Stanway Parish Council			will continue to work with a wide range of stakeholders to assist with the development of the Site Allocations document.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Major issues with the sewers downstream of this development at the southern trunk sewer. Further investment will be needed in this area if the development on this site takes place.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.

**S284 – Land at Colchester Quarry (Stanway)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Quarry Land**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Support	Support safeguarding land for quarry uses, however there is no need to direct development away from these areas because each quarry has its own suitable buffer strip to ensure it is environmentally acceptable.	Comments Noted
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No comment provided for this site	
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for future quarry use. The first point of access would be Junction 26 at Eight Ash Green. The sustainability of the site was not ranked however its	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways

			potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor provided there was no intensification of use at this site.	Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns
S25/293	Mr Alan Beverley Stanway Parish Council	Objection	Strong objection to the current proposal in Reg 25 Site Allocations document to safeguard this site for future quarry use. Bulk of the site has been quarried and there are few minerals left in greater part of the site. An extension to Bellhouse Farm is already allocated in the Minerals Development Framework. Small area at Fiveways Orchard identified in Minerals LDF but not shown in Site Allocations DPD. Site on east side of Warrens Lane largely worked out. It is already used for a number of temporary operations Safeguarding site for quarry use conflicts with long established plans to restore land for Informal Leisure use as it would increase scope for the intensification of quarrying related uses and jeopardise long established plans to restore land as open space.	The Borough Council have met with Essex County Council Minerals and Waste Team who have also identified issues with the proposals as outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation. The land identified in the Minerals LDF outlines that the site will revert to informal recreation following the closure of the quarry. The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure the details contained in the next consultation document are correct and more in line with the Minerals LDF and the interests of local stakeholders such as Stanway Parish

				Council.
S25/295	Lesley Scott-Boutell	Object	Support Stanway Parish Council's strong objection to this site proposal.	Comments noted
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	No specific comments to make on this site and the proposals	Comments noted.

**S294 – Land at Evergreen House & D Hollick Car Sales (Stanway )  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Employment Zone**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/067	Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Support	Support the preferred employment allocation of site S294.	Comments noted
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	Improvements will be needed access to public transport, cycling and walking facilities at this site. Contributions will also have to be secured for capacity and safety improvements along Tollgate/Stanway area (as per S.106 Agreement attached to planning consents in the area).	The Core Strategy outlines the key facilities and infrastructure which is expected to be delivered as part of the Stanway Growth

				Area. The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for residential development (Colchester Borough Council's preferred allocation is for Employment). It was ranked as good on sustainability grounds as it has relatively good public transport links Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor due to the size of the development and distance from the A12.	Comments noted.
S25/293	Mr Alan Beverley, Stanway Parish Council	Object	The allocation of this site for housing would be an anomaly-the site has had established employment uses for many years therefore allocating it for employment seems more sensible. (Colchester Borough Council's preferred allocation is for Employment).	The site is intended to be allocated for employment uses. The original representation submitted during the Issues and Options public consultation sought residential development on the site but the Borough Council consider the land more suited for employment purposes.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Major issues with the sewers downstream of this development at the southern trunk sewer. Further investment will be needed in this area if the development	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to

			on this site takes place.	engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.
--	--	--	---------------------------	---

**S286 – Land at Grange Road (Tiptree)**

**CBC Preferred Allocation – Mixed Use incorporating sports facilities, residential and employment land**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	Support	The current proposal is supported in principle as it would offer potential to help address the outdoor sports deficiencies in Tiptree that have been identified in the PPG17 study. The proposal is seen as a positive response to addressing the community infrastructure needs identified.	Comments noted
S25/049	Mrs McSweeney, Tiptree Parish Council	Object	Tiptree Parish Council does not want to see any more housing development before the necessary infrastructure is in place as current provision is inadequate. The loss of employment land is unacceptable unless other employment opportunities are put in place. Tiptree Parish Council strongly disagrees with the comments attributed to them in Chapter 5.	Comments noted. A summary of the meetings with town/parish council's was included to outline discussions to date. Future discussions are likely as the Site Allocations document is progressed further.
S25/100 – S25/290	Tiptree Residents (190 reps)	Object	Vine Farm is grade II farm land which typically grows barley and corn. The Landscape Character Assessment (Nov 2005) outlines that the area should be conserved and	Comments noted and will be considered as the Site Allocations

	received which are all identical)		enhanced and future development could increase the traffic pressure on rural and minor roads. Additional traffic pressure at Vine Road/Maldon Road and Vine Road/Kelvedon Road junction(s) would result as the junctions cannot be widened in this area. Both junctions lack public footpaths and there is no capacity to provide them. Increased visitors to the proposed community uses would bring additional traffic pressures at functions and evening events. The site has been supported by the Council partly due to the additional sport facilities that are to be provided with the development. Alternative sites for community pitches exist at Warriors Rest and land owned by CBC adjacent to Tiptree Sports Centre. The PPG17 study recommended siting new sports facilities at Tiptree Sports Centre which would make use of existing infrastructure and services. An alternative site in the south of Tiptree was also identified in the PPG17 study and not the site at Grange Road. There are several alternative sites available within the existing built up area of Tiptree to meet the Core Strategy housing target. Various Core Strategy policies outlined to demonstrate that the site proposal is considered contrary to existing policy and is not supported by a large number of residents.	DPD is progressed.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of Suds to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/076	Edward Gittins &	General	Not seeking to oppose an appropriate level of growth in the north west of Tiptree if this is demonstrated to be the most	As outlined in the Regulation 25

	Associates on behalf of Mr D Clough		appropriate location. The preferred allocations of the Council are unclear and the access arrangements off Kelvedon Road and Grange Road remain in doubt. Draft settlement boundary for Tiptree shown in Appendix 7 does not take account of the proposals which is misleading and has scant regard for its relationship with established development. The draft settlement boundary is unacceptable without clear definition of the long term uses on the site. Careful consideration of alternative options is required as indicated in the Inspector's Core Strategy Examination Report.	consultation document the Council at this stage did not support every element of the original proposal so it was inappropriate to prejudge the areas of residential, open space and sports facilities expected as part of this development. If this site is demonstrated to be the most appropriate location, further work will be carried out to ensure the exact boundaries can be shown in the next document.
S25/080	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr R Martin	General	Not seeking to oppose an appropriate level of growth in the north west of Tiptree if this is demonstrated to be the most appropriate location. The preferred allocations of the Council are unclear and the access arrangements off Kelvedon Road and Grange Road remain in doubt. Draft settlement boundary for Tiptree shown in Appendix 7 does not take account of the proposals which is misleading and has scant regard for its relationship with established development. The draft settlement boundary is unacceptable without clear definition of the long term uses on the site. Careful consideration of alternative options is	As outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document the Council at this stage did not support every element of the original proposal so it was inappropriate to prejudge the areas of residential, open

			required as indicated in the Inspector's Core Strategy Examination Report.	space and sports facilities expected as part of this development. If this site is demonstrated to be the most appropriate location, further work will be carried out to ensure the exact boundaries can be shown in the next document.
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	Improvements will be needed in respect of access to public transport, cycling and walking facilities at this site. Contributions will also have to be secured for capacity and safety improvements along Tiptree/Kelvedon/Feering area	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked as medium on sustainability grounds and the potential impact on the A12 was regarded as being minor/significant.	Comments noted.
S25/312	Sharon Tyson, Lawson Planning Partnership on behalf of Colchester United Football Club	General	Support the general principle of the allocation but have concerns regarding the specific wording as included within the Regulation 25 consultation document. Revised proposals comprise of sports training pitches with ancillary accommodation for Colchester United Football Club, residential development for a minimum of 140 dwellings, with public open space including a village green, community sports uses including playing pitches and an indoor sports facility, allotment gardens, landscaping and wildlife areas and employment generating development	Comments noted. Details will be considered further.

			with a potential new access. Development of this site provides a good opportunity to plan for the future of Tiptree in a positive way by providing a range of complementary and compatible land uses by meeting identified needs. The site is expected to be come forward in a series of stages starting with the sports development of pitches and changing facilities for which a planning application has recently been submitted. Residential development will then come forward north and south of Grange Road. A detailed transport assessment has also been submitted as part of this representation.	
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Insufficient capacity in the local sewers. The nearest point with capacity is 780 metres to the south east of the site on Church Road. The nearest Sewage Treatment Works has capacity to accommodate the development.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.

**S003 – Waldegraves Holiday Park (West Mersea)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Holiday Caravans**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/048	Captain Ian Crossley, Mersea Island Society	Support	Supports the Council's preferred allocation on this site	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site falls partly within Flood Zones 2 & 3. For sites in Flood Zones 2 & 3 and where the site exceeds 1ha, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required in compliance with PPS25.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No environmental constraints issues were raised about this site	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	Comments noted.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked as medium on sustainability grounds and the potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor as it is located a considerable distance from the Trunk Road although there are potentially many first points of access to this site.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull,	General	West Mersea is a small Sewage Treatment Works but will	Comments noted and

	Anglian Water		need further details on the size and capacity of the proposed caravan site and how many months of the year these will be occupied.	further work will be undertaken regarding the capacity and usage of the site to inform the next stage of the Site Allocations.
--	---------------	--	--	--

**S009 – Land adjacent to Waldegraves Business Park (West Mersea)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment Site**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/048	Captain Ian Crossley, Mersea Island Society	Support	Supports the Council's preferred allocation on this site	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in terms of environmental constraints on site	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	Comments noted.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for Employment use. It was ranked as medium on sustainability grounds and the potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian	General	West Mersea is a small Sewage Treatment Works but will need further details on the proposed employment activities	Comments noted and further work will be

	Water		in order to provide any further comments.	undertaken regarding the capacity and usage of the site to inform the next stage of the Site Allocations.
--	-------	--	---	---

**S107 – University of Essex land between Colchester and Wivenhoe (Wivenhoe Cross and part in St Johns)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Part inclusion in East Growth Area and part land no change to current allocations**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	Support	The proposal to allocate part of this site for sport and recreation needs is supported in principle as it would offer potential to help address the growing demand for sports facility needs.	Comments noted
S25/026	Chris Fox	Object	Object to any proposal to make changes that would permit further development on Site S107. Green break should not be opened up to development and therefore should be no change to existing allocation(s).	Comments noted. The Borough Council is undertaking a green break study which will become part of the evidence base in due course which will consider the green break between settlements including Colchester and Wivenhoe.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of

			examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits. Site falls partly within Flood Zones 2 & 3. For sites in Flood Zones 2 & 3 and where the site exceeds 1ha, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required in compliance with PPS25. Site within 250m buffer zone of the Molar Works landfill site. The EA highlighted the risk of landfill gas migrating off site through the strata below the proposed development. A site investigation should be carried out by a qualified engineer prior to submission of a planning application.	the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	The County Council will have to be satisfied regarding highway safety and access issues. Development will be required to contribute towards highway/transportation improvements as per the adjacent Research Park.	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site has various points of access. The site was ranked as good on sustainability grounds due its relatively good public transport links. The potential impacts on the A12 were regarded as minor/significant, due to the size of the development and distance form the A12.	Comments noted.
S25/299	Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of the Wivenhoe Consortium	General	The inclusion of S107 is welcomed and fully supported however the current allocation is insufficient to meet the University's medium term needs over the plan period and as such is not in conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy. Request that land to the south of Boundary Road is included in the Submission Site Allocations DPD and rejects concerns raised over the risk of settlement	Comments noted and will be considered further prior to the publication of the Site Allocations DPD.

		<p>coalescence between Colchester and Wivenhoe.</p> <p>There are significant constraints affecting land the University could potentially develop in the future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Listed buildings</li> <li>ii) Grade II Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>iii) Marshland to the west of the University – restricted on flood risk grounds</li> <li>iv) S107 already falls within East Colchester Growth Area and is already committed for housing, lack of suitable land within campus.</li> </ul> <p>The only available and viable option is to develop land to the south of Boundary Road.</p> <p>Essex University has to meet two objectives within plan period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) identify additional sports facilities and accommodate academic development.</li> </ul> <p>Proposal for an extension of 6.5ha to the northern edge of Wivenhoe to accommodate a new Health Facility, other facilities identified in the Wivenhoe Town Plan and enabling housing required to pump prime the Golf Academy and University facilities. The settlement boundary should be extended to accommodate these needs. PCT are supportive of the provision of a Health Centre as part of the new mixed use allocation proposal.</p> <p>Justification for this proposal includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) proposal meets University needs and local needs</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>ii) development proposals are confined to the edge of settlements</p> <p>iii) development in the break between Wivenhoe and Colchester although within Coastal Protection Belt does not impact on the open and rural character of the undeveloped coastline, its historic features or nature conservation interests.</p>	
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Unclear as to the level of development expected on this site and will need clarification before comments can be provided regarding capacity at the nearest Sewage Treatment Works.	Comments noted and further work will be undertaken regarding the capacity and usage of the site to inform the next stage of the Site Allocations.

#### General Comments

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Site	Summary of comments	Council Response
S25/010	Clive Kerr	Sites S273, S090 and S221 in Appendix 3c	Areas of land near Bullock Wood are important for wildlife, wild flowers and green areas which should not be developed. This green space is an asset to Colchester and should be retained	Comments noted
S25/008	David Williams, Great Tey Parish Council	Great Tey	Parish Council is pleased to see no expansion to the existing village envelope is proposed at this stage.	Comments noted
S25/007	Andrew Zachwatajlo	Retention of Open Spaces	Wish to see the following sites retained as green spaces: Maldon Rd/Drury Rd Allotments, Irvine Road Orchard and Allotments, The Green and Playing Field in Prettygate	Comments Noted. The LDF seeks to protect existing open space

				across the borough and the Council would not support development proposals on these sites.
S25/006	Rachael Bust, The Coal Authority	General Comments	The Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the Site Allocations document at this stage	Comments noted
S25/005	Helen De La Rue, East of England Regional Assembly (EERA)	General Comments	EERA have indicated that the Site Allocations Regulation 25 document does not raise any issues of general conformity in relation to the East of England Plan	Comments noted
S25/002	Paula Baker	Open Spaces	There are not enough open spaces proposed in the document. More public open space needs to be made available both for human use and also wildlife use. The local authority should have stronger powers regarding the Sustainable Communities Act and PPG17.	The Borough Council have commissioned various studies relating to open space and green breaks across the Borough which will inform the Site Allocations document and other aspects of the LDF.
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England endorses the principle of all school fields being allocated as open space with a general presumption against development which accords with PPG17 and is considered to be justified locally in view of the significant deficiencies in outdoor sports facilities as identified.</li> <li>• DPD does not appear to have fully considered</li> </ul>	Comments noted and officers will continue to work closely with colleagues from Leisure Services and appropriate stakeholders to identify

			identifying sites for meeting existing and future outdoor sports facility needs, especially around the urban area of Colchester where deficiencies are particularly high. Site Allocations DPD represents main opportunity for planning to address some of the deficiencies and it is therefore recommended that additional suitable sites are allocated for meeting the identified need for both outdoor and indoor facilities.	any possible opportunities across the Borough which can be included within the next Site Allocations consultation document.
S25/004	Sue Pullen, Winstred Hundred Parish Council	General sites in Peldon, The Wigborough & Salcott cum Virley	Parish Council agree with the conclusions that none of the sites in the parish are suitable for large scale housing development. Following a recent public meeting the clear message was that a small number of affordable houses would be welcomed if they brought families into the community. There is a strong desire to see a shop re-open in a suitable location, there is also an awareness that without such community facilities villages will become unsustainable and die. Firm view that the village envelope should not be changed and that the existing open spaces and woodland in the parish are valued amenities which must be retained.	Comments noted.
S25/014	Gordon Parker	Site 189, Land North of Birch Road, Layer-de-la-Haye.	Site currently in Appendix 3a and could be appropriate for affordable housing scheme. Request that the site is considered in the next stage of consultation where detailed representations will be made.	The Site Allocations document will not allocate land for affordable housing as these sites are delivered as exceptions in accordance with Core Strategy policy H4.
S25/015	Gordon Parker	Site 185 & 213. Land at The Folly,	The site(s) is available immediately to help address the affordable housing issue within the Borough. Further consideration should be given to allocating this land for	The Site Allocations document will not allocate land for

		Layer-de-la-Haye	affordable housing.	affordable housing as these sites are delivered as exceptions in accordance with Core Strategy policy H4. The principal of affordable housing adjacent to village envelopes is supported in the Core Strategy and a scheme could be delivered through a planning application.
S25/016	Gordon Parker	S078, Land at Hardings Close, Aldham	The Landowner is content with the site being developed for affordable housing and seeks support for development of this site.	The Site Allocations document will not allocate land for affordable housing as these sites are delivered as exceptions in accordance with Core Strategy policy H4. The principal of affordable housing adjacent to village envelopes is supported in the Core Strategy and a scheme could be delivered through a planning application.
S25/017	Eugene Kraft	Sites in Wivenhoe – 1136, 1137,	Accepts that development on land allocated as residential would not be supported by the Council but areas such as The Nook, Bobbits Way and the open space opposite	Comments noted and the Borough Council will work in partnership

		1135, 180, 181, 247	Milfields School, should be allocated as Open Space as outlined in the Wivenhoe Town Plan	with Wivenhoe Town Council and appropriate stakeholders to incorporate appropriate elements of the Town Plan into the LDF.
S25/018	Angus Forrest	Land at Swan Grove, Chappel	Requests that this site be considered for rural housing development as indicated by the Parish Council on page 61 of the Site Allocations document. Site could be suitable for residential mixed use development including cemetery and village hall.	Comments noted and will be passed onto Parish Council. Principal of affordable housing on suitable sites outside of village envelope is supported in the Core Strategy.
S25/019	Cllr Ray Gamble	Land in St Johns	Would not wish to see the loss of any woodland (Bullock Wood) around the Betts Factory. Agrees in principal with the views of Paula Baker S25/002.	Comments noted.
S25/020	Penny Kraft	Sites in Wivenhoe	Accepts that development on land allocated as residential would not be supported by the Council but areas such as 'The Nook' should be allocated as Open Space as outlined in the Wivenhoe Town Plan	Comments noted and the Borough Council will work in partnership with Wivenhoe Town Council and appropriate stakeholders to incorporate appropriate elements of the Town Plan into the LDF.
S25/021	Antoinette Stinson, Wivenhoe Town	Sites in Wivenhoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wivenhoe Town Council would like to see more land made available for allotments and a new cemetery</li> <li>• Raise issues regarding the number of anomalies on the maps and key including the Engine Shed being</li> </ul>	Comments Noted and the Borough Council will work in partnership with Wivenhoe Town

	Council		<p>designated as open space whereas the Nook is considered residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wivenhoe Town Council believes the text on page 69 is incorrect and should be deleted from future policy documents.</li> <li>• Conservation Area appraisal has been undertaken and currently waiting formal approval from the Borough Council.</li> <li>• Business Park is designated as residential; this should be an employment area.</li> <li>• Coastal Protection belt needs to be retained to ensure the gap between Wivenhoe and Colchester is maintained</li> </ul>	Council and appropriate stakeholders to incorporate appropriate elements of the Town Plan into the LDF. As a result Wivenhoe Town Council will have opportunity to influence the Site Allocations document prior to the next round of consultation. Mapping errors will be corrected.
S25/022	Adam Wilson	Objects to development on all sites	Consultation documents are difficult to read with obscure language. Decent transport links are needed to support all new developments. Colchester is locked with traffic and there has been a high loss of green sites. The Council should just drop the pretence and be honest about which areas are being dug up.	Officers strive to write to documents in plain English and do not wish to alienate people with language used. The Core Strategy aims to deliver the necessary infrastructure alongside any development.
S25/023	Sarah Burgess, CABA	General	Due to limited resources, CABA are unable to comment on the document. They do however make some general comments regarding design and its role in national and regional policy and links to appropriate CABA guidance.	Comments noted and will be fed into the Development Policies DPD.
S25/025	Amy Carter, East Donyland Parish	Rowhedge Port	Parish Council are pleased to see their comments regarding flooding problems have been endorsed and the only area earmarked for development is the Port area. Difficulties with the key and the maps being smaller than	Officers appreciate the difficulties many people faced with regards to the key and the maps

	Council		the Local Plan.	contained within the document. These issues will be rectified before the next round of consultation.
S25/026	Chris Fox	Wivenhoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of maps and key needs to be improved</li> <li>• Green corridors need to be wider to fulfil their biodiversity function.</li> <li>• Wivenhoe Business Park near Brook Street should be employment land.</li> <li>• Areas that do not form retail centre could be considered for mixed use to help protect employment in Wivenhoe.</li> <li>• Wivenhoe Conservation Area should be extended and text amended to acknowledge appraisal work that is being undertaken.</li> <li>• Designation near Broadfields sport ground needs to be clarified.</li> <li>• Clarification sought over land which appears to be residential but is outside of settlement boundary</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Officers appreciate the difficulties with the maps and will rectify these issues prior to the next round of consultation through partnership working with Wivenhoe Town Council and appropriate stakeholders to address issues raised during this round of consultation.
S25/027	Amy Carter, Eight Ash Green Parish Council	Eight Ash Green	Eight Ash Green PC in broad support of the Site Allocations document and confirm their objection to the allocation of any further sites within the parish. Parish council has a long held view that any future developments should aim to retain the rural nature of the village and be towards the centre of the communities as opposed to the periphery. Parish council would welcome opportunity to be involved in review of existing village envelope and have successfully established a group of volunteers to prepare a VDS and Parish Plan.	All parish councils will be invited to provide assistance in the work the Borough Council is undertaking on the village envelopes. The creation of a VDS and Parish Plan will also assist this work and is likely to be adopted by the Borough Council following its completion

				as outlined in the Core Strategy.
S25/028	Paul Matthews	S106 – Peldon	Extremely anxious that site S106 as identified following the Issues and Options consultation is not developed. Peldon has limited infrastructure to support future development.	S106 is outside of the existing Peldon village envelope and therefore there is a presumption against development. In addition, However landscape issues such as the existing Tree Preservation Order will add weight to that presumption.
S25/029	Frances Fergus	Sites in Peldon	Relieved to see that no sites in Peldon have been supported at this stage, but remain concerned that they could be suitable as Rural Exception Sites. Central area of Peldon is important for the local wildlife and biodiversity of the area and a recent village survey demonstrated the importance of this area to local residents. Peldon is a small non sustainable village lacking in services and has a limited bus service and therefore can not cope with any future development. The countryside should be protected for environmental reasons outlined.	The Borough Council is aware of the recent village survey and is working with the Parish on a Village Design Statement. There is a general presumption against new development outside village envelopes. Any development on a rural exception site will have to take into account the local environment and character of the area such as existing Tree Preservation Order. Winstred Hundred Parish Council does

				not deem it necessary to change the existing village envelope as outlined in Chapter 5 of the Site Allocations document.
S25/030	Alex and Margaret McArthur	Sites in Peldon	Pleased to see no changes proposed to the Peldon village envelope although are concerned that some sites may be suitable for affordable housing. Any future development should be within the existing village envelope. Peldon is lacking in village amenities and Mersea Road poses highway safety issues.	The Borough Council is aware of the recent village survey and is working with the Parish on a Village Design Statement. There is a general presumption against new development outside village envelopes. Any development on a rural exception site will have to take into account the local environment and character of the area such as existing Tree Preservation Order. Winstred Hundred Parish Council does not deem it necessary to change the existing village envelope as outlined in Chapter 5 of the Site Allocations document.
S25/031	Mr P Egan	Alternative	Oppose any development on these sites and support the	Comments noted.

		Sites 1, 9 and 11	Council's position.	
S25/032	Mr M Knowles	Appendix 4 and 5 and Scheduled Ancient Monuments	Scheduled Ancient Monument 5729455 Gosbecks Iron Age and Roman Settlements. The area of the allocation is under review by English Heritage and may well change in the future.	The Borough Council invites English Heritage to comment on all LDF documents which are out for public consultation. In the next consultation document the Borough Council will use the most up to date information available.
S25/033	Cllr Martin Goss	Sites in Mile End Ward and North Colchester	Residents on North Colchester do not welcome the development proposed. The area lacks appropriate community facilities and open space. Roads and supporting infrastructure need to be provided first because there is complete grid lock currently. The ridiculous amount of housing required needs to be reduced to stop building slums of the future.	The Core Strategy identifies the level of growth for North Colchester which is to be delivered through a comprehensive Master Plan which will seek to provide improved community facilities and open space provision. The Core Strategy also outlines the infrastructure requirements that are expected to be delivered alongside future developments.
S25/034	Mark Archer	Site at Simpsons	A site for future housing development is put forward for consideration in the Site Allocations.	The site is adjacent to the existing settlement

		Lane, Tiptree		boundary of Tiptree and therefore only considered suitable for affordable housing. Site would have been put into Appendix 3a had it been submitted during the Issues and Options consultation
S25/035	Malcolm Inkster, Tendring District Council	General comment	The Site Allocations DPD proposes a number of rural employment sites. The explanations for these refer to Rural Employment Sites but TDC have been unable to find the companion term in either the Core Strategy or Development Policies DPD. Without a link to policy the term offers no guidance.	Comments noted. Any future allocation of land will need to be based on policies in the Development Policies DPD, Core Strategy or appropriate national or regional policies. Officers will ensure that justifications given for any sites are based on sound policies and best practice guidance.
S25/036	Neil Waterson, Bidwells on behalf of Glanmore Investments Ltd	Turner Rise, Urban District Centres	The Core Strategy identifies Urban District Centres in accordance with PPS6. The designation will provide greater scope to foster a more viable and sustainable future for the retail park without competing with the Town Centre alongside the regeneration surrounding the station. PPS6 underlines the need for Local Planning Authorities to consider the network of centres and their relationship in the centres hierarchy. Given the scale of new retail floor space identified in the Core Strategy it is appropriate to consider some retail within the accessible Urban District	Comments noted. The Core Strategy outlines the general principles and uses expected for each area. Alongside this the emerging Development Policies Document will add further detail to the uses which are

			Centres.	appropriate within certain areas. Turner Rise is expected to remain an Urban District Centre and will be shown as such again in the next consultation document.
S25/037	Strutt and Parker, on behalf of the Trustees of the Round 1969 Settlement – Noble Fund	Sites S138 Birch, S139 Layer-de-la-Haye and S140 Layer-de-la-Haye	These three sites on the edge of village envelopes should be considered as suitable sites for housing, either on a mix of housing or solely for affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy H3. Sites are in close proximity to southern growth area and have no site constraints.	These sites were placed into Appendix 3a as they are outside of the existing village envelope(s). Further work is being undertaken by officers regarding the existing village envelopes. There is presumption against new development outside village envelopes but Core Strategy policy H4 supports rural exception sites to meet local need.
S25/038	Andrew Hodgson, Savills on behalf of Essex and Suffolk Water	Essex and Suffolk Water land in Layer-de-la-Haye and Abberton	The sites identified are on land owned by Essex and Suffolk Water which is surplus to operational requirements. Both sites are outside of the existing village envelopes and could help meet the local housing need. Given the existing housing market there should be an element of market housing allowed on rural exception sites, an approach taken in other Essex authorities.	These sites were placed into Appendix 3a as they are outside of the existing village envelope(s). Further work is being undertaken by officers

				regarding the existing village envelopes. There is presumption against new development outside village envelopes but Core Strategy policy H4 supports rural exception sites to meet local need.
S25/041	Robert McClure, Defence Estates on behalf of MoD	Middlewick Rifle Range and Training Area	Appendix 5 shows Middlewick Rifle Range as a potential open space site. Such a designation would be wholly inappropriate as this area is a live firing range.	Officers agree that the Open space allocation is inappropriate and will be removed prior to the next consultation document.
S25/043	Lee Melin, Bidwells	Legion Playing Field, West Mersea.	Representation seeks the allocation of part of Legion Field for the development of a GP Surgery. At present there is no other viable or available site in West Mersea.	Officers have been involved with this site and will further explore the options and possibilities for creating of new community facilities in West Mersea with appropriate stakeholders.
S25/044	Lee Melin, Bidwells	Land adjacent to Wivenhoe Fire Station	Representation seeks to allocate approximately 1ha of land adjacent to Wivenhoe Fire Station for the development of a GP Surgery. At present there are no other viable or available sites in Wivenhoe.	Officers have been involved with this site and will further explore the options and possibilities for creating of new community

				facilities in Wivenhoe with appropriate stakeholders.
S25/046	Neil Osborn	Alternative Site 1 – Cymbeline Way	Council has failed to have sufficient regard to the evidence base which indicates the need for additional hotel bedrooms. Development of the site would accord with tourism and employment policies and is on a site free from constraints. The site should be allocated for a 3 star hotel as indicated in the Hotel Demand Study.	The Council clearly set out their position against the development of this site in the evidence base and hearing statements for the Core Strategy and the Council's position has not changed since the Core Strategy Examination. The site has also been subject to a recent planning application that was refused.
S25/047	Nigel Gough, Bigwood Associates Ltd on behalf of Abberton Manor Development Ltd	Abberton Manor, Layer Road, Abberton	Abberton Manor is a registered Nursing Home and close-care apartments as an integrated Care Village. Initial studies have indicated there is a need for specialist Elderly Mental and Infirm care on the site which would enhance the facilities on site. LDF provides an opportunity to establish principle of Care Village with appropriate links to the NHS.	Comments noted regarding the requested changes to the Site Allocations DPD which will be considered during the preparation of the next Site Allocations consultation document. A Community Facilities Audit has also been carried out which will form part of the

				extensive LDF evidence base and help identify areas of community needs.
S25/048	Captain Ian Crossley, Mersea Island Society	West Mersea	In the summer months the roads around West Mersea are clogged up with parked cars, the infrastructure to cater for visitor numbers is not in place. More car parks and private open space is needed.	Comments noted and Policy DP8 of the Development Policies consultation document indicates the Council's position with regard to tourism.
S25/050	David Barbour, on behalf of the Barbour Family	Land at Gosbecks Farm S260	Opportunity for a mixed development, open space, considerable landscaping and provision for the continuation of Cunobelin Way this by-passing most of the remainder of Gosbecks Road. Development of this site would be a logical extension to the built up area.	There is no need to allocate additional greenfield sites.
S25/051	Mrs and Mrs Diggle	Sites in Eight Ash Green	Support the exclusion of sites in Eight Ash Green. Some of these areas best examples of arable farmland in the village and contribute to the environment and have been rejected in the past in previous Local Plans and Planning Committees.	Comments noted and at this stage the Borough Council are not proposing any change to the existing village envelope of Eight Ash Green.
S25/052	Mrs and Mrs Diggle	Sites in Eight Ash Green	Support the exclusion of sites in Eight Ash Green. Some of these areas best examples of arable farmland in the village and contribute to the environment and have been rejected in the past in previous Local Plans and Planning Committees.	Comments noted and at this stage the Borough Council are not proposing any change to the existing village envelope of Eight Ash Green.
S25/053	Brian Morgan	Residential development	Express concerns that future residential development in rural areas should reflect acknowledged rural needs and	Comments noted and supported. Further

	ADP Ltd	in rural areas	not be seen as a simple development opportunity. It has become self evident that housing growth in villages has not protected or improved local community facilities, nor has this reversed the increasing trend for villages to become dormitories. Believe it is necessary for the Council to resist expanding village envelopes to accommodate more housing unless there is robust and credible evidence. The Council's recent consultation with Parish Councils has not provided any evidence of rural housing demand which requires the expansion of village envelopes.	work is being undertaken to look at the existing village envelopes which will form part of the evidence base.
S25/054	Mrs Burwood	Site in Eight Ash Green	Proposed residential site in Eight Ash Green. Similar to S246 submitted as part of the Issues and Options Consultation	Site is outside of the existing village envelope and in Appendix 3a. At this stage no changes are proposed to existing village envelopes.
S25/055	Cllr Paul Smith	General comment	Object to the proposal to combine public and private open space. Having two designations affords greater protection to sites allocated a public open space	Comments noted.
S25/056	Andrew Crayston, Fenn Wright	Site S131, Land South of Peldon Common	Site S131 includes former agricultural buildings and is well should be allocated as rural employment	Any rural employment site will have to accord with the policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Policies document. The Borough Council will consider this new site against the criteria already in place.
S25/057	Andrew	Site S134,	Site S134 should be included within the settlement	The possible change to

	Crayston, Fenn Wright	South of Brierley Hall, West Mersea	boundary of West Mersea. The site has potential for planned release and mixed use development to be delivered through a design brief	the settlement boundary of West Mersea was a question on the representation form and the results of this consultation will influence the future boundary of West Mersea.
S25/058	J.E. Harris on behalf of Mr B Kinnear	Extension of Marks Tey village envelope	Proposed change to the Marks Tey village envelope to include land near Marks Tey Hall and fronting onto A12 slip road. Current junction causes problems and development in this area could help to pay for the necessary redesign of the road and turning area. An affordable housing scheme is unlikely to generate the funds needed to address the highway issues.	This site was put forward as part of the Issues and Options Consultation. At this stage the Council do not have any justification for the extension of the village envelopes but are undertaking work on the village envelope which will form part of the evidence base. Highway issues would have to be resolved satisfactorily with Essex County Council as Highways Authority and the Highways Agency.
S25/059	Catherine Pollard, Boyer	Crossfield Way, Boxted	Site is approximately 0.12ha and is bound by the existing residential area and primary school which pre-dates the Adopted Local Plan. As such the site has no affinity with	Further work is being undertaken to look at the existing village

	Planning on behalf of Mr Sexton		the open countryside and is entirely enclosed.	envelopes which will form part of the evidence base.
S25/060	Catherine Pollard, Boyer Planning on behalf of J.C Contractors	The Mullions, Great Horkesley	Site is enclosed by residential properties and the A12. It represents an appropriate location for a Rural Employment Site with direct access to the A134 and well served by bus services. Allocation of the site for rural employment is requested.	Any rural employment site will have to accord with the policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Policies document. The Borough Council will consider this new site against the criteria already in place.
S25/062	Steve Norman	Site S050, Land at Cannock Mill, Old Heath Road	Current Open Space allocation in this area is incorrect. Part of the current allocation forms part of the extensive cartilage of Cannock Mill House and is used as a private garden whilst land to the north and west is public open space. Request change of allocation to reflect the current uses.	Comments noted. As part of the Site Allocations formulation the Borough Council is also looking closely at every existing Local Plan Allocation to see if these are still correct and/or appropriate. Land at Cannock Mill will be looked at as part of this background work.
S25/063	Richard Inman, GO-East	General comments	GO-East does not propose to offer detailed comments on this draft DPD but highlights that the document does not appear to include any additional sites to accommodate the needs of gypsies/travellers and identified in the Core Strategy. Recommend that future documents provide sufficient sites to meet the required needs.	Comments noted. Since the document was printed the Borough Council has received information relating to the gypsy

				and traveller need within the Borough as a result of the RSS Single Issues Review which was published in December 2008. This document will become part of the evidence base and be fed into the next consultation document.
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Rowhedge Settlement Boundary	Add the boundary of the Rowhedge Port Development Brief onto the Proposals Map and rationalise the south west boundary as shown on map submitted with representation.	Comments noted and the boundary of the Rowhedge Port Development Brief is likely to be a worthy addition to the proposals map. Work is being undertaken on the settlement boundaries and consultation responses will feed into this work.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	General comments	<p>1. Document should include an up to date Proposals Map that includes site numbers This would make it easier for those not familiar with the area to understand and avoid the need for extensive referencing to locations.</p> <p>2. Myland Parish Council has identified the need for 2 community centres on land between Mile End Road, Bergholt Road, Nayland Road and Boxted Road. This is in addition to one secured under S.106 agreement for the</p>	<p>1. Sites which were identified previously were not included in the Regulation 25 consultation as this would have made the document unwieldy and was considered to be an unnecessary</p>

			<p>Severalls Development and included in Severalls Masterplan. The current document only identifies 1 community centre.</p> <p>3.The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of Table 3a in the Site Allocations document</p> <p>4. The Parish Council have requested that Table 3c in the Site Allocation document be included in future masterplans for North Colchester</p>	<p>addition.</p> <p>2. Comments noted and these will be fed into the North Colchester SPD which is anticipated for public consultation autumn 2009. Myland Parish Council are a stakeholder in the preparation of the North Colchester SPD and will continue to be involved as the document develops further.</p> <p>3. This table is unlikely to be repeated in the final Site Allocations document.</p> <p>4. This table is unlikely to be repeated in the final Site Allocations document</p>
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland	General	S129 is land to the north of Coggeshall Road not land to south of Bergholt Road	Comments noted

	Parish Council			
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Site S180	Myland PC proposed that this land was used for either a secondary school or a cemetery while CBC put it forward as a suitable site for Park and Ride. Myland requesting that the site is moved to Appendix 3c on the grounds that CBC are being inconsistent in terms of the future uses of the site.	The principal of a Park and Ride was agreed in the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations document outlines the preferred site. Key facilities and infrastructure to be delivered alongside the North Growth Area are outlined in the Core Strategy and the Borough Council will continue to work with stakeholders and partners to deliver these “necessary” projects.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Site S282	Allotments off Norman Way not in Mile End	Comments noted
S25/066	Simon Neate Indigo Planning on behalf of Wharf Land Investments	Rowhedge Port	Request made that the Rowhedge Port site be carried forward in the Site Allocations process as it can accommodate 300 houses and help contribute to the Borough’s housing targets.  Objection raised that the Site Allocation document recommends that the site be retained for employment as this conflicts with CBC’s aspirations in relation to the	The next consultation document will have to take into account any recent planning applications as well as the aims and objectives of the adopted development brief for

			redevelopment the site. Request that the site is taken forward the Site Allocations process as a Regeneration Area	Rowhedge Port. The employment allocation will be corrected.
S25/068	Atisreal	Colne Bank House, St Peter's Street, Castle Ward	Atisreal is supportive of the removal of the Local Plan Employment allocation on Colne Bank House and its presentation in the Site Allocations as white land. Atisreal whilst supportive that the employment allocation has been removed they suggest that emerging policy needs to go further than Local Plan EMP1 to enable and guide the redevelopment of this site for mix use developments that would be compatible in this predominantly residential area.	Comments noted. CBC will be looking in detail at St Peters Street prior to finalising Site Allocations in view of the recent planning permissions and its proximity to the Town Centre and North Station Regeneration Area.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	The EA re-emphasised the importance of applying the Sequential approach particularly in East Colchester where there are known Flood Risk issues. In this area more vulnerable development such as Housing should be set back from the river frontage with less vulnerable development i.e. commercial, offices or retail located between the residential and river frontage.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development in the Borough satisfies their concerns.
S 2 5 / 0 7 0	Simon Plater, Plater Claiborne Architecture and Design	Site S247, Eight Ash Green	The site should be considered for allocation as an extension to the Eight Ash Green village envelope because it is surrounded on three sides by existing housing, fronts a dual carriageway and is in a sustainable location.	This site was included in Appendix 3a of the Regulation 25 consultation as a site outside the existing village envelope. Further work is being undertaken with

				regards to the village envelopes which will become part of the evidence base.
S 2 5 / 0 7 1	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Messrs M&M Parmenter	Site S156, Salcott	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. The proposed site could provide a cluster of new housing for the village along with some car parking for the church which is opposite and contribute towards the Core Strategy Other Villages Housing Target of 435.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 7 2	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Beales	Site S166, Land off Berechurch Hall Road	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The proposed site is on the periphery of a Key Centre for Growth and is closely located to a range of community services, public transport and the town centre.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries

				which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 7 3	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr S Brown	Site S157, Layer-de-la-Haye	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. Layer-de-la-Haye was recognised as a Principal Village in the previous Local Plan's with a good level of services and facilities and this is still the case although there is no longer a settlement classification or Hierarchy for villages in the Core Strategy. Site could provide 3 dwellings which would supplement the housing targets for the villages.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 7 4	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr D Miller	Land adjacent to Ramparts Farm, Bakers Lane, Braiswick, Colchester	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The site on the periphery of a Key Service Centre will feature highly in any sequential approach to future development. Alongside residential development of the site (up to 5 units) it is proposed to extend West Wood to Bakers Lane to increase the attractiveness of the Colne Valley.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.

S 2 5 / 0 7 5	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of NWT Distribution Ltd	Site at Rowhedge Wharf	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The site is brownfield land and is largely vacant having formerly been in active commercial use and is visually unattractive from the High Street. A transport assessment indicates that development of the site is technically feasible.	The site is included within the draft settlement boundary for Rowhedge as shown in Appendix 9 of the Site Allocations document. This area of Rowhedge is subject to a development brief which has been adopted by the Council. Any future development of this site is expected to accord with the adopted development brief as well as appropriate Core Strategy, Regional and National Policies.
S 2 5 / 0 7 6	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr D Clough	Site S158, Land at Bull Lane, Tiptree	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. Tiptree is the second largest settlement in Colchester Borough Council and has its own secondary school and a high level of community services and facilities. Site is bound by existing residential areas and could provide approximately 90 dwellings of the housing target outlined in the Core Strategy for Tiptree.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the

				settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 7 7	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Messrs Jones & Whymark	Site S152, Land off Spring Lane, Wivenhoe	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Wivenhoe as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The site is currently Open Space in the Local Plan but there has been no approach by CBC to acquire the land for such purpose. The site could accommodate approximately 3 units and assist towards the housing targets as outlined in the Core Strategy	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map..
S 2 5 / 0 7 8	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Colchester Golf Club	Site S162, Land adjacent to Colchester Golf Club	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The draft Proposals Map shows the site as white land sandwiched between areas of residential and open space (associated with the golf course). As such the site is landlocked and cannot be regarded as open countryside or of any realistic alternative use for agriculture. The site on the periphery of the Growth Area is close to services and facilities and could accommodate approximately 5 units towards the Core Strategy housing targets.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on

				the Proposals Map. The Gold Club are involved in the preparation of the masterplan for North Growth Area.
S 2 5 / 0 7 9	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr French	Site S155, Land off Motts Lane, Marks Tey	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. Marks Tey was recognised as a Principal Village in the previous Local Plan's with a good level of services and facilities and this is still the case although there is no longer a settlement classification or Hierarchy for villages in the Core Strategy.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 8 0	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Martin	Site S160, Land at Peaks Farm, Tiptree	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Tiptree as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. Tiptree is the second largest settlement in Colchester Borough Council and has its own secondary school and a high level of community services and facilities. Site is bound by existing residential areas and could provide approximately 140 dwellings (including affordable units) of the housing target outlined in the Core Strategy for Tiptree.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will

				be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 8 1	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf on Mr Firth	Site S165, Land at Fingringhoe	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 8 2	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Davidson	Site S164, Brickhouse Farm, Peldon	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. Development of this site could provide opportunity for a mixed use scheme incorporating a village shop, further community uses and indoor sport and recreational facilities in an existing modern barn. Affordable housing could also be delivered 'on or off' site as part of the scheme.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries

				which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 8 3	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr & Mrs Sutton	Site S292, Land at Appletrees, Messing	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 8 5	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Powerplus Engineering Ltd and Whitnell Contracts Ltd	School Farm Buildings, School Road, Langham	This site has not been subject to previous land bids to the council and is an established commercial site with two successful local companies operating from it. Land bid includes existing buildings and adjoining agricultural land to enable the businesses to expand if necessary in the future. Land should be allocated as a Local Employment Zone in line with Core Strategy Table CE1a and PPS7.	As this site has not been put forward previously the Council has not considered it to date in the Site Allocations process. Following this consultation period the site will be considered for the suggested use by using the same methodology that has been outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.

S 2 5 / 0 8 6	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Whitnell	Ruby's Barn, Contractors Depot, Ipswich Road, Dedham	The site has not been subject to previous land bids to the council and has operated as a sui generis use Contractor's Depot since 1977. Site is suitable for allocation as a Local Employment Zone in line with Core Strategy Table CE1a for B1 uses	As this site has not been put forward previously the Council has not considered it to date in the Site Allocations process. Following this consultation period the site will be considered for the suggested use by using the same methodology that has been outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.
S 2 5 / 0 8 7	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr G Wallace	30a Straight Road, Boxted	The site has not been subject to previous land bids to the council and is an established commercial site known as the Classic Pot Emporium. The site is suitable for allocation as a Local Employment Zone in line with Core Strategy Table CE1a. The Boxted Straight Road, Special Policy Area is being saved from the Local Plan but these places restrictions on the future use of the site. Reallocating the site as a Local Employment Zone would strengthen the Council's position when faced with unauthorised development.	As this site has not been put forward previously the Council has not considered it to date in the Site Allocations process. Following this consultation period the site will be considered for the suggested use by using the same methodology that has been outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.
S 2	Edward Gittins & Associates on	Poplar Nurseries,	Allocation of Poplar Nurseries as a Local Employment Zone. The site provides employment to approximately 50	Previous site representations sought

5 / 0 8 8	behalf of Mr M Cowan	Marks Tey	people and is currently an active garden centre which would remain as the anchor business within the Local Employment Zone. Continuing the current business uses and introducing small number of B1/B2 uses would be in line with the Core Strategy Table CE1a and PPS7.	residential use on the site but as this representation is seeking Local Employment Uses the Council has not considered it to date in the Site Allocations process. Following this consultation period the site will be considered for the suggested use by using the same methodology that has been outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.
S 2 5 / 0 8 9	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr and Mrs Trollope	Site S154, Fingringhoe	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.

S 2 5 / 0 9 0	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Poplar Nurseries	Site S085 and S163, Marks Tey	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. Marks Tey was a principal village in the Local Plan and many of the services and facilities are still in place. The Site Allocations document does not indicate how the 70 dwellings for Marks Tey as identified in the Core Strategy are to be distributed.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map. The Housing Trajectory and the Schedule of Small Sites which were part of the Core Strategy Evidence Base (CBC/EB/106) outline how some of the dwellings earmarked for Marks Tey in the Core Strategy are to be delivered.
S 2 5 / 0	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr and Mrs Crowley	Site in Eight Ash Green – Fordham Heath Village Envelope.	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries

9 1				un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 9 2	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr D White	Site in Wakes Colne and changes to the Village Envelope	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 9 3	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr L Whitnell	Changes to Langham St Margaret's Cross Village Envelope	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this

				consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 9 4	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of NEEB Holdings Ltd	Land in West Bergholt. Maltings Park and Armoury Road.	A larger site was put forward previously but this representation is for a smaller site with residential uses. Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 9 5	Edward Gittins & Associates	General	The Core Strategy Inspector's Report indicated that a review of settlement boundaries was to be undertaken as part of the Site Allocations document. This has not been done and is a grave omission from the Regulation 25 consultation document. The methodology is puzzling and is a direct contradiction to the commitment in the Inspector's report to review the settlement boundaries and is seriously flawed. Consultation with town and parish council's does not constitute a review of settlement	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration

			<p>boundaries, nor does it justify an embargo on site allocations outside of settlement boundaries. The Sustainability Appraisal Revised Scoping Report is flawed as it has ignored the need to undertake the required review of settlement boundaries and which is directly prejudicial to the interest of good planning and the right to have sites properly evaluated. Specific land uses are not outlined in the Growth Areas or the Regeneration Areas, neighbouring residents do not know what will be built next to them as the balance between various uses is not elaborated. No quantitative information regarding open space allocations in these areas – it would be useful to have some detail provided to explain and justify the future land uses envisaged. Opportunity still remains to address glaring defects before the Site Allocations Examination in Public.</p>	<p>in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map. The Council has adopted various Master Plans to guide the future development of various Regeneration Areas which outline the appropriate land uses. The Growth Areas will be delivered through Supplementary Planning Documents which will be subject to extensive public consultation and in accordance with the Core Strategy and other LDF documents. The Core Strategy outlines the facilities which are expected to be delivered as part of the Growth Areas and the Regeneration Areas.</p> <p>The Borough Council</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				have noted concerns addressed regarding the methodology and Sustainability Appraisal.
S 2 5 / 0 9 6	Essex County Council	General	The County Council do not support formally designating School Playing Fields as Open Space. A more flexible policy approach is needed because over time there will be a need to review school capacity and reorganise the distribution of local school provision. This may require the sale of surplus school land from time to time. Furthermore the loss of primary schools must be agreed by the Secretary of State therefore such sites already enjoy reasonable protection. ECC have suggested that designating school playing fields for Community Use or Education Use would be more appropriate however they have added a caveat that any such allocation should be accompanied by suitable wording to ensure that such land can be released if suitable adequate services are provided to the local population as proposed in DP3	This issue will be considered further prior to publication of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 0 9 6	Essex County Council	General	ECC are not supportive of Myland Parish Council's proposal to locate a secondary school on land north of the A12 because of the geographical dislocation from the local community it would be provided to serve.	Comments noted.
S 2 5 / 0	Essex County Council	General	ECC proposed the addition of the following wording on page 76 under Essex County Plans 'Essex County Council Childcare Sufficiency Assessment'.	Comments noted.

9 6				
S 2 5 / 0 9 6	Essex County Council	General	Glossary to be re-worded to read Transit Corridor: Colchester's rapid transit corridor will enable buses and coaches to bypass traffic congestions and.....These corridors may also provide quality walking and cycling paths.	Comments noted and proposed wording will be incorporated.
S 2 5 / 0 9 7	Hills Residential	General	<p>Fiveways Fruit Farm covers a total area of 31.9ha. Of this total 14.9ha to the south is under option for a quarry extension. Changing economic conditions means farm no longer viable and site put forward for residential development. Proposal includes an extension to the boundary of the Stanway Growth Area between Dyers Road and Heath Road to include the residual 16.3 ha of land at Fiveways Fruit Farm. This would reconcile the settlement boundary and Proposals map and provide sufficient land for residential development close to existing services and facilities at Stanway. These two areas would deliver the housing requirements for Stanway Growth Area as identified in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Locating housing on both sides of Dyers Road represents a sustainable strategy for housing provision. Hills Residential are also requesting that the southern 14.8ha of the farm be excluded from the Growth Area and placed within the area 'safeguarded for future quarry use' proposed within the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Further work is being undertaken with regards to the village envelopes and settlement boundaries which will become part of the evidence base and support the next consultation document. The Core Strategy outlines the facilities which are expected to be delivered as part of the Growth Areas and the Regeneration Areas.</p> <p>Areas of land for future quarry uses will be identified in the Minerals LDF which Essex County Council are currently preparing</p>

				and amendments will be made to the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 9 8	Hills Residential Ltd.	Site S001, Dedham	Site S001 currently falls outside existing settlement boundary of Dedham and in the current Site Allocation document it is listed in Appendix 3b as a site potentially suitable for affordable housing. The site should be considered as an alternative site for Local Housing for Local People (including a mix of 40% affordable housing and smaller open market housing catering for the over 55 age group who wish to move within Dedham) because of its location. The Farm buildings are currently redundant and no longer viable. Including S001 would create a logical and defensible settlement boundary by creating an infill between existing houses and the doctors surgery.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	Objection to future developments in Marks Tey / Eight Ash Green	The Highways Agency reiterated the objections raised in previous consultations about more development around Marks Tey/Eight Ash Green. Any major development at this location would require the creation of a new community and at this stage they do not feel that there is adequate justification during the current plan period. Marks Tey offers public poor transport opportunities compared to the Core Strategy approach. Also Marks Tey Junction 25 roundabout already at capacity. Cumulative development around Eight Ash Green/ Marks Tey would have major impact on the A12 truck road. Both junctions are currently over capacity and additional trips would put them under severe pressure.	Comments noted.
S	Highways Agency	Objection	<u>Growth Areas</u> – The sites proposed in the Reg 25	The housing trajectory

2 5 / 0 9 9			<p>consultation are consistent with Growth Areas identified however they fall short of identifying the full extent of the growth required e.g. 1600 homes proposed for Tiptree, Wivenhoe and West Mersea but only one major allocation has been proposed at Grange Road Tiptree which can accommodate 800 dwellings. How will 800 houses shortfall be accommodated?</p> <p>Also no sites have been identified that will contribute 2000 dwellings,67,000sqm of retail floorspace or 40,000sqm office space in Town Centre, Highways Agency would strongly support such sites given their inherent sustainability.</p>	<p>and employment land study which was submitted as part of the Core Strategy Examination in Public outlines a wide range of sites which will deliver the housing and employment targets. Local Plan allocations which have been carried forward will provide a large proportion of the targets. The figures also include a large number of dwellings already built.</p>
S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	<p>Objection to Alternative site 1. Cymbeline Meadows</p>	<p>HA not supportive of this Alternative site proposal for Business /Hotel use which could potentially have a significant impact on the trunk road network.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	<p>Objection to Alternative Site 2. Choats Corner Eight Ash Green</p>	<p>HA still not supportive of the proposal for residential development on this site which could potentially have a significant impact on the trunk road network.</p>	<p>Comments noted and supported. The site will not be taken forward in the Site Allocations DPD.</p>

S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative sites A-D at Langham	Sites not supported by HA for mixed use development due to potentially major impact on trunk road network.	CBC supports HA comments. Large number of representations received in response to these site proposals at Core Strategy Regulation 32 stage. CBC still considers sites as inappropriate as they fall outside village envelopes. Park and Ride proposals also considered inappropriate. CBC do not support this proposal as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 4.Braiswick	HA not supportive of residential development at this site despite potential minor impacts on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.

S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 5. Marks Tey and Stanway.	HA not supportive of mixed use development at either Eight Ash Green (J26) or Marks Tey interchange (J25) due to potentially major impacts on the trunk road network	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	Objection Alternative Site 6. Marks Tey Stanway	HA not supportive of mixed use development at either Eight Ash Green (J26) or Marks Tey interchange (J25) due to potentially major impacts on the trunk road network	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 7. Marks Tey	HA maintaining objection to mixed use development at this site due its potentially major impact on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 0	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 9. Spring Lane	HA maintaining objection to proposed park and Ride at Spring Land and have identified potentially major impacts on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this

9 9				allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 10. Halstead Road.	HA maintaining objection to residential development due to potentially major impacts on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 0 9 9	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 11. Chitts Hill	HA maintaining objection to proposed residential development due to its potentially significant impact on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 2 9 1	Natalie Wells Gladedale Special Projects Division c/o Barton Wilmore	Objection to Alternative Site 11 Chitts Hill and settlement boundary shown for Colchester	Objection raised about the exclusion of this site at Chitts Hill in the Site Allocations document. The site is in conformity with PPS3 as it is available for development, is a greenfield site located close to existing housing, facilities and services and that the development of the site is achievable. Site should be considered as a viable alternative site. Strong objection raised to the proposed settlement boundary for Colchester. Proposal made for the boundary to follow the railway line to the north as this is a natural settlement edge to Colchester . Disagree with	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The

			<p>findings of the Sustainability Appraisal which concluded that development at this site would fail to promote regeneration, be unlikely to benefit from existing facilities, would increase pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and set a precedent for development in the countryside north of the A12. Deliverability in the current economic climate is potentially an issue where there is a reliance one or two large developers to bring sites forward on PDL within growth areas as this approach makes the housing land supply fragile.</p> <p>Chitts Hill is located on the urban edge of Colchester. If the Railway Sidings currently allocated for residential development are developed, the Chitts Hill site will be surrounded on 3 sides by urban development and the railway track on the fourth side. This would round off the settlement boundary if developed. Provides opportunities to provide sustainable cycle and pedestrian links and improves public transport opportunities.</p> <p>Gladedale have suggested a number of changes to the Site Allocations DPD in relation to the Chitts Hill Alternative Site</p>	<p>resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p>
S 2 5 / 2 9 2	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	General/support for inclusion of Hythe Quay Gas Depot for residential led mixed use development.	<p>The inclusion of this site alongside other sites proposed for mixed use development close to the Gas Depot e.g. Albany Gardens, Kind Edward Quay offers a holistic approach to developing this part of the Colne Harbour Regeneration Area.</p> <p>The land is contaminated and will require remediation which will incur significant costs.</p> <p>Support for CBC's approach to promote the development of contaminated land. Inclusion of this site helps meets strategic housing targets and regeneration priorities for East Colchester.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

S 2 5 / 2 9 4	David Poole Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Tiptree United Football club	Site off Colchester Road, Tiptree.	Objection raised about the identification of land on Colchester Road, Tiptree within the Reg 25 Site Allocations DPD as open space. Request that this land be shown as white land as it currently is in the Local Plan and amendments made to Appendix 7 to reflect this change. Allocation of site as open land could inhibit TFC aspirations for the site. Discussions already held with CBC and ECC however there are unresolved vehicular and pedestrian access issues.	Comments noted and further work will be conducted with colleagues in Leisure Services to consider the future allocation of this site. As outlined discussions have taken place previously between the landowner and the Council and these may well continue in the future to agree the future use of this site and an appropriate allocation to be shown on the Proposals Map which will support the Site Allocations document.
S 2 5 / 2 9 5	Cllr Lesley Scott - Boutell	General	Queried the omission of S072 in the Site Allocations DPD.  Quarry extension at Fiveways Orchard shown in Minerals Development Framework is not shown in the Site Allocations DPD.  Request for family houses - semi detached or detached rather than large terraces.	The Sustainability Scoping Report did not support the allocation of this land as the sustainability of S072 is reliant on the development of the larger site S070 to the north. Development of the larger S070 site would bring this land into the Stanway built

				<p>up area and new residents would benefit from sustainable transport links. A failure to develop S070 however would leave S072 detached from Stanway and car dependence would not reduce. The limited size of the site would fail to deliver a range of facilities needed to meet community needs. Amendments will be made to the Proposals Map to ensure consistency with the Minerals Plan.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy H3 and Table H3a identifies the need to provide a range and diversity of housing styles and tenures</p>
S 2 5 / 2 9	Cllr Gerard Oxford	General	<p>3b sites in Site Allocations DPD</p> <p>1. 70 – currently open space area that needs to be retained due to below average provision in this ward. 2. 649 - currently open space area that needs to be retained due to below average provision in this ward.</p>	<p>Comments noted and open space allocations will be informed in part by work with colleagues in Leisure Services and also the</p>

6			<p>3. 650 listed as derelict but it is Essex County Council's Youth Centre.</p> <p>4. 651 – narrow roadside verge with protect trees along them therefore totally unsuitable for development.</p> <p>5. 652 - narrow roadside verge with protect trees along them therefore totally unsuitable for development.</p> <p>No allocations for future travellers sites despite regional need identified for at least two sites. Important to identify sites as Severalls Lane still not in compliance with planning conditions preventing development moving forward. CBC unlikely to remove conditions holding up development.</p> <p>The maximum parking standards adopted some years ago have been an abysmal failure and created nightmare problems in certain areas of the Borough</p>	<p>PPG17 study which is part of the extensive LDF evidence base. There is no intention to develop these areas of open space.</p> <p>The lack of sites for future travellers has been identified by GO-East and this omission will be rectified prior to the next round of consultation. The results of the East of England Single Issue Review were only published once the Site Allocations document was printed and therefore officers were unable to feed these findings into the current consultation document.</p> <p>The County Council are currently preparing guidance on Parking Standards and it is expected to be finalised prior to the next round of LDF</p>
---	--	--	--	---

				consultation.
S 2 5 / 2 9 8	David Miller Hanover Bloc	London Road, Copford Place	<p>Request that this land is included in the existing Copford settlement boundary and the site allocated for the purposes of a Continuing Care Retirement Community in the Submission Site Allocations DPD. There is currently an inherent lack of CCRC facilities within the Borough. The inclusion of this site would 'round off' the settlement boundary in the north east corner of Copford (London Road). Developing this facility in the Borough frees up under occupied larger family homes as older people would relocate to this type of facility.</p> <p>The site should be supported as it includes brownfield land on the London Road frontage and rough meadow to the rear. Its inclusion in the village envelope would not impact negatively on the setting of Copford. Nor would it encroach into the strategic gap between Copford and Stanway.</p>	<p>Comments noted regarding the requested changes to the Site Allocations DPD which will be considered during the preparation of the next Site Allocations consultation document. Further work is being undertaken with regards to the settlement boundary which will become part of the evidence base. A Community Facilities Audit has also been carried out which will form part of the extensive LDF evidence base and help identify areas of</p>

				community needs.
S 2 5 / 3 0 0	Mr Graham, Coast Road Association	Additional car parking in West Mersea	Previous Local Plans have stressed the lack of car parking in West Mersea and therefore additional car parking should be allocated. A “northern approach” to West Mersea waterfront deserves examination through the LDF.	Comments noted- any future car parking and transport infrastructure will be discussed with Essex County Council.
S 2 5 / 3 0 1	Ian Thurgood, Wilkin & Sons Ltd	Land to the East of Factory Hill, Tiptree	Site is currently shown as white land on the Local Plan Proposals Map. Reallocation of the land for residential purposes would ensure the continued presence and development of Tiptree Jam Factory. Adjacent woodland could be passed over for community use and ownership	Site will be assessed against the methodology as outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document. If this site was developed it would change the Tiptree settlement boundary as outlined in Appendix 7.
S 2 5 / 3 0 2	Ian Thurgood, Wilkin & Sons Ltd	International Farm Camp, Land at Hall Road, Tiptree	Existing International Farm Camp is outside of the draft settlement boundary and shown as white land on the Local Plan Proposals Map. Farm Camp to be relocated to adjacent land to meet expanding business needs and the land of the existing Farm Camp to be reallocated as residential.	Site will be assessed against the methodology as outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document. If these changes were supported it would change the Tiptree settlement boundary as outlined in Appendix 7.
S 2	Ian Thurgood, Wilkin & Sons Ltd	Reallocation of land at Wilkin & Sons Jam	Change of employment allocation on part of the existing Factory site to residential. Redevelopment	Development of the site would be on

5 / 3 0 3		Factory	of the site will enable existing factory to relocate and expand which will provide more local jobs.	previously developed land and contribute towards the brownfield target as outlined in the Core Strategy. The site will be assessed against the methodology as outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.
S 2 5 / 3 0 4	Ian Thurgood, Wilkin & Sons Ltd	Land to the South of Wilkin & Sons Jam Factory	Extend the current employment land allocation further South to meet the expanding company needs in response to new legislation and commercial demands. Extension of the factory would retain approximately 200 jobs with 400 additional seasonal jobs which supports the local economy.	This is new site put forward and will have to be considered during the next stages of the Site Allocations DPD.
S 2 5 / 3 0 6	Neil Osborn, DLP Planning	Alternative Site 3 – Land West of A12, Langham for Park and Ride	The site was discussed at the Core Strategy and the Council outlined their position on park and ride facilities. The Council's preferred site at Cuckoo Farm is highly dependent on the funding and delivery of the new A12 junction. The Inspector's report into the Core Strategy encouraged the Borough and County Council's to pursue provision sooner rather than later (para 7.64) and this has not been done. The site at Langham is deliverable and viable and not dependent on the proposed new junction and should be allocated in the Site Allocations document.	The Council clearly set out their position against the development of this site in the evidence base and hearing statements for the Core Strategy. Funding submissions have been made and both the Borough and County Council are confident these will be successful to deliver the preferred

				location for Park and Ride at Cuckoo Farm. The Council's position on the Langham Park and Ride has not changed since the Core Strategy examination.
S 2 5 / 3 0 9	Andrew Cook, Eight Ash Green Parish Council	General comments	Parish Council has a long held view that future developments should aim to retain rural nature of the village. Parish Council welcomes the exclusion of a number of previously identified major sites on the periphery of the village; however should any rural exception sites come forward these should be towards the geographical centre of the communities. Parish Council would welcome opportunity to be involved in process of looking at village envelopes and has recently set up a group to prepare Village Design Statement and Parish Plan.	Comments noted.
S 2 5 / 3 1 0	Pravin Patel, PPML Consulting Ltd on behalf of Annington Property Limited.	Site off Elmwood Avenue and Littlefield Road, Colchester	Site is currently allocated as open space which is incorrect. Site was occupied by the Ministry of Defence as a nursery school which is surplus to requirements now. The site is previously developed and should not be considered as open space. Site adjoins existing residential areas and is well served to existing services and facilities.	Work is being undertaken to look at the existing Local Plan Allocations which may well identify the current allocation as inaccurate which may result in a proposed change of allocation to better reflect the current situation.
S	Sharon Tyson,	Alternative Site 9, Land	Although the site was not supported at the Core	The Council clearly set

2 5 / 3 1 5	Lawson Planning Partnership on behalf of Lanswood Ltd	at Spring Lane for Park and Ride	Strategy stage it is important for Park and Ride provision in Colchester to progress with greater urgency. Work undertaken for the Core Strategy has been re-submitted to provide further background at this stage. The site is well located to the principal and trunk road network and would catch incoming traffic from the west and north west of Colchester. Site could provide approximately 660 spaces with necessary landscaping and future land for expansion. Site Allocations document is an opportunity to redress matters and regain the initiative in the development of park and ride facilities for Colchester.	out their position against the development of this site in the evidence base and hearing statements for the Core Strategy. Funding submissions have been made and both the Borough and County Council are confident these will be successful to deliver the preferred location for Park and Ride at Cuckoo Farm. The Council's position on the Spring Road Park and Ride has not changed since the Core Strategy examination.
S 2 5 / 3 1 6	Sharon Tyson, Lawson Planning Partnership	Land at The Heath, Dedham	Land to the rear of Sundowne, The Heath Dedham represents a suitable location for approximately 35 units including affordable units. The site is currently neglected scrubland and within the cartilage of the dwelling Sundowne. Dedham has a range of services and facilities which make it one of the most sustainable villages in the Borough. Development of this site would represent an opportunity to develop an area of distinct character which would relate to the evolved form of Dedham Heath. The site is discrete, virtually hidden and is	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will

			acknowledged to have no adverse effect on the AONB.	be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 3 1 7	Mrs B D Eagland	Land in Eight Ash Green	Seek changes to the Eight Ash Green village envelope near Abbots Lane as the land is surrounded by new developments.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 3 1 8	Anthony Borges, The Wine Centre	Land in Great Horkesley	Seek changes to the Great Horkesley village envelope near Gardenhurst.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries

				which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S 2 5 / 3 1 9	Joseph Greenhow, Edward Gittins and Associates	General	The Regulation 25 consultation document does not define the Mixed Use Centres and Employment Zone boundaries as outlined in Core Strategy Policies CE1-CE3. New notations for “Employment Zones” and “Proposed Employment Zones” appear instead of Mixed Use Centres and Local Employment Zones as outlined in Table CE1a. Present document is confusing and inconsistent with the Core Strategy and that the omissions/errors should be rectified and document re-drafted for further consultation.	Comments noted. The Site Allocations document is intended to accord with the Core Strategy. Any inconsistencies regarding the labelling of allocations will be rectified before the next round of consultation to ensure consistency between all elements of the LDF. Any omissions/errors can be identified and changed accordingly as the document develops further over the coming months.
S 2 5 / 3 2 0	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Completion of the Haven Gateway Water Cycle Study will provide a better understanding of constraints and requirements to service the growth aspirations. Anglian Water also request that no residential development will be within 15 metres of Pumping Stations to prevent any possible odour issues.	Comments noted, the Council expect the Water Cycle Study to be completed and used as part of the extensive LDF evidence base prior to the formal submission of the Site Allocations document.

Following the LDF Committee Meeting of March 2009, the Council also received a number of further comments which have been taken into account during the formulation of the Site Allocations document. The Council considered it appropriate to accept these late representations as consultation is an on-going process during the formulation of the Site Allocations document. Table 5 below details the representations received after the LDF Committee meeting of March 2009.

After the LDF Committee in March 2009, the Council received a number of late representations which have been taken into account as part of the Site Allocations document. Between the Regulation 25 Consultation and the Submission Document Publication the Council accepted a number of late representations and these are summarised briefly below. The entries in *italics* are late additions to the Regulation 27 Consultation Statement published in September 2009 and are incorporated for completeness and to demonstrate that the Site Allocations document has been subject to on-going and extensive public consultation.

Table 5

**Representations received after the Regulation 25 consultation and LDF Committee**

Tiptree Residents (x4) - Site S111

Opposing development of Grange Road Site in Tiptree. General support for development of Wilkin and Sons Factory, Tiptree (site ref S111). Redevelopment of site would be on previously developed land and therefore in accordance with Core Strategy SD1 and SD2 and contribute towards the Council's target for 85% of development to be on previously developed land. Site S111 is also considered to accord with TA1, TA4, ENv1 and ENv2 and is therefore a more appropriate site for allocation instead of the site at Grange Road, Tiptree.

English Heritage – Raised archaeological issues in Stanway discussed at the Core Strategy stage and highlighted the need for future allocations in the Stanway area to be based on prior assessment of the archaeological interest.

Essex Wildlife Trust – Highlighted the need for CBC to place greater importance on sites of nature conservation and local wildlife importance. Essex Wildlife Trust also highlighted the need for biological and geological conservation sites to be taken into account in the LDF as outlined in PPS9.

*Edward Gittins & Associates – Land Bid at Moor Road, Langham. Extension to the Langham Village Envelope Proposed and considered as part of the Settlement Boundary Review.*

*Edward Gittins & Associates – Land bid received in April 2009 for Local Employment Zone at Tin Bins, Straight Road, Boxted. Site considered against defined criteria for Local Employment Zone allocation, Core Strategy Policies and emerging Development Policies.*

*Tolleshunt Knights Parish Council – Letter received by CBC 7<sup>th</sup> May 2009 outlining their concerns about settlement coalescence between their village and Tiptree should the Wilkin & Sons Factory be extended along Factory Hill as proposed under representation S25/304.*

*Tiptree Residents – Letters received in May and June outlining objections and concerns with regards to representations S25/301, S25/302, S25/303 and S25/304.*

*Copford & Stanway Ward Councillor – Letter received in May with regards to Hanover representation S25/298. Concerns and objections outlined against the proposed scheme.*

*Edward Gittins & Associates – Land Bid on behalf of Powerplus Engineering and The Whitnell Group for land West of A12, Langham. Site representation proposes a business park on a site which was originally put forward as Park and Ride Alternative Site during Core Strategy Regulation 32 Consultation. Land Bid received July 2009 and considered as part of the Settlement Boundary Review.*

*One Land Bid Submitted in August 2009 by Edward Gittins & Associates for Land at Patterns Yard, Nayland Road, West Bergholt. Unfortunately this arrived too late to be incorporated into the Site Allocations Submission Document and the agent was informed*

## Regulation 27 consultation

Following the Regulation 25 consultation a submission version of the Site Allocations document was produced and published for public consultation as required by the regulations. The work undertaken during previous stages of consultation was important in the development of this document. In response to Regulation 25 consultation comments and following further analysis of Government guidance and best practice, the Council modified the final submission version of the Site Allocations DPD to incorporate policies to support specific site allocations, fill the policy gap between the Core Strategy and Supplementary Planning Documents or Master Plans and improve clarity and consistency in terms of land use allocations. The Site Allocations document along with the Proposals Map has given the Council the opportunity to correct mapping errors from the Local Plan Proposals Map, reflect recent developments and planning permissions and to show the Council's preferred allocation for the various land parcels across the Borough.

Key changes in the submission version include:

- Clarification of settlement boundaries for urban Colchester, Wivenhoe, Rowhedge the district Centres of Tiptree and West Mersea and all the villages in the Borough of Colchester
- Clarification of the boundaries for the East and Stanway Growth Areas and the boundary of the North Growth Area Urban Extension, as outlined in the Core Strategy.
- Policies which will guide the future development of sites across the Borough (in conjunction with the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Policies document and Proposals Map).

As with previous consultations, copies of the Site Allocations consultation document will be made available on the website, along with supporting explanatory information, and were circulated to a wide range of organisations and individuals, including all Borough Councillors and the required consultation bodies. The representation period extended from 18 September-30 October 2009 and included both the Site Allocations and the Development Policies DPDs. The Council sent letters and/or emails to more than 450 individuals recorded on our Local Development Framework List of Consultees. The Sustainability Appraisal prepared to assess the Site Allocations document has been made available on the Council's website and circulated to statutory consultees.

A copy of the statutory public advertisement published in the Essex County Standard is shown in Appendix 3C below. This advert will be published on the 18<sup>th</sup> September at the beginning of the consultation.

Consultation at the submission stage is required to be related to issues of soundness which will form the basis of the Examination in Public scheduled for spring 2010. The number of representations received and the main issues raised in these representations can be found in the Site Allocations Regulation 30(1)(e) statement.

## Appendix 1 - List of Consultees

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix 2A

**Colchester Borough Council**

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

Phone (01206) 506477 Fax (01206)282711

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

Your ref

Our ref KS/Consultation

Date Date as postmark

Dear Sir/Madam

**Local Development Framework**

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

Please find below a brief description of each document;

**Colchester's Submission Draft Core Strategy, November 2007**

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

**Development Policies Issues & Options**

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

**Site Allocations Issues and Options**

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

**How to Respond**

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

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

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

Representations on the documents should be made on the response form provided and returned to the above address or by email to [planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk). The deadline for responding is 5.00pm on Friday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2008.

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

Yours faithfully



Karen Syrett  
**Spatial Policy Manager**

Appendix 2B

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

Address here

**Strategic Policy & Regeneration**  
Phone (01206) 506477 Fax (01206) 282711

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

Your ref

Our ref KS/CA

Date 16 January 2009

Dear Sir or Madam

### **Local Development Framework**

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

Please find below a brief description of each document;

- **Colchester's Development Policies Consultation**

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

- **Colchester's Site Allocations Consultation**

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

### **How to Respond**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours faithfully



Karen Syrett  
**Spatial Policy Manager**

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL**

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

**AND**

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

**(A) COLCHESTER'S DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

**(B) COLCHESTER'S SITE ALLOCATIONS**

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

**PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004**

**Colchester's Submission Draft Core Strategy, November 2007**

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

**(A) Colchester's Development Policies issues & Options**

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

**(B) Colchester's Site Allocations Issues & Options**

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

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

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

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

Representations should be made on the response forms provided only and sent to the Spatial Policy Team, at Environmental Policy, PO BOX 885, Town Hall, Colchester, CO1 1ZE or by email to [planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk). The deadline for responding is **5.00pm on Friday 4 January 2007**. The Council may not be able to consider your views if your representations are received later than this time.

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

## Appendix 3B

### COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Appendix 3C

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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