



North Essex Authorities (NEAs) Section One Shared Strategic Plan

Matter 9: Proposed Amendments

Further Hearing Statement

December 2019

Matter 9 - Suggested Amendments to the Section 1 Plan [EB/] - NEAs Statement

SUMMARY

The North Essex Authorities (NEAs) consulted on a number of proposed amendments to Section 1 of their Local Plans as part of the consultation on the further evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal work held from 19 August to 30 September 2019. The responses to these amendments made by a range of stakeholders were logged on the [NEA's consultation portal](#) and are available to be viewed in full there.

The table below records those comments where the respondent disagreed with a proposed amendment along with a response from the North Essex Authorities. Comments in support are not included. Comments making general objections or observations on a policy have also not been included on the basis that substantive issues concerning policy content will be addressed in Examination hearings on the other Matters. The NEA Response column accordingly focuses on whether further amendments are required to Plan wording in addition to those already proposed to address respondent concerns.

The Council has agreed to amend the Proposed Amendments in response to consultee views on the following points:

Proposed Changes from Anglian Water and Environment Agency - The NEAs have agreed the amendments suggested by both bodies and have signed a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) (insert link) with Anglian Water and the Environment Agency. The following amendments have been agreed:

Para 1.26 -addition of wording to clarify environmental aspects to be conserved and enhanced as well as how net environmental gains will be quantified.

.... continues to conserve and where possible enhance the historic **and natural** environment, **including landscape and habitat creation**, and will also seek net environmental gains, **possibly making use of the Defra biodiversity accounting metric 2.0 to account for possible effects** ~~where possible~~.

Para 6.1 – addition of wording to clarify wastewater infrastructure –

...other infrastructure requirements such as education, healthcare, digital connectivity, water supply and wastewater **infrastructure and treatment**.

Para 6.24 – addition of wording to clarify process for water supply, foul drainage and wastewater treatment –

The authorities will need to work with Anglian Water, Affinity Water, Environment Agency, **developers and** other infrastructure providers to ensure sufficient capacity and provision of an adequate water supply, **foul drainage and wastewater treatment and** waste water management facilities to support growing communities as outlined in the Integrated Water Management Strategy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This will be particularly important as water supplies continue to be threatened by climate change **and pressures from continuing growth and development.** **Water provisions need to be protected and it is essential for adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to be in place to accommodate the demands of growth and development in accordance with the Water Framework Directive and the Habitats Directive.**

SP5 Section E, Water and Wastewater – addition of wording to clarify process for water supply, foul drainage and wastewater treatment

“The authorities will work with relevant providers to ensure that there is resilient **and sufficient** capacity in the water **supply and** management and waste water **infrastructure** systems to respond to new development. and provide improvements **Where necessary, improvements** to water infrastructure, and waste water treatment and off-site drainage **should be made** improvements **ahead of the occupation of dwellings in accordance with environmental legislation.**

Para 7.3 - addition of wording to clarify how net environmental gains will be quantified.

Strategic scale and more local green infrastructure can make a vital contribution to quality of place, biodiversity and health outcomes if properly integrated into the design and delivery of new development. **The Defra biodiversity accounting metric 2.0, or future iterations of this, can be used to accurately assess habitat impacts”**

SP6 (Mod G) – Addition of wording to clarify role of public open space in increasing biodiversity -

“Provide an integrated and connected network of **biodiverse** public open space...”

SP6 (Mod H) – Addition of wording to clarify SuDs requirements –

including the use of open space to provide **flora and fauna rich** sustainable drainage solutions”

Add the following to the end of paragraph 7.3 (please note the proposed addition to paragraph 7.3 in response to the EA reps reference AM142, AM147):

“Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) provide abundant opportunities to introduce wildflower strips and soft landscaping to a development or urban area. This not only brings an attractive feature to the area for people but acts as a wildlife corridor, connecting the rivers, ditches, hedges, verges and gardens, allowing movement of wildlife through an area, connecting to the wider environment and therefore greatly enhancing the biodiversity value of the site.”

Criterion (iv) of policy SP7, F17 of SP8 and F18 of policy SP9 and F18 of SP10 - Amend wording to clarify process for avoiding adverse effect on designated sites:

To ensure new development does not have an adverse effect on any European Protected **or nationally important** sites **and complies with environmental legislation (notably the Water Framework Directive and the Habitats Directive)**, the required waste water treatment capacity must be available **ahead of the occupation of dwellings** ~~in advance of planning consent.~~

Policy SP8, Para F.17, SP9, Para F.18; and Policy SP10, Para F.17 - Add wording to clarify process for addressing flood risk –

“The delivery of smart, innovative and sustainable water efficiency/re-use solutions that fosters climate resilience and a 21st century approach towards water supply, water and waste water treatment and flood risk management. **Taking a strategic approach to Flood Risk through the use of Strategic Flood Risk Assessments and the updated Climate Projections 2019 and identifying opportunities for Natural Flood Risk Management.**”

Policy SP6 10th bullet point – Amend wording to include coverage of water infrastructure measures –

“Include measures to promote environmental sustainability including addressing energy and water efficiency, and provision of appropriate **water and** wastewater infrastructure and flood mitigation measures”.

Proposed Changes from Essex Wildlife Trust - Essex Wildlife Trust (AM128) requested the following wording change to SP7 criteria (xi): to secure **measurable** net gains in local biodiversity. The NEAs understand that biodiversity net gain (or net gains in local biodiversity) means leaving the environment in a better state and is additional to measures required to mitigate harm. The Plan is being examined under the NPPF 2012 which states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provided net gains in biodiversity where possible (para 109). The NEAs have not agreed to amend the wording on the basis that it goes beyond that required by the NPPF 2012.,

The NEAs would support the addition of further explanatory text for policies SP8 F.20 and SP 10 F. 20 if considered appropriate to add clarity. The NEAs are proposing to list heritage and biodiversity requirements in separate paragraphs.

SP8 F.20: Biodiversity assets within the area include Bullock Wood SSSI, Ardleigh Gravel Pits SSSI, Wivenhoe Pits SSSI and Upper Colne Marshes SSSI and relevant European protected sites.

SP10 F.20: Biodiversity assets include areas of deciduous woodland within and adjoining the Saling Grove site and the key habitats of Boxted wood, golden Grove and Rumley Wood. **Pods Brook should be protected by suitable buffers of natural vegetation and managed carefully for the benefit of otters and water voles.**

Proposed Changes from Natural England – The NEAs have agreed the amendments suggested by Natural England and have signed an updated SoCG agreeing the following changes.

Para 1.26 – addition of wording to clarify how net environmental gains will be quantified as also agreed with AWS and EA above

Policy SP1B – addition of wording to clarify how wintering bird surveys will fit into the planning process:

Depending on the findings of the wintering bird surveys, development may need to be phased to take into account the cumulative numbers of SPA birds. In the unlikely but possible event that cumulative numbers of SPA birds affected are likely to exceed thresholds of significance (i.e. > 1% of the associated European Site), appropriate mitigation in the form of habitat creation and management in perpetuity, either on-site or through provision of strategic sites for these species elsewhere, will be required. If required, mitigation will need to create and manage suitably located habitat which maximises feeding productivity for these SPA species, and such mitigatory habitat would need to be provided and fully functional prior to development which would affect significant numbers of SPA birds.

Additionally, amend proposed **new policy SP1B** as follows to reflect the completion and adoption of the Essex Coast RAMS Strategy Document:

An Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy ~~has been~~ **will be** completed in compliance with the Habitats Directive and Habitat Regulations.

Contributions will be secured towards mitigation measures identified in the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMSs) ~~which will be completed by the time the Local Plan is adopted.~~

~~Prior to RAMS completion, the NEAs will seek contributions from proposed residential development to deliver all measures identified (including strategic measures) through project level HRAs, or otherwise, to mitigate any recreational disturbance impacts in compliance with the Habitat Regulations and Habitats Directive.~~

Policy SP7 -addition of wording to clarify the methodology concerning protected sites:

To ensure new development does not have an adverse effect on any European Protected or nationally important sites and complies with environmental legislation (notably the Water Framework Directive and the Habitats Directive), the required waste water treatment capacity must be available including any associated sewer connections ahead of the occupation of dwellings in advance of planning consent.

Proposed Change from University of Essex – The NEAs agree that a point previously agreed in a Statement of Common Ground failed to be carried forward in the Proposed Amendments and have updated the SoCG and Proposed Amendments to reflect the addition of a sentence in Policy SP8, para F.25 providing for ‘**allocation of additional land within the Garden Community to accommodate University expansion which is at least equivalent in size to the allocation in the Colchester Local Development Framework Site Allocations document October 2010.**’

An updated version of the Proposed Amendments highlighting the additional amendments agreed above is available to view on the Examination webpage. (insert link)

Proposed Changes from Historic England – The NEAs are in the process of agreeing amendments with Historic England and have written a separate note on this.

Table Listing Consultee Proposed Wording Changes/Objections and NEA Responses

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>Proposed Amendment Reference 7 Paragraph 1.26 last sentence</p> <p>... does not erode the special environment, continues to conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment (Mod A) and will also seek net environmental gains where possible, (Mod B) heritage and urban assets....”</p>			
<p>AM140 Environment Agency</p>	<p>Wording change to emphasise the negative impacts developments, can have to local and wider flora, fauna and habitats.</p> <p>Further wording change suggested to provide clarity for biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>Suggested addition “conservation and enhancement of natural and historic environment, including landscape and habitat creation”.</p> <p>Remove ‘where possible’ and replace with ‘and make use of the Defra biodiversity accounting metric 2.0 to account for possible effects’.</p>	<p>Proposed wording agreed in a Statement of Common Ground prepared between the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and the NEAs (SCG/002a).</p>
<p>AM69 Margaret Rufus</p>	<p>Final clause does not make sense and does not accord precisely with the requirements of NPPF (clause 1.29).</p>	<p>“and will also seek net environmental gain where possible, (Mod B) heritage and urban assets and qualities of the area or exacerbate pressure on natural resources.</p>	<p>Additional wording agreed in SoCG noted above provides wording in accordance with NPPF.</p>
<p>AM67 Halstead 21st Century Group</p>	<p>‘where possible’ may give rise to an interpretation that is to the detriment of the environment, when attached to the verb to seek. ‘where possible’ should relate to</p>	<p>Measurement of net environmental gains is essential if the statement is to be credible.</p>	<p>Additional wording agreed in SoCG noted above addresses this issue.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>the outcome of 'net environmental gains'.</p> <p>There is no reference to any method by which 'net environmental gains' will be measured.</p>		
AM6	<p>Examples of best practice should be included in support of the current plan.</p>	<p>Examples of best practice should be included in support of the current plan.</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to include examples of best practice within the Local Plan. This would be best placed within the Garden Community Development Plan Documents or a specific Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document.</p>

**Proposed Amendment Reference 10
Vision for North Essex**

North Essex will be an area of significant growth over the period to 2033 and beyond, embracing positively the need to build well-designed new homes, create jobs and improve and develop infrastructure for the benefit of existing and new communities.

It will continue to be an attractive and vibrant area in which to live and work, making the most of its rich heritage, town centres, natural environment, coastal resorts, excellent educational facilities and strategic transport links which provide access to the ports, Stansted Airport, London and beyond. Rural and urban communities will be encouraged to thrive and prosper and will be supported by adequate community Infrastructure. (Mod A)

Sustainable development principles will be at the core of the strategic area's response to its growth needs, balancing social, economic and environmental issues. Green and blue infrastructure and new and expanded education and health care facilities **enabling healthy and active lifestyles (Mod B)** will be planned and provided along with other facilities to support the development of substantial new growth; while the **undeveloped** countryside, **(Mod C) natural environment (Mod D)** and the countryside and heritage assets **historic environment** will be protected **preserved** and enhanced. **Key**

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>to delivering sustainable development is that new development will address the requirement to protect and enhance be informed by an understanding of the historic environment and settlement character (Mod E)</p> <p>At the heart of our strategic vision for North Essex are new garden communities, the delivery of which is based on Garden City principles covered by policy SP7.</p> <p>The garden communities provide an opportunity to create the right balance of jobs, housing and Infrastructure in the right locations and (Mod F) will attract residents and businesses who value innovation, community cohesion and a high quality environment, and who will be provided with opportunities to take an active role in managing the garden community to ensure its continuing success.</p> <p>Residents will live in high quality, innovatively designed, contemporary homes, (Mod G) accommodating a variety of needs and aspirations, located in well-designed neighbourhoods where they can meet their day-to-day needs. There will be a network of tree-lined streets and green spaces, incorporating and enhancing existing landscape features and also accommodating safe and attractive routes and space for sustainable drainage solutions; and leisure and recreation opportunities for both residents and visitors of the garden communities.</p> <p>Suitable models for the long term stewardship of community assets will be established and funded to provide long term management and governance of assets. All Garden City principles as specified in the North Essex Garden Communities Charter will be positively embraced including new approaches to delivery and partnership working for the benefit of the new communities. Central to this is the comprehensive planning and development of each garden community, and the aligned delivery of homes and the supporting infrastructure. (Mod H)</p>			
AM49 Galliard Homes Ltd (WYG)	Reference should be made to TCPA Garden City Principles, and not the NEGC Charter. The Charter contains assumption that development of the Garden Communities will be achieved using one per-determined method of delivery.	Reference to the NEGC Charter should be removed entirely or the NEGC Charter should be significantly amended to reflect the choice of delivery methods available, including delivery and role of Master Developer is entrusted to an experienced developer/home builder.	<p>The NEGC Charter builds upon the TCPA Garden City Principles and provides a local context to guide development in North Essex.</p> <p>The NEAs have not made any decision about the delivery model. This matter will be further addressed in the Matter 5 Examination Hearing session.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM 119 CAUSE	The vision is imbalanced, notwithstanding the amendments that have been suggested to address the Inspectors earlier concerns. There is a disconnect with the earlier statement within the Vision which makes clear that rural and urban communities will be encouraged to thrive and prosper.	No specific wording provided.	NEAs consider the proposed Vision wording presents a balanced view on sustainable development.
AM 151 Williams Group (Emery Planning)	The vision should give greater recognition to the potential for the improvement and sustainable extension of the existing settlements and the growth of services, facilities, homes and jobs as part of the future for established settlements. Without this, there is a danger that the achievement of the vision will come at the expense of beneficial change in the existing communities.	The Vision should include a statement placing the existing settlements and their capacity to accommodate sustainable change at the heart of the strategic vision for North Essex: Braintree (and Colchester) should be identified as the highest order settlements.	NEAs consider the focus on Garden Communities in the Vision is appropriate as they establish the distinctive spatial planning approach of the Vision.
SA 191 Historic England	There is no specific consideration for the historic environment within these principles. It is essential that the local plan should contain a framework to guide how the boundaries and extent of the	The third paragraph in the Vision should be amended to read 'At the heart of our strategic vision for North Essex are new garden communities to be sensitively integrated within the existing	Amendments are being discussed with Historic England to address their comment.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	garden communities are determined in the subsequent development plan documents.	historic built and natural environment , the delivery of which is based on Garden City principles covered by policy SP7.'	
<p>Proposed Amendment Reference 11 Strategic Objectives Providing New and Improved Transport & Communication Infrastructure – to make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure and to ensure sustainable transport opportunities are promoted in all new development to support new and existing communities. (Mod A) Add sentence to end of paragraph 'Ensuring High Quality Outcomes'- New development needs to be informed by an understanding of the historic environment resource gained through the preparation of Historic Impact Assessments and to conserve and enhance the significance of the heritage assets and their settings. (Mod B)</p>			
AM144 Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium & Countryside Properties (GL Hearn)	Support additional text requiring new development proposals to be informed by understanding of historic environment through Heritage Impact Assessments.	Amendment to paragraph 1.36 to make absolutely clear that in the case of the Garden Communities, a heritage impact assessment should be prepared to inform either the (WBGC) Development Plan Document and/or a planning application.	Amendments being discussed with Historic England would address this comment.
SA 191 Historic England	Historic Impact Assessments should have already been undertaken for each of the proposed broad locations.	Final paragraph Ensuring High Quality Outcomes will be amended to include: <i>New Garden Community development needs to be informed by an understanding of the historic environment resource gained through the preparation of Historic Impact Assessments and to conserve and enhance</i>	The NEA will undertake HIAs to inform the preparation of the DPDs and discussing policy wording with Historic England to secure that as a policy commitment.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
		<i>the significance of the heritage assets and their settings.</i>	
<p>Proposed Amendment Reference 12 Policy SP1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>When considering development proposals the Local Planning Authorities will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. They will always work pro-actively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p> <p>Sustainable development in North Essex will demonstrably contribute to the strategic and local vision and objectives and will accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans). Development that complies with the Plan in this regard will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Where there are no policies relevant or the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise taking into account whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole or • Specific policies in that Framework or the Plan that indicate that development should be restricted. 			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM169 Parker Strategic Town Planning Ltd (Turley)	Amended text does not align with the presumption in favour of sustainable development paragraph 11 of the NPPF 2019.	Text in the Local Plan should reflect the NPPF 2019 which will apply for decision making. Replace “ relevant policies ” with “ the policies which are most important for determining the application ”.	The Local Plan is being examined under the 2012 NPPF, as per the transitional arrangements. The NEAs proposed wording is considered to appropriately reflect national policy.
AM134 Mersea Homes	Question whether policy serves any substantive purpose, in effect it is a statement that reiterates what is already in national planning policy regarding proactive working, approving proposals that accord with the Development Plan and apply the <i>'presumption in favour'</i> .	No specific further amendment provided.	The NEAs proposed wording is considered to appropriately reflect national policy.
<p>Proposed Amendment Reference 13 New Policy SP1A to follow after Policy SP1</p> <p>SP 1A Delivering Sustainable Development through the planning system</p> <p><i>Explanatory Text</i> Development that is in accordance with the policies in this Plan will normally be permitted.</p> <p>The policies in this strategic Section 1 of the Local Plan are common to and important to each North Essex Authority. Accordingly policy SP 1A seeks to make sure that development which would prejudice the delivery of any of the policies in Section 1 will be refused. Examples of prejudice might include a failure to meet the high standards proposed in the place making principles, a lack of comprehensive development or prematurity.</p> <p><i>Policy</i></p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>Development that demonstrably contributes to the achievement of the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, of policies in neighbourhood plans) will normally be permitted unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Development that is not in accordance with, or which will prejudice the delivery of, the strategic scale development or the achievement of the place making principles, in this Local Plan will not normally be permitted.</p>			
AM 107 Wivenhoe Town Council	This highlighted section looks to have been inserted to protect the development of GCs in favour of any other form of development, be it sustainable or not. This in itself is not acceptable, but if the GC's prove to be as difficult to deliver, as we believe they will, we will have a policy that rather than corrects this, will compound the problems. Furthermore, this policy directly contravenes the assumption in favour of development.	No specific wording provided but assumed deletion of policy recommended.	The policy seeks to ensure that the place-making principles included in the Plan are delivered – whether that be in the garden community areas or elsewhere in the NEAs. Proposed wording is considered appropriate in the context of national policy and plan-specific objectives.
AM 119 CAUSE	It appears to be the council's attempt at hardwiring key aspects into the plan, for example the reference to achievement of place making principles. We would expect to see this set out in more detail, with reference to the Garden Communities charter and to some specific goals.	No specific wording provided.	Policy needs to be read in context of other policies which collectively address how the plan will achieve sustainable place making. Given those specific references are set out elsewhere it is not considered necessary to repeat them,
AM134 Mersea Homes	<i>"normally"</i> in the first sentence of the suggested policy is not required.	Remove <i>"normally"</i> as in these circumstances planning permission should always be	Change supported.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
		granted in accordance with S38 of the Act.	
AM 151 Williams Group (Emery Planning)	The proposed content of this additional policy would be acceptable if the Stage 1 Plan recognises the role of the existing settlements and in particular the higher order settlements in achieving sustainable growth. However, without this recognition this proposed policy is unsuitable, as it could stifle development proposals which are highly sustainable and should have an important role in providing sustainable growth to existing communities in North Essex.	Add recognition of role of existing settlements including higher order settlements.	Framework for developing spatial hierarchy is provided in SP2 and does not need to be restated here.
AM 156 Gladman	Gladman object to Modification 13 as it states that proposals will not be permitted if they would prejudice the delivery of the strategic scale development or the achievement of the place making principles. This is regardless of the status of the 5-year housing land supply position and is diametrically opposed to the fundamental premise of the Framework to boost significantly	Delete additional wording.	NEAs consider wording is required to support delivery of the Plan's strategic development sites.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	the supply of housing and to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements.		
AM 160 L&Q, Cirrus Land & G120 (Carter Jonas LLP)	The policy needs review to better reflect PPG and national policy.	<p><i>Development that is in accordance with the policies in this Plan will normally be permitted. unless material circumstances indicate otherwise.</i></p> <p><i>The policies in this strategic Section 1 of the Local Plan are common to and important to each North Essex Authority. Accordingly policy SP 1A seeks to make sure that development which would prejudice run contrary to the delivery of any of the policies in Section 1 will be refused. Examples of prejudice might include a failure to meet the high standards proposed in the place making principles, or a lack of comprehensive development or prematurity.</i></p> <p><i>Policy</i></p> <p><i>Development that demonstrably contributes to the achievement of</i></p>	Given those specific references are set out elsewhere it is not considered necessary to repeat them.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
		<p><i>accords with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, of policies in neighbourhood plans) will normally be permitted unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Development that is not in accordance with, or which will prejudice the delivery of, the strategic scale development or the achievement of the place making principles, in this Local Plan will not normally be permitted, unless material circumstances indicate otherwise.</i></p>	
<p>AM170 Parker Strategic Town Planning Ltd (Turley)</p>	<p>No explanation in supporting text as to circumstances where development would not be permitted despite being in accordance with the Plan.</p> <p>Consistency issue within second paragraph in policy.</p>	<p>Amend text of second paragraph of policy to add at the end “unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.</p>	<p>Given those specific references are set out elsewhere it is not considered necessary to repeat them,</p>
<p>Suggested Amendment Reference 14 New Policy SP1B</p> <p>SP1B Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) <i>Explanatory Text</i></p> <p>A Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) was completed for Section 1 of the Plan. The loss of off-site habitat, water quality and increased recreational disturbance were identified as issues with the potential to result in likely significant effects on European Sites, without mitigation, to address the effects.</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>The Appropriate Assessment (AA) identified a number of avoidance and mitigation measures to be implemented, to ensure that development proposals in the Plan will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the Blackwater Estuary SPA and Ramsar site, Colne Estuary SPA and Ramsar Site, Colne Special Area of Conservation Abberton Reservoir SPA and Ramsar, Hamford Water SPA and Ramsar Essex Estuaries SAC and the Stour and Orwell SPA/Ramsar sites and are HRA compliant.</p> <p>To mitigate for the loss of off-site habitat, the AA identified the need for wintering bird surveys for the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community as part of any project level development proposals and masterplanning.</p> <p><u>Depending on the findings of the wintering bird surveys, development may need to be phased to take into account the cumulative numbers of SPA birds. In the unlikely but possible event that cumulative numbers of SPA birds affected are likely to exceed thresholds of significance (i.e. > 1% of the associated European Site), appropriate mitigation in the form of habitat creation and management in perpetuity, either on-site or through provision of strategic sites for these species elsewhere, will be required. If required, mitigation will need to create and manage suitably located habitat which maximises feeding productivity for these SPA species, and such mitigatory habitat would need to be provided and fully functional prior to development which would affect significant numbers of SPA birds.</u></p> <p>To protect water quality, the AA recommended the inclusion of policy safeguards to ensure that adequate water and waste water treatment capacity or infrastructure upgrades are in place prior to development proceeding. Recreation activities can potentially harm Habitats Sites. The Shared Strategic Plan AA identified disturbance of water birds from people and dogs, and impacts from water sports/watercraft as the key recreational threats to Habitats Sites.</p> <p>To mitigate for any increases in recreational disturbance at Habitats Sites, the AA identified the need for a mitigation strategy. Natural England's West Anglian Team identified the Essex coast as a priority for a strategic and proactive planning approach as it is rich and diverse ecologically, and many of the coastal habitats are designated as Habitats Sites. Consequently, 12 local planning authorities in Essex have prepared an Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS).</p>		

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>The Essex Coast RAMS sets out specific avoidance and mitigation measures by which disturbance from increased recreation can be avoided and mitigated thus enabling the delivery of growth without adversely affecting Habitats sites. These measures are deliverable, realistic, underpinned by robust up to date evidence, precautionary and provides certainty for developers around deliverability and contributions. The Essex Coast RAMS Strategy Document was completed in 2019 and will be supported by an SPD.</p> <p><i>Policy</i> SP1B Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS)</p> <p><i>An Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy <u>has been</u> will be completed in compliance with the Habitats Directive and Habitat Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>Contributions will be secured towards mitigation measures identified in the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMSs) which will be completed by the time the Local Plan is adopted.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to RAMS completion, the NEAs will seek contributions from proposed residential development to deliver all measures identified (including strategic measures) through project level HRAs, or otherwise, to mitigate any recreational disturbance impacts in compliance with the Habitat Regulations and Habitats Directive.</i></p>			
AM 151 Williams Group (Emery Planning)	The general policy wording of Draft Policy SP1B is considered acceptable, however in the absence of an SPD, the proposed requirements for developer contributions prior to RAMS completion should be quantified.	No specific wording provided, but policy should include amount for developer contributions on RAMS.	An SPD is the appropriate level to set contributions given the need for them to be revised periodically.
AM172 Parker Strategic Town Planning Ltd (Turley)	The policy and RAMs are focused on mitigation, a great emphasis should be placed on avoidance, especially in the selection of development proposals for	Either additions to SP1B or standalone policy to better ensure impacts upon coastal designated sites are avoided and would provide a more robust basis for the comparison of existing Plan	The RAMS sets out the specific avoidance and mitigation measures so it is not necessary for those to be referenced here.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>inclusion within the Section 1 Local Plans.</p> <p>King Dene site should be included within Section 1 Local Plan.</p>	<p>proposals, Garden Communities and alternative proposals. Additions to be made include:</p> <p>Proposals located within minimum possible number of Zones of Influence and inner Impact Risk Zones associated with coastal designated sites; and Proposals with minimum possible number of impact pathways connecting to coastal sites should be prioritised for inclusion within Section 1.</p> <p>Proposals which seek to retain recreational football within their own footprints should be prioritised for inclusion within Section 1.</p>	
<p>Proposed Amendment Reference 15 Para 3 3. Spatial Strategy Context</p>			
<p>AM 119 CAUSE</p>	<p>The respondents strongly object to this change. The Spatial Strategy is a combination of the approach being taken in this Section 1 and Section 2 plans combined. It cannot be right that the Spatial Strategy is found in Section 2 only, given that the Section 1 plans are dealing with</p>	<p>Retain 'Strategy'</p>	<p>Wording appropriately reflects strategic role of Section 1, with detailed spatial strategy for each authority to be found in Section 2.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	the Garden Communities to which the Vision is so heavily biased.		
Proposed Amendment Reference 16			
Paragraph 3.1 2 nd Line			
<p>New homes, jobs, retail and leisure facilities serviced by new and upgraded infrastructure will be accommodated as part of existing settlements according to their scale, sustainability and role, and by the creation of strategic scale new settlements based on the North Essex Garden Community Charter principles. The countryside will be protected and enhanced.</p>			
AM50 Galliard Homes Ltd (WYG)	<p>Question reference to '<i>Community Charter Principles</i>' and not nationally known TCPA Garden City Principles. With regard to West of Braintree, Uttlesford have used the TCPA Principles and there is a need for consistency so people can properly understand the standards that will be applied. Different principles is confusing to apply and undermines the ability of the 2 Councils to demonstrate how effectively they have co-operated.</p>	<p>Delete reference to Community Charter and reinstate reference to TCPA Garden City Principles.</p>	<p>The NEGC Charter builds upon the TCPA Garden City Principles and provides a local context to guide development in North Essex.</p> <p>A Statement of Common Ground has been agreed between the NEAs and Uttlesford District Council which outlines the agreement that the authorities have continued to work collaboratively on all cross boundary and strategic issues, including the West of Braintree Garden Community. Joint work will continue to be undertaken.</p>
Suggested Amendment Reference 18			
New Paragraph 3.6			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>The three new Garden Communities are identified as new settlements in each of the Section 2 settlement hierarchies. Over time each of the Garden Communities will grow to influence the area’s spatial hierarchy and will be included in the tiers underneath the sub-regional centre role played by Colchester. Future reviews of the plans will address this point, but the Garden Communities will not grow to a size that will affect the spatial hierarchy within the plan period to 2033.</p>			
<p>AM 119 CAUSE</p>	<p>The respondents suggest that some examples from the Charter be set out to bolster this paragraph.</p> <p>It is important to recognize that to 2033 the intention is that the 3 Garden Communities would contain a maximum of 2,500 homes only. It is questionable whether any of the supporting infrastructure would be in place to support the homes delivered in the plan period. At that scale they will fall some way short of being under the sub-regional role played by, for example, Colchester.</p> <p>3.6 is therefore confusing, insofar as the position of the Garden Communities in the settlement hierarchy will evolve over time to be assessed in evidence based to be prepared in relation to future reviews of the Section 1 plans. In this context there seems little benefit in including new para 3.6</p>	<p>No specific further amendments provided.</p>	<p>NEAs consider existing level of detail is adequate given that the North Essex Garden Communities Charter is covered in detail in Policy SP7.</p> <p>It is important to establish the evolving role and place of Garden Communities in the spatial hierarchy of the area over the longer term. The NEA wording allows for that.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM135 Mersea Homes	Question whether it is appropriate for the TCBGC to be considered a separate settlement for the purpose of each local authority's settlement hierarchy. The TCBGC is closely linked to the existing urban area and in the future may be more appropriately considered to be part of the wider geography of Colchester (albeit with its own identity and focus) rather than as a separate settlement for the purposes of settlement planning.	No specific further amendment provided.	The NEAs consider that the scale of Garden Communities over the longer term means that they need to be considered as separate settlements to ensure proper assessment of their role and impact.
AM 149 Marks Tey Parish Council	Will the new homes in the Garden Community all be subsumed within Marks Tey Parish or will a new administrative arrangement have to be started i.e. changing the spatial hierarchy? This needs to be specifically addressed.	No specific wording provided.	Administrative boundaries for local government lie outside scope of Section 1 Local Plan.

Suggested Amendment Reference 19

Policy SP2

Policy SP2 –Spatial **Planning Strategy** for North Essex (**Mod A**)

Existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across the North Essex **Authorities area** within the Local Plan period. (**Mod B**) Development will be accommodated within or adjoining settlements according to their scale, sustainability and existing role both within each individual district and, where relevant, across the wider strategic area.

Policy SP6 (Place Shaping Principles), Policies SP7-10 (in respect of the Garden Communities) and Section 2 of the plan provide detail on how Ffuture growth will be planned to ensure **existing** settlements maintain their distinctive character and role. (**Mod C**) Re-use of previously-developed land within settlements is an important objective, although

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>this will be assessed within the broader context of sustainable development principles, particularly to ensure that development locations are accessible by a choice of means of travel.</p> <p>Each local authority will identify a hierarchy of settlements in Section 2 of its Local Plan where new development will be accommodated according to the role of the settlement, sustainability, its physical capacity and local needs. (Mod D)</p> <p>Beyond the main settlements the authorities will support diversification of the rural economy and conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Three new garden communities will be developed and delivered as part of the sustainable strategy for growth at the locations shown on Map 3.3 below and the Proposals Map the Key Diagram and the Policies Map. (Mod E) These new communities will provide strategic locations for employment and at least 7,500 5,910 additional homes within the Plan period in North Essex. Employment development will also be progressed with the expectation is that substantial additional housing and employment development will be delivered in each community beyond the current Local Plan periods. (Mod F) As specified in Policy SP7, they will be planned and developed drawing based on North Essex Garden City Community Charter principles, with necessary infrastructure and facilities provided and a high quality of place-making and urban design. (Mod G)</p> <p>Beyond the main settlements the authorities will support diversification of the rural economy and conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. (Mod H)</p>			
AM51 Galliard Homes Ltd (WYG)	Mod G - Reference to ' <i>community character principles</i> ' instead of ' <i>charter</i> ' could be a typo. It is confusing to the public to understand what tests will be applied. It would be more straightforward to refer to TCPA principles.	Delete reference to ' community charter ' and ' community charter principle ' and re-instate reference to ' TCPA Garden City Principles '.	The NEGC Charter builds upon the TCPA Garden City Principles and provides a local context to guide development in North Essex.
AM 119 CAUSE	Policy SP2 Modification A (Existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across the North Essex Authorities area within the Local	No specific wording provided.	Proposed wording appropriately addresses the role that both existing settlements and new Garden Communities can play in

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>Plan period) relates back to reference 15 in terms of the change from spatial strategy to spatial context. Modification B illustrates the disconnect between the Vision and policy SP2 since it is quite clear that all of the council's efforts are going into justifying Garden Communities when the first paragraph of policy SP2 alleges that existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across the North Essex authority's area.</p>		<p>delivering sustainable development.</p>
<p>AM138 Crest Nicholson. Operations Ltd, RF West Ltd, Livelihoods and David G Sherwood (Andrew Martin Planning Limited)</p>	<p>No explanation given for change to 5th paragraph in reasons column.</p>	<p>Explanation for this change should be provided.</p>	<p>Changes in housing numbers arising from evolving delivery considerations will be addressed in examination hearings.</p>
<p>AM 151 Williams Group (Emery Planning)</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy for North Essex in SP2 itself is confused. On the one hand it states that existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional</p>	<p>No specific wording provided, but amend policy to identify the highest order settlements, Braintree and Colchester and identify them as the focus for</p>	<p>NEA wording correctly reflects the role of Section 1 in setting the spatial planning framework which is then detailed in Section 2 Local</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>growth across North Essex yet the plan then goes on, in subsequent policies, to effectively place an over-reliance on delivery of growth in the new garden communities. The Framework (para 52) does not elevate the supply of new homes in new settlements; it is an option for larger scale development, alongside extensions to towns.</p> <p>This strategic policy needs to identify the highest order settlement, namely Braintree (and Colchester) and explicitly identify them as the focus for growth. The garden communities are no more than conceptual at this stage and should be identified as a lower order settlement. The detail of the strategic hierarchy needs to be identified so that the weight to be given to development proposals can be assessed.</p> <p>Whilst it is now proposed that the delivery expectations from two of the three garden communities by 2033 be reduced, a revised housing trajectory has not been</p>	<p>growth. Garden Communities should be identified as a lower order settlement. The detail of the strategic hierarchy needs to be identified so that the weight to be given to development proposals can be assessed.</p>	<p>Plans and Development Plan Documents.</p> <p>The issues raised on the spatial strategy will be explored Examination hearings on Matter 8 (Sustainability Appraisal).</p> <p>The NEAs have published a Garden Communities Trajectory and explanatory note (document reference: EXD/070) which is also attached as Appendix 1 of this document. Section 2s will set out further information on housing allocations and delivery.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>provided. Once the housing trajectory has been published, we respectfully request the opportunity to comment further. If fewer dwellings are expected on the two Braintree garden communities by 2033 then further sites will be required from sustainable urban extensions around Braintree.</p>		
<p>AM 152 Lightwood</p>	<p>Respondents object to change from 'Spatial Strategy' for North Essex to 'Spatial Planning'. If Policy SP2 in Section 1 were not to be a spatial strategy, then we struggle to see how a positive finding of soundness on the proposed garden communities can be made within the Section 1 examination. We submit that Section 1 could not be adopted if it contained 'broad locations' that were proposed in a spatial strategy policy vacuum. That would be back-to front planning.</p>	<p>Objection raises fundamental issues which cannot be addressed by amendment. If the suggested amendment is retracted, and SP2 retains spatial strategy status (in which case there would be a spatial strategy policy in Section 1 and Section 2), there is methodological problem in that the SA work has not fully tested the scope for hierarchical growth throughout the plan-making process.</p>	<p>NEA wording correctly reflects role of Section 1 in setting the spatial planning framework which is then detailed in Section 2 Local Plans and Development Plan Documents. The issues raised will be explored Examination hearings on Matter 8 (Sustainability Appraisal).</p>
<p>Suggested Amendment Reference 20 Additional Paragraph 4.8</p> <p>4.8 The North Essex authorities will identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their individual housing requirements set out in Policy SP3 below.</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
Each authority will incorporate an additional buffer as required by national planning policy to ensure choice and competition for land.			
AM 38 Wivenhoe Society	These changes are justified by the NEAs with reference to the NPPF. The NPPF requirements are for the provision of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing. It is not clear if the amendment to SP3 is intended to provide for a buffer stock for the entire Plan Period in excess of the numbers identified in the housing table and if so what percentage buffer is proposed. Given the Section 2 allocations plus windfalls it would appear from Appendix 6 of the Sustainability Appraisal that sites for only 2,000 additional dwellings are required to meet requirements but given the suggested allocations for the Garden Communities the housing buffer would amount to some 12% of dwellings yet to be built. Such a high buffer is not an NPPF requirement.	No specific wording provided – lower buffer figure required.	Buffer figure has been introduced to comply with national requirements. The issue will be addressed at Matter 3 Examination hearings.
AM 48 Michael Walsh	In the case of BDC, it would be useful for the Draft Housing Plan Trajectory for 2016-2033 to brought up to date.	Include updated housing trajectory for Braintree.	The NEAs have published a Garden Communities Trajectory and explanatory note (document reference: EXD/070) which is also

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	To make clearer the underlying supply position, the updated version should ideally exclude any contributions from the proposed West of Braintree and Land at Marks Tey developments.		attached as Appendix 1 of this document. This clarifies housing delivery of Garden Communities, with delivery of other housing to be covered in Section 2s of each Local Plan. The Matter 3 Examination hearings will cover this issue.
AM176 Parker Strategic Town Planning Ltd (Turley)	Consultation not supported by an updated housing trajectory.	Housing trajectory is fundamental evidence to examination and should be provided.	The NEAs have published a Garden Communities Trajectory and explanatory note (document reference: EXD/070) which is also attached as Appendix 1 of this document. The Matter 3 Examination hearings will cover this issue.
AM100 Skyla Homes (Collective Planning)	Reference should be made to size, type and tenure of housing need to be in conformity with paragraph 60 of the NPPF.	The North Essex authorities will identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites, by size, type and tenure , sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their individual housing requirements set out in Policy SP 3 below. Where sufficient deliverable and developable sites are not forthcoming within identified settlement boundaries,	Detailed policies on size type and tenure covered at level of authority-specific Section 2 Local Plans. The Matter 3 Examination hearings will cover this issue.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response															
		alternative appropriate sites should be considered and assessed against national and local planning policy criteria.																
<p>Suggested Amendment Reference 21 Policy SP3</p> <p>The <i>local planning North Essex</i> Authorities will identify sufficient deliverable or developable sites or broad locations for their respective plan period, against to meet the requirement in the table below and will incorporate an additional buffer to ensure choice and competition for land. (Mod A)</p> <p>Each authority will maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites to provide for at least five years' worth of housing, plus an appropriate buffer in accordance with national policy, and will work proactively with applicants to bring forward sites that accord with the overall spatial strategy and relevant policies in the plan. The annual housing requirement figures set out below will be used as the basis for assessing each authority's five-year housing land supply subject to any adjustments in Section 2 of each plan to address any undersupply since 2013. (Mod B) The North Essex authorities will review their housing requirement regularly in accordance with national policy requirements, and in doing so will have regard to the housing needs of the wider area. (Mod C)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Local Authority</th> <th>Objectively Assessed Need for Housing requirement per Aannum</th> <th>Total minimum housing supply in in requirement for the plan period (2013-2033)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Braintree</td> <td>716</td> <td>14,320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colchester</td> <td>920</td> <td>18,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tendring</td> <td>550</td> <td>11,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>2,186</td> <td>43,720</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Local Authority	Objectively Assessed Need for Housing requirement per A annum	Total minimum housing supply in in requirement for the plan period (2013-2033)	Braintree	716	14,320	Colchester	920	18,400	Tendring	550	11,000	Total	2,186	43,720
Local Authority	Objectively Assessed Need for Housing requirement per A annum	Total minimum housing supply in in requirement for the plan period (2013-2033)																
Braintree	716	14,320																
Colchester	920	18,400																
Tendring	550	11,000																
Total	2,186	43,720																
AM58	No logical reason to remove ' <i>minimum</i> ' as under NPPF 2012 housing policies should be	Number of dwellings identified in Policy SP3 should continue to be expressed as a ' minimum '.	The NEAs proposed wording to remove ' <i>minimum</i> ' is to address the national															

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
Welbeck Strategic Land (Mr D Barnes)	<p>seeking to boost significantly the supply of housing rather than constraining delivery.</p> <p>Due to delay in examination, 'sense check' of housing need of three authorities would be beneficial. Although not assessed under NPPF 2019, affordability ratio of homes remains a relevant factor for determining housing requirements under Objectively Assessed Housing Need approach.</p> <p>If housing need exceeds minimum requirement, consideration should be given to sustainable settlements for additional sites or identification of reserve sites to address shortfall in Section 2.</p>		<p>requirement to have regard to wider housing needs. It is considered that this provides a more flexible approach as required by national policy.</p>
AM100 Skyla Homes (Collective Planning)	<p>Policy SP3 does not refer to specific housing needs of different tenure groups as required by paragraph 61 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Removal of word '<i>minimum</i>' does not conform with paragraph 60 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Specific housing needs of different tenure groups should be established in the policy requirements.</p> <p>Policy should make clear the number of homes required by each authority is a minimum and applications exceeding the minimum housing need should be considered favorably.</p>	<p>Detailed policies on tenure covered at level of authority-specific Section 2 Local Plans.</p> <p>The NEAs proposed wording to remove 'minimum' is to address the national requirement to have regard to wider housing needs. It is considered that this provides</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
		<p><i>'minimum'</i> should be inserted into title of second column of table to read as <i>'minimum housing requirement per annum'</i>.</p> <p><i>'minimum'</i> should be retained in title of third column of table to read as <i>'total minimum housing requirement for plan period (2013-2033)'</i>.</p>	<p>a more flexible approach as required by national policy.</p>
<p>AM 151 Williams Group (Emery Planning)</p>	<p>Mod A – Inclusion of a buffer welcome, but further wording needed to add flexibility to ensure that the overall housing requirement is met in addition to providing choice and competition. Mod B - The local housing need for each authority and the plan area is significantly below the local housing need. Whilst the plan was submitted before January 2019 and therefore under transitional arrangements is being assessed within the context of the 2012 Framework, the housing requirement should be increased to at least the local housing need figure. Otherwise, the plan will need to be reviewed and the</p>	<p>Mod A – amend as follows: the text of the policy should also state: <i>“and to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply”</i>. Mod B – increase housing requirement. Mod C – amend to state that the housing requirement should be reviewed and updated before five years. Reinstate ‘minimum’ in the table of housing requirements. Extend the plan period to ensure that there is at least 15 years left after Section Two plan adoption.</p>	<p>The NEAs consider there is no evidence of any meaningful change since June 2018 in the situation regarding housing need in North Essex and there is no need to modify the wording on that basis. Specific factors mentioned by the Inspector have not changed, nor is there evidence of any other meaningful changes. The NEAs proposed wording to remove ‘minimum’ is to address the national requirement to have regard to wider housing needs. It is considered that this provides a more flexible approach as required by national policy.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>housing requirement updated as soon as it is adopted. To prevent the need for an early review, the proposed housing requirement should be increased now.</p> <p>Mod C - The wording stating that the North Essex authorities will review their housing requirement in accordance with national planning policy should be amended to state that the housing requirement will be reviewed immediately. This is because the proposed housing requirement is significantly below the local housing need and the Framework and the PPG state that this means the requirement should be reviewed and updated before five years.</p> <p>The respondents disagree with the deletion of the word “minimum” from the table. The housing requirement is clearly a minimum requirement.</p> <p>The plan period should be extended to ensure that there is at</p>		<p>Housing numbers will be further explored during the Matter 3 Examination Hearing session.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	least 15 years left of the plan period from the time the Section Two plans are expected to be adopted.		
AM177 Parker Strategic Town Planning Ltd (Turley)	Retrograde step to remove 'minimum' from table as reduces the flexibility and deliverability of the Section 1 Local Plan. Removal of 'minimum' puts Policy SP3 in conflict with Policy SP2 which indicates that the Garden Communities will deliver 'at least' a certain level of development during the Plan period.	Number of dwellings identified in Policy SP3 should continue to be expressed as a ' minimum '.	The NEAs proposed wording to remove 'minimum' is to address the national requirement to have regard to wider housing needs. It is considered that this provides a more flexible approach as required by national policy.
AM214 Oakleigh Residential Park (Avison Young)	Object to the removal of " <i>objectively assessed need</i> " as does not accord with paragraph 11, 35 and 60 of the NPPF. Lack of supply in Tendring needs to be taken into account in this Local Plan and must take into account the objectively assessed need.	No specific further amendment provided.	As the Local Plan is being examined under the NPPF 2012 as per the transitional arrangements, in order to calculate the housing requirement this has been in accordance with the objectively assessed need methodology. The NEAs proposed wording to remove reference to Objectively Assessed Need is not considered to be problematic, as the figures are produced from the objectively assessed need methodology. Housing numbers will be further

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
			explored during the Matter 3 Examination Hearing session.
AM220 Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (Woolf Bond Planning)	<p>Reference to 'minimum' should not be omitted. It must be made clear that the approach on revised policy SP3 is that the annual requirements outlined in the plan are minimums.</p> <p>To resolve undersupply since the start of the plan period (2013) in Section 2 of the Plan does not include sufficient flexibility to accommodate the rapid changes associated with the 2019 NPPF.</p>	Number of dwellings identified in Policy SP3 should continue to be expressed as a ' minimum '.	The NEAs proposed wording to remove 'minimum' is to address the national requirement to have regard to wider housing needs. It is considered that this provides a more flexible approach as required by national policy.
AM223 Bloor Homes (Strutt and Parker LLP) AM200 City and Country (Strutt and Parker LLP) AM171 M Scott Properties Ltd	<p>Mod B - irrational approach to use housing requirements as currently proposed given the known position on housing requirements. Compounds the risk that Section 1 as currently proposed will result in fewer homes being delivered than required.</p> <p>Mod C - Question why housing requirements have not been reviewed before now, it is unclear what the mechanism for addressing new housing</p>	No specific further amendment provided.	<p>The NEAs consider there is no evidence of any meaningful change since June 2018 in the situation regarding housing need in North Essex. Specific factors mentioned by the Inspector have not changed, nor is there evidence of any other meaningful changes.</p> <p>Housing numbers will be further explored during the Matter 3 Examination Hearing session.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
(Strutt and Parker LLP)	requirements identified through this would be.		
<p>Suggested Amendment Reference 22 Paragraph 5.9</p> <p>As part of the work to assess housing requirements, an analysis of economic forecasts was undertaken together with demographic projections to establish the inter-relationship between population growth, forecasts of new jobs and the number of new homes needed to accommodate these levels of growth. Employment forecasts have been developed using two standard models (East of England Forecasting Model (EEFM) and Experian 2016) which forecast total job growth for each of the local authorities based on past trends. Each local authority has been advised on the most appropriate modelling figure to use in the context of reconciling job and housing demand. The forecast growth figures for the housing area for the period 2013-2037 as are set out in Policy SP4. Employment Land Needs Assessments have been carried out by each authority which set out the amount of employment land that is required within the Plan period. In terms of specific B use land provision, each local authority has undertaken work to establish what quantum of employment land would be required within the Plan period to meet the demand identified below for additional B use employment land. These B use employment areas are distributed between each local authority area and based on achieving a sustainable balance between jobs and the available labour force through population growth. As noted above, calculations of employment land required are affected by a range of issues that lead to different employment land portfolios for each local authority area, resulting in a proportionately greater quantum of new floorspace per job in Braintree and Tendring than in Colchester. This is a function of the prominence of higher density office requirements in Colchester and lower density logistics and industrial uses in Braintree and Tendring. The table in Policy SP4 below sets out the three authorities' employment land (B Class uses) requirements for the period 2016 – 33 for two plausible scenarios, baseline and higher growth These two bookends provide flexibility to allow for each authority's supply trajectory to reflect their differing requirements. Site specific employment allocations meeting the needs of different sectors in each local authority are set out in section 2 of their Local Plan.</p>			
AM178 Parker Strategic Town Planning Ltd (Turley)	Relocated text blurs the separate assessments of need for housing and employment land. Concern of Higher Growth Scenarios methodologies. Scenarios	No specific further amendment provided.	The 'bookend' approach is intended to provide flexibility to allow for each authority's supply trajectory to reflect their differing requirements.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	continue to be described as 'bookends' which could be constructed as a cap or limit to investment and job growth. This is incompatible with the positive approach outlined in NPPF 2012 and 2019.		
Suggested Amendment Reference 24 Policy SP4			
<p>A strong, sustainable and diverse economy will be promoted across North Essex with the Councils pursuing a flexible approach to economic sectors showing growth potential across the Plan period. Jobs provision is reconciled with housing demand and is informed by modelling. The following forecasts will apply to the North Essex Authorities; (Mod A)</p>			
<p>Annual Job Forecast:</p>			
Braintree (EEFM)	490		
Colchester (EEFM)	928		
Tendring (Experian)	490		
<p><i>Relocated second paragraph to supporting text - see above modification to paragraph 5.9 (Mod B)</i></p>			
<p>In order to meet the needs of the three authorities' employment land requirements for B class employment uses and maintain appropriate flexibility in provision to meet the needs of different sectors, Section 2 of each plan will allocate employment land within the ranges set out below. (Mod C)</p>			
<p>Hectares of B use employment land required:</p>			
	Baseline (2012 Based SNPP) (ha)	Higher Growth Scenario	
Braintree	23 20.9	43.3	
Colchester	22.0	30	
Tendring	20-12.0	38-20.0	

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
North Essex (Mod D)	65-54.9	137.1-93.3	
AM12 Andy Murphy	Data should be shown graphically and for an extended period using smaller amounts of text to highlight takeaways and planning assumptions. Likely commuting distances for jobs should also be included.	No specific further amendment provided.	Level of detail provided is sufficient for strategic employment land policy.
AM 119 CAUSE	The position in relation to employment land remains confused. The overall figure set out in policy SP4 seems to be for each of the districts as a whole, including the Garden Communities, although it is not clear from policy SP4 whether this is the case. Furthermore, the range between Baseline and Higher Growth scenario is substantial. This demonstrates that the councils have not invested anywhere near the time necessary to understand what employment requirements there are over the plan period, and furthermore what type of employment is required. By way of comparison, the housing figure for each district is fixed per annum. The councils should	Provide a single annual employment figure for each district rather than a range.	Given the fluid nature of employment land requirements, a range provides more flexibility to respond to changing circumstances than a fixed number. Trigger points, timescales for delivery are set out in policies SP7-10.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	commit to a single annual employment figure for each district, rather than a range.		
AM 151 Williams Group (Emery Planning)	This strategic policy SP4 should be redrafted for clarity with explanatory text moved outside the policy wording. The policy should clarify whether the baseline employment land forecast is to be regarded as a minimum requirement.	No specific wording provided.	Amended wording is considered to have addressed this point.
AM179 Parker Strategic Town Planning Ltd (Turley)	Lack of integration between assessment of housing need and separate employment land assessments. Specifying a precise level of job growth purely in the context of employment land provision is misleading, implying a degree of technical alignment between housing and employment land provision that does not exist.	Employment land requirements should be described as indicative and will not prevent a higher level of development where opportunities emerge. Baseline scenario should be removed in its entirety. 'Higher Growth Scenario' should be more accurately labelled as the minimum level of employment plan provision.	Proposed figures correctly reflect NEA evidence base. The issue will be addressed in the Matter 2 examination hearing.
<p>Proposed Amendment 25</p> <p>Para 6.1</p> <p>A coordinated and integrated approach to infrastructure planning and delivery is required to implement the vision for North Essex. Provision of appropriate and timely infrastructure to support growth will be central to the area's continuing prosperity, attractiveness and sustainability. Plan-led growth that includes proposed large scale garden community infrastructure with a particular focus will be on transport, education, healthcare, telecommunications (including broadband). Section 1 of the Local Plan highlights strategic and cross-boundary infrastructure, identifying the</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>strategic transport infrastructure projects required to underpin delivery of the planned growth in the area including the proposed Garden Communities, and sets priorities for other infrastructure requirements such as education, healthcare, digital connectivity, water supply and wastewater.</p> <p>Section 2 of the Local Plan contains the infrastructure requirements for allocations made in that section of the plan The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) provides more detail about the phasing and costing of infrastructure requirements. for the Garden Communities and the Section 2 allocations required within the plan period.</p>			
<p>AM 90 Anglian Water</p>	<p>We note that changes have been made to paragraph 6.1 of the supporting text to include explicit reference to water supply and wastewater infrastructure which is supported. However the text should refer to wastewater systems and treatment for consistency with Policy SP5 as amended.</p>	<p>Amend the wording as suggested: Section 1 of the Local Plan highlights strategic and cross-boundary infrastructure, identifying the strategic transport infrastructure projects required to underpin delivery of the planned growth in the area including the proposed Garden Communities, and sets priorities for other infrastructure requirements such as education, healthcare, digital connectivity, water supply and wastewater infrastructure and treatment.</p>	<p>Agreed in Statement of Common Ground December 2019 signed by NEAs, Anglian Water and Environment Agency</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 27</p> <p>Para 6.242 The North Essex Garden Communities Charter seeks to ensure that land use planning of the new communities maximises the provision and use of sustainable transport internally and connects externally to key urban centres. Given the Charter’s commitment to the timely delivery of infrastructure, policies SP7-10 will ensure that key transport projects align with housing and employment delivery.</p>			
<p>AM 119 CAUSE</p>	<p>This section remains too vague. It requires trigger points, timescales for delivery, completion, cost and sourcing of funding.</p>	<p>No specific wording provided.</p>	<p>Wording as proposed is considered to provide sufficient detail. Issue will be</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
			covered in hearings on other Matters.
Proposed Amendment 28			
Para 6.253 To achieve the desired step change in sustainable transport, policy will require that this infrastructure will need to be funded and its delivery phased to align with provided early in with the development phases.			
AM 119 CAUSE	This section remains too vague. It requires trigger points, timescales for delivery, completion, cost and sourcing of funding.	No specific wording provided.	Wording as proposed is considered to provide sufficient detail. Issue will be covered in hearings on other Matters.
Proposed Amendment 33			
Para 6.7			
Braintree, Colchester and Tendring will continue to work closely with government departments, Highways England, Essex County Council, Network Rail, rail and bus operators, developers and other partners to better integrate all forms of transport and improve roads and public transport and to promote cycling and walking. Key projects during the plan period will see improvements to the A12, A120, Great Eastern Main Line including rail services, and provision of rapid transit connections in and around urban areas and the Garden Communities. An integrated and sustainable transport system will be delivered that supports economic growth and helps deliver the best quality of life.			
AM 186 Parker Strategic	The amendments to this policy seem at odds with the policy statement in suggested amendment 28 which requires the infrastructure from the outset. The text being removed highlights the uncertainty of the delivery of the infrastructure.	No specific wording provided.	The NEA are committed to ensuring that the delivery of infrastructure is phased to align with the development phases. It is not considered that this amendment is inconsistent with that principle.
Proposed Amendment 34			
On the inter urban road network traffic levels have increased significantly in recent years with parts of the A12 around Colchester and Marks Tey carrying up to 90,000 vehicles per day, which is high for an A-class trunk road.			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM149 Marks Tey Parish Council	Para 6.6 proposes removing the “extreme traffic volume” reference on the A12 at Marks Tey as it “is overly detailed”. MTPC feel that as the road runs through an urban area, adjacent to shops and housing it has a strategic significance.	The extreme traffic notation should remain and should be added to by committing to mitigation.	Text is overly detailed for a strategic section of the plan. SP9 D7 has been amended to strengthen securing funding and route commitments for strategic improvements benefitting Marks Tey.
<p>Proposed Modification 38</p> <p>Para 6.10</p> <p>Consultation on A120 route improvement options between Braintree and the A12 ended in March 2017. and ECC has identified a favoured route which has been recommended to Highways England and the Department of Transport for inclusion in Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2), which is the next funding period for the strategic road network and will make a recommendation for a preferred option to the Secretary of State for Transport and Highways England in Autumn 2017. ECC will recommend the preferred route to Government for inclusion in the next Route Investment Strategy 2, which will run from 2020 to 2025. In addition a series of short term interventions will be delivered along the route to improve safety and relieve congestion. The final alignment may influence the final boundaries and scale of the proposed Garden Community on the Colchester Braintree border. The A120 from the A12 to Harwich is subject to a Highways England Route Based Strategy and improvements to this section of road are expected over the plan period.</p>			
AM14 Mr. Andy Murphy	This feels like a step backwards - previously it noted any decisions on infrastructure upgrades/improvement might influence community boundaries. Respondent questions removal of reference to this.	No specific wording provided.	Reference to final alignment influencing final boundaries remains in the policy.
AM 119 CAUSE	The respondents object to the proposed wording, and note that the strategic infrastructure for the	An amendment should be made to state that any future DPD not including full details of land	.The amendments to the garden community policies include appropriate

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>Garden Communities should be committed to in policy before adoption and not within a reasonable period of time; its phasing alongside the delivery of new communities must be dealt with in a more detailed manner with firm commitments which could be introduced through an infrastructure delivery plan IDP (see comments in relation to references 27 & 28).</p>	<p>ownership funding and delivery made available for public scrutiny should be found unsound at subsequent EiP.</p>	<p>commitments regarding the timing of the delivery of infrastructure. It is not appropriate for a Local Plan to seek to re-define the test of soundness.</p>
<p>AM 156 Gladman</p>	<p>Gladman note the proposed amendment and comment that the A120 route improvement works are not currently funded and rely on a successful bid through RIS2. Given that the Inspector recognised that the West of Braintree GC would be reliant on the A120 improvements for eastward strategic road connections and the A120 and A12 improvements were essential strategic highway links for the Colchester Braintree Borders GC, it is fundamental to the deliverability of these schemes that the A120 improvements are not yet funded.</p>	<p>No specific wording changes proposed.</p>	<p>Wording accurately reflects commitment to required road improvements. Topic covered by Matter 6 examination discussion.</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 41</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
Para 6.4311	The Anglia Route Study prepared by Network Rail (March 2016) shows that while capacity varies along the Great Eastern Main Line, capacity to accommodate growth is limited and is particularly constrained in peak times from Chelmsford to London.		
AM 189 Parker Strategic	Reference should be made to the more recent Network Rail document, Great Eastern Main Line Study: Railway investment choices (July 2019), which notes that (section 3.1) <i>“The future growth and enhancements for the GEML were previously considered as part of the Anglia Route Study published by Network Rail in 2016. The study was published before the decision to replace the entire rolling stock fleet.”</i> Network Rail also notes (page 11) that the new fleet will increase seating capacity per train by between 17% and 36%, stating (page 12) <i>“As part of the assessment of the need for additional services, the increased capacity of the new trains is expected to defer the need for additional services to London Liverpool Street as would be the case with the capacity of the existing rolling stock. This capacity increase is significant as, in addition to providing an</i>	Add additional text.	Information is too detailed for the strategic Section 1.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<i>improved passenger experience, it reduces the need for expensive infrastructure interventions in the short ”</i>		
<p>Proposed Amendment 42 Para 6.4513 A new franchise has been awarded to Greater Anglia for passenger services in the region. New services will be provided which commencing ed in 2018 and the entire fleet of trains will be replaced and in service by 2020 adding capacity.</p>			
AM 190 Parker Strategic	Reference should be made to the more recent Network Rail document, Great Eastern Main Line Study: Railway investment choices (July 2019), which notes that (section 3.1) <i>“The future growth and enhancements for the GEML were previously considered as part of the Anglia Route Study published by Network Rail in 2016. The study was published before the decision to replace the entire rolling stock fleet.”</i> Network Rail also notes (page 11) that the new fleet will increase seating capacity per train by between 17% and 36%, stating (page 12) <i>“As part of the assessment of the need for additional services, the increased capacity of the new trains is expected to defer the need for additional services to</i>	Add additional text	Information is too detailed for the strategic Section 1.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p><i>London Liverpool Street as would be the case with the capacity of the existing rolling stock. This capacity increase is significant as, in addition to providing an improved passenger experience, it reduces the need for expensive infrastructure interventions in the short term”</i></p>		
<p>Proposed Amendment 49 Deletion of former para 6.21 To maximise the use of public transport new forms of high quality rapid transit networks will be provided to connect the proposed garden communities to existing urban centres such as Colchester and Braintree; key destinations such as the University of Essex; and key transport interchanges in North Essex. To achieve the desired step change in sustainable transport this infrastructure will be identified in subsequent development plan documents and need required to be funded and provided early in the development phase to enable subsequent housing and employment delivery.</p>			
<p>AM 186 Parker Strategic</p>	<p>The text being removed highlights the uncertainty of the delivery of the infrastructure. The deletion of this paragraph is identified as being covered in paragraphs 6.4 – 6.7. However it is considered that the proposed paragraphs are not sufficient to ensure the RTS infrastructure is provided from the outset of the development proposals</p>	<p>No specific wording provided.</p>	<p>Revisions to Policy SP5 concerning RTS infrastructure is then supported by more detailed wording on RTS in policies SP7-10,</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 56 New Section E Water Supply and Wastewater The authorities will need to work with Anglian Water, Affinity Water,</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>Environment Agency and other infrastructure providers to ensure sufficient capacity and provision of an adequate water supply and waste water management facilities to support growing communities as outlined in the Integrated Water Management Strategy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This will be particularly important as water supplies continue to be threatened by climate change. Garden Communities have the opportunity to minimise demand and wastewater generation, through exploring opportunities at both the strategic and local level.</p>			
<p>AM 131 Environment Agency and AM91 Anglian Water</p>	<p>EA: The authorities will need to work with Anglian Water, Affinity Water, Environment Agency and other infrastructure providers to ensure sufficient capacity and provision of adequate water supply and waste water management facilities to support growing communities as outlined in the Integrated Water Management Strategy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This will be particularly important as water supplies continue to be threatened by climate change and pressures from continuing growth and development. Water provisions need to be protected and it is essential for adequate water infrastructure to be in place to accommodate the demands of growth and development and ensure that there is no breach of existing environmental legislation, notably WFD and the Habitats</p>	<p>The authorities will need to work with Anglian Water, Affinity Water, Environment Agency and developers other—infrastructure providers to ensure sufficient capacity and provision of an adequate water supply and foul drainage and wastewater treatment waste—water management facilities to support growing communities as outlined in the Integrated Water Management Strategy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This will be particularly important as water supplies continue to be threatened by climate change and pressures from continuing growth and development. Water provisions need to be protected and it is essential for adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to be in place to accommodate the demands of growth and development in</p>	<p>Wording agreed for proposed amended wording in Statement of Common Ground signed by NEAs, Environment Agency and Anglian Water.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>Directive. Garden Communities have the opportunity to minimise demand and wastewater generation, through exploring opportunities at both the strategic and local level.</p> <p>AWS: We note that a new paragraph has been added to the supporting text to add reference to North Essex Authorities working with water and sewerage companies and Environment Agency to ensure sufficient water supply and wastewater management facilities are provided.</p> <p>Reference is made to 'other infrastructure providers' it is not made clear which organisations are being referred to in this context. We would therefore suggest the text refer to developers rather than 'other infrastructure providers'. Also for clarity it would be helpful if the text foul drainage and wastewater treatment as developments sites would be expected to connect to the public sewerage network.</p>	<p>accordance with the Water Framework Directive and the Habitats Directive. Garden Communities have the opportunity to minimise demand and wastewater generation, through exploring opportunities at both the strategic and local level."</p>	
<p>Proposed Amendment 57 SP5 Infrastructure</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>If the necessary strategic infrastructure for the Garden Communities as required by Policy SP5 is not committed within a reasonable period of time and phased alongside the delivery of new communities a review of the Plan will be undertaken prior to any consent being implemented, in order that the consequential shortfall in housing delivery does not overburden the infrastructure of existing communities/settlements. ...</p>			
<p>AM39 Bellway Homes</p>	<p>Although Bellway broadly supports the new paragraph to be added to Policy SP5, the 'early' review mechanism is still likely to take at least 3-4 years to produce a new local plan. Given the delivery uncertainty that exists around the new GCs and their associated strategic infrastructure, a more robust solution would be to add additional growth sites into the current Plan, thereby boosting its housing supply and future proofing the Plan now.</p>	<p>No specific wording provided.</p>	<p>No additional sites need to be added given that there is sufficient certainty regarding the delivery of supporting transport infrastructure for Garden Communities. Discussion at the Matter 6 hearing will cover this issue</p>
<p>AM160 L&Q, Cirrus Land, G120 (Carter Jonas LLP)</p>	<p>The respondent can support in principle a review mechanism that links the delivery of the garden communities with funding and route commitments to the A12 and A120 upgrade schemes, but there is no need to delay delivery by seeking to artificially constrain it by linking any in-principle delivery at CBBGC to this trigger</p>	<p>Delete restriction on housing delivery in advance of infrastructure. <i>If the necessary strategic infrastructure for the Garden Communities as required by Policy SP5 is not committed within a reasonable period of time and phased alongside the delivery of new communities a review of the Plan will be undertaken prior to any consent being implemented,</i></p>	<p>NEA wording is required to ensure new housing is supported by infrastructure and that existing communities are not disadvantaged due to delays in supporting infrastructure provision. Issue will be covered by a number of the examination hearing sessions.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
		<i>in order that the consequential shortfall in housing delivery does not overburden the infrastructure of _____ existing communities/settlements.</i>	
AM 152 Lightwood	<p>We object to the changes to the first two paragraph and these suppose that all three garden communities can be found sound in the absence of confirmed funding for the A120, A12 (widening and re-alignment), and to enable 'rapid' transit route to be in place for first occupations.</p> <p>The respondents object to <i>'prior to any consent to be implemented'</i> as this implies that permission will be granted with conditions even in the absence of funding. The principle should not be given away at all in the absence of funding, especially for CBBGC given reference case viability assessment, and for WoBGC given the absence of funding for RTS to be running by 2023/24.</p> <p>The respondents also object to the unsubstantiated use of the word <i>'overburden'</i></p>	Delete proposed wording.	NEA wording is required to ensure new housing is supported by infrastructure and that existing communities are not disadvantaged due to delays in supporting infrastructure provision. A review prior to implementation is considered appropriate. Issue will be covered by a number of the examination hearing sessions

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM 156 Gladman	<p>Gladman object to Modification 57 as although it states that a review of the Plan will be undertaken if the strategic infrastructure is not committed within a reasonable period of time, there is no definition of what actual timeframes would be considered reasonable.</p> <p>3.7.4 Further detail is therefore required in this Policy to stipulate enforceable timeframes within which the review of the Plan will be commenced and submitted for Examination to ensure that the Policy is compliant with the Framework and is implementable.</p>	No specific wording provided.	<p>Detail on timescales is not appropriate given that the frequency and need for Plan review is linked in Government guidance to the outcomes of regular monitoring rather than arbitrary review intervals. Issue will be covered by a number of the examination hearing sessions</p>
AM 193 Parker Strategic Planning	<p>The text results in the Section 1 Local Plans creating a significant degree of uncertainty regarding the Garden Communities, either in principle or in the timescales that might be expected by the NEAs. Parker Strategic Land consider that the Section 1 Local Plans should establish certainty over the key allocations given their significance to the overall strategy.</p>	No specific wording provided.	<p>Proposed NEA wording considered to provide sufficient assurances on timescales. Issue will be covered by a number of the examination hearing sessions</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 58 SP5 Infrastructure</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>New para A. Garden Communities</p> <p>Infrastructure provision will be secured in a timely manner and programmed to keep pace with growth of new communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding and route commitments for the following strategic transport infrastructure projects will need to be secured in advance of the start of the Garden Communities as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colchester/Braintree Borders A12 widening and junction improvements A dualled A120 from Braintree to the A12 - Tendring/Colchester Borders A120-A133 Link Road <p>.....</p>		
AM 40 Bellway Homes	<p>The respondents note that the suggested amendments to Policy SP5 include recognition that funding and route commitments for strategic transport infrastructure projects (comprising the A12 widening and junction improvements, a dualled A120 from Braintree to the A12 and an A120-A133 link road) must be secured in advance of the start of the new Garden Communities (GCs). However, it is also noteworthy that two of these major infrastructure projects, i.e. the A12 widening and the A120 dualling, are still awaiting funding commitments. At the time of writing no decisions have been made by the Government on the</p>	<p>Add NE Witham Phase 4 to the Plan as either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an alternative 'strategic location' which, along with other promoted sites in Witham North, could replace one of the new GCs in Section 1 of the Plan – if the Inspector is minded to remove a GC or a HIF bid fails; or • an additional 'growth site' in its own right in Section 2 of the Plan – in the event that the GCs remain, but with fewer new homes envisaged during the Plan period. 	<p>No additional sites need to be added given sufficient certainty can be demonstrated on supporting transport infrastructure for Garden Communities. Discussion at the Matter 6 hearing will cover this issue.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	A12 and A120 Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bids. However, if either or both of these bids are unsuccessful, this is likely to have significant consequences for Section 1 of the Plan.		
AM 119 CAUSE	The respondents suggest that the wording in the new paragraph on Garden Communities is tightened, to define what is meant by a timely manner and to set out that where infrastructure provision is not provided the Garden Communities should not proceed.	Precise wording not provided.	Proposed wording is sufficiently precise on requirements for ensuring development is supported by necessary infrastructure and that funding and route commitments in respect of the named projects will need to be secured in advance of the start of development. Discussion at the Matter 6 hearing will cover this issue.
AM149 Marks Tey Parish Council	This states that the A12 and A120 improvements need to be "secured" prior to the start of CBBGC. This is helpful but could mean only in a committed programme.	MTPC feel that the "delivery" of CBBGC should be integrated with the actual "delivery" and provision of the A12 and A120 improvements.	NEA wording is considered to provide sufficient commitment to provision of infrastructure in advance of delivery of Garden Communities
AM 151 Williams Group	The Garden Communities west of Braintree should be subject to the same requirements for the provision of necessary infrastructures as set out for the other Garden Communities.	Add in West of Braintree Garden Community to list in 'funding and route commitments' bullet point along with specific transport commitment.	The proposed NEA wording sets out the specific transport infrastructure requirements for Colchester/Braintree Borders and Tendring/Colchester Borders

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
			<p>under the first bullet point. The NEA do not consider it necessary to include reference to specific transport infrastructure for West of Braintree. This issue will be addressed in the Matter 6 examination hearing.</p>
AM 152 Lightwood	<p>The respondents object to the fourth main bullet above requiring <i>a scheme and specification for a phased rapid transit network and programme</i> as the essential trigger for measuring whether this infrastructure will be programmed to keep pace with the growth of garden communities. The NEA's evidence states a genuine alternative must be available immediately, and relevant polices should hold that line. The focus should be on the actual delivery of the scheme. In this respect the fourth bullet and the use of the phrase 'at the outset' is more appropriate. There is a danger that first completions are simply conditioned to the scheme being operational but that LPAs vary that condition. This point should flow</p>	<p>Add 'at the outset' to the rapid transport scheme requirement and ensure each Garden Community policy (SP8, 9 and 10) carries forward this point.</p>	<p>Existing NEA wording reflects appropriate requirements for delivery of the rapid transport scheme. This issue will be addressed in the Matter 6 examination hearing.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	into the site-specific policy wording changes under SP 8,9 and 10.		
AM160 L&Q, Cirrus Land, G120 (Carter Jonas)	The respondents consider that the technical evidence demonstrates that over 2,500 dwellings can be accommodated within CBBGC prior to the delivery of the A12 upgrade, with localised road and junction improvements unlocking this capacity. With these measures in place, plus the delivery of the A12 widening (whether through an online widening, offline route under committed RIS funding, or the wider HIF bid alignment), and a link to the A12 from the existing A120, a capacity of 6,500 dwellings can feasibly be delivered. Then, with the extension of the A12-A120 to join at the point of the Coggeshall bypass, a garden community of up to 9,000 dwellings can be delivered, prior to the delivery of a dualled A120. Following the delivery of the dualling of the A120, it can complete delivery of 17,000 dwellings (or a larger scale	<p><i>Garden communities will be restricted to the following scales prior to funding and route commitments for the following strategic transport infrastructure projects and delivery of stated local highways improvements will need to be secured in advance of the start of the Garden Communities as follows:</i></p> <p>Colchester/ Braintree Borders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>2,500 dwellings: enhancements to Marks Tey, Prince of Wales, and Marks Farm roundabouts, A120 Marks Tey bypass and widening;</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>6,000 dwellings: A12 widening and junction improvements, A12-A120 link;</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>9,000 dwellings: Extended A12-A120 link to tie in directly at the Coggeshall bypass;</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>15,000-24,000: A dualled A120 from Braintree to the A12.</i> 	The respondents' proposed wording is considered to weaken the necessary commitment linking the delivery of Garden Communities from early stages on to appropriately phased and delivered infrastructure.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	envisioned by the NEAs if appropriate).		
AM138 Crest Nicholson. Operations Ltd, RF West Ltd, Livelihoods and David G Sherwood (Andrew Martin Planning Limited)	Amendment should not preclude planning permission being granted for either standalone sustainable urban extension to Marks Tey or an initial phase of the GC, where it would not overburden the existing infrastructure.	Amendment should not preclude standalone urban extension to Marks Tey.	Reference to a standalone urban extension would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy proposed.
<p>Proposed Amendment 59</p> <p>B. Transportation and travel</p> <p>The authorities will work with government departments, Highways England, Essex County Council, Network Rail, rail and bus operators, developers and other partners to deliver the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in travel behaviour by applying the modal hierarchy and increasing opportunities for sustainable modes of transport that can compete effectively with private vehicles. • A comprehensive network of segregated walking and cycling routes linking key centres of activity planned to prioritise safe, attractive and convenient routes for walking and cycling <p>New and improved infrastructure required to support economic growth, strategic and site-specific priorities outlined in the second part of each Local Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantially improved connectivity by promoting and enabling more sustainable travel patterns, introducing urban transport packages to increase ing transport modal choice, providing better public transport infrastructure and services, and enhancing ing inter-urban transport corridors • Increased rail capacity, reliability and punctuality; and reduced overall journey times by rail 			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support changes in travel behaviour by applying the modal hierarchy and increasing opportunities for sustainable modes of transport that can compete effectively with private vehicles • Prioritise Improved urban and inter-urban Public transport, particularly in the urban areas, including new and innovative ways of providing public transport provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o high quality rapid transit networks and connections, in and around urban areas with links to the new Garden Communities as required by policy SP5 (A) and policies SP8, 9, and 10 o maximising the use of the local rail network to serve existing communities and locations for large-scale growth o a bus network providing a high frequency, reliable and efficient service, that is high quality, reliable, simple to use, integrated with other transport modes serving and offers flexibility to serve areas of new demand o promoting wider use of community transport schemes <p>Increased rail capacity, reliability and punctuality; and reduced overall journey times by rail</p> <p>New and improved road infrastructure to help reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability along the A12, A120 and A133 that will also link new development and provide strategic highway connections specifically: to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth</p> <p>Improved access to and capacity of junctions on the A12 and other main roads to reduce congestion, improve journey time reliability and address safety</p> <p>A dualled A120 between the A12 and Braintree</p> <p>A comprehensive network of segregated walking and cycling routes linking key centres of activity contributing to an attractive, safe, legible and prioritized walking/cycling environment</p> <p>Develop innovative strategies for the management of private car use and parking including the promotion of car clubs and car sharing, and provision of support for electric car charging points.</p>		
AM 119 CAUSE	The respondents note that though not an amendment, the policy to <i>'make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure'</i> has been overlooked again in the evidence	Add rail lines listed.	A requirement to make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure is clear and does not need to be

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>base. The Colchester-Clacton line has been ignored once more, as has the Sudbury Line, and even the Braintree branch line, which has featured in Braintree's Local Plan as an opportunity for some time.</p>		<p>supported by a list of all relevant infrastructure.</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 62 SP5 New section E. Water and Wastewater E. Water & Waste water The authorities will work with relevant providers to ensure that there is resilient capacity in the water management and waste water systems to respond to new development and provide improvements to water infrastructure and waste water treatment and off-site drainage improvements.</p>			
<p>AM 131 Environment Agency AM 92 Anglian Water</p>	<p>EA: This section should be reworded to ensure that no breach of environmental legislation and protect water capacity. The authorities will work with relevant providers to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the water management and waste water systems to accommodate new development and provide improvements where necessary to water infrastructure, waste water treatment and off-site drainage ahead of the occupation of dwellings. This will ensure there is no breach of environmental legislation and reduce the risk of adverse</p>	<p>Amend text as follows: The authorities will work with relevant providers to ensure that there is resilient sufficient capacity in the water supply and management and waste water infrastructure systems to respond to new development. and provide improvements Where necessary, improvements to water infrastructure, and waste water treatment and off-site drainage should be made improvements ahead of the occupation of dwellings in accordance with environmental legislation.</p>	<p>Wording agreed for proposed amended wording in Statement of Common Ground signed by NEAs, Environment Agency and Anglian Water.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>impacts on the water environment.</p> <p>AWS: We note that an additional paragraph has been added to the text of Policy SP5 of the submitted Local Plan to refer to the North Essex Authorities working with water and sewerage undertakers for the area which is supported.</p>		
<p>Proposed Amendment 64</p> <p>Para 7.3 3rd line</p> <p>Strategic scale and more local green infrastructure can make a vital contribution to quality of place, biodiversity gains, alleviating recreational pressure, and health outcomes if properly integrated into the design and delivery of new development</p>			
<p>AM 145 and 147</p> <p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Addition of explanatory text – 1) include a mention of the use of the DEFRA biodiversity accounting metric 2.0 to accurately assess habitat impacts.</p> <p>2). We support the addition of the words ‘including the use of open space to provide sustainable drainage solutions...’. We would add that it should further this even more by reading along the lines of ‘including the use of open space to provide green sustainable drainage solutions - flora and fauna rich solutions. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are abundant opportunities to</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 7.3 as follows:</p> <p>Strategic scale and more local green infrastructure can make a vital contribution to quality of place, biodiversity and health outcomes if properly integrated into the design and delivery of new development. The Defra biodiversity accounting metric 2.0, or future iterations of this, can be used to accurately assess habitat impacts. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) provide abundant opportunities to introduce wildflower strips and soft</p>	<p>Wording agreed for proposed amended wording in Statement of Common Ground signed by NEAs, Environment Agency and Anglian Water.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	introduce wildflower strips and soft landscaping to a development or urban area. This not only brings an attractive feature to the area for people but acts as a wildlife corridor, connecting the rivers, ditches, hedges, verges and gardens, allowing movement of wildlife through an area, connecting to the wider environment and therefore greatly enhancing the biodiversity value of the site.	landscaping to a development or urban area. This not only brings an attractive feature to the area for people but acts as a wildlife corridor, connecting the rivers, ditches, hedges, verges and gardens, allowing movement of wildlife through an area, connecting to the wider environment and therefore greatly enhancing the biodiversity value of the site."	
<p>Proposed Amendment 65 SP6 All new development must meet the highest high (Mod A) standards of urban and architectural design. The local authorities encourage the use of Development frameworks, masterplans, design codes, and other design guidance documents and will be prepared in consultation with stakeholders where they are needed to support this objective. use design codes where appropriate for strategic scale development. (Mod B) All new developments should, where applicable, (Mod C) reflect the following place shaping principles:</p> <p>Respond positively to local character and context to preserve and enhance the quality of existing communities places (Mod D) and their environs. Provide buildings that exhibit individual architectural quality within well- considered public and private realms; Protect and enhance assets of historical or natural value; Incorporate biodiversity creation and enhancement measures; (Mod E) Create well-connected places that prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport services above use of the private car; Where possible, appropriate, provide a mix of land uses, services and densities with well-defined public and private spaces to create sustainable well-designed neighbourhoods; Enhance the public realm through additional landscaping, street furniture and other distinctive features that help to create a sense of place;(Mod F)</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>Provide streets and spaces that are overlooked and active and promote inclusive access; Include parking facilities that are well integrated as part of the overall design and are adaptable if levels of private car ownership fall; Provide an integrated and connected network of multi-functional public open space and green and blue infrastructure that connects with existing green infrastructure where possible, including alleviating recreational pressure on designated sites; (Mod G) Include measures to promote environmental sustainability including addressing energy and water efficiency and provision of appropriate wastewater and flood mitigation measures including the use of open space to provide sustainable drainage solutions; (Mod H) and Protect the amenity of existing and future residents and users with regard to noise, vibration, smell, loss of light, overbearing and overlooking. (Mod I)</p>		
AM16 Mr. Andy Murphy	Respondent objects to move from the highest standards to high standards...we should probably avoid requesting more revisions to avoid getting to average standards or below!	Retain 'high' standards of urban design.	Retain proposed change as it was modified to align with NPPF guidance and to suggest a proportionate design response.
AM 93 Anglian Water	Anglian Water had sought changes to the 10th bullet point to include reference to water infrastructure as agreed with North Essex Authorities (document SCG/002) which were not included in the Proposed Changes consultation.	Include measures to promote environmental sustainability including addressing energy and water efficiency and provision of appropriate water and wastewater infrastructure and flood mitigation measures.	Change agreed as per original Statement of Common Ground. Oversight remedied by addition of 'water' to further proposed amendments.
AM 119 CAUSE	We object to the watering down of standards of urban and architectural design in the change 'highest' changed to 'high	Retain 'high' standards of urban design.	Retain proposed change as it was modified to align with NPPF guidance and to suggest a proportionate design response.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM 142 and 145 Environment Agency	<p>Mod E -Where it says 'Incorporate biodiversity creation...' the following should be added to the end 'to ensure net gain.'</p> <p>Mod G -Where it says 'Provide an integrated and connected network of public open space...' it should say 'Provide an integrated and connected network of biodiverse public open space...'. As mentioned in the subsequent text in the policy, alleviating pressure on designated sites is key in respect to all new development. Even if designated sites are not in the immediate vicinity of a development, increases in local population have a domino effect on the local natural infrastructure.</p> <p>Mod H - We support the addition of the words 'including the use of open space to provide sustainable drainage solutions...' EA add that it should further this even more by reading along the lines of 'including the use of open space to provide green sustainable drainage solutions - flora and fauna rich solutions. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are abundant opportunities to</p>	<p>Mod E: Incorporate biodiversity creation and enhancement measures to ensure net gain</p> <p>Mod G: Provide an integrated and connected network of biodiverse public open space</p> <p>Mod H: including the use of open space to provide flora and fauna rich sustainable drainage solutions"</p>	<p>Wording agreed for proposed amendments in Statement of Common Ground signed by NEAs, Environment Agency and Anglian Water.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	introduce wildflower strips and soft landscaping to a development or urban area. This not only brings an attractive feature to the area for people but acts as a wildlife corridor, connecting the rivers, ditches, hedges, verges and gardens, allowing movement of wildlife through an area, connecting to the wider environment and therefore greatly enhancing the biodiversity value of the site.		
<p>Proposed Amendment 70 SP7 First section The following three new garden communities are proposed in North Essex. Tendring/Colchester Borders, a new garden community will deliver 2,500 homes and 7 hectares of employment land within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7-900 homes and 25 hectares of employment land to be delivered beyond 2033). Colchester/Braintree Borders, a new garden community will deliver 2,500, 1,350 homes and 4 hectares of employment land within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 15,00 – 24,000 homes and 71 hectares of employment land to be delivered beyond 2033). West of Braintree in Braintree DC, a new garden community will deliver 2,500 2,060 homes and 9 hectares of employment land within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7,000-10,000 homes and 44 hectares of employment land to be delivered beyond 2033).</p>			
AM 119 CAUSE	The respondents consider that the section must ensure that aspiration and step-change are reflected in policy and deliverable.	No specific wording provided, but garden city charter should be mentioned.	The 14 principles listed are derived from the TCPA Garden Community Charter and the statement following

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	We suggest that it should link to deliverables and specifically to the garden city charter		the list notes that the North Essex Garden Community Charter clarifies this.
AM 152 Lightwood	Object to proposed changes reflecting criticisms made on additional evidence base and SA.	Delete new wording.	Criticisms made relating to additional evidence base and SA will be addressed in relevant Examination hearing session.
AM 136 Mersea Homes	The conversion of a target for jobs in to a land use requirement is not an exact science, and is dependent upon a number of assumptions. These include assumptions not just about floorspace, plot ratio and density of employment, but also the sectors in which employment is generated. Whilst it is useful to have a floorspace/site area for employment land as a guide a more accurate approach may be to reference the target for employment in terms of job creation for each Garden Community, or else otherwise amend the policy to refer to a land area or employment/jobs equivalent.	No specific wording given, but amend target to refer to job creation for each Garden Community or alternatively refer to a land area or employment/jobs equivalent.	Hectares are used as they, along with floorspace, is a standard metric for employment land provision in Local Plans in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Issue will be addressed in Matter 2 hearing.
AM138 Crest Nicholson.	No explanation given in reasons column, current reason is unclear	Explanation should be clearly provided.	

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
Operations Ltd, RF West Ltd, Livelihoods and David G Sherwood (Andrew Martin Planning Limited)	and misleading due to differing dwellings figures used.		
AM160 L&Q, Cirrus Land, G120 (Carter Jonas LLP)	The respondents oppose the suggested reduction in the housing yield of CBBGC from 2500 to 1350, which reflects the timetable for completion of the A12 and A120 upgrades. However, the respondents consider that there is no technical evidence to justify such a delay to delivery and doing so would run contrary to Government policy. The respondents consider that development can come forward in advance of road improvements.	<i>Colchester/Braintree Borders, a new garden community will deliver a minimum of 2,500 1,350 homes and a minimum of 4 hectares of employment land within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 15,000 – 24,000 homes and 71 hectares of employment land to be delivered beyond 2033).</i>	The revised housing numbers reflect a realistic assessment of delivery based on the need to ensure necessary transport improvements in advance of delivery of the CBBGC Garden Community.
AM 196 Parker Strategic	Respondents consider that the evidence and resulting employment land requirements for the Garden Communities are deficient in their consideration of the relationship with the wider evidence base; market evidence on the opportunities for higher growth around Braintree; and the	No specific wording provided.	Issues raised will be addressed in Matter 2 examination hearings.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	contribution of Garden Communities in responding to unmet qualitative needs		
<p>Proposed Amendment 71 SP7 The public sector working pro-actively and collaboratively with the private sector to design, and bring forward these garden communities, deploying new models of delivery where appropriate sharing risk and reward and ensuring that the cost of achieving the following is borne by landowners and those promoting the developments....</p>			
AM 53 Galliard	The respondents don't believe there should even be mention of 'new models of delivery' despite the caveat of 'where appropriate'. They suggest the wording should just be 'appropriate models of delivery' as the local plan should not be attempting to influence the method of delivery in any way. As the Council states elsewhere, each new garden community should be delivered in a way that is most appropriate to its circumstances and there is no justification for suggesting any particular community should be delivered in a certain way or in accordance with a particular model.	Delete 'where appropriate'.	NEA wording supported as Garden Community principles support innovative approaches to delivery, particularly given the period over which the garden communities will be developed. Issue will be addressed in Examination hearings on other Matters.
AM 119 CAUSE	The requirement to ensure landowners and developers bear all the infrastructure costs is	No specific wording provided.	Wording does not confine funding to specific sources only. Issue will be covered in

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	inconsistent with the NEA reliance on HIF bids.		Matter 7 and Viability Technical seminar.
AM 152 Lightwood	There is no reason to mention new models of delivery in SP7(ii) The proposed wording falsely lays all 'costs' and the landowners and promoters door, and ignores the need for taxpayer funding	Delete 'deploying new models of delivery where appropriate'	NEA wording supported as Garden Community principles support innovative approaches to delivery. Issue will be addressed in Examination hearings on other Matters.
AM160 L&Q, Cirrus Land, G120 (Carter Jonas LLP)	The respondent supports the proposed deletion of " <i>sharing risk and reward</i> " within Mod 71. However, the proposed inclusion of " <i>where appropriate</i> " does not go far enough in addressing the Inspector's initial concern that new models of delivery were being unnecessarily favoured by the Councils without any evidential support. The effect of this would be damaging where the alternative proposed by the Delivery Partners is clearly justified, well-funded and experienced upon a development. In the proposed amended form, the policy still provides a default towards the implication of new models of delivery. This flips the burden of proof, placing the onus on any future applicant to show	<i>The public sector working pro-actively and collaboratively with the private sector to design, and bring forward these garden communities, deploying new models of delivery where appropriate and ensuring that the cost of achieving the following is borne by landowners and those promoting the developments:</i>	The caveat 'where appropriate' is considered to provide an appropriate balance between supporting innovation and recognizing that these may not always be appropriate.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>why it would not be appropriate to deploy new models of delivery. As the Inspector previously concluded, there is no substantial evidence to show that only new, unconfirmed models of delivery are capable of achieving the policy's objectives, and should be the default unless demonstrated otherwise.</p>		
<p>Proposed Amendment 72 Policy SP7 criteria (v) To meet the requirements of those most in need including a minimum of 30% affordable housing in each garden community.</p>			
<p>AM 136 Mersea Homes</p>	<p>The previous Hearing sessions gave some consideration to the affordable housing requirements and the use of the term "minimum" in the context of the previously proposed viability work. Irrespective of viability, however, we would question the need for the use of the word "minimum" when the SHMA suggests that the affordable housing requirements for Braintree, Colchester and Tendring are 25.8%, 30.2% and 27.3% respectively i.e. it is unclear what the policy justification is for seeking in excess of 30% affordable housing anyway.</p>	<p>Remove the word 'minimum'.</p>	<p>Affordable housing requirements reflect viability in addition to need, so actual need is higher. The NEAs expect the Garden Community model to have greater potential to address this actual need and to provide over 30% affordable housing when appropriate.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>Proposed Amendment 73 Policy SP7 criteria (vi) In accordance with the Garden Community Charter principle of providing one job per household within the new community or within a short distance by public transport, provide and promote opportunities for employment within each new community and within sustainable commuting distance of it. Around 850,000 square metres of floorspace will be provided in total, with allocations to be defined within Development Plan Documents for each Garden Community totalling some 138 hectares.</p>			
AM 136 Mersea Homes	The conversion of a target for jobs in to a land use requirement is not an exact science, and is dependent upon a number of assumptions. These include assumptions not just about floorspace, plot ratio and density of employment, but also the sectors in which employment is generated. Whilst it is useful to have a floorspace/site area for employment land as a guide a more accurate approach may be to reference the target for employment in terms of job creation for each Garden Community, or else otherwise amend the policy to refer to a land area or employment/jobs equivalent.	No specific wording given, but amend target to refer to job creation for each Garden Community or alternatively refer to a land area or employment/jobs equivalent.	Floorspace and hectares used as they are standard metric for employment land provision in Local Plans in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Issue will be addressed in Matter 2 hearing.
AM 196 Parker Strategic	In the context of the Garden Communities, it is recommended that further clarity is provided on opportunities for employment	No specific wording provided.	The NEA consider that the policy is sufficiently clear that the figure of 138 hectares represents the total amount of

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>which represent ‘a <i>sustainable commuting distance</i>’ to the Garden Community, as this is currently undefined.</p> <p>The amendment goes on to confirm that 850,000 sqm will be provided in total, with allocations totalling 138 hectares to be defined within Development Plan Documents. It is of note that these requirements relate to the ‘Final State’ and not the quantum of employment land to be delivered within the current Plan period, which is the subject of the Section 1 Local Plans.</p> <p>It is recommended that the suggested amendment is updated to acknowledge this distinction and the levels of employment land delivery proposed across each Garden Community during the Plan period.</p> <p>It should also be updated to reflect the total provision outlined within Suggested Amendment 70, which implies 140 hectares will be provided across the three Garden Communities</p>		<p>floorspace to be delivered across the three garden communities. The issues raised will be covered by the Matter 2 examination hearing. It is noted that the slight discrepancy in the individual employment land figures in Policy SP7 totalling 140 hectares versus the total figure in SP7 criteria (vi) reflect the fact that the individual figures have been rounded up to the nearest whole number of hectares.</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 74 Policy SP7 criteria (xi)</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>Secure a smart and sustainable approach that fosters climate resilience and a 21st century environment in the design and construction of each garden community to secure net gains in local biodiversity, highest standards of energy efficiency and innovation in technology to reduce impact of climate change, the incorporation of innovative water efficiency/re-use measures (with the aim of being water neutral in identified areas of serious water stress), and sustainable waste and mineral management.</p>			
<p>AM 128 Essex Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>Require net gains in biodiversity to be measurable</p>	<p>Amend wording as follows: to secure measurable net gains in local biodiversity</p>	<p>As a definition it is understood that biodiversity net gain (or net gains in local biodiversity) means leaving the environment in a better state and is additional to measures required to mitigate harm.</p> <p>While not necessary for soundness to include the word 'measurable' as this forms part of the principles of BNG, the NEAs would not oppose its inclusion to increase clarity.</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 75 SP7 criteria (iv), F17 of SP8 and F18 or policy SP9 and SP10</p>			
<p>AM132 EA AM94, AM95, AM96, AM98 AWS</p>	<p>Environment Agency: Sequencing of development and infrastructure provision (both on-site and off-site) to ensure that the latter is provided ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports to address the impacts of the new garden communities,</p>	<p>Add to all policies listed above as follows: To ensure new development does not have an adverse effect on any European Protected or nationally important sites and complies with environmental legislation (notably the Water Framework</p>	<p>Wording agreed for proposed amendments in Statement of Common Ground signed by NEAs, Environment Agency and Anglian Water.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>meet the needs of residents and establish sustainable travel patterns. To ensure new development does not have an adverse effect on any European Protected sites or contribute to a breach of important environmental legislation (notably Water Framework Directive & Habitats Directive), the required waste water infrastructure and treatment capacity must be available including any associated sewer connections ahead of the occupation of dwellings.</p> <p>This paragraph is repeated in Section F “Other requirements” in points 17 and 18. We suggest the amended wording to be added to all sections containing this paragraph.</p> <p>Anglian Water</p> <p>As drafted the policy would require investment to be made to at the receiving Water Recycling Centre in advance of planning permission being granted. However the timing of any investment is dependant upon the certainty of when development will come forward.</p>	<p>Directive and the Habitats Directive), the required waste water treatment capacity must be available ahead of the occupation of dwellings in advance of planning consent.</p>	

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>Similarly developers would apply directly to Anglian Water as sewerage undertaker to connect to the public sewerage network in accordance with the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 rather than as part of a planning application to the relevant North Essex Authorities. Applications to Anglian Water can be made at any time and are not required to be made in advance of planning permission being granted.. As such we unable to specify when an application is made to Anglian Water to connect to the public sewerage network. For this reasons the wording as proposed is ineffective.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that Policy SP10 is amended to make this clear and ensure the policy is effective.</p>		
<p>Proposed Amendment 76 SP7 final paragraph A Development Plan Document will be developed for each of the garden communities to set out how they will deliver the above principles as well as further detail of their design, development and phasing. as well as a A mechanism to appropriately distribute housing completions to the three Councils and this will be agreed through a Memorandum of Understanding</p>			
AM 119 CAUSE	Additional text should be added to the final paragraph to make clear	No specific wording provided but paragraph should add reference to	Community and stakeholder empowerment through

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>that the DPDs should be the subject of community and stakeholder empowerment through proportionate consultation. Any planning applications for the Garden Communities should not be prepared or submitted prior to the DPDs being adopted.</p> <p>We note that the DPDs will need to be the subject of separate consultation, examination and Inspection. Separate DPDs should be prepared for each of the Garden Communities – there are 3 distinct settlements and require 3 Separate policy documents.</p>	<p>community and stakeholder empowerment through proportionate consultation.</p>	<p>proportionate consultation is already enshrined in the 1st bullet point of the policy. The NEAs agree that separate DPDs will be prepared for each Garden Community.</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 77 Policy SP8 First Para The adopted policies map identifies the broad location for the development of a new garden community of which the details and final number of homes along with allocations supporting the delivery of B use employment space will be set out in a Strategic Growth Development Plan Document to be prepared jointly between Colchester BC and Tendring DC and which will incorporate around 2,500 dwellings within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7,000-9,000 homes) and provision for Gypsy and Travellers.</p>			
<p>AM 79 Maldon Council</p>	<p>The policies map only shows broad locations for the development of the garden community. As the planning of the Garden Communities has been delegated down to a Strategic Growth DPD, the strategic areas</p>	<p>Show precise boundaries for Garden Communities on Local Plan policies maps.</p>	<p>The maps show defined areas for the garden community areas of search. The exact boundaries will not be set until DPD stage. Statement of Common Ground does not include this</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	as shown on the policies maps can be indicative only. It is insufficient to allocate 5,910 homes to these Garden Communities in this plan period, based on an indicative area. To provide more certainty, these areas should be defined more clearly on the Local Plan policies maps.		as a point of difference between the councils.
AM 153 Pigeon Investments	The proposed amendments also refer to a 'Local Plan trajectory', which is not included as part of the technical consultation. It is therefore unclear what assumptions have been made in respect of when the first housing completions are anticipated. This should be clearly set out in the Section 1 Plan to allow for effective monitoring.	Housing trajectory for Garden Communities should be provided.	Trajectory has been added to examination documents and is attached as Appendix 1 to this statement. Section 2s of Local Plans will set out full trajectories.
<p>Proposed Amendment 78 Policy SP8 new third paragraph For the Plan period up to 2033 Tendring District Council and Colchester Borough Council agree that housing delivery from the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community will be distributed to the Authorities as set out in the published Local Plan trajectory, irrespective of where they are built. Should there be additional or fewer new dwellings delivered up to 2033 in the Garden Community then the number above or below the cumulative number will be distributed evenly between the Authorities. If there remains a shortage of overall delivery against need then each Authority, having taken 50% of the shortfall into account, would need to make up the shortfall within their Authority area given their overall Authority position.</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM 153 Pigeon Investment	We welcome the further clarity that is provided in respect of the distribution of any surplus or shortfall of housing between the Authorities. However, we would suggest that further clarification is required in respect of the mechanism by which the shortfall will be addressed	No specific wording provided.	Proposed further amendment, as agreed in Maldon District Council Statement of Common Ground, provides that housing shortfall will be addressed by agreed Essex-wide protocol.
AM 222 Taylor Wimpey	The approach to allocating shortfall is considered inconsistent with the requirements of the 2012 NPPF in relation to addressing readily foreseeable changes (paragraph 14). Paragraph 73 of the NPPF (2019) details how assessments of land supply should be assessed having regard to the housing requirement in adopted policies – in the North East Authorities case this would be policy SP3. Consequently, any assessment of the adequacy of housing land supply must be derived from the extent that delivery within the respective Authority has met the requirements of the Plan. This approach of relying upon the annual requirements in the Development Plan rather than an	The addition to policy SP8 should be amended in order to ensure upper case policy includes a clear explanation that all assessments of housing supply will be undertaken at the respective Authority level; with each Council undertaking separate assessments of the extent that the overall target has been achieved.	Given the cross-border nature of the proposals and the boundary-blind approach which will be adopted to master planning, this approach is considered appropriate. Proposed further amendment, as agreed in Maldon District Council Statement of Common Ground, provides that housing shortfall will be addressed by agreed Essex-wide protocol.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	artificial trajectory as envisaged in Policy SP8 is also inconsistent with the advice in the NPPF (2012 (Paragraph 47). This also emphasises the importance of the Authority's housing requirements to inform the adequacy of land supply.		
<p>Proposed Amendment 79 Policies SP8, 9, 10 Para A2 Planning applications for this garden community will be expected to be consistent with, and follow on from, the approved DPDs and subsequent masterplans and design and planning guidance. A Heritage Impact Assessment for each DPD in accordance with Historic England guidance will be required in order to assess impact of proposed allocations upon the historic environment, to inform the appropriate extent, nature and form of the development and establish any mitigation measures necessary.</p>			
AM 119 CAUSE	<p>Note comments on sequencing in relation to planning applications and the DPDs at reference 76 above.</p> <p>We note that Historic England raised concerns in the consultation on methodology to be used for the Additional SA, stating that "The impact of proposals on the significance of heritage assets should be taken into consideration at an early stage", by which we understand from the submission means at plan-making stage, not DPD.</p>	No specific wording provided.	A Statement of Common Ground is being discussed with Historic England which includes a framework for future HIA work.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>Proposed Amendment 81 Policy SP81 Para D.7 A package of measures will be introduced to encourage smarter transport choices to meet the needs of the new community and maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel. As highlighted in Policy SP5 funding and route commitments for the following strategic transport infrastructure will be required to be in place in advance of the Tendring / Colchester Borders Garden Community starting: A120-A133 Link road A scheme and specification for a phased rapid transit network and programme for the integration of the Garden Community into the rapid transit network Additional transport priorities including the provision of a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways to enhance permeability within the site and to access the adjoining areas; development of a public rapid transit system connecting the garden community to Essex University and Colchester town centre park and ride facilities and other effective integrated measures to mitigate the transport impacts of the proposed development on the strategic and local road network. Longer term transport interventions will need to be carefully designed to minimise the impacts on the strategic and local road transport network and fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts arising from the development. These shall include bus (or other public transit provisions) priority measures between the site, University of Essex, Hythe station and Colchester Town Centre;</p>			
AM 119 CAUSE	The respondents recommend an amendment for the terms of sequencing, making clear that funding and route commitments for the strategic transport infrastructure would be required to be in place before the commencement of the DPDs	No precise wording provided, but assumed that 'in advance of DPD preparation' would need to be added: ...the following strategic transport infrastructure will be required to be in place in advance of commencement of the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community DPD	The DPD is an integral part of defining and securing the wider infrastructure and its preparation should not be delayed to await full resolution of all matters related to securing transport infrastructure. Matter 6 discussions at the examination will cover this issue.
<p>Proposed Amendment 84 Policy SP8, Para F17 and SP9, Para F18 The delivery of smart, innovative and sustainable water efficiency/re-use</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
<p>solutions that fosters climate resilience and a 21st century approach towards water supply, water and waste water treatment and flood risk management. Provision of improvements to waste water treatment plant including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plan and off-site drainage improvements aligned with the phasing of the development within the plan period and that proposed post 2033.</p>			
<p>AM 137 Environment Agency</p>	<p>Additional guidance on appropriate approaches to flood risk advised.</p>	<p>The delivery of smart, innovative and sustainable water efficiency/re-use solutions that fosters climate resilience and a 21st century approach towards water supply, water and waste water treatment and flood risk management. This will include taking a strategic approach to Flood Risk through the use of Strategic Flood Risk Assessments and the updated Climate Projections 2019 and identifying opportunities for Natural Flood Risk Management...</p>	<p>Wording agreed for proposed amendments in Statement of Common Ground signed by NEAs, Environment Agency and Anglian Water.</p>
<p>Proposed Amendment 85 Policy SP8 Para F. 20 Avoidance, Protection and/or enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets within and surrounding the site, including Bullock Wood SSI, Ardleigh Gravel Pits SSSI, Wivenhoe Pits SSSI and Upper Colne Marshes SSSI and relevant European protected sites. Contributions will be secured towards mitigation measures identified in the Essex-wide Recreational Disturbance, Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS). Wintering bird surveys will be undertaken at the appropriate time of year as part of the DOD preparation to identify any offsite functional habitat. Should any be identified, development must firstly avoid impacts. Where this is not possible, it must be phased to deliver habitat creation and management either on- or off-site to mitigate any significant impacts.</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM183 Natural England	We note the policy additions as outlined within the HRA relating to mitigation requirements for the Tendring/Colchester border. We support this inclusion within policy, notably the requirement for wintering bird surveys, but note that the need for the commitment to the phasing of development and mitigation, as outlined within the recommendations of the HRA, has not been referenced	The text should be further updated to reflect this requirement.	A Statement of Common Ground is being discussed with between Natural England to respond to this comment.
<p>New Proposed Amendment 85A SP8 New para F.25 Allocation of additional land within the Garden Community to accommodate University expansion which is at least equivalent in size to the allocation in the Colchester Local Development Framework Site Allocations document October 2010</p>			
AM 163 University of Essex	Not all the matters agreed with Colchester and Tendring Councils, in the Statement of Common Ground, have been incorporated into the policy. In particular, it was agreed that Part of Policy SP8 would be amended to make specific reference to the University's expansion needs with the following wording to be added: 'Allocation of additional land within the Garden Community to accommodate University expansion which is at least	The new Local Plan must replace the existing allocation – which the Council proposes to delete. In the absence of a commitment to do so (in Policy SP8), the University has to reinstate / maintain its original objections (CBC Rep No's. 6154 and 6171 and Tendring Rep No's LPP51 and 55).	Proposed additional para SP8 F.25 agreed and reflected in the updated Statement of Common Ground between the University of Essex and the Colchester/Tendring Councils.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	equivalent in size to the allocation in the Colchester Local Development Framework Site Allocations document October 2010'.		
<p>Proposed Amendment 87 SP9 first para The adopted policies map identifies the broad location for the development of a new garden community of which the details and final number of homes along with allocations supporting the delivery of B use employment space will be set out in a Strategic Growth Development Plan Document to be prepared jointly between Colchester BC and Braintree DC and which will incorporate around 2,500, 1,350 dwellings within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 15-00-24,000 homes) and provision for Gypsy and Travellers.</p>			
AM 82 Maldon Council	The policies map only shows broad locations for the development of the garden community. As the planning of the Garden Communities has been delegated down to a Strategic Growth DPD, the strategic areas as shown on the policies maps can be indicative only. It is insufficient to allocate 5,910 homes to these Garden Communities in this plan period, based on an indicative area. To provide more certainty, these areas should be defined more clearly on the Local Plan policies maps.	Show precise boundaries for Garden Communities on Local Plan policies maps.	The maps show defined areas for the garden community areas of search. The exact n boundaries will not be set until DPD stage. Statement of Common Ground does not include this as a point of difference between the councils.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM 151 Williams Group	The number of homes stated to be delivered at the Colchester/Braintree borders Garden Community site should be reduced in line with the review of delivery rates as described in our response to Policy SP2.	No specific number provided.	The NEA's proposed Plan period housing yield for CBBGC is considered to be appropriate in the context of infrastructure and delivery issues. These issues are to be explored in Examination sessions on Build out Rates (Matter 4) and Infrastructure (Matter 6).
AM138 Crest Nicholson. Operations Ltd, RF West Ltd, Livelihoods and David G Sherwood (Andrew Martin Planning Limited)	No explanation given for reduction in dwelling figure.	Explanation should be provided.	The revised housing numbers reflect a realistic assessment of delivery based on the need to ensure necessary transport improvements in advance of delivery of the CBBGC Garden Community.
AM 154 Pigeon Investments	Whilst we note that the number of new dwellings that are proposed to be delivered at Colchester/Braintree Borders has been reduced to 1,350 dwellings, it is unclear when the first completions are anticipated in the absence of the 'Local Plan Trajectory' referred to in the policy.	Housing trajectory for Garden Communities should be provided.	Trajectory has been added to examination documents and is attached as Appendix 1 to this statement. Section 2s of Local Plans will set out full trajectories.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM160 L&Q, Cirrus Land, G120 (Carter Jonas LLP)	Reference to overall total of between 7,000 and 9,000 homes is a typo and does not appear to be suggested as an amendment. Oppose suggested reduction in housing yield of CBBGC proposed within the Plan period to 1,350 dwellings as no rationale nor any evidence to support this proposed delay in the delivery of CBBGC.	“The adopted policies map identifies the broad location for the development of a new garden community of which the details and final number of homes along with allocations supporting the delivery of B use employment space will be set out in a Strategic Growth Development Plan Document to be prepared jointly between Colchester BC and Braintree DC and which will incorporate around a minimum of 2,500 1,350 dwellings within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7,000-9,000 15,000-24,000 homes) and provision for Gypsy and Travellers”	Typo was limited to on-line version of EB/091 Suggested Amendments only. The revised housing numbers reflect a realistic assessment of delivery based on the need to ensure necessary transport improvements in advance of delivery of the CBBGC Garden Community.
<p>Proposed Amendment 88 SP9 new third para For the Plan period up to 2033 Colchester Borough Council and Braintree District Council agree that housing delivery from the Colchester Braintree Borders Garden will be distributed to the Authorities as set out in the published Local Plan trajectory, irrespective of where they are built. Should there be additional or fewer new dwellings delivered up to 2033 in the Garden Community then the number above or below the cumulative number will be distributed evenly between the Authorities. If there remains a shortage of overall delivery against need then each Authority, having taken 50% of the shortfall into account, would need to make up the shortfall within their Authority area given their overall Authority position.</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM 61 Wellbeck Strategic Land	Clarity should be given about where any shortfall in housing is expected to be delivered. As an example, within Colchester Borough it would be appropriate for housing growth to occur at sustainable settlements, as defined in the Section 2 Local Plan.	No specific wording provided.	The spatial strategy provides sufficient guidance on the preferred sustainable hierarchy for the location of new development.
AM 154 Pigeon Investment	We welcome the further clarity that is provided in respect of the distribution of any surplus or shortfall of housing between the Authorities. However, we would suggest that further clarification is required in respect of the mechanism by which the shortfall will be addressed.	No specific wording provided.	Proposed further amendment, as agreed with Maldon District Council, provides that housing shortfall will be addressed by agreed Essex-wide protocol.

Proposed Amendment 91

A package of measures will be introduced to encourage smarter transport choices to meet the needs of the new community and maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel. **As highlighted in Policy SP5 funding and route commitments for the following strategic transport infrastructure will be required to be in place in advance of the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community starting:**

A12 widening and junction improvements

A dualled A120 from Braintree to the A12

A scheme and specification for a phased rapid transit network and programme for the integration of the Garden Communities into the rapid transit network

Additional transport priorities including including the provision of a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways to enhance permeability within the site and to access the adjoining area; development of a public rapid transit system connecting this new garden community to the wider Colchester context; development of opportunities to improve accessibility to Marks Tey rail station (or provide for its relocation to a more central location within the garden community);

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
and effective measures to mitigate the transport impacts of the proposed development on the strategic and local road network.			
AM 119 CAUSE	The respondents recommend an amendment terms of sequencing, making clear that funding and route commitments for the strategic transport infrastructure would be required to be in place before the commencement of the DPDs	No precise wording provided, but assumed that 'in advance of DPD preparation' would need to be added: ...the following strategic transport infrastructure will be required to be in place in advance of commencement of the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community DPD	The DPD is an integral part of defining and securing the wider infrastructure and its preparation should not be delayed to await full resolution of all matters related to securing transport infrastructure. Matter 6 discussions at the examination will cover this issue.
AM160 L&Q, Cirrus Land, G120 (Carter Jonas LLP)	The respondents do not support the wording stating funding and route commitments for the A12 and A120 improvements, as well as a scheme and specification for a phased RTS will be required to be in place in advance of the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community starting. There is potential to deliver over 2,500 dwelling phase of a garden community before the widening of the A12 is completed, and up to a 9,000 dwelling garden community before a dualled A120 is delivered. The RTS comprises a regional project that will provide a benefit to	Deletion of proposed wording providing commitments to specific schemes: funding and route commitments for the following strategic transport infrastructure will be required to be in place in advance of the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community starting: □ A12 widening and junction improvements □ A dualled A120 from Braintree to the A12 Page 21 of 38 □ A scheme and specification for a phased rapid transit network and programme for the integration of	The wording is required as it supports the NEAs commitment to delivery of infrastructure to support Garden Communities. The issue will be explored in Examination sessions on Matter 6.

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	each garden community when/if delivered. An RTS is not a requirement of West Tey and does not form a justification for why it is a sustainable and deliverable site for delivering the long term growth needs of the NEAs	the Garden Communities into the rapid transit network	
AM138 Crest Nicholson. Operations Ltd, RF West Ltd, Livelihoods and David G Sherwood (Andrew Martin Planning Limited)	New wording for funding and route commitments should not preclude development of a sustainable urban extension to Marks Tey or an early phase of the GV where it would not overburden existing infrastructure. Consistency issue with suggested amendment 92.	Amendment should not preclude standalone urban extension to Marks Tey. <i>“or provide for its relocation to a more central location within the garden community”</i> should be deleted.	This would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy proposed.
<p>Proposed Amendment 92 Policy SP9 Para D11 Opportunities will be explored to establish how Marks Tey rail station can be made more accessible to residents of the new community including relocation of the station to a more central location and improvement of walking, cycling and public transport links to the station.</p>			
AM149 Marks Tey Parish Council	In the removal of the commitment to move Marks Tey station. MTPC would like to see some commitment to accessibility and the provision and management of formal and informal car parking for	Addition of wording on improved accessibility and car parking at existing station in Marks Tey.	Wording on improved accessibility is considered adequate. The need for additional car parking can't be assumed in the context of

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	an expanding facility given strategic commitment in the Plan.		improved accessibility by other means.
<p>Proposed Amendment 94 SP10 1st Para The adopted policies map identifies the broad location for the development of a new garden community of which the details and final number of homes along with allocations supporting the delivery of B use employment space will be set out in a Strategic Growth Development Plan Document to be prepared jointly between Braintree DC and Uttlesford DC if applicable and which will incorporate around 2,500 2,060 dwellings within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7,000-10,000 homes) and provision for Gypsy and Travellers.</p>			
AM 86 Maldon Council	The policies map only shows broad locations for the development of the garden community. As the planning of the Garden Communities has been delegated down to a Strategic Growth DPD, the strategic areas as shown on the policies maps can be indicative only. It is insufficient to allocate 5,910 homes to these Garden Communities in this plan period, based on an indicative area. To provide more certainty, these areas should be defined more clearly on the Local Plan policies maps.	Show precise boundaries for Garden Communities on Local Plan policies maps.	The maps show defined areas for the garden community areas of search. The exact boundaries will not be set until DPD stage. Statement of Common Ground does not include this as a point of difference between the councils.
AM 151 Williams Group	The number of homes stated to be delivered in Braintree District at the West of Braintree Garden	No specific housing number of strategic transport improvement wording provided.	The NEA's proposed Plan period housing yield and infrastructure requirements

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	Community site should be reduced in line with the review of delivery rates as described in our response to Policy SP2. A delivery mechanism and the detail of the strategic transport improvements needed for this proposal should be set out and reflect the requirements referred to in the infrastructure evidence base.		for WOBGC are considered to be appropriate in the context of infrastructure and delivery issues. These issues are to be explored in Examination sessions on Build out Rates (Matter 4) and Infrastructure (Matter 6).
AM155 Pigeon Investments	Whilst we note that the number of new dwellings that are proposed to be delivered at West of Braintree has been reduced to 2,060 dwellings, it is unclear when the first completions are anticipated in the absence of the 'Local Plan Trajectory' referred to in the policy. The trajectory should be included with the amendments to the Section 1 Plan.	Housing trajectory for Garden Communities should be provided.	Trajectory has been added to examination documents and is attached as Appendix 1 to this statement. Section 2s of Local Plans will set out full trajectories.
<p>Proposed Amendment 94 SP10 First para The adopted policies map identifies the broad location for the development of a new garden community of which the details and final number of homes along with allocations supporting the delivery of B use employment space will be set out in a Strategic Growth Development Plan Document to be prepared jointly between Braintree DC and Uttlesford DC if applicable and which will incorporate around 2,500 2,060 dwellings within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7,000-10,000 homes) and provision for Gypsy and Travellers.</p>			
AM 55 Galliard	The DPD should be the product of participation by the promoters as well as the 2 Councils, and some	No specific wording provided.	There will be engagement with members of the public and promoters as part of the

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	of the information required may be provided by a planning application that will run in parallel to minimise delays in the planning process.		DPD preparation process. The policy wording is clear that any planning application is expected to follow on from the approved DPD (i.e. the DPD will be in place first).
AM 148 Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium	The respondents object to the proposed reduced requirement for 2,060, rather than 2,500 dwellings to be provided at the WBGC within the Plan period. It is submitted that the revised delivery target of 2,060 is not justified, and that delivery rates can be achieved to ensure 2,500 dwellings are completed within the Plan period. It is submitted that more than 300 dwellings per annum can be delivered at the WBGC	The respondents consider that an amendment should be made to policy SP10 to either revert back to the previous delivery requirement for the WBGC of 2,500 dwellings within the Plan period, or alternatively to make clear through strengthened wording that 2,060 represents an absolute minimum and that the NEAs expect to deliver more than 2,060 dwellings within the Plan period.	The NEAs consider the revised figure of 2,060 accurately reflects delivery considerations. The issue will be covered in examination hearings, including Matter 4.
<p>Proposed Amendment 95 SP10 New 4th para Within the Plan period completions in a given year will be assigned to BDC and UDC in line with the trajectory contained within the Local Plans regardless of where dwellings are built in the Garden Community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Plan period if the site over-delivers on housing in a given year then that over-delivery will be split 75% BDC and 25% UDC regardless of where the dwellings are built in the Garden Community. • Within the Plan period if the site under-delivers on housing in a given year the number of homes delivered will be split 75% BDC and 25% UDC regardless of where the dwellings are built in the Garden Community • The total number of dwellings assigned to UDC will not exceed 3,500, or any subsequent figure for dwellings in Uttlesford defined in the West of Braintree DPD. The total number of dwellings assigned to BDG will not exceed 10,000 or any subsequent figure for dwellings defined in the West of Braintree DPD. 			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
This will not artificially constrain the DPD in identifying the capacity of the site, the capacity of the site will be design-led and defined through the DPD and subsequent planning applications.			
AM 155 Pigeon Investment	We welcome the further clarity that is provided in respect of the distribution of any surplus or shortfall of housing between the Authorities. However, we would suggest that further clarification is required in respect of the mechanism by which the shortfall will be addressed	No specific wording provided.	Proposed further amendment, as agreed with Maldon District Council, provides that housing shortfall will be addressed by agreed Essex-wide protocol.
AM199 Pegasus Planning	There are clear implications for the soundness of both UDC and NEA plans. The NEAs' proposed modifications affect the soundness of the UDC Plan and it is possible that further modifications to the policy and the apportionment of dwellings will be necessary for UDC and in turn, the NEAs.	As a proposed remedy, we recommend that the change in the apportionment of dwellings at West of Braintree is supported by a clear explanation of why that has happened, prepared jointly by UDC and the NEAs, and subject to consultation through both Examinations.	The level of detail provided within the policy is considered sufficient given that the approach to over-and under-delivery is based on a straightforward formula-based calculation.
<p>Proposed Amendment 97 SP10 Para F.17 The delivery of smart, innovative and sustainable water efficiency/re-use solutions that fosters climate resilience and a 21st century approach towards water supply, water and waste water treatment and flood risk management. Provision of improvements to waste water treatment and off-site drainage improvements aligned with the phasing of the development within the plan period and that proposed post-2033.</p>			

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
AM 137 Environment Agency	Additional guidance on appropriate approaches to flood risk advised.	Add additional sentence – The delivery of smart, innovative and sustainable water efficiency/re-use solutions that fosters climate resilience and a 21st century approach towards water supply, water and waste water treatment and flood risk management. This will include taking a strategic approach to Flood Risk through the use of Strategic Flood Risk Assessments and the updated Climate Projections 2019 and identifying opportunities for Natural Flood Risk Management.	Wording agreed for proposed amendments in Statement of Common Ground signed by NEAs, Environment Agency and Anglian Water.
<p>Proposed Amendment 98 Policy SP10 F.20 Avoidance, Protection and/or enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets within and surrounding the site including Great Saling Hall conservation area and areas of deciduous woodland within and adjoining the site. Contributions will be secured toward mitigation measures identified in the Essex wide Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) as outlined in Policy SP1B.</p>			
AM73 Ms. Margaret Rufus	Heritage and biodiversity assets should be treated separately as they are in the NPPF, but more importantly, RAMS only relates to mitigation strategies for coastal habitats - so far as I am aware the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community is an inland	Incorporate list of all priority habitats and mitigation strategies.	Amendments being discussed with Historic England would have the effect of separating out the heritage and biodiversity limbs of the policy. All proposed Garden Community sites lie within Zone of

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	<p>site. RAMS is therefore entirely irrelevant in this context and the paragraph should be amended to reflect this. Policy SP 10 should be amended to identify all those priority habitats in and around the proposed Garden Community that fall within the purview of the NPPF, accompanied by a brief statement of how the impact from the proposed development on each will be adequately mitigated.</p>		<p>Influence covered by RAMS. Additional reference to RAMs have been added which signposts source of information on habitats and mitigation strategies. Issue will be covered by Matter 1 HRA examination hearing.</p>
<p>AM 127 Essex Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>Pods Brook should be protected by suitable buffers of natural vegetation and managed carefully for the benefit of otters and water voles. Other key habitats, including Boxted Wood, Golden Grove and Rumley Wood should be protected and connectivity enhanced through additional habitat creation to secure a measurable net gain in biodiversity across the site. To conform with NPPF para.174</p>	<p>Amend text as proposed.</p>	<p>NEAs would support amended wording as follows if needed for clarity. <i>Pods Brook should be protected by suitable buffers of natural vegetation and managed carefully for the benefit of otters and water voles. The key habitats of Boxted Wood, Golden Grove and Rumley Wood will be protected.</i></p>
<p>AM 148 Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium</p>	<p>The respondents recommend that further clarity is provided to policy SP10 that a Heritage Impact Assessment will be prepared to inform both the</p>	<p>No specific wording provided.</p>	<p>Wording being discussed with Historic England would address this point.</p>

Rep. ID	Issue	Amendment suggested by respondent	NEA Response
	WBGC Development Plan Document and / or a planning application.		
No Suggested Amendment Reference Appendices and Maps			
AM135 Mersea Homes	Concerns that were previously raised regarding the different graphical approaches to the treatment of the three Garden Communities, and in particular the graphics used for the TCBGC, are not covered by any proposed Modifications to the Policies Map.	Updated maps should be provided.	Maps illustrate adopted policy and will be revised if required to accurately reflect areas of search in the final adopted Local Plan
AM20 Anthony Dunn	Map 10.1 (Key Diagram) shows West of Colchester and East of Braintree Garden Community in a different location to Map 10.3.	Consultation should make clear where New Town is proposed to be located.	Maps illustrate adopted policy and will be revised if required to accurately reflect areas of search in the final adopted Local Plan

APPENDIX 1

Garden Communities Trajectory and explanatory note (EXD/070)

Question from the Inspector:

Suggested Amendments 78, 88 and 95 in EB/091 refer to “the published Local Plan trajectory / the trajectory contained within the Local Plans”. Could the NEAs please clarify which trajectory this refers to and where it is published?

North Essex Authorities reply:

The reference to the 'published Local Plan trajectory' in EB/091 is in fact the relevant housing numbers in the submitted Section 2 element of each Local Plan of the three Authorities. Some of these Section 2s actually have tables not trajectories as such. These Section 2 figures will need amending in the light of revised figures for the anticipated delivery from each Garden Community. In particular, the NEA's had already stated the delivery of the Colchester Braintree Borders proposal would **is being** moved back in the Local Plan period to reflect the infrastructure requirements. The delay in reply is so that we could check the forecasted delivery trajectory in each Garden Community given delays in Local Plan adoption. We include a **The** table of trajectories below for each Garden Community in the Local Plan period which will then inform amended figures for each Authority throughout their Local Plans.

	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	Total in plan period
Tendring Colchester Borders		100	150	200	250	300	300	300	300	300	300	2500
Colchester Braintree Borders							150	300	300	300	300	1350
West of Braintree - BDC		100	200	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	1960

West of Braintree - UDC		0	0	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	740
West of Braintree total		100	200	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	2700
Total	0	200	350	500	550	600	750	900	900	900	900	900	6550