



Colchester Borough Local Plan

Consultation Statement

October 2017

Table of Contents	2
1. Introduction.....	4
2. Legislation and requirements.....	6
3. Which bodies and persons the LPA invited to make reps under regulation 18	7
4. How those bodies and persons were invited to make representation under regulation 18.....	10
Letters and emails.....	10
Drop in sessions	11
Leaflets	13
Press releases	156
Response form.....	18
5. A summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18.....	25
Table 1. Summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to the Preferred Options consultation	37
6. How many representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account.....	103
7. If representation were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations.....	105

Appendices

Appendix A - List of Consultees	133 - 143
Appendix B - Consultation on Colchester Local Plan Issues and Options (Local Plan Committee Report 8 June 2015)	144-165
Appendix C - Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Report with Responses (Local Plan Committee Report 19 December 2017)	166 - 169
Appendix D - Publication Draft Local Plan (Local Plan Committee Report 12 June 2017)	170- 187
Appendix E - Draft Publication Local Plan Consultation Reponses (Local Plan Committee Report 2 October 2017)	188 - 193

Appendix E1 - Section 1 Representation Schedule - see separate document

Appendix E2 - Section 2 Representation Schedule - see separate document

Appendix F - Statement of Representations Procedures

194 - 195

1. Introduction

Colchester Borough Council has prepared a Local Plan to guide development up to 2033. The Local Plan comprises two sections. Section 1, which identifies strategic growth priorities for North Essex, was prepared in partnership with Braintree District Council and Tendring District Council (the North Essex authorities) and also plans for the creation of three garden communities across North Essex, which will include longer term development beyond the plan period. Section 2 is unique to Colchester and includes allocations and policies to guide development in Colchester Borough up to 2033.

The timetable for the Local Plan production, as set out in the Local Development Scheme, has been as follows:

- Issues and Options consultation (Regulation 18) - 16 January - 27 February 2015
- Preferred Options consultation (Regulation 18) – 9 July - 16 September 2016
- Publication Draft consultation (Regulation 19) – 16 June – 11 August 2017
- Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22) October 2017

This Consultation Statement accompanies the submission documents for examination.

In August 2014 the Local Plan Committee authorised initial work on a new Local Plan for Colchester Borough. Initial work included the following elements:

- commissioning of evidence base studies;
- communication and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, including infrastructure providers, Parish/Town Councils, Residents Associations/Community groups, and adjacent authorities;
- a Call for Sites; and
- Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report.

Regulation 18(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 provides that a local planning authority must invite consultees to 'make representations to the local planning authority about what a local plan ought to contain', and that the local authority should then take account of these views when developing its plan. Accordingly, an Issues and Options document seeking views on what the new Local Plan ought to contain was published for public consultation from 16 January to 27 February 2015. At the same time, landowners and developers were invited to put forward potential development sites ('Call for Sites'). The LPA ran further Call for Sites during 2015 and 2016 however the process remained open for site submissions almost until the start of the consultation on the Local Plan Publication draft document.

The Issues and Options document provided background on the plan-making process and then posed a series of open-ended questions on key issues and high level options for growth. The document made it clear that the local planning authority was at the initial stages of considering policy and site allocation options. It also made clear that it was open to suggestions from all respondents on how the Local Plan can best be

revised to meet the needs of a growing population, changing social and economic circumstances, and evolving national policies.

Following the Issues and Options, consultation the local planning authority considered all representations (649), which are summarised in this Statement, the evidence base, national policy, and began the process of drafting the Preferred Options Local Plan.

The Preferred Options Local Plan was published for consultation from 9 July - 16 September 2016 (10 weeks). 3102 representations were received on numerous aspects of the Preferred Options Local Plan. Following consideration of all representations received and further evidence the LPA amended the Preferred Options draft and the Local Plan Committee approved the Publication Draft Local Plan for consultation on 12 June 2017. The Publication Draft Local Plan was published for consultation from 16 June – 11 August 2017 (8 weeks)

Between the Issues and Options consultation and the Preferred Options consultation, the LPA purchased an online based consultation portal called JDi Consult. Following the launch of the portal at Preferred Options stage, the LPA received a number of complaints about the system. In response, the LPA offered training to all Parish and Town Councils and produced a detailed guidance note on how to use the on-line system to respond to the Local Plan Publication stage consultation.

The on-line portal provided an alternative means for consultees to submit their views to emerging Local Plan proposals. Approximately 61% of all responses received to the Preferred Options and Draft Local Plan Publication consultation were submitted via the JDi system.

2. Legislation and requirements

Regulation 17(d) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) states that proposed submission documents include a Consultation Statement. The Consultation Statement must set out:

- (i) Which bodies and persons were invited to make representation under regulation 18;
- (ii) How those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations;
- (iii) A summary of the main issues raised by those representations; and
- (iv) How those main issues have been addressed in the DPD.

Regulation 22(1) (Submission of documents and information to the Secretary of State) states that the documents prescribed for the purposes of section 20(3) of the Act are:

- (a) Sustainability appraisal report
- (b) Submission policies map
- (c) Consultation statement*
- (d) Copies of any representation made in accordance with regulation 20
- (e) Such supporting documents the LPA consider relevant to the preparation of the local plan

* The Consultation Statement must set out:

- (i) which bodies and persons the LPA invited to make reps under regulation 18;
- (ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make representation under regulation 18;
- (iii) a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18;
- (iv) how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account;
- (v) if representation were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations; and
- (vi) if no representations were made that no reps were made.

The following sections address requirements (i) – (v). Representations were made pursuant to regulation 20 and so (vi) is not applicable to the Colchester Local Plan.

3. Which bodies and persons the LPA invited to make reps under regulation 18

The local planning authority maintains a Planning Policy consultation database, which currently contains 2833 consultees. All of these consultees were informed of each of the stages of consultation and invited to make representations. A list of organisations on the LPAs consultation database is included in appendix A. Please note that the individuals on this database have not been listed in the appendix.

Regulation 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended) states that '**general consultation bodies**' means the following bodies:

- (a) voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the authority's area,
- (b) bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the authority's area,
- (c) bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the authority's area,
- (d) bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the authority's area,
- (e) bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying out business in the authority's area.

'**specific consultation bodies**' means:

- (a) in relation to a local planning authority whose area is in a region other than London, means the regional planning body and the bodies specified or described in sub-paragraphs (i) to (x);
 - (i) the Countryside Agency,
 - (ii) the Environment Agency,
 - (iii) the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England),
 - (iv) English Nature,
 - (v) the Strategic Rail Authority,
 - (vi) the Highways Agency,
 - (vii) a relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority,
 - (viii) a Regional Development Agency whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority,
 - (ix) person—
 - (aa) to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003, and

- (bb) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority,
- (x) if it exercises functions in any part of the local planning authority's area
- (aa) a Strategic Health Authority,
- (bb) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989,
- (cc) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986,
- (dd) a sewerage undertaker,
- (ee) a water undertaker;

if the authority are a London Borough Council, means the Mayor of London and the bodies specified or described in paragraph (a)(i) to (x);

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by S100 of the Localism Act 2011) introduced a Duty to Cooperate. Section 33A **Duty to Cooperate** in relation to the planning of sustainable development:

- (1) Each person who is (a) a local planning authority, (b) a county council in England that is not a local planning authority, or (c) a body, or other person that is prescribed or of a prescribed description, must co-operate with every other person who is within paragraph (a), (b) or (c) or subsection (9)

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) Regulation 4(1) states the bodies prescribed for the purposes of section 33A(1)(c) of the Act are:

- (a) The Environment Agency;
- (b) The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as Historic England);
- (c) Natural England;
- (d) The Mayor of London;
- (e) The Civil Aviation Authority;
- (f) The Homes and Communities Agency;
- (g) Each Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006 or continued in existence by virtue of that section (now Clinical Commissioning Groups);
- (h) The Office of Rail Regulations;
- (i) Transport for London;
- (j) Each Integrated Transport Authority;
- (k) Each highway authority within the meaning of section 1 of the Highways Act 1980 (including the Secretary of State, where the Secretary of State is the highways authority); and
- (l) The Marine Management Organisation.

Regulation 4(2) states the bodies prescribed for the purposes of section 33A(9) of the Act are:

- (a) London Enterprise Panel; and
- (b) Each local nature partnership (Essex Wildlife Trust).

The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

Regulation 4(1) identifies the following consultation bodies under the Regulations:

- (a) The Countryside Agency
- (b) Historic England
- (c) Natural England
- (d) Environment Agency

Regulation 18(2)(c) refers to '**local consultees**': such residents or other persons carrying on business in the LPA area from which the LPA consider it appropriate to invite representations.

4. How those bodies and persons were invited to make representation under regulation 18

The LPA carried out two periods of consultation under Regulation 18. The Issues and Options consultation took place between 16 January and 27 February 2015. The Preferred Options consultation took place between 9 July and 16 September 2016.

The LPA has ensured that consultation has complied with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

Letters and emails

The LPA emailed all consultees on the Planning Policy consultation database. These consultees included all of the groups/ people referred to in section (i). Letters were sent to those without an email address.

Below is a copy of the letter sent to statutory consultees as part of the Issues and Options consultation. Please note that all other consultees were sent a slightly amended version of the letter and did not include a copy of the Issues and Options document or Sustainability Appraisal.

Dear ,

Reference: Notification of Colchester Borough Council's Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation - 16 January 2015 - 27 February 2015

The Council is carrying out a consultation on the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Paper, in accordance with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012. The new Local Plan is an important document which will determine the way forward for Colchester. It will provide the strategy for the growth of the Borough, setting out what development will take place and where, to 2032 and beyond. Once adopted, the new Local Plan will replace the Borough's existing local planning policies.

The Plan will set out a vision for the area, establishing the long term aims and aspirations for the Borough going forward. The Plan will include policies and allocations that help to deliver these aims and aspirations.

Enclosed with this letter is a hard copy of the Issues & Options document and Sustainability Appraisal. Also all the details of the consultation, including the Issues and Options Consultation Paper and a questionnaire, are available via our website on the [Issues and Options](#) page.. Paper copies of the consultation documents will be available at Colchester Library during normal opening hours.

Consultation drop-in sessions are being held at the times and locations set out on the website

The consultation runs from Friday 16 January 2015 until 5pm Friday 27 February 2015.

All representations should be made using the online questionnaire, or emailed to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk. Please note that all documents (other than maps and images) should be submitted **in Word format**, pdf submissions will not be accepted.

If you, or someone you know, do not have access to a computer, consultation responses can be posted to:

Spatial Policy

Colchester Borough Council

FREEPOST RLSSL-ZTSR-SGYA

Colchester Essex CO1 1ZE

In conjunction with the Issues and Options consultation the Council is carrying out a further Call for Sites exercise. The Council will be inviting further submissions for the future use of land in the Borough in order to provide an opportunity to those who did not submit sites in 2014. To find out more about the Call for Sites, including how you can submit sites, please visit the [Call for Sites](#) page of the website.

If have any queries about the Issues and Options consultation, or the Local Plan process, please contact the Planning Policy team on 01206 282473 or 01206 508639.

Yours sincerely

Laura Chase

Planning Policy Manager, Spatial Policy

Below is a copy of the email, which was sent to consultees at the start of the Preferred Options consultation. Consultees without an email addresses were sent letters.

Colchester Borough Council Draft Local Plan Preferred Options

Colchester Borough Council is publishing its preferred Options for its new Local Plan under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The primary role of the document is to set out the required housing delivery growth and other land use requirements for the District, to allocate sites to meet that growth, and to produce policies for the determination of planning applications up to 2033. It also includes proposals for strategic development for north Essex.

The full document can be found on the Council's website at www.colchester.gov.uk/localplan

www.colchester.gov.uk
[Colchester Borough Council - Emerging Local Plan 2017-2033](#)

Find out more about the new Local Plan for Colchester Borough.

and is available to view at the Council's offices at Rowan House in Colchester. The supporting evidence base will also be made available and updated on the website as required together with the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA).

The consultation period runs from 9th July to 1th 6th September at 5pm. Late responses are not able to be accepted.

Consultation responses are strongly encouraged directly to the Councils online consultation system available at.

www.colchester.gov.uk/localplan

Drop in sessions

As part of both consultations, exhibitions were held at various locations throughout the Borough. These exhibitions provided consultees the opportunity to discuss the

emerging Local Plan with Planning Officers and also provide support on how to make a representation.

The following drop in sessions were held as part of the Issues and Options consultation:

Date	Time	Location
17 January 2015	10am-2pm	Colchester Library
24 January 2015	10am-2pm	Asda (Turner Rise)
27 January 2015	2pm-6pm	Colchester Library
31 January 2015	10am-2pm	Great Horkesley New Village Hall
7 February 2015	10am-2pm	Tiptree Community Centre
11 February 2015	4pm-8pm	The Mersea Centre (West Mersea)
14 February 2015	10am-2pm	Wivenhoe Scout and Guide Hall
16 February 2015	12pm-8pm	Hythe Community Centre (in conjunction with Hythe Forward)
21 February 2015	10am-2pm	Marks Tey Parish Hall

An estimated 415 people attended the Issues and Options workshops. At the drop-in sessions, attendees were provided with background information on the Local Plan process; copies of the consultation document; opportunities to ask questions of the officers in attendance; the chance to leave initial thoughts on post-it notes; and information on how to respond more formally to the consultation.

The following drop in sessions were held as part of the Preferred Options consultation:

Date	Time	Location
9 July 2016	10-2	Marks Tey Parish Hall Old London Road, Marks Tey CO6 1EJ
12 July 2016	4-8	Langham Community Centre School Road, Langham CO4 5PA
13 July 2016	4-8	The Mersea Centre 38a High Street, West Mersea
15 and 16 July 2016	10-2	Colchester High Street Market Stall
18 July 2016	4-8	Eight Ash Green Village Hall Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green CO6 3QF
18 July 2016	2:30-7:30	Coggeshall (Colchester BC representative present at workshop)

		organised by Braintree District Council St Peters Church CO6 1UD
19 July 2016	4-7	Wakes Colne and Chappel Village Hall Colchester Road, Wakes Colne CO6 2BX
20 July 2016	4:15-8	Tiptree Community Centre 1a Caxton Close, Tiptree CO5 0HA
21 July 2016	4-8	Wivenhoe – William Loveless Hall 85-87 High Street, Wivenhoe CO7 9AB
23 July 2016	10-2	Stanway Village Hall Villa Road, Stanway CO3 0RH
26 July 2016	4-8	Layer de la Haye Village Hall New Cut, Layer de la Haye CO2 0EH
28 July 2016	4-8	Myland Parish Halls Mile End Road CO4 5DY
30 July 2016	10-2	Greenstead Community Centre Hawthorn Ave, Colchester CO4 3QE
2 August 2016	4-8	Rowhedge Village Hall Rectory Road, Rowhedge CO5 7HX
4 August 2016	4-8	Dedham Assembly Rooms High Street, Dedham CO7 6HJ
10 August 2016	4-8	Great Horkesley New Village Hall Tile House Lane, Great Horkesley CO6 4EA

Leaflets

Leaflets and posters were circulated as part of both the Issues and Options and Preferred Options consultations. Copies of these were taken to the drop in sessions, sent to Town/Parish Councils and deposited in Colchester Library. Copies of the posters for both consultations are set out below.



BE PART OF THE **COLCHESTER** CONVERSATION

Help develop a new Local Plan for the Borough

Issues and Options Consultation 16 January - 27 February 2015

Drop-in sessions

Colchester Library Trinity Square, Colchester, CO1 1JB **17 January 10am-2pm & 27 January 2pm-6pm**

Asda Turner Rise, Colchester, CO4 5TU **24 January 10am-2pm**

Great Horkesley New Village Hall Tile House Lane, Great Horkesley, CO6 4EA **31 January 10am-2pm**

Tiptree Community Centre 1a Caxton Close, Tiptree, CO5 0HA **7 February 10am-2pm**

The Mersea Centre 38a High Street, West Mersea, CO5 8QA **11 February 4pm-8pm**

Wivenhoe Scout and Guide Hall Off High Street, Wivenhoe, CO7 9AB **14 February 10am-2pm**

Hythe Community Centre (in conjunction with Hythe Forward) 1 Ventura Drive, Colchester, CO1 2FG
16 February 12pm-8pm

Marks Tey Parish Hall Old London Road, Marks Tey, CO6 1EJ **21 February 10am-2pm**

Contact details

Visit the Council website for more information on the Issues and Options consultation and for regular Local Plan updates – www.colchester.gov.uk

If you have any questions, please contact us at: E-mail – planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk
Telephone – Spatial Policy team, **01206 282473/76/80 or 508639**





BE PART OF THE **COLCHESTER** CONVERSATION

Help develop a new Local Plan for the Borough

Preferred Options Consultation 9 July – 2 September 2016

Drop-in sessions

- Drop-in Sessions Marks Tey Parish Hall** Old London Road, Marks Tey CO6 1EJ **9th July 10am-2pm**
Langham Community Centre School Road, Langham CO4 5PA **12th July 4-8pm**
The Mersea Centre 38a High Street, West Mersea CO5 8QA **13th July 4-8pm**
Colchester High Street Market Stall **15th and 16th July 10am-2pm**
Eight Ash Green Village Hall Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green CO6 3QF **18th July 4-8pm**
Coggeshall (Colchester BC representative present at workshop organised by Braintree District Council)
St Peters Church CO6 1UD 18th July **2:30-7:30pm**
Wakes Colne and Chappel Village Hall Colchester Road, Wakes Colne CO6 2BX 19th **July 4-7pm**
Tiptree Community Centre 1a Caxton Close, Tiptree CO5 0HA **20th July 4:15 – 8pm**
Wivenhoe – William Loveless Hall 85-87 High Street, Wivenhoe CO7 9AB **21st July 4-8pm**
Stanway Village Hall Villa Road, Stanway CO3 0RH **23rd July 10am-2pm**
Layer de la Haye Village Hall New Cut, Layer de la Haye CO2 0EH **26th July 4-8pm**
Myland Parish Halls Mile End Road CO4 5DY **28th July 4-8pm**
Greenstead Community Centre Hawthorn Ave, Colchester CO4 3QE **30th July 10am-2pm**
Rowhedge Village Hall Rectory Road, Rowhedge CO5 7HX **2nd August 4-8pm**
Dedham Assembly Rooms High Street, Dedham CO7 6HJ **4th August 4-8pm**
Great Horkesley New Village Hall Tile House Lane, Great Horkesley CO6 4EA **10th August 4-8pm**

Contact details

Visit the Council website for more information on the Preferred Options consultation and for regular Local Plan updates – www.colchester.gov.uk/localplan

If you have any questions, please contact us at: E-mail – local.plan@colchester.gov.uk
Telephone – Planning Policy team, **01206 282473/76/80**



Press releases

The following press release was prepared for the Issues and Options consultation:

12.1.15

Have your say on future development in Colchester

Colchester Borough Council is producing a new Local Plan to guide development in the Borough and is urging residents and businesses to have their say on what it covers.

The new Local Plan will guide development in the borough to 2032 and beyond. The new Plan will set out the strategy for the growth of the Borough including:

- What types of development are needed
- How much development is needed
- Where the development should be located, and
- When development will happen.

In order to ensure that the Local Plan sets off in the right direction and covers the things it should cover, it is important the Council receives as much input as possible. The initial Issues and Options consultation is the opportunity for residents and businesses to identify any planning issues that they think the new Local Plan should address, and comment on possible ways that the plan might deal with those issues.

The consultation runs from **Friday 16 January to Friday 27 February** and there are a number of ways that people can get involved:

- Attend one of our Local Plan workshops (dates and venues listed below)
- Visit our website and find out more about the new Local Plan consultation:
<http://www.colchester.gov.uk/planningconsult>
- Get in touch with the service directly (contact details below)

Councillor Anne Turrell, Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth and

Regeneration said: “The Local Plan affects everyone and every organisation, both now and for many years to come- that’s why it is important to let us know what you think.

“It is crucial that we make informed choices about the location of new development to allow the Borough to accommodate growth and change in the most sustainable ways possible. The Plan will also set out ways to preserve and enhance the Borough’s existing rich built and natural heritage, we want to hear your views on the best ways to achieve this.”

Once the Issues and Options Consultation closes on Friday 27 February, the Council’s Planning Policy team will collate and summarise the representations that have been received. The comments will then be used alongside the evidence the team will be gathering to produce the Local Plan Preferred Options Paper for consultation. The preferred Options Paper will be in the form of a draft Local Plan.

ENDS

Notes to editors:

Press enquiries please contact communications@colchester.gov.uk or 07815088150.

For further comment please contact: PFH contact details here

Dates and locations of local plan workshops

Please drop in and any time- no need to book:

Date	Time	Location
17 January	10am-2pm	Colchester Library
24 January	10am-2pm	Asda (Turner Rise)
27 January	2pm-6pm	Colchester Library
31 January	10am-2pm	Great Horkesley New Village Hall
7 February	10am-2pm	Tiptree Community Centre
11 February	4pm-8pm	The Mersea Centre (West Mersea)
14 February	10am-2pm	Wivenhoe Scout and Guide Hall
16 February	12pm-8pm	Hythe Community Centre (in conjunction with Hythe Forward)
21 February	10am-2pm	Marks Tey Parish Hall

Service contact details:

Representations should be emailed to: planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

If you do not have access to a computer or the internet, representations can be posted to:

Spatial Policy Team

Colchester Borough Council

FREEPOST RLSSL-ZTSR-SGYA

Colchester

Essex

CO1 1ZE

If you have any queries or problems in relation to the Local Plan Issues and Options consultation, please contact the Planning Policy team using the contact details below:

Email: planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

Telephone: 01206 282473 or 01206 508639

Social Media

Social media was used to promote both the Issues and Options and the Preferred Options consultations. Details of the drop in sessions were promoted via the Council's Facebook page.

Response form

At the Issues and Options stage consultees were asked to complete the following questionnaire:



Issues and Options Consultation Questionnaire

The new Local Plan is an important document which will determine the way forward for Colchester. It will provide the strategy for the growth of the Borough setting out what development will take place, and where, to 2032 and beyond.

This consultation is your opportunity to identify any planning issues that you think the new Local Plan should address, and comment on possible ways that the Plan might deal with those issues. This includes the key issue of identifying where future growth in the Borough might be located.

The Issues and Options Paper identifies a number of issues in each section and asks questions in relation to those issues. These issues and questions are set out in this questionnaire. The Issues and Options Paper should therefore be read in conjunction with this questionnaire. The Issues and Options Paper can be found at <http://www.colchester.gov.uk/article/15275/New-Local-Plan-2017-2032>

This questionnaire contains 32 questions, relating to the questions in the Issues and Options Paper. There is no requirement for you to comment on every issue or to answer every question; we would like you to submit comments on any areas that you wish to. Please note that it is important to comment on things that you may be in support of as well as aspects that you do not support.

The consultation will close on Friday 27 February at 5pm. Responses received after the deadline may not be included in the results. For more information about this consultation please:

- Visit <http://www.colchester.gov.uk/article/15275/New-Local-Plan-2017-2032> ;
- Email planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk; or
- Telephone 01206 282473 or 01206 508639.

Please make sure that your name and contact details are included, as anonymous responses will not be accepted. Please note that following the close of the consultation, and once all comments have been processed, all responses including your name (but excluding your contact details) will be made publicly available.

INTRODUCTION
Key Issues a) Whether the proposed plan period is appropriate b) Whether the scope of the evidence base is appropriate/sufficient
Questions 1. Do you agree that the Plan should cover the period to 2032 and beyond? 2. Do you agree with the scope of the evidence base set out under the heading ' <i>What Information will be used to inform the Plan?</i> ', is there anything that you think is missing from the list, or that you think is not needed?

OVERARCHING LOCAL PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Key Issues

- c) Whether the Issues and Options Paper has covered all of the key issues that the new Local Plan should seek to address
- d) Whether there are any other issues or considerations that we need to take into account or to be aware of in the process of formulating a new Local Plan for the Borough

Questions

- 3. Do you think we have identified all of the key planning issues facing Colchester and which the Plan should address? If not, please set out any additional issues that you have identified, along with your thoughts on how the Plan could address them.
- 4. Do you think we have identified all of the strategic cross-boundary issues? If not, please explain what issue(s) we have missed and include supporting evidence.
- 5. Are there any other issues or considerations that we should take into account, or be aware of in formulating the new Local Plan.

VISION

Key Issues

- e) Establishing a vision that is aspirational yet achievable
- f) Establishing a vision that is fit for purpose for the next 15 plus years
- g) Bottoming out what we want for the future of the Borough; how it should develop; what it should offer; what key things it should be good at or well known for, etc.
- h) Establishing what, in addition to the Council's Strategic Plan, could help inform the vision for the new Local Plan

Questions

- 6. What would you like to see for the Borough's future, what do you think should be included in the Local Plan vision for the Borough, what should we be aiming and aspiring to achieve and why?
- 7. Are there any other documents or visions that you think might help to inform the vision for the new Local Plan?

HOUSING

Key Issues

- i) Development of realistic housing targets for both market and affordable housing.
- j) Allocation of new housing sites in the most sustainable locations.
- k) Integrating new housing into the community by getting the right densities and character appropriate to the Borough's diverse neighbourhoods ranging from the Town Centre.
- l) Building housing of different types and sizes to cater for the full range of ages and needs, with particular regard to the needs of specific groups including students, families, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities such as gypsies and travellers, and older residents.
- m) Address the issue of supporting people who want to build their own homes.
- n) Achieving high quality sustainable housing design with policies that strike a balance between ensuring quality through standards and supporting innovation through a flexible approach.
- o) Seeking to ensure, in addressing all of the issues above, that the end result is the creation of high quality, sustainable places.

Questions

- 8. Have the correct issues been identified, are there any missing?
- 9. Do you have any thoughts on how the Plan could or should address these issues?
- 10. Do you have any further comments to make on housing related issues?

EMPLOYMENT

Key Issues

- p) Ensuring the delivery of well-located sites to support employment with particular regard to growing sectors of the economy
- q) Development of policies to support new investment and help existing businesses overcome barriers to success and to help train new workers
- r) Ensuring there is sufficient land across the plan period to support housing growth
- s) Development of a retail hierarchy which safeguards the pre-eminence of the Town Centre while supporting appropriate levels of growth in other areas.
- t) Review of existing Town Centre boundary, primary shopping area and primary shopping frontages.
- u) Development of policies for the Town Centre that help to create a balanced mix of activities in the daytime, evening and night time.
- v) Development of policies which support tourism, leisure, culture and the arts.

Questions

- 11. Have the correct issues been identified, are there any missing?
- 12. Do you have any thoughts on how the Plan could or should address these issues?
- 13. Do you have any further comments to make on employment related issues?

RURAL COLCHESTER

Key Issues

- w) Increasing the delivery of rural housing, including affordable housing, to create sustainable rural settlements
- x) Increasing the delivery of rural jobs
- y) Improving the provision of and access to community facilities in rural areas to support community needs and reduce social isolation.
- z) Defining settlement boundaries to allow sustainable levels of growth in rural villages/hamlets without adversely impacting on the character of the villages/hamlets and surrounding countryside.
- aa) Protecting the countryside for its own sake

Questions

- 14. Have the correct issues been identified, are there any missing?
- 15. Do you have any thoughts on how the Plan could or should address these issues?
- 16. Do you have any further comments to make on issues related to the Borough's rural area?

PROMOTING HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

Key Issues

- bb) Building inclusive and healthy communities with good and equitable access to well located high quality key services (health, social, care, education) and community facilities.
- cc) Promoting healthy lifestyles through support for initiatives such as provision of sports and recreation facilities, improved access to green infrastructure and local small-scale food production schemes.
- dd) Protecting existing community facilities and the delivery of new facilities to meet community needs.
- ee) Protecting existing areas of public and private open space and ensuring development delivers adequate levels of new public and private open space.

Questions

- 17. Have the correct issues been identified, are there any missing?
- 18. Do you have any thoughts on how the Plan could or should address these issues?
- 19. Do you have any further comments to make in relation to the promotion of healthy communities?

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Key Issues

- ff) Balancing new development with traffic and congestion;

- gg) Managing congestion and minimising the impact of traffic on our communities;
- hh) Promoting alternative ways of travelling around the Borough;
- ii) Balancing the different transport needs of urban and rural areas.

Questions

- 20. Have the correct issues been identified, are there any missing?
- 21. Do you have any thoughts on how the Plan could or should address these issues?
- 22. Do you have any further comments to make on transport related issues?

HERITAGE AND TOWNSCAPE

Key Issues

- jj) How to support enhancement of the historic environment
- kk) Development of policies to support specific methods of delivering high quality design, including design codes, characterisation studies, design review panels; inclusion of historical interpretation; and development briefs.
- ll) The potential for adding to and improving the quality of our public spaces

Questions

- 23. Have the correct issues been identified, are there any missing?
- 24. Do you have any thoughts on how the Plan could or should address these issues?
- 25. Do you have any further comments to make on design and heritage related issues?

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Key Issues

- mm) Protecting and enhancing the countryside
- nn) Developing a multi-functional green infrastructure network across urban and rural Colchester by protecting, enhancing and extending landscapes, biodiversity and geodiversity sites, heritage sites, green spaces and river corridors.
- oo) Defining the extent and function of the Coastal Protection Belt

Questions

26. Have the correct issues been identified, are there any missing?
27. Do you have any thoughts on how the Plan could or should address these issues?
28. Do you have any further comments to make about issues related to the Natural Environment?

GROWTH OPTIONS / DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Key Issues

- pp) Determining the broad locations to accommodate the Borough's required level of growth
- qq) Allocation of sufficient land to accommodate the objectively assessed housing need
- rr) Allocation of a sufficient variety of sites in order to maintain a five year land supply throughout the Plan period
- ss) Provision of the infrastructure required to support development

Questions

29. Which option do you think would form the most appropriate strategy for the growth of the Borough and why?
30. Are there other reasonable/realistic options which could meet the necessary requirements (including their ability to accommodate the objectively assessed need and ensure the maintenance of a five year housing supply) that you think we have missed and would provide a more preferable option?
31. Should any new sustainable settlement aspire to the Garden City principles?
32. Should we look to have high densities if possible, if so, where do you think higher densities would be appropriate and why?

5. A summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18

A questionnaire was prepared as part of the Issues and Options consultation, 32 questions were asked on a range of issues. A summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to the Issues and Options consultation by key themes is set out below.

Vision

Those commenting on the overall vision tended to accept the need for a well-considered long term approach. Essex County Council, for example, stated that “a robust long-term strategy will provide a reliable basis on which ECC and its partners may plan future service provision and required community infrastructure for which they are responsible”. CAUSE, a residents group formed in response to proposals for development in the Colchester/Braintree border area, accepted that ‘a long-term plan that extends beyond political cycles is desirable’.

Comments on the content of the vision tended to highlight the importance of sustainability as a guiding principle, although both the general term ‘sustainability’ and the more specific planning concept of Garden Cities were viewed as contested terms that could mean different things to different people. Several respondents sought to illustrate their ideas with reference to other places i.e. Freiburg Germany, or the hypothetical Uttoxeter Garden City proposed in the winning Wolfson Prize entry. The Colchester Natural History Society welcomed the CBC support for garden city principles, although it considered that the Council had breached these principles in the past. Proponents for large settlements (i.e. Gateway 120 and East Colchester/West Tendring) felt that the vision should identify locations for new centres of growth away from the urban areas that would be sustainable and energy efficient and also contribute to the economic well-being of the Borough. Proponents of development adjacent to villages contended that growth should be more widely dispersed in a proportional manner to make villages more self-sufficient and sustainable.

In terms of further work to inform the vision, in addition to looking to best practice elsewhere the planning consultants for Stane Park considered that a study assessing Colchester’s position and function within the regional context should be prepared to inform the vision for the new Local Plan strategy which would provide evidence as to how Colchester can compete effectively against other regional destinations to achieve inward investment and growth over the course of the plan period, and to reinforce and strengthen its position as a regional centre.

A number of respondents mentioned the need for joint working on formulating a vision, as part of joint work on the plan as a whole. In particular, other local authorities including Essex County Council and adjacent district councils highlighted the importance of co-operation on strategic issues. Mersea Homes’ representation highlighted the need for the vision to address issues of complexity and increasing community involvement and suggested that Colchester should utilise university research to inform the Borough’s future vision possibly running a joint exercise or having the University as an active participant in developing the vision.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The existing Spatial Vision in the adopted 2008 Core Strategy is considered to provide a solid basis for the vision for the next Local Plan. Equally, however, changing circumstances and priorities may lead to more fundamental changes to the vision. To redraft the vision, the Council will set up meetings with key members and stakeholders to agree priorities for the new Local Plan vision which can then be incorporated into the Preferred Options documents programmed for public consultation in early 2016. Officers will continue to keep abreast of best practice elsewhere and will use evidence from work such as the Employment Land Needs Assessment to help consider the Borough's regional role and function.

Housing

Justification for overall housing numbers

While many people accepted the need for housing, a significant percentage questioned the amount of additional housing needed, particularly on greenfield land. Barton Willmore on behalf of Gladman Homes submitted its own Housing Market Assessment questioning the findings of Colchester's work on housing demand and supply. The CPRE considered that the quality of the Borough's countryside for its landscape character, for its setting for town and villages, for its biodiversity and for its agricultural productivity is sufficient to say that the growth can't be accommodated.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The NPPF requires that Local Plans meet the full, objectively assessed needs for housing. To set a target, the Council needs to ensure that its projections of housing need are based on careful consideration of population, economic and housing trends. The Council is carrying out joint work with Braintree, Chelmsford and Tendring Councils to help it set an Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) number as required by national policy. Initial work carried out by consultants Peter Brett Associates is expected imminently, and their work will form the basis of the OAHN number used to underpin housing allocations in the Local Plan.

Need for new housing to be supported by adequate infrastructure

The need for infrastructure to support housing growth was a clear and consistent theme running through a majority of responses. Many of the individual responses noted current infrastructure capacity problems and the need to make new development contingent on the up-front delivery of infrastructure across all categories, including transport, education, health, open space, telecommunications and community facilities. Essex County Council responded that the new Local Plan should ensure there are clear policies for the full provision, enhancement and funding of infrastructure arising from planned development and pointed to the mechanisms that could help to achieve this, including planning obligations, the use of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and the ability to negotiate specific contractual obligations for major strategic sites (where Garden City principles may be adopted).

Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is in the initial stages of developing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will provide information on the infrastructure needs associated with new development and how it will be delivered. The range of infrastructure included in the plan will cover

the full extent of facilities expected to be needed, including transport, utilities (including broadband), education, health, open space, and community facilities.

Need for housing for specific groups

The need for housing for specific segments of the population was raised, including older people (The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone) and gypsies and travellers (the Gypsy Council). Several landowners noted that account will need to be taken not only of overall need for different types of housing but also varying market conditions; individual site characteristics; and the fact that need for particular housing mix will change over time.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment carried out by consultants for the Council provides information on the demand for specific sizes, tenures and types of housing in the Borough which will inform policies guiding those aspects of housing allocations.

Development of high quality, well-designed sustainable homes

The promotion of high quality sustainable design was frequently mentioned in individual responses. A number of East Colchester residents noted that more control should be placed on housing developers so that estates have a uniform, attractive appearance. The representation on behalf of Mersea Homes, however, stated that design codes should promote diversity not conformity.

Initial Council response/next steps:

Formulation of policies on housing design and sustainability issues will have regard to government guidance on issues such as viability, sustainable construction and design. Planning policy officers will work with development management colleagues to ensure that proposed policies will result in clear and effective guidance for applicants for planning permission.

Centres and Employment

Supporting the Town Centre and defining an appropriate role for other commercial areas of the Borough

Respondents on the issue of town centre uses and Colchester's commercial hierarchy recognised the need for the Council to comply with national guidance on this topic and for new policy to be based on an up-to-date evidence base. There were, however, varying views on how this could be achieved. While the planning consultants for Sainsbury's considered that the existing retail hierarchy within the Borough is logical and should remain, agents for Turner Rise and Tollgate interests supported a more nuanced approach to policies on town centre uses which recognise the role and potential of District Centres to accommodate some limited growth whilst the Town Centre remains the primary focus for such activity. The planning consultants for Stane Park considered that capacity for growth in the Town Centre is severely restricted due to a combination of topography, heritage assets and the constraining road network, so the Town Centre should focus on specific sectors and allow other sectoral needs to be appropriately permitted elsewhere in the area. Planning consultants for Culver Square in the Town Centre requested that the council consider specific town centre and district centre policies, in addition to setting out a defined retail hierarchy, to further clarify the vision for the future of these locations. They commented that were the

situation to arise that the council were considering identifying sites outside of Colchester town centre, the impact of these sites upon the town centre is considered before allocating such sites in order to safeguard the vitality and viability of Colchester town centre.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council will commission additional work as required to ensure its evidence base on the supply and demand of town centre uses is up-to-date and provides a reliable basis for developing a spatial hierarchy for town centre functions and activities.

Providing sufficient jobs to keep pace with housing growth

The planning consultants for Stane Park questioned the need for further land to support the delivery of jobs in Colchester and highlighted the need to have regard to market signals such as take-up rates in considering allocations. ECC stated that the role of the A120 as an economic corridor should be strengthened. ECC also highlighted the important role of education in supporting economic growth, with particular regard to the potential of joint projects with the University of Essex and development of programmes to improve educational attainment.

A high number of individual respondents noted that it would be important to deliver jobs alongside new housing.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has completed an Employment Land Needs Assessment (January 2015) which will form the basis for assessing employment site allocations for the Local Plan. The next stage of work is the completion of a Strategic Employment Land Assessment which will be carried out jointly with the Strategic Housing Land Assessment and used to inform the Preferred Options.

Rural Colchester

Striking an appropriate balance between protecting the character of rural Colchester and meeting the need for more housing and employment

While the predominant view among respondents was that rural areas should be protected from development, many accepted the desirability of limited infill growth to meet local needs. Six parish councils supported a limited review of their settlement boundaries to accommodate growth (see separate section below on parish council responses).

Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is undertaking a Settlement Boundary Review which will inform the Preferred Options document and will be published as part of consultation on the document. The Review will have regard to the particular circumstances of each village in the Borough, including the views of parish councils as expressed in their consultation responses and, where relevant, evolving Neighbourhood Plans.

Promoting Healthy Communities

Providing access to high quality facilities and open spaces/sports facilities to maintain healthy lifestyles

Many individual respondents highlighted current capacity problems with health facilities, Colchester General Hospital in particular. Links between health and planning were widely recognised, and the provision of open space, sports facilities and walking/cycling links were identified as important elements of sustainability requiring policy support in the Local Plan.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The delivery of health services is a rapidly evolving area, and the Council has initiated liaison with relevant providers (including the Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS England, ECC Public Health) to ensure planning policy reflects the actual delivery mechanisms chosen for health provision. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include information on a wide range of health and community infrastructure, including hospitals, clinics/surgeries, community facilities, educational facilities, open space, green infrastructure and recreational facilities.

Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

Ensuring transport infrastructure keeps pace with growth

Highways England (formerly the Highways Agency) welcomed the fact that the plan looks to 2032 and beyond as they recognised that appropriate infrastructure takes a long time to deliver and this needs to be identified early in order that it comes on stream as required. They noted that the Government had made commitments to widening the A12 between Chelmsford and Marks Tey, while the A120 has not been identified for improvement. (Please also see their comments in growth options section below)

ECC supported the emphasis placed on sustainable transport and recommends the inclusion of policy options to implement and deliver a range of measures. As the local highway authority, ECC stated that it will ensure the appropriate and necessary assessments are undertaken as Colchester BC seeks to adopt a preferred spatial option for growth and development. ECC supported the objective to increase the numbers of people walking and cycling and noted that this will need to be embedded as part of new settlement options (if they are progressed by Colchester BC as part of the preferred spatial strategy) to reduce short journeys made by car and the impact on the local and strategic highway network. A number of specific measures were suggested to help achieve more sustainable travel patterns such as car clubs, public transport vouchers, additional cycle/walking paths, and shuttle bus services. In order to help limit impact on the local public transport networks, ECC recommended that rail and bus providers should be involved in the identification and planning of any new or improved services. The mainline rail service between Norwich and London Liverpool Street (which passes through Colchester) is often at full capacity during peak times, it will therefore be important to identify what potential impact any new development will have on these services and what can be done to limit this (please also see their comments in growth options section below).

Transport issues were raised by a high percentage of individual responses, including existing problems with road congestion, rail capacity, bus capacity, and non-motorised routes. As with infrastructure in general, many respondents considered that new transport links should be provided in advance of any new development. Some respondents noted the need to improve facilities for the full range of non-motorised

transport types (walking, cycling, horse riding) and the associated health, biodiversity and environmental benefits this could bring. In particular, the potential of an orbital green route around Colchester was raised by the Colchester Natural History Society.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is working closely with ECC and Highways England to carry out modelling and analysis of current and projected transport demand for all modes across the Borough, with particular regard to the transport implications of developing large new settlements. This work will be fed into the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan explaining the requirements and the delivery/funding arrangements for required infrastructure. Although no formal responses to the Issues and Options consultation were received from Network Rail or the train operator Abellio, the Council is actively engaged meeting with both bodies to develop an agreed approach to future rail development affecting the Borough.

Heritage and Townscape

Preserving and enhancing the town's rich heritage

English Heritage commented that the Local Plan will be an important factor in conserving and enhancing its rich historic environment. They recommended that the Council carry out a full analysis of existing and potential historic environment evidence base sources. While largely supportive of the issues raised in the Heritage section, English Heritage considered that the consultation document missed out some issues and referred to their guidance document on Local Plans for best practice on a holistic approach to planning for the historic environment and particular issues such as assets on the Heritage at Risk Register, and Conservation Areas.

The ECC response stated that greater priority needed to be given in the plan to the borough's rich but finite archaeological resource, which has come under considerable pressure from development during the period of the current Local Plan, and which is more likely to be overlooked than the built heritage, when considering enhancement opportunities through high quality design. Innovative interpretive approaches to telling the story of the borough is one way in which enhancements can be secured, but this should be guided by a coordinated interpretive masterplan to ensure quality and consistency. Existing and updated Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Conservation Areas within the Borough should be included as evidence base documents for the new Local Plan.

A number of individual responses highlighted the importance of preserving and enhancing Colchester's heritage.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has reviewed the existing evidence base on the historic environment issues used to inform current adopted policies and will update as needed to ensure that information is up to date, including evidence on the Historic Environment Record and archaeological data.

Natural Environment

Ensuring the protection and improvement of countryside, green spaces and corridors

Natural England supported references to the requirements for green infrastructure, biodiversity, and habitat protection within the Issues and Options document and encouraged more explicit attention to these issues as policies are developed. The Environment Agency also highlighted these issues and additionally referred to the importance of Blue Infrastructure as well as Green Infrastructure; the need to address requirements for flood risk assessment and sustainable water management systems.

The Essex Wildlife Trust recommended that the 2008 Local Wildlife Site Review be updated given that site conditions can change relatively quickly. They also stated that the Local Plan should address how green corridors and biodiversity can be robustly defended and enhanced, supported with evidence based on biological records and surveys.

A high percentage of individual responses stressed the importance of protecting open countryside and preserving wildlife habitats.

Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has reviewed the existing evidence base on natural environment issues used to inform current adopted policies and will update as needed to ensure that information is up to date, including evidence on landscape and townscape character; flooding; Local Wildlife Sites; and water supply. In particular, detailed work will be carried out for proposed large settlements.

Growth Options and comments on particular sites

General points on growth options

A number of individual responses queried the need for large scale development in the first instance and considered brownfield sites within Colchester would be able to play a greater role in meeting housing need. The CPRE questioned all the growth options given their impact on the countryside and good quality agricultural land, but would not be opposed to sensible development in villages to meet local needs. Numerically, the responses were dominated by views on particular sites put forward for development. Many members of the public were concerned about the implications of development near them on their quality of life, and assumed that additional growth would by definition result in problems such as increased congestion; infrastructure capacity problems; harm to the countryside; and poor quality development. Those who accepted in principle the need for further development to address the need for more homes and jobs frequently considered that the need should be met in a different part of the Borough.

Landowner/developer views on the vision correlated closely with the development they were proposing – i.e. those proposing development adjacent to villages supported proportionate growth, while those advocating large settlements supported the option including their proposal. Developers of smaller schemes suggested that their sites could make a contribution to housing delivery in the earlier part of the plan period in advance of the slower delivery of large settlements.

Views of adjacent local authorities and Essex County Council on growth options highlighted their willingness to work with Colchester to agree and refine a strategic approach. Option 1 (either A or B) was supported in principle by Tendring District

Council. Essex County Council and Braintree at this stage did not express a view on options but did state their willingness to work with Colchester on a joint approach to strategic development. Maldon DC expressed a preference for Option 1B which was considered to be likely to result in a lower volume of land release needed in the rural areas, and in particular around the settlements of West Mersea and Tiptree to the south of the borough, which are close to the border with Maldon.

Option 1 – Development to the East and West

Highways England noted that Options 1a, 1b and Options 2a, 2b are likely to result in significant impacts on both the A12 and A120 which are already running close to capacity. They considered that modelling work, yet to be undertaken will confirm that upgrading of the A12 and A120 will be required. Their view was that it may be better to focus growth to be delivered in the early part of the planning period to the east of Colchester until the situation regarding the future improvement of the A120 becomes clearer. Significant growth around Marks Tey may only be possible with appropriate mitigation measure funded through development.

The Environment Agency considered that in terms of flood risk, options 1a, 1b or 2a and 2b would probably be preferable. Surface water from options 3a and 3b (in north Colchester) would have to drain through existing urbanised areas to discharge to the River Colne and would potentially increase the vulnerability of adjacent areas to surface water flooding or flooding from minor watercourses that receive the flows from the development. Development to the west could discharge to the Roman River, while the area to the east of Colchester would drain to tidal waters via Salary Brook.

Anglian Water noted that all options for growth would result in a substantial requirement for new foul sewerage infrastructure and water treatment works, and they would expect to work with developers to address these requirements.

(Please see Option 2 below for comments exclusively on developments to the west, and Option 3 for comments on developments to the east)

Option 2 – Development to the West

82 respondents objected to large scale development in West Tey. The main concerns expressed included the current lack of infrastructure in the area; the need for infrastructure to be provided up-front in advance of any development; the impact on the character of surrounding villages; the loss of countryside and open space.

The Colchester Natural History Society consider Option 2 to be the 'least worst' option. Currently, all options include development in and at the edges of the current urban area, which runs counter to the Garden City concept of expanding green areas.

ECC as Highway Authority would seek a new A120 between Braintree and Marks Tey as part of any new settlement to the west of Colchester. They thought that this settlement could also require provision of a new railway station on the mainline.

Persimmon Homes stated that the Council could not be reliant on delivery from this site in the early part of the plan period and should therefore consider phasing of current

identified allocations, alongside less infrastructure hungry schemes in the first five years of the plan.

Option 3 – Development to the East and North

22 respondents commenting on proposals for East Colchester/West Tendring were largely of the view that Options 2A and B are most appropriate because East is already well-developed and has well-used and important green open spaces nearby. Too much new development directly on the eastern border was considered to create an unpleasant and unmanageable urban sprawl which would harm character and appearance of rural area. If there is to be new development to the east, respondents from the East Colchester area considered that there should be a buffer of green land of 1.5km around Salary Brook.

The Colchester Natural History Society highlighted the potential for a green walking/cycling orbital route around Colchester which could include the Salary Brook Valley. A commitment to simply preserving a route was considered insufficient – the route needs to be set within a sufficiently wide area and serve as a connection between places of value and utility.

Essex Wildlife Trust objects to development on land to the east of Colchester as it considers it would have serious adverse impacts on an important strategic wildlife corridor including Salary Brook Local nature Reserve.

ECC stated that given the levels of congestion in Colchester, particularly east Colchester, ECC as Highways Authority would only be able to support a new settlement to the east of Colchester with a new link road between the A133 and A120, and a new junction on the A120. Proposals for growth to the north of the A12 will need to be informed by modelling to establish impacts. Junction 28 on the A12 was not designed/constructed to be loaded with development traffic arising from growth north of this location; a key issue to consider when assessing this option.

Irvine Road Orchard

The largest number of responses to the consultation were received on a proposal for residential development of the Irvine Road orchard (289 responses.) The majority of responses took the form of an e-mail stating that allocation would be ‘completely against the council’s own policy on protecting urban open space, and its allocation in the previous LDF.’ Other respondents noted the importance of the site as an orchard; wildlife site; and open space in an urban area.

Battleswick Farm, Rowhedge

34 respondents objected to development of land at Battleswick Farm in Rowhedge, raising concerns about development resulting in coalescence of Rowhedge with the urban area of Colchester; the loss of open space/greenfield land; lack of infrastructure capacity and transport access in Rowhedge; loss of village character which is already being affected by development at Rowhedge Wharf; and impact on amenity and wildlife.

Layer de la Haye

32 respondents objected to the cumulative effect that residential development proposals could have on Layer de la Haye, noting concerns about constrained road access to the village; school and health capacity; the negative effect on village character; loss of countryside and wildlife habitats; and coalescence with Colchester. Some respondents noted that the need for further development could be better met elsewhere at larger strategic sites.

Boxted/Langham

22 respondents raised concerns about proposals to development in the Boxted/Langham area, noting concerns about current infrastructure constraints; impact on the character of villages; loss of countryside/green space/wildlife habitats. Many Boxted respondents noted that the residents of Boxted had recently been canvassed for their views in relation to their Neighbourhood Plan and that there had been overwhelming support (94%) for the maintenance of a clear green boundary between Boxted and Colchester to maintain the village identity of Boxted. Responses to the Issues and Options consultation did not address the proposal for a Garden Suburb in Langham because unlike the other Garden City/Suburb options to the east and west of Colchester, the Garden Suburb proposal for Langham was submitted through the concurrent Call for Sites process and was not included as a potential option in the Council's Issues and Options document.

Response from Parish Councils

24 Parish Councils in Colchester Borough responded to the Issues and Options consultation. Kelvedon Parish Council also responded from Braintree District. There was a varied response from the parish councils in terms of the level of support or opposition to the 6 growth options set out in the Issues and Options consultation document. 4 Parish Councils did not identify a preferred option where they could support growth. 8 Parish Councils expressed varying degrees of support for Options 1A, 2A or 3A which promoted urban extensions with 2 proposed new settlements to the west and east of Colchester and growth to the north of the A12. Myland Community Council and Little Horkesley Parish Council, support for option 2A was conditional on new or improved infrastructure being delivered as part of any future growth. Stanway Parish Council was generally opposed to any significant new levels of growth, but, felt that if growth had to proceed, then the garden city approach was the most sustainable approach to adopt. Hence they supported option 1A over the other proposed options. Eight Ash Green Parish Council was generally more supportive of the A options, as they felt that directing growth to existing or new urban areas was more sustainable than expanding rural villages. Aldham Parish Council and Wivenhoe Town Council identified growth option 3A as their preferred option because there was more land to develop north of Colchester and because these areas had better suitable infrastructure to support new growth. Layer de la Haye Parish Council was most supportive of Options 1A and 2A where additional housing settlement areas could be developed in existing settlements which already had space to expand and where appropriate infrastructure either already exists or could

be provided. Messing cum Inworth Parish Council only expressed support for option 1A as they felt that rural villages and their character and open spaces/biodiversity needed to be protected.

There was also varied support for the B options which included the same growth area as proposed in the A options but with additional growth in rural settlements. 6 parish councils supported at least one of the B options (Wivenhoe, Little Horkesley, Myland, Marks Tey, West Bergholt and Tiptree Parish Council). Tiptree Parish Council supported option 1B as they felt rural areas needed additional growth to prevent them from stagnating. Wivenhoe Town Council supported options 1B & 3B because they felt that there was more development land available north of the A12 while West Bergholt Parish Council felt that there was scope for limited (10%) expansion to settlement boundaries as well as urban expansions and new settlements. Little Horkesley Parish Council and Myland Community Council expressed support for option 2B, however their support was conditional on infrastructure upgrades or new facilities being delivered. Layer Marney Parish Council had concerns about options 2A & 2B, namely, because of the number of potential development sites that had been put forward for development through the Call for Sites processes. There was no support for expanding the settlement boundary in Layer de la Haye or increasing the size of the village significantly. They were also opposed to the expansion of Colchester Town which the parish council did not feel was realistic given existing congestion and shortage of infrastructure in the Town.

Wivenhoe and West Mersea Town Councils and Winstred Hundred Parish Council were opposed to any growth in their areas because they felt that there was no suitable development land left, other areas had more development potential, existing infrastructure was at capacity making further growth unsustainable or that the area was unsuitable for growth without impacting on rural character. Marks Tey Parish Council was most opposed to the 1A & 1B and 2A & 2B options which they felt were over reliant on excessive growth to the west of Colchester. They felt that growth needed to be more fairly distributed across all development areas including rural areas. They also identified the need for an alternative growth option to the west of Colchester focused around the A12 to be explored that promoted lower housing numbers than those proposed in the Issues and Options consultation paper. Wivenhoe Town Council felt that the option of no further growth was missing from the consultation paper.

Little Horkesley was not convinced that the areas proposed for growth under options 1A & 1B could sustain the level of development being proposed. They were also strongly opposed to options 3A & 3B due the impact on the open countryside in north Colchester and the Dedham Vale AONB. Copford/Easthorpe and Great Tey Parish Councils objected strongly to options 2A & 2B due their potential impact on the rural areas/character and on traffic and local facilities. Boxted Parish Council was also strongly opposed to the inclusion of options 3A & 3B on the grounds that development in these areas would result in creeping development between Boxted and Colchester and Dedham Vale AONB and adversely impact on the surrounding

countryside character and landscape. Boxted requested the removal of these options.

Many of the parish councils recognised the need for small amounts of modest growth to deliver smaller houses and affordable units particularly for young families and older people. 6 parish councils expressed support for either reviewing existing settlement boundaries to help meet the above identified local housing needs or requested a meeting with the Council to discuss future housing needs and potential sites to accommodate it. These were Chappel, West Bergholt, Copford/Easthorpe, East Donyland, Layer Marney, and Great Tey parish councils.

7 of the parish councils who responded to the Issues and Options consultation are currently preparing Neighbourhood plans. 6 of these neighbourhood plans are expected to identify sites for growth including Boxted, Eight Ash Green, West Bergholt, Wivenhoe, and Tiptree) and). Myland and Stanway Neighbourhood Plans are not expected to deliver new housing growth through their Neighbourhood Plans. Copford/Easthorpe, Fordham and Great Tey Parish Councils are also considering preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

Table 1, below includes a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to the Preferred Options consultation. The table also includes the number of representation received and a Council response, which demonstrates how representations have been taken into account. This was reported to the Local Plan Committee in December 2016.

Table 1. Summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to the Preferred Options consultation

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Local Characteristics	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for sustainable land use patterns, delivery of economic growth, supporting town centre & improving accessibility • Support approach regarding climate change and focusing development at sustainable locations • Braintree DC supports aims & objectives • Essex County Council suggest minor changes to text • Homes should be built to lifetime homes standards • Larger employers should be encouraged to locate in Colchester • Transportation links on the A12/ A120 are problematic
Vision	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support vision to maintain a good housing delivery rate • A Transport Plan is required • There is no analysis as to the sectors within which continuing and important job growth are likely to be focused within • There is no specific mention of working with the health sectors & health and wellbeing of residents • Welcome identification of protecting environment, good design & streetscapes • Need a clear vision for the town centre • Green infrastructure is needed for all users • University welcomes recognition in the plan. Land for expansion is needed
Objectives	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for environmental objectives • Actions need to live up to sentiments expressed • No specific mention of working with stakeholders such as health • High quality and accessible leisure facilities should be listed • Green infrastructure is needed for all users
<p>CBC response: Comments are generally supportive and noted. Some detailed changes will be made to wording to reflect points made.</p>		

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
The Spatial Strategy	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly sustainable needs better definition • Uncertainty on number and location of Stanway dwellings • Spatial strategy must be informed by flood risk sequential test and exceptions tests • Proposals maps and key diagram should be better labelled
Spatial Strategy Policy	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased to see flood risk was assessed • Land should be allocated for housing in Tiptree • Sites within the town centre should be developed as a priority
Sustainable Settlements	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict criteria in paragraph 4.20 penalises the assessment of rural communities • The Local Plan does not support sustainable development – comments about West Tey
SG1: Colchester's Spatial Strategy	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the allocation of numerous towns/ villages as district centres/ sustainable settlements • New development can maintain and improve the sustainability of existing settlements • West Tey is highly accessible but unsustainable in the long term • Spatial strategy will reduce the need to travel • Middlewick Ranges site is immediately available adjacent to the built up area of Colchester • Sites within 250m of safeguarded operational or permitted minerals and/or waste developments need reference to specific requirements • Colchester road network is largely at capacity particularly at peak periods • The spatial strategy is based on the premise that it is necessary to categorise rural settlements as unsustainable
Table SG1	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural and public land is precious • Table fails to differentiate between district centres and sustainable settlements • Great Tey does not fulfil the criteria set in 4.20

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
4.25 Alternative Spatial Strategy	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibilities for Middlewick Ranges should be explored as an alternative to garden communities • Council should have an open debate about an alternative spatial strategy
<p>CBC Response: Comments are noted. The comments are varied and many also relate to issues which appear in other sections of the plan. There will be some consequential changes to the Spatial Strategy and relevant sections of the Plan to reflect other changes made elsewhere in the Plan.</p>		
SG2: Housing Delivery	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support proposal to deliver 920 dwellings per annum • Plan must have a larger buffer than 240 units, this amounts to 2%. Buffer should be closer to 20% • Greater emphasis should be given to satellite villages surrounding Colchester • Uncertainty on number and location of Stanway dwellings • Smaller greenfield sites can make an important contribution to strategic housing numbers • Strategy should not be overly reliant on large strategic sites • Council should consider increasing the allocations in its sustainable settlements as a contingency • Council should not hold back development of sites to the east and west at the expense of the garden communities • An initial phase of development for the West garden community should be allocated • Clarity sought on the relationship between part 1 and part 2 • Balance the demand for housing with the desire to retain important areas for nature • Colchester's infrastructure isn't coping already • Omitting other villages does not reflect the spatial strategy or spatial hierarchy
Table SG2	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of justification of housing figures • Housing numbers should be maximum for Wivenhoe • Support housing in existing settlements

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East garden community should be deleted • Support for a number of housing allocations • Table 2 should make it clear that Marks Tey is identified for development • The Council should review the approach to the delivery of additional housing beyond the numbers agreed in part 1 • Demonstrate that infrastructure can support new housing
4.32: Alternative Options Considered	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has not properly consulted on the size or location of the alternative options or why they were dismissed
<p>CBC Response: Housing numbers reflect approach set out in NPPF. A 5% buffer is required for the first five years only brought forward from later in the plan period. The Submission Plan will clearly identify sites in Stanway and will provide boundaries for the Garden Communities to the east and west. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared and will inform final allocations. The strategy is based on a number of sites varying in size and location in accordance with the NPPF. There is a comprehensive evidence base for the housing targets (SHMA, OAN).</p>		
Economic Delivery Policies	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about recent ruling on Stane Park, which said Colchester had too much land earmarked for employment
Strategic Economic Areas	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support, especially the University
Centres Hierarchy	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new Sainsburys store should be designated as a district or local centre • Existing centres should be reinstated
SG3: Economic Growth Provision & Centre Hierarchy	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy requirement for at least 55.2ha of B Class land is not sound • Plan does not consider how the full spectrum of job creation will be managed and delivered • It is vital that primary care workforce planning and need is full considered • Town centre uses in existing centres should be proportionate to the role and function of that centre in the hierarchy

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic economic area of Northern Gateway and Severalls Business Park is vital • The Rowhedge Business Centre would make a preferable site for mixed use residential and community use • The exclusion of urban district centres from the hierarchy is not justified & is contrary to NPPF para 23 • Tower Business Park should not be allocated for employment • Road infrastructure in the east of Colchester has to be significantly improved
Table SG3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colchester Institute pledge their support through the supply of a local workforce with the necessary construction and engineering skills
<p>CBC Response: This section of the Plan is likely to generate the most changes as a result of comments received during the consultation and new evidence that has been commissioned. It is proposed that a retail hierarchy will be reinstated based predominantly on the existing urban and rural district centres. An employment land trajectory is being prepared and there will be a rationalisation of employment land to ensure the best sites are retained to encourage inward investment and support existing business expansion for the duration of the plan i.e. 15 years.</p>		
Local Economic Areas	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity needed
SG4: Local Economic Areas	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDP should cover emerging developments • Flexibility is sensible • Rowhedge Business Park should be allocated for mixed use housing and community use • Need to check for consistency • White Lodge Road & Oak Farm, Layer Marney and Poplar Nurseries, Marks Tey should be allocated as a local employment area
Table SG4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oak Farm, Layer Marney and Poplar Nurseries, Marks Tey should be allocated as a local employment area • Whitehall local employment area boundary should be amended

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>CBC Response: A response to specific site proposals is included in the relevant place policy. The policy is worded to provide a balance between flexibility and safeguarding Local Employment areas. The IDP will include infrastructure requirements arising from employment sites.</p>		
Existing Mixed Use Commercial Areas within Colchester	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More areas are needed if traffic congestion is to be reduced • Sustainable transport links between the Cowdray Centre and Turner Rise should be considered
SG5: Existing Mixed Use Commercial Areas within Colchester	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases in out of town retail areas would be inappropriate • The exclusion of urban district centres from the hierarchy is not justified. A new bespoke policy wording for the UDCs similar to existing policy BE2b should replace policy SG5 • Sustainable transport links between the Cowdray Centre and Turner Rise should be considered • Policy does not allow for flexibility contrary to NPPF paragraph 22 • Object to identification of land north/south of Tollgate West for B class use • Object to removal of Tollgate UDC, no evidence is provided as to the definition of a district centre
<p>CBC Response: As noted above a retail hierarchy will be reinstated but it will make clear that Colchester Town Centre is at the top of the hierarchy. There are walking and cycling links between the Cowdray Centre and Turner Rise. Provision has been made within the planning permission for the Cowdray centre to safeguard land for a future road link. This will be clarified in the policy. The policy is considered to be flexible but land does need to be retained for the whole plan period. Rationalisation exercise will take place.</p>		
Strategic Infrastructure Policy	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no IDP
SG6: Strategic Infrastructure	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure is essential before garden communities can deliver • Welcome consideration of flood risk management

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timescales needed for when input to the IDP will be • Policy does not recognise the limitations on the ability to pool contributions via s106 nor the role that CIL will have in the delivery of infrastructure • Policy suggests an infrastructure first policy, which is beyond the remit of the development industry. • Policies SG6 & SG8 should be merged • Policies should not have an adverse impact on healthcare provision • SP4, SP8 & SP10 do not provide guidance or reassurance about how strategic infrastructure delivery will be co-ordinated • Air quality must be included in the policy
<p>CBC Response: An Infrastructure Plan is being developed to be published alongside the Submission version of the Local Plan. Essex County Council's suggestion to merge the infrastructure policy with the developer contribution policy is considered to add clarity and wording for a comprehensive policy highlighting the need for development to contribute to necessary infrastructure will accordingly be recommended.</p>		
Neighbourhood Plan	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency would welcome the opportunity to assist the LPA in providing advice to neighbourhood planning groups • Evidence base should include SFRA, SWMP and Flood Mapping where appropriate
SG7: Neighbourhood Plans	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan should ensure policies are in place to deliver housing in the event that a neighbourhood plan does not materialise • Neighbourhood plans should be required to demonstrate how the strategic objectives regarding meeting housing needs will be identified • Neighbourhood plan timetables should be published • Marks Tey should provide some housing • Tiptree is omitted from policy • University concerned that the neighbourhood plan and Local Plan allocate different areas of land for university expansion

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
CBC Response: Minor rewording will ensure points of concern or conflict are clarified		
Developer Contributions	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a proactive policy to spend developer contributions
SG8: Developer Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency welcome the opportunity to contribute to CIL and developer contribution considerations • There should be a policy that indicates a supportive approach from the LPA towards the improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities • Existing healthcare infrastructure requires further investment • Policy should include provision for developer contributions to a strategic mitigation package for recreational disturbance impacts on Natura 2000 sites • The CIL consultation of £150sqm was too high, Colchester should engage with developers • New development will not always give rise to the need for many new or improved services • Policies SG6 & SG8 should be merged • This does not address lack of infrastructure from past developments, long term view is needed
CBC Response: An Infrastructure Plan is being developed to be published alongside the Submission version of the Local Plan. The Council has engaged with developers regarding CIL and put it on hold because of viability concerns. Healthcare is a key issue and officers are continuing to engage. Policy cannot address existing deficits – this is clear in national policy. Essex County Council’s suggestion to merge the infrastructure policy with the developer contribution policy is considered to add clarity and wording for a comprehensive policy highlighting the need for development to contribute to necessary infrastructure will accordingly be recommended.		
Environment		

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Natural Environment	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference should be made to enhancing and improving the natural environment • What evidence has been used to identify vulnerable species and necessary corridors? How will developers contribute to such measures • Rewording suggested to reflect protection afforded to internationally designated sites
ENV1: Natural Environment	27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing wildlife areas need suitable protection • Rewording suggested to reflect protection afforded to internationally designated sites • Policy should be renamed to refer to historic environment • Policy should recognise that brownfield sites can be important for biodiversity • Plan is silent on agriculture • A Habitats Regulations Assessment is required • Land south of West Bergholt should be designated as an Area of Special Landscape • Various minor amendments suggested
<p>CBC Response: Comments noted on need to protect natural environment. Policy amendments needed for compliance with NPPF and to strengthen policy in relation to Natura sites, protected species, brownfield sites. Impact of development on agriculture/soils is considered through the Sustainability Appraisal process. Further consideration needed about the need to strengthen policy in relation to agriculture/soils. A Habitats Screening Report has been prepared and an Appropriate Assessment is under development. Local sites to be added to Proposals Map.</p>		
Coastal Areas	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various minor amendments suggested • Council should resist the erection of a new Nuclear Power Station at Bradwell
ENV2: Coastal Areas	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various minor amendments suggested • Council should resist the erection of a new Nuclear Power Station at Bradwell • No map is provided for the proposed update of the coastal protection belt • Potential for development adjoining the built up areas of the coast

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>CBC Response: The revised Coastal Protection Belt will be shown on the final Proposals Map. A Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report has been prepared and work is underway on an Appropriate Assessment for the Local Plan. Minor policy amendments will be made to reflect changes sought by Environment Agency.</p>		
Green Infrastructure	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs of horse riders should be included • More information is needed on the Colchester Orbital and the map is out of date
ENV3: Green Infrastructure	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to water bodies • Need to include existing wildlife areas • Green infrastructure has the potential to mitigate recreational pressure on designated sites • Colchester Orbital does not recognise the other functions of green infrastructure • Unclear what the Council is seeking to achieve through the policy • Multi user off road rights of way are needed in Colchester • Colchester Orbital should include the longer term vision of an outer orbital • Too vague and caveat ridden
<p>CBC Response: Policy to be amended to reflect the multi-functional benefits developed by green infrastructure including its role in relieving pressure on Natura 2000 sites. A topic paper on the Orbital Route will be added to the Local Plan evidence base. The Orbital map will be reviewed for accuracy.</p>		
ENV4: Dedham Vale AONB	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small amendment to policy suggested by AONB group • Major proposals within AONB will require a Landscape Visual Assessment • Dedham Vale would benefit from more new housing • Protected lanes is missed from the policy/ Plan • Guidance on minimising light pollution would benefit the AONB • Council should underground all infrastructure associated with offshore delivery schemes

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
CBC Response: Minor rewording will take place to reflect comments made. Housing development within the Dedham Vale will be permitted subject to complying with other relevant policies on rural exception sites.		
Climate Change	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various minor amendments suggested • Greater emphasis should be given to the development and preservation of water resources
CC1: Climate Change	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include reference to flood risk • Policy should not go beyond the standards for energy efficiency set within Building Regulations • Green infrastructure should be included • List of measures should reflect the energy hierarchy • Local Plan falls short of addressing climate change and sustainability issues • Need to insist on low carbon technologies being fitted where available • This section should mention the impact of the larger A12/A120 and consequent increased congestion
5.47 Alternative Policy Options	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has a statutory duty to monitor air pollution
CBC Response: Minor wording changes will take place to ensure the policy is comprehensive and deliverable, but at the same time does not repeat other guidance / statutory requirements.		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
East Colchester Garden Community		
Policy SP8: East Colchester/West Tendring New Garden Community	101 Plus a petition with 733 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect Salary Brook area, hillside overlooking Salary Brook Valley. Concern over impact on ecological assets including wildlife. Natural History Society would prefer Salary Brook contained within wider nature reserve rather than country park to protect site's integrity. Inclusion of Churn Wood in GI network welcomed. Open countryside east of Greenstead should be retained as far as the eye can see. • Development would be in Tendring but would rely on infrastructure paid for by Colchester residents. • Direct development elsewhere. Alternative proposals include brownfield sites in East Colchester urban area; Weeley new town; and deprived towns like Clacton and Harwich where infrastructure can support development. • A120/133 link road should be constructed and transit link operational before new dwellings occupied. Local roads improved before development. Cycle path improvements; a new part and ride scheme; and dedicated bus lanes needed along with equestrian access. • Development would overload infrastructure, including roads, schools, healthcare and sewage. Traffic congestion already bad, particularly on Clingoe Hill. Facilities already under pressure including local primaries, surgeries and Colne Community School/Colchester secondary schools. . Infrastructure in place before building commences. Commitment from partner organisations needed. • Extra burden of traffic through Wivenhoe of commuters using railway station. • Impacts on waste water treatment, flood management. • Loss of top grade agricultural land.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred option needs further work to reassure local residents that it can deliver improved quality of life for both existing and new residents. • Social housing provision needed. • Concerns over proximity with Greenstead and Longridge. Buffer zone needed as proposed for Elmstead Market. Development should be over brow of Salary Brook hill so it is out of sight of existing residents. • Noise from development will affect existing residents. • Objects to development, but if built then 15 pitch Gypsy and Traveller site should be included. • Environment Agency –Support high proportion of green infrastructure for area found in plan. Advise that the outer boundary of new Salary Brook country park should be commensurate with the outer boundary of Flood Zone 2 to avoid development in flood risk areas. • RSPB - Specific protection for protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets required. • Historic England – difficult to comment on impact without knowing boundaries. • ECC – New 2 form entry primary school required in early phases; second new 2 forms of entry later in plan period, plus potential expansion of existing primary to account for additional east Colchester growth. New 4 form secondary school needed for early phases followed by expansion to accommodate 9-12 forms. Full package of transport measure to be developed through masterplan framework. Strategic link road needed between A120 and A133. • University – objects to deletion of land allocated for future campus expansion to the southwest unless alternative allocation made in Colchester or Tendring plan.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>CBC Response: Concept Frameworks are being developed which will inform the Submission version of the Plan which will define boundaries and more detailed masterplan DPDs which will follow. There is an intention to include a large area of strategic open space around Salary Brook</p> <p>There is also an intention to incorporate expansion of the University within the Garden Community and this is seen as preferable to the existing site allocated south of Boundary Road which is within a flood plain and incorporates a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Comments are noted about gypsy and travellers and those from RSPB, ECC, Environment Agency, and Historic England.</p> <p>Infrastructure and affordable housing will be provided as part of future development and the timing of delivery is a critical part of creating new communities.</p>		
<p>West Colchester New Garden Community</p>		
<p>Policy SP9: West Colchester/East Braintree New Garden Community</p>	<p>259</p> <p>Plus a Petition from CAUSE– 8,482 signatures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will create urban sprawl of Colchester, destroy rural character. • New residents will be London commuters, but rail is inadequate. • Infrastructure already inadequate – roads, rail, schools, hospital all not able to support high levels of new growth. No new housing until infrastructure built, including roads – A12 tripled, A120 dualled; dedicated bus routes; station properly connected to community; funding for rail capacity increases, school and health facilities provided. • Loss of agricultural land. • Questions about economic viability given lack of established employment generators. Risk of commuter community. Need early investment in employment. • Garden Communities can't be guaranteed to be accepted and in place within timeframe – transport infrastructure delivery will take time. • Make clear that delivery vehicle will be responsible for master planning. • Development is too big. • Increase in pollution, noise and fumes. • Use sites in existing built up areas.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Infrastructure Delivery Plan or full transport modelling to accompany proposal. • Increased likelihood of flooding. • Any new town should have its own centre and identity. • Lack of evidence for town of this size at this time. Housing numbers lack credibility. • North Essex authorities lack experience, expertise and resources to implement Garden Communities. • Environment Agency – supportive of policy. Foul drainage capacity will need to be upgraded. • RSPB – sections on master planning should specify that green infrastructure provision should be described. Need to secure management of biodiversity assets. • Historic England – difficult to comment on impact without seeing boundaries of what is proposed. • ECC – New primary required in early phases of development, second primary later in plan period. Some expansion of Honywood School and Thurstable School possible, but new secondary school needed before end of plan period. Full package of transport measure need to be developed through masterplan framework.
<p>CBC Response: Concept Frameworks are being developed which will inform the Submission version of the Plan which will define boundaries and more detailed masterplan DPDs which will follow. All these documents are underpinned by the principle that infrastructure and affordable housing is to be provided as part of future development and the acknowledgement that timing of delivery is a critical part of creating new communities.</p> <p>Comments are noted from RSPB, ECC, Environment Agency, and Historic England.</p> <p>Consultation expected to start in January on proposals for the A120 and A12.</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
The CAUSE Representation is being dealt with separately.		
CENTRAL COLCHESTER: TOWN CENTRE	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consideration given to flood risk issues reflected in the Surface Water management Plan – discuss with ECC as the LLFA • Differentiate between evening and night time economy • Support continued commitment to the town centre • Concerns about student accommodation • Welcome regeneration but seek to safeguard Sainsbury's in Priory Walk
Policy TC1: Town Centre Policy and Hierarchy	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support threshold for retail impact assessment, but question requirement for RIA in centre outside of Town Centre • Alternative sliding scale for requirements retail impact assessments suggested for district and local centres • Floor space requirements outside of town centre are not justified • Support the hierarchy with Town centre at the top and the 3 rural district centres. Reserve position in respect of Garden Communities and centre designation. Welcome a change in respect of Urban district centres • New Sainsbury's at the Hythe should be a new district centre • Support role of the town centre as a cultural hub • Reference to Jumbo / Balkerne Gate and its importance and public realm should be included in the Plan and afforded some priority
<p>CBC Response General points noted, with some rewording of the policy to be recommended to mention in particular role of evening economy; clarify that the 500 sqm threshold applies to District Centres in Tiptree, West Mersea and Wivenhoe and reinstate Tollgate, Peartree Road, Highwoods and Turner Rise as Urban District Centres to reflect the recommendations of the Retail Study update (to be published to inform the Submission Local Plan).</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Policy TC2: Retail Frontages	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach supported but justification required • Map / key to better reflect Policy reference • Support bringing sentiments of Better Town Centre SPD to fore. Mention of safeguarding enhancing key heritage assets should be added e.g. St Botolph's Priory/ Roman Wall
<p>CBC Response Revisions to the Primary and Shopping area frontages will be recommended to reflect the recommendations of the Retail Study update (to be published to inform the Submission Local Plan) Heritage assets are protected by other policies.</p>		
Policy TC3: Town Centre Allocations	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan does not set out justification for meeting the floor space requirements • No sequential test has been carried out to accommodate this floor space need for retail uses • Sequential test should include existing District Centres including Tollgate Village • Reference to key heritage assets should be made in these allocation policies • Objections to Housing allocation at Britannia Car Park- Loss of car park space and impact on traffic, and use for the school and church • University accommodation to be provided closer to the Campus rather than within Town Centre area
<p>CBC Response: The Plan is considered to identify adequate floorspace to accommodate projected capacity requirements, and these are in sequentially preferable locations. The Council will publish an updated Retail Study to inform the submission version of the plan which will update capacity figures but will not identify the need to allocate further land for town centre uses in the absence of demand.</p>		
NORTH COLCHESTER	9	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Policy NC1: North Colchester and Severalls Strategic Economic Area	20	Note comments overlap in respect of various elements of Policy NC1 (eg Comments on Housing allocation at the Rugby Club are not just confined only to this element.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 1 - Strategic Employment Area 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed suggestions for reconfiguration of the land within the 3 zones; Inclusion of additional areas of land within the SEA including land to the north and south of the traveller site and land around Cuckoo farm Studios
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 2 - Cuckoo Farm North West 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed policy wording amendments proposed regarding uses permitted; Inconsistent approach with other Strategic Economic Areas in particular Stanway;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 3 - Northern Gateway area north of the A12 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support additional community facilities in relation to need –reference identified need for a place of Worship in this area which could be accommodated as part of community provision Other uses should be specified in the policy for zone 2 Concern about infrastructure capacity including A12 from traffic generated by uses associated with policy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at the Rugby Club 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No residential provision on this site Loss of open space Loss of sports field and the lack of local facilities for local sport, displacing sports including American Football, Cricket and Rigby League; Rugby Club receiving preferential treatment to other sporting activities / local clubs Sports provision proposed as part of Northern Gateway Strategic Proposals is insufficient to meet the growing needs; Number of houses should be increased to 300 allowing for higher density and higher rise development;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional / alternative sites proposed on land including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposal for extra care retirement village to provide 250 mixed tenure extra care units within Policy Area NC1 (no site definition specified) (in addition to other housing allocated within this policy area ○ Land at Oxley Parker Drive (area of open public open space) ○ Land At Axial Way -reinforcement of current planning position (retention of site for housing)
<p>CBC Response: Some rewording and reconfiguration of the Strategic Employment area will be recommended, with the retention of equivalent land areas to ensure adequate provision for employment. Minor policy wording changes will be made to provide clarity and ensure sufficient flexibility.</p> <p>An increase in the housing number to 500 at the Rugby club site will be recommended to also include provision for an extra care housing facility for 250 units.</p> <p>Mapping changes will be made to reflect reconfiguration and ensure consistency with the Myland and Braiswick Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Allocation of the site promoted at Oxley Parker Drive is not supported for allocation for housing since it is currently open space which will continue to be protected for its amenity value serving the adjoining residential area.</p> <p>Other comments are noted.</p>		
Policy NC2: North Station Special Policy Area	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consideration is given to fluvial or surface water flooding; • The sequential test must be applied for all sources of flooding; • The area encompasses a Critical Drainage Area; • Turner Rise should be incorporated within the boundary of the policy area; • Traffic problems at North Station will get worse as more homes are built;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct and rapid transport links to North Station are required from other parts of the town; in particular the East, including the University; • One of the key radial links on the Colchester Orbital is via Castle Park and through High Woods; • A designated bus for the town centre from the station ticket office is required.
<p>CBC Response: The comments are noted. The flooding and drainage issues are covered by other Policies and there is no need for duplication here. Minor wording changes will reflect any amendments to other policies where relevant. Rapid Transport links between the East and West of Colchester are being investigated. No need for significant change to the policy.</p>		
Policy NC3: North Colchester	27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure capacity • Capacity of B1508 • Impact on North Station Junction; • Not able to absorb this as well as Chesterwell development (1600) • Contrary to the M&B NHP • Highways England- objection to any development to the North of Colchester • Support for sites from the site promoters • Alternative sites proposed on land including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land at Bakers Lane Land east of Bakers Lane 7.53 ha plus land west of Bakers Lane 1.29 ha (adjacent to ramparts farm. ○ Further land at Bakers Lane- 1.95 ha. ○ Land at St John's Road (39 ha)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential Allocations 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land At St Botolph's Farm Braiswick 	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of green space • Detrimental Impact on wildlife • Reduces separation between Colchester and W Bergholt (coalescence) • Access within the 60 mile per hour section of Road

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that Site falls within EH protected land Moat Farm National Monument 1019964 • Site unsuitable as subject to subsidence; • Flood risk on part of site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land north of Achnacone Drive Braiswick 	31*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Amenity of area • Detrimental effect on character of residential area • Safety for users of Achnacone Drive • Road too narrow – not suited to increase or construction traffic • Suggested that Site falls within EH protected land Moat Farm National Monument 1019964
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land south of Braiswick Golf Club 	18*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor access to site • Narrow access – difficult for service vehicles; • Backland development • Detrimental to amenity of existing residents • Over development • Loss of trees
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>The points raised regarding local traffic concerns are noted and access to the sites will be designed with the Highway Authority to ensure adequate capacity exists and safe vehicle and pedestrian access is provided.</p> <p>It will be recommended that the allocation on Land South of Braiswick- Golf Club be removed from the plan. Further investigation has identified concerns in respect of achieving an acceptable access and the site promoter has submitted information to indicate that the site is no longer available within the forthcoming Plan period.</p> <p>The allocations for development on sites at Achnacone Drive and St Botolph’s Farm are recommended to be retained with further consideration given to policy wording to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity.</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>The alternative sites off Baker's Lane are not considered appropriate for allocation with key constraints linked to the proximity to Moat Farm Dyke which is classified as an Area of High Archaeological Potential and a Scheduled Monument by Historic England because of its significance to Iron Age settlement defences. In addition the Highway Authority has concerns about increasing any access onto Bakers Lane.</p> <p>Further consideration of any recommendations in relation to land at St John's Road Colchester, is linked to the consideration of the proposed Garden Community Development to the East of Colchester.</p>		
EAST COLCHESTER		
Knowledge Gateway and University Strategic Economic Area	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to make reference to urgent need for additional housing to match the expected growth at the Knowledge Gateway • Policy should refer to the many heritage assets on the site including Grade ii* listed Wivenhoe House and the Register Park and Garden • Environment Agency suggest reference in the policy to the avoidance of development within the flood plain at Salary Brook • Similar allocation should be included in the Tendring Local Plan as largely in TDC area. TDC acknowledge joint working and further discussion regarding boundary • TDC also raise concern regarding any additional housing in the east of Colchester over and above that as part of the Garden Community • Support for the recognition and importance of University and its contribution to growth and in particular incubator units • Remember expansion allocation comes with the expectation for the deallocation of land to the south for university expansion
Policy EC1: Knowledge Gateway and University of Essex Strategic Economic Area	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zone 1 Knowledge Gateway 	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zone 2 University Expansion 	1	
<p>CBC Response: The comments are noted, but no significant changes to policy will be recommended other than to remove designation on Proposals Map of University expansion land lying within Tendring jurisdiction, although there is continued support for its retention in the Tendring Local Plan</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
East Colchester/Hythe Special Policy Area	4	
Policy EC2: East Colchester Hythe Special Policy Area	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure full consideration of flood risk issues in this area with strategic approach between EA / CBC/ AW/ ECC (as the LLFA). EA seek further discussion on Flood risk issues here including ref to DM23 and pragmatic management of flood risk in this area • Reference to surcharging of surface sewers to be added to text as this is where infrastructure investment is vital for future regeneration in this areas • Reference to CIL / Contributions to be levied to support water infrastructure • Policy should be less prescriptive and more flexible • New Sainsbury’s store should be designated as a new “centre” • Regeneration needs to consider biodiversity and also reference should be made to heritage assets as well as environmental assets and refer to opportunities to enhance such assets • Policy should also acknowledge suitability for high rise development and formal sports provision • Particularly important that development proposals are subject to scrutiny and the application of appropriate design and build principles. We would like these sites to be explicitly referred to in the Local Plan • Suggest plan states a desire to support the establishment of properly constituted local groups committed to driving appropriate development - such as CLTs. • Suggest mention of a desire to help identify assets suitable for community ownership/and or management (with due regard to the effect this might have on affordability/viability). • Hythe Forward would appreciate the opportunity for further dialogue and trust that our submission reflects shared strategic objectives of Colchester Borough Council and Hythe Forward CLT

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>CBC Response: The policy wording will need to be amended regarding flood risk management in the Hythe. Discussion will take place between CBC, the Environment Agency, ECC and AW to agree an approach. Greenstead will not be recommended for reinstating as an Urban District Centre as a single supermarket is not considered to fill the role of a District Centre. This consideration also applies to the new Sainsbury's store. Further comments noted, with additional revisions only warranted if not covered by other parts of the Local Plan or guidance elsewhere.</p>		
<p>Policy EC3: East Colchester</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Alternative sites proposed by representations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ * Place Farm 5.5ha allocated as employment as part of Whitehall Industrial Estate ○ Middlewick Ranges (Rep includes details including reference for up to 2000 dwellings on 84.69 ha)
<p>Port Lane</p>	<p>3*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Concern over capacity especially traffic for accumulative delivery of housing with east Colchester / Hythe area. (In view of this is it right to loose Britannia Car park yet?) ● Detailed points regarding pavements / parking / gardens and lighting referenced for planning conditions ● Limit to 115 dwellings so not overly crammed in
<p>East Bay Mill</p>	<p>4*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Correct reference to Exception test – DCLG not Environment Agency ● Support reference theme of riverside walks as part of regeneration encouraged
<p>Magdalen Street Sites</p>	<p>5*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Concern over capacity especially traffic for accumulative delivery of housing with east Colchester / Hythe area. (In view of this is it right to loose Britannia Car park yet?) ● More Almshouses are needed in area for elderly population ● Traffic management could include congestion based charge for non-access through traffic Brook St, Magdalen Street and Barrack Street. ● Proximity to town centre should mean no requirement for car parking spaces

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Employment Sites	2*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support proposals • Area of extension at Whitehall Industrial Estate includes 5.5ha at Place Farm which is not considered viable for employment and should instead in part contribute to Housing Supply which will help deliver employment on remainder (also listed with alternative site above*)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Economic Areas 	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whitehall Industrial Estate 	1	
<p>CBC Response: Magdalen Street and Britannia car park will be retained as residential allocations and the policy wording reviewed to ensure appropriateness in light of traffic and car parking management issues within Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>Middlewick Ranges: It will be recommended that land at Middlewick Ranges be allocated for residential development having received new information regarding its availability in the consultation. A new policy will be drafted promoting 1000 residential dwellings at the site. The policy will include mitigation needed to reflect the constraints on this site, principally, ecology and highway capacity and to ensure inclusion of relevant infrastructure to support the allocation. Discussions are on - going with the MOD, Essex Wildlife Trust and Highways Authority which may further influence the allocation.</p> <p>The policy wording will need to be amended regarding flood risk management in East Colchester. Discussion will take place between CBC, the Environment Agency, ECC and AW to agree an approach.</p> <p>Development at Place Farm to be recommended to allow limited housing development off Old Heath Road outside the cordon sanitaire for the sewage works which should help deliver development of an extension to Whitehall Industrial Estate. A policy will be drafted which reflects site constraints including adequate requirements associated with Air Quality Management, ecology and landscape.</p>		
WEST COLCHESTER	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns expressed about impact on road infrastructure in particular A12 junction • Roads are inadequate and need traffic management • Safeguard roman river – protect its history

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area incorrectly shown as Public Open Space (part of MOD land)
Policy WC1: Stanway Strategic Economic Area	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections to the removal of Urban District Centre (also comment received supporting the approach proposed in the PO) Approach inconsistent with that of North Colchester Object to safeguarding for b class uses Alternative configuration part of this site and other land with part of Lakelands Need to consider detailed amenity and place making and adequate infrastructure provision Reallocate the Trafalgar Farm area as Employment- no longer in Agriculture use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 1 	6	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 2 	4	
<p>CBC Response: The comments are noted. The Urban District centre Allocation will be reinstated. The approach is consistent with that at North Colchester in that no/limited retail is permitted and land is retained for employment use. In response to updated Employment evidence some rationalisation and reconfiguration is likely of the Strategic Economic Area. Residential use of parts of the area will be considered. The map will be amended to reflect any updates and corrections as required.</p> <p>The policy wording, together with other policies in the plan will ensure adequate consideration of relevant constraints and respect amenity and place making considerations as appropriate.</p> <p>It will be recommended that the area of Trafalgar Farm is reallocated as part of the employment area since it has been advised that it is no longer in agricultural use which was the justification for removing this area in the Preferred Options Local Plan.</p>		
Stanway Area Housing/Other Allocations	3	Alternative sites promoted via representations; Site Locations:
Policy WC2: Stanway	9	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lexden Spring School site and Essex Fire Brigade Workshop site - representations – to include both sites in settlement boundary ○ Land to the South and West of Lakelands- reconfiguration of the Preferred Options allocation for 150 dwellings and employment ○ Additional land at Lakelands (not identified by allocation in the PO) ○ Land north west of 296 London Road 130 dwellings ○ Land between London Road and A12 Stanway 500 dwellings <p>See also sites suggested under WC4 – alternative options</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land between Church Lane, Churchfields and Partridge Way 	28*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be retained as open space • Status of site in adopted Local Plan- open space • Site promoter confirms delivery (Flagship Housing)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Fiveways Fruit Farm 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for robust transport plan / strategy • Safeguard trees in area and open spaces
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Chitts Hill 	4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site does not have good access to bus travel; • School capacity / infrastructure • Question access restrictions and maximum number (promoter)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the West of Lakelands 	4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public rights of way • Open space • Alternative configuration part of this site and other land with part of Lakelands
<p>CBC Response: The comments relating to the proposed housing allocations are noted. It will be recommended that all of the allocations identified in Stanway in Policy WC2 will be retained. Further consideration will be given to policy wording to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity. In addition the policy wording will reflect the access arrangements which satisfy the Highway Authority and ensure safe vehicular and pedestrian access within the site and to the existing network.</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to allocation of additional land at Stanway now that further work has been carried out in respect of the proposed Garden Community to the west of Colchester. A number of alternative sites</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>were promoted for Stanway through the Consultation. The following sites having been assessed as being appropriate with favourable consideration as part of the SLAA and Sustainability Appraisal assessments.</p>		
<p>Land between London Road and A12 Stanway: It will be recommended that land between London Road and Stanway be allocated for 500 houses and that the settlement boundary be amended to include this. An allocation policy will be drafted to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints, to ensure there is a separation between settlements and safeguard existing residential amenity and ensure provision for sufficient infrastructure and site specific requirements to support delivery.</p>		
<p>Land north west of 296 London Road: It will be recommended that land north west of 269 London Road Stanway be allocated for approx. 130 houses. This adjoins the site recommended for allocation, the settlement boundary will be amended to also include this. An allocation policy will be drafted to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity and ensure provision for sufficient infrastructure and site specific requirements to support delivery.</p>		
<p>As detailed above further consideration is being given to alternative uses of some employment allocations in Stanway.</p>		
<p>Sites at Lexden Spring School site and Essex Fire Brigade Workshop will be included in the settlement boundary.</p>		
Colchester Zoo	3	
Policy WC3: Colchester Zoo	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Masterplan approach • Essential to consider junction improvements and transport and access strategy for the zoo and in the wider context. • Support reference to Mineral safeguarding and associated requirements • Details comments regarding policy wording on public rights of way and protection / enhancement biodiversity / environmental assets. • Support in principle to approach • Policy should include reference to Surface water management and SuDS

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
CBC Response Comments are noted and no significant amendment to Policy is necessary		
Policy WC4: West Colchester	8	General comments from ECC on WC4 – total development 308 dwellings: further expansion of primary provision would be required; plans for secondary schools in area would allow the provision of additional secondary places to serve this area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Gosbecks Phase 2 	2*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England welcome policy wording in respect of scheduled monument and archaeological potential. • Not acceptable location so close to a historic site. It would create an even higher throughput of traffic for cyclists and horse riders to have to deal with when exercising in the area. Crossing Maldon Road is horrible. • it should be made clear that improved public transport services and infrastructure would be required • Support from the site promoter with some suggested amendments to policy wording / requirements including to read approximately 150 dwellings and other details which will be considered by the planning application process;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South of Berechurch Hall Road 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECC – no public transport services along Berechurch Hall Road. • ECC – the paragraph (6.87) refers to access onto Berechurch Road. Suggest this should be Berechurch Hall Road. Promoter of 2 of the 3 land parcels supports allocation and has begun discussions with land owners of remaining land parcel.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Irvine Road 	9*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSPB – support policy regarding Ecological Management Plan. Recommend provisions made to secure long term ecological management of the site; ECC – require clarification on access arrangements if there is no public access to this land (para 6.88); Comment regarding ensuring Norman Way remains as a bridleway; IRARA wish Orchard protected and managed and object to allocation. If policy WC4 is retained measures are needed to guarantee security of remaining Orchard land – ownership of remaining land transferred to a body with the Orchard’s wildlife at its heart. Colchester Civic Society – object as one of a tiny handful of old orchards left in the country. It should be managed properly as a community asset. If this is promoted so should site at Highfield Drive be. Support on behalf of the site promoter
Alternative Option	2	<p>Alternative sites proposed on sites including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of St Albans Road (two site areas indicated in representation- 0.58 / 0.91) Land at Highfield Drive 0.03ha
<p>CBC Response: The comments relating to the proposed allocations of Land at Gosbecks Phase 2 and South of Berechurch Hall Road are noted. No significant changes will be necessary, other than amendment to the map for accuracy. Further consideration will be given to policy wording to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity and provision for infrastructure requirement as appropriate. In addition the policy wording will reflect the access arrangements which satisfy the Highway Authority and ensure safe vehicular and pedestrian access within the site and to the existing network.</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>Mapping change will be made to reflect consistency with the Policy wording for the Irvine Road allocation which will safeguard part of the site for wildlife interest. Minor wording changes to the supporting text will also be made to provide consistency with the policy.</p>		
<p>The alternative sites promoted are not supported with land at St Albans Road being adjacent to Hilly Fields which is not considered suitable for development and land at Highfield Drive, which is former garden land and too small (0.03ha) to be considered for assessment or allocation. The SLAA minimum size threshold is 0.25ha which is compliant with National Guidance.</p>		
GARDEN COMMUNITIES	6	Comments relating to the Garden Community proposals refer to issues above under SP8 and SP9
<p>CBC Response</p>		
<p>See response above to SP8 and SP9</p>		
SUSTAINABLE SETTLEMENTS	<p>Note generic comment from Essex County Council on School Places (not repeated in each settlement but potentially relevant to all): ECC have said in many cases the Primary School places can be accommodated either in existing schools or in expanded schools. They have also stated that there might be an impact from the accumulation of new school places needed if new houses are also built in adjacent villages. In most cases they have said there will be implications on Secondary School places with development. These will need to be addressed by appropriate contributions/expansion/new build as required at the time.</p>	
ABBERTON AND LANGENHOE	1	<p>General Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not need additional housing; • Not a sustainable settlement; • Speeding traffic through village, inadequate footways; • School would need expansion; • School parking issues; • Need for starter homes in the village;
<p>Policy SS1: Abberton and Langenhoe Housing Sites</p>	44	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites will require screening under HRA due to proximity to Abberton Reservoir SPA/Ramsar site; • Visibility issues at Peldon Road/Layer Road junction identified by ECC. <p>Peldon Road site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would disconnect listed building from rural context (Pete Tye House); • Peldon Road rural character, ditched hedges; • Revised proposal received from promoter for up to 50 homes on just on west side of Peldon Road with potential for village car park or financial contribution. <p>Ashpark House site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access along privately owned drive; • Impact on many native species including nightingales; • Rear gardens in Peldon Road flood; • Representation received from promoter to enlarge site to 10 dwellings
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Abberton is identified as a sustainable settlement within the spatial strategy and as such is justified to support additional growth. The issues raised are noted and the school capacity concerns are acknowledged. Any expansion required will need to be addressed as part of development in the village. The concerns raised regarding local traffic concerns are noted and access to the sites will be designed with the Highway Authority to ensure adequate capacity exists and safe vehicle and pedestrian access is provided.</p> <p>It will be recommended that the Ashpark House allocation is removed from the Plan with further investigation demonstrating concerns regarding satisfactory access to the site. The site at Peldon Road will be extended to the south to accommodate additional dwellings and provide an area for school car parking to address local parking issues. Play equipment will also be included within the site to encourage parents to use the car park.</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
The Plan will be subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment as required by the relevant legislation.		
BIRCH	2	
Policy SS2: Land East of Birch Street	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure eg no medical facilities or shops; • High levels of traffic already on road; • Parking issues at school; • Consideration needs to be given to neighbouring Listed Buildings; • Need a range of affordable properties; • Early years and Primary School could accommodate growth; • Site will require screening under HRA due to proximity to Abberton Reservoir SPA/Ramsar site; • Additional information provided by promotor for two development options. <p>Alternative site promoted via representation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Birch Business Park, Maldon Road, Birch.
CBC Response		
<p>Birch is one of the smaller villages identified in the Preferred Options as a Sustainable Settlement. Since drafting the evidence which considered the relative sustainability of the settlements around the Borough, the Doctor's surgery has closed in the village. As other services are limited, the Council has formed the view that the range of services/facilities in Birch Green is now more comparable with the Borough's 'Other Villages' rather than the 'Sustainable Settlements', and as such allocation for development in this location will no longer be supported by the Spatial Strategy. Consequently it will be recommended that Birch be classified as an 'Other Village' in the spatial hierarchy and that the allocation of land east of Birch Street will be removed from the Local Plan.</p> <p>The alternative site at Birch Business Park will not be supported as the identification of the settlement as an "Other Village" suggests that allocation of the site is not supported by the spatial strategy and is considered to be unsustainable.</p>		
BOXTED	2	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Policy SS3: Boxted Housing Sites	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure at Hill Farm site; • Support for continued small scale employment use on Hill Farm Site; • Lack of consultation on Neighbourhood Plan; • No early years or Primary School capacity issues; • Development should consider impact on Listed Building.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Comments noted. The Boxted Neighbourhood Plan is now made and includes the allocation of this site.</p>		
CHAPPEL		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking issues at Swan Grove; • Too many houses for the site/capacity of the village infrastructure; • Support for proposal from Parish Council – some comments on Policy wording. • Access to the site should not be limited to a single access point from Swan Grove but should also be accessed from the existing vehicular access point, direct to the site, at the top of Chappel Hill opposite Hill Farm Bungalow, connecting with the southern end of Swan Grove, facilitating through traffic flows and alleviating some of the existing problems
Policy SS4: Chappel Housing Sites	17	<p>Alternative sites promoted via representations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vernon’s Road: 21 dwellings • Spring Gardens: 21 dwellings <p>Land to west of Bures Road with recreation provision off Colchester Road (north): 50 dwellings</p>
<p>CBC Response</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>It will be recommended that the allocation be retained with further consideration given to policy wording to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity. In addition the policy wording will reflect the access arrangements which satisfy the Highway Authority and ensure safe vehicular and pedestrian access within the site and to the existing network. The allocation may also include the opportunity to provide parking to address issues raised in Swan Grove. Minor changes to the policy wording will therefore be recommended.</p> <p>The alternative sites at Vernons Road and Spring Gardens are both located away from the concentration of key services within Chappel and Wakes Colne, close to small detached clusters of development which are proposed remove the settlement boundary due to their unsustainable location. Therefore it is considered that allocation of these sites is not supported by the spatial strategy and is considered to be unsustainable.</p> <p>The alternative site on Bures Road, with recreation provision on Colchester Road is not supported for allocation as additional sites in Chappel are not required and concerns regarding the potential impacts on the landscape remain as the site is quite prominent in the landscape from the south and development could adversely affect landscape character. Development of the site would extend the village's existing development edge along Bures Road into the open countryside.</p>		
COPFORD AND COPFORD GREEN	5	<p>Hall Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers too large/disproportionate level of growth; • Alternative brownfield sites in Copford should be delivered first; • No capacity at Copford Primary School; • No mention of affordable housing, density and mix important; • Lack of adequate infrastructure; • Environmental impacts on Roman River Valley; • Loss of agricultural land; • High traffic volumes <p>Queensbury Avenue</p>
Policy SS5: Copford Housing Sites	39	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision on housing numbers required is premature • Housing numbers too large • Alternative brownfield sites exist in Copford that should be developed first • School capacity issues at primary and secondary schools • No mention of affordable housing provision as part of proposal • Queensberry unsuitable access – • Upgrade existing PROW for all users including horse riders • Impact on residential and public amenity • Service cables follow PROW- would also need to be diverted • Loss of trees – used by bats • HE – no concerns about impact on strategic road network • No capacity at primary school in Copford. Primary School already has significant amount of temporary accommodation • New play area requested • Queensberry Avenue is a feeder road ending in cul- de sac – new development would increase houses served off this road to 220 which is not complaint with EDG <p>Alternative sites promoted via representations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London Road Marks Tey (Car Boot Sale Site): 60-70 dwellings; site previously assessed in SLAA; • Renzlands & Telephone exchange: site suggested – not by land owner; no information provided.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Copford is identified as a sustainable settlement within the spatial strategy and as such is justified to support additional growth.</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>The concerns raised regarding local traffic concerns are noted and access to the sites will be designed with the Highway Authority to ensure adequate capacity exists and safe vehicle and pedestrian access is provided. The issues raised are noted and the school capacity concerns are acknowledged and any expansion required will need to be addressed as part of development in the village.</p> <p>The allocations for development on sites at Hall Road and Queensbury Avenue will be recommended to be retained with further consideration given to policy wording to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity. There will be a requirement for the development to contribute towards affordable housing in accordance with the relevant policy requirement adopted. Any evidence which identifies a specific need can be reflected in this provision</p> <p>The alternative sites suggested are not considered appropriate for allocation, with the Renzlands / Telephone exchange site having no further information provided and no evidence of availability being significant constraints. Developing the London Road site would lead to coalescence between Marks Tey and Copford, which is not desirable</p>		
DEDHAM AND DEDHAM HEATH	4	<p>Corner of The Heath and Long Road West</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on AONB; • Traffic congestion/safety; • Sewage/surface water drainage issues; • Impact on Listed Building; • Covenant preventing development on the land. <p>North of Long Road East</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on AONB and prominence of the site when viewed from the north within the AONB; • Traffic congestion/safety; • Sewage/surface water drainage issues; • Impact on Listed Building (Old Church House); • Layouts submitted by site promoter.
Policy SS6: Dedham Heath Housing Sites	74 Plus a petition with 168 signatures	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<p>South of Long Road East</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on AONB; • Traffic congestion/safety; • Sewage/surface water drainage issues; • Support from site promoter but no new information submitted. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North of Long Road East: approx. 5 dwellings • Back land development using Sun Downe for access: 17 dwellings; site previously assessed.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Following further consideration it will be recommended that the residential allocations in Dedham Heath are removed from the Local Plan on the basis that they are located within or adjacent to the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and it is not considered to be justifiable given the availability of additional residential land in areas of lower landscape value elsewhere in the Borough. Furthermore the sites are some distance from the nearest services and facilities in Dedham village and development of the scale previously proposed is not able to adequately mitigate against this important sustainability indicator.</p> <p>Representations have been received promoting land on the southern boundary of the existing settlement however development at this location is considered to have worse sustainability credentials than the previously promoted sites given that the settlement's core services and facilities are located in Dedham village, to the north of Dedham Heath.</p> <p>For the purposes of consistency with the Local Plan spatial strategy it will also be recommended that Dedham Heath will be classed as an 'Other Village' in recognition of its unsuitability and lower sustainability for further residential allocations and ability to support sustainable growth.</p>		
EIGHT ASH GREEN		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Policy SS7: Eight Ash Green	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers shouldn't be minimum; • Impact on A12 Junction 26; • Impact on Listed Building setting; • School capacity issues – ECC consider primary school could potentially expand; • Surface water flooding risk; • Development should be split between Fiddlers Farm site and land north of Halstead Road. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Halstead Road East: 61 dwellings; site assessed previously in SLAA (RNW09); • Halstead Road: 30 or care home; site assessed previously in SLAA (STN20); • Brick & Tile PH site, Halstead Road: 8 dwellings • Halstead Road adjacent Choats Hill SB: approx. 25 dwellings
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>The Eight Ash Green Neighbourhood Plan will make site allocations, so the points raised and alternative sites will be considered as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan will retain the housing number and direction of growth referencing the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites to provide certainty and policy guidance until such time the NHP is made.</p>		
FORDHAM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fordham PC support proposed number of dwellings; • Primary School can accommodate growth, Early Years has current capacity; • Proposed location should be nearer village; • Increased risk of accident and noise;
Policy SS8: Fordham	7	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information provided by site promoter with regard to highway access.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Fordham is identified as a sustainable settlement within the spatial strategy and as such is justified to support additional growth.</p> <p>The allocation for development at Plummers Road will be recommended to be retained with further consideration given to policy wording to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity. The concerns raised regarding local traffic concerns are noted and access to the site will be designed with the Highway Authority to ensure adequate capacity exists and safe vehicle and pedestrian access is provided. The issues raised are noted and the school capacity concerns are acknowledged and any expansion required will need to be addressed as part of development in the village where it is evidenced at the time. It is noted that Essex County Council has indicated that Primary School and Early Year provision can accommodate the growth proposed.</p>		
GREAT HORKESLEY	5	Great Horkesley Manor site
Policy SS9: Great Horkesley	44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing not needed, Gt Horkesley should remain a village; • Congestion in village and around North Station will get worse; • Pressure on infrastructure; • No local shops and amenities; • Children would have to cross busy road; • No safe pedestrian route along A134, pavements narrow and speeding traffic; • Access to Myland should be improved; • Loss of agricultural land; • Lack of development for employment; • Parish Council support both sites; • Query over need to expand village hall;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information provided by site promoter regarding omitted land. <p>Alternative Site promoted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coach Road – Land north of Coach Road promoted for 140 dwellings and provision for open space.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Great Horkesley has a range of facilities and is one of the Borough's sustainable settlements. It is an appropriate location for a limited number of new dwellings over the plan period. Housing will need to be of a mix and type to meet local needs.</p> <p>The allocations at Great Horkesley Manor and School Lane will be recommended to be retained in the plan. The issues raised are noted and minor wording changes will be incorporated to add clarity and reflect some of the points. with further consideration given to policy wording to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity.</p> <p>The requirement in the draft policy for traffic management and crossing opportunities will remain in the policy, helping to encourage walking as a safe and reasonable option throughout the village, including to the school. Essex County Council has confirmed in their representation to the Draft Local Plan that whilst the Bishop William Ward CE VC Primary School, which serves Great Horkesley, is operating at close to capacity, forecasts indicate a decline in pupil numbers in future years which would allow the school to accommodate the level of growth proposed in the Plan.</p> <p>The alternative site promoted at Coach Road is not supported as it is not considered appropriate to allocate further development in Great Horkesley in addition to the sites in the Preferred Options Plan and it is considered that the Manor House site has advantages over this site in particular associated with relative access to public transport, proximity to services and facilities, and visual impact.</p>		
GREAT TEY	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary school capacity and growth can be accommodated; Parish Council support proposal but consideration to investigate traffic calming measures including footway;
Policy SS10: Great Tey	11	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities should be explored to upgrade PROW to bridleway; • Concern regarding development on a very narrow country road; • Road has existing parking issues; • Access issues into site, safe access/exit; • Question ability to provide safe footway; • Support from site promoter. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land between Greenfield Drive and Newbarn Road: 40 dwellings plus 1ha public open space adjacent to existing sports pitches.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Great Tey is identified as a sustainable settlement within the spatial strategy and as such is justified to support additional growth.</p> <p>The comments are noted. It will be recommended that the allocation at Brook Road will be retained in the Plan with further consideration given to policy wording to reflect adequate protection of relevant site constraints and safeguard existing residential amenity. The concerns raised regarding road safety concerns are noted and access to the site will be designed with the Highway Authority to ensure adequate capacity exists and safe vehicle and pedestrian access is provided. ECC commented that the school could accommodate the pupils generated from the allocated site.</p> <p>It will be recommended that an additional allocation on land at Greenfield Drive for 40 dwellings plus provision of an extension to the Playing Field be allocated in Great Tey. Although this will represent an increase in the level of growth in this location, it provides an opportunity to extend the playing field. In addition the site is in a location which is relatively free of constraints, and therefore more suited to an additional allocation than some other locations around the Borough.</p>		
LANGHAM	2	General comments – all sites:
Policy SS11: Langham	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of houses too high and not proportionate, should not be higher than 85 dwellings;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
	Plus a petition with 267 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will become suburb of Colchester; • Inadequate infrastructure and facilities; • Traffic on School Road – accident risk for school children; • Inadequate public transport; • Development could have an impact on substandard A12 junction (Highways England); • Development would impact on AONB - landscape assessment required for sites near AONB; • Land use conflict – industry/school/housing; • Lack of evidence during consultation; • Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land currently actively farmed. <p>Wick Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impact on Listed Building; • Supported by Parish Council for frontage development. <p>School Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council support frontage development of site to right of Powerplus but consider site selected hadn't received proper identification earlier as a potential site. Object to estate development, total number due to impact on School Road, effect on village character; • Development would affect historic character of Boxted Airfield; • Upgrades to School Road needed; • Inadequate drainage; • Move industry away; • Availability confirmed of Powerplus. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Langham Cottage, 9 High Street: 1 to 4 dwellings;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lodge Lane: commercial 1.76ha existing; 1 ha potential new; • Extension to Powerplus site: commercial 1.06ha extension; • Land at Perry Grove: 5 dwellings; previously assessed in SLAA (RNE06).
<p>CBC Response: Langham is identified as a sustainable settlement within the spatial strategy and as such is justified to support additional growth.</p> <p>It will be recommended that the three housing allocations for Langham be retained, but that the two allocations on School Road be reduced in number to address infrastructure capacity issues (sewage in particular) and local concerns about village character and impact. Further dialogue with the Parish Council and site promoters will continue to agree the final number for the allocations.</p> <p>The alternative housing sites suggested are not considered appropriate given that further sites in Langham are not required and Langham Cottage development would have landscape impacts and vehicle/pedestrian access at Perry Grove could be constrained.</p> <p>Allocation of further employment land at Langham will be considered in light of the recommendations of the Employment Land Needs Assessment Study Update to be published alongside the Submission version of the Local Plan.</p>		
LAYER DE LA HAYE	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments range from 50 houses too much to support for 50 houses (no more); • Opposition to proposed site access; • Existing infrastructure and facilities inadequate; • Primary school could accommodate growth; • Screening site under HRA required; • Site promoter request amend polity to read approx. 50 dwellings; • Site promoter provided additional information including illustrative plan and delivery statement;
Policy SS12: Layer de la Haye	42	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenge raised over the proposed removal of Malting Green settlement boundary. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malting Green: 10 dwellings; previously assessed (RSE09)
<p>CBC Response: The comments are noted. No significant change to the policy will be required, as it already covers requirements in respect of supporting infrastructure. Alternative access to the site is not supported by the Highway Authority, although support has been expressed regarding temporary access arrangements from The Folley during construction. This will be considered further with the highway Authority and appropriate wording will be included in Policy SS12.</p> <p>The alternative site proposed at Malting Green is not supported. It relates to the Malting Green settlement boundary which is proposed for removal in the Preferred Options Plan due to its relative sustainability and being situated remote from the key services available in the core of the village.</p>		
MARKS TEY	1	
Policy SS13: Marks Tey	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marks Tey Parish Council - SS13 should be unchanged until further clarity of wider strategic implications are clear. Investigation should be undertaken to explore innovative ways by which evolving Neighbourhood Plan can link into wider strategy to form a Neighbourhood Plan 'plus'. • Environment Agency – expansion of Copford facility needed. • Highways England – Development here would have severe impact on the Strategic Road Network. Proposals to widen both A120 and A12 may affect the site. • Historic England – significant number of grade II listed buildings in Marks Tey which need consideration in determination of growth proposals.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – need to have regard to Marks Tey Brickpit SSSI and findings of Habitat Regulations Assessment to be carried out. • Proposals for small sites in Marks Tey area put forward by landowners/developers. • Objections to Garden Community proposals for area.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Decisions on smaller allocations will be made by the Marks Tey Neighbourhood Plan once there is more certainty on the scope for such allocations outside a Garden Community. The Council want to increase the support offered to the Parish Council. Amendments to explanatory text will be recommended to highlight concerns of statutory consultees.</p>		
ROWHEDGE	18	Battleswick Farm
Policy SS14: Rowhedge	204	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield/agricultural land; • Impact on doctors surgery; • Impact on Primary School – school cannot expand; • Cumulative impact on infrastructure and facilities with other new developments; • Flooding issues; • Loss of hedgerows; • Coalescence with Old Heath; • Overlooking on to existing properties; • No further information submitted by site promoter. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rowhedge Business Centre: 60 dwellings

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<p>CBC Response: The representations raise a range of issues, which include concerns which relate specifically to the site location at Battleswick Farm including potential coalescence of the village with Old Heath, flood risk, landscape impact and potential impact of nearby residents. Other concerns relate to the capacity of the infrastructure to accommodate further growth, in particular the school and the Doctor's surgery.</p> <p>An alternative site at Rowhedge Business Park was previously assessed and not supported due to its function providing employment in the village. This consultation has provided new evidence in respect of this site which demonstrates the inherent unsuitability of the site for any enhanced role for employment. In addition, the site promoter has sought to address improvements to health care provision identified as a key infrastructure problem in Rowhedge which is able to be improved by the provision of land for a new GP surgery which has been met with support by the North East Essex Clinical Care Commissioning Group.</p> <p>It will be recommended that the site at Battleswick Farm be removed from the plan as a housing allocation and that land at the existing Business Park be allocated for 40 houses and a site within the allocation be reserved for health care provision. Policy wording to support the allocation will be provided including safeguarding land for a new GP surgery (wording to be agreed with relevant Health care representatives).</p> <p>Whilst issues with local education capacity will need to be addressed, the reduced residential growth at the business centre will reduce the strain on primary school capacity before mitigation options are explored with the school and Essex County Council. Additionally the redevelopment of the business centre will be phased over the plan period to ensure that the impact on primary school places emanating from the Wharf development is properly mitigated before any additional residential development is built</p>
TIPTREE	15	Neighbourhood Plan will define Settlement Boundary and allocate specific sites. Comments on direction of growth:
Policy SS15: Tiptree	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers; • Cross boundary issues; • Longstanding access problems to A12;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School capacity – surplus capacity exists but there will be additional required, including Secondary expansion and new Early Years facility needed; • Flood risk; • Map changes/corrections needed; • Additional information provided by site promoters – additional highway information to support site TIP09 and additional information to support sites TIP03, TIP10 and TIP11. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rhubarb Hall, Grove Road: approx. 10 dwellings (previously assessed TIP11); • Brook Meadow, Tiptree: 100 dwellings (previously assessed (TIP03); • Bull Lane: 74 dwellings (previously assessed TIP10); • Land off B1022 Maypole Road: no number dwellings specified; • Extra Care Home, Factory Hill: 80 units; • Grove Road Tiptree: 75-80 dwellings & 25/30 affordable; • Wood Lane: no number dwellings specified.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>The Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan will make site allocations, so the points raised and alternative sites will be considered as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan will retain the housing number and direction of growth referencing the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites to provide certainty and policy guidance until such time the NHP is made.</p>		
<p>WEST BERGHOLT</p> <p>Policy SS16: West Bergholt</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan will define Settlement Boundary and allocate specific sites. Comments on direction of growth:</p>

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer contributions would be required to expand early years facilities; • School could accommodate level of growth; • Neighbourhood Plan should include SuDS requirements; • Parish Council request policy read 100 dwellings and suggest that 20 dwellings will be provided in settlement boundary; • Parish Council request other areas to be identified as Local Economic Areas; • Parish Council would like to see area of West Bergholt to be designated as Special Character Area, and area south of village to be designated as Special Landscape; • Limiting development to 120 homes may prevent Parish from delivering wider benefits – should be at least 150 homes as per Eight Ash Green; • Policy aimed at preventing coalescence is welcomed – concern over development in Braiswick; • Promoter of alternative site disagrees with broad areas of growth – disregards other suitable sites; • Question designation of Pattens Yard given unsustainable location; <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colchester Road (WBG03 & WBG04): sites previously assessed – objection on broad areas of growth and further information provided; • Cooks Hall Lane: 3 dwellings; • Land behind the White Hart PH, Nayland Road: approx. 6 dwellings.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>The West Bergholt Neighbourhood Plan will make site allocations, so the points raised and alternative sites will be considered as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<p>The Local Plan will retain the housing number and direction of growth referencing the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites to provide certainty and policy guidance until such time the NHP is made. West Bergholt is considered a sustainable settlement and 120 houses over a 15 year period is considered proportionate to the size of the village and the available facilities and infrastructure and reasonable contribution towards the overall Borough Housing Delivery Target (920 dwellings/year. An allowance for windfall development has already been taken into account as part of the Borough housing provision in addition to the annual housing delivery target, which allows for unallocated usually small sites, within the settlement boundary, coming forward during the plan period.</p>		
MERSEA ISLAND	16	
East Mersea	2	<p>General Comments – development on Mersea Island</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers too high for Mersea Island; • Need to check population figures for Mersea – caravan parks are being used year round as permanent residences; • Primary School and Early Years facilities would need expansion; • Inadequate infrastructure and facilities to cope with further developments – problems compounded in summer due to influx of tourists; <p>Only one road off the island, regular flooding and poses evacuation risk in event of an accident at Bradwell Nuclear Power Station</p> <p>Dawes Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk – significant part of the site is subject to surface water flooding; • Inadequate access. <p>Brierley Paddocks, East Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private access – access to site questioned; • Impact on Listed Building (Brierley Hall); • Additional information provided by site promoter to support site.
West Mersea	24	
Policy SS17a: Mersea Housing and Employment	<p>534</p> <p>Plus a petition with 143 signatures</p>	

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Road: 48 dwellings (site previously assessed MER24).
Coast Road	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency support the presumption against residential development; • Projects within Coast Road should be screened under the Habitat Regulations; • Proposed new housing in Mersea will generate additional traffic in this area; • Mersea Waterfront should be strengthened further to avoid change of use to residential; • The environmental impact of motorised leisure equipment needs to be looked into as it could cause damage by dredging up the seabed and wave impact on The Strood Road; • Object to new housing in Mersea.
Policy SS17b: Coast Road	24	
Caravan Parks	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caravan parks add to the pressure of the infrastructure without contributing financially; • Caravan parks should build a stronger rapport with the island; • Reference should be made to flood warning and evacuation arrangements; • Many caravans are the main home of the occupiers; • Direct and indirect impacts to designated nature conservation sites need to be assessed; • Congestion will increase, particularly during the summer; • Sustainable travel to caravan sites is very unlikely as no buses pass most of the sites and there is no room to build bikes lanes.
Policy SS17c: Caravan Parks	15	
<p>CBC Response: Following a review of the consultation responses and discussions with the site promoters, it will be recommended that the number of houses being proposed for West Mersea is reduced from 350 to 200. The</p>		

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<p>reduction in housing numbers reflects the infrastructure capacity on Mersea, and the need to consider alternative highway access to the 2 sites. The Primary School in West Mersea will need to expand to provide new places and the school has confirmed that there is scope to extend to meet the need. Neither Anglian Water nor the Environment Agency have identified any capacity issues in relation to waste water and sewage capacity. The draft Water Cycle Study also concluded that there is sufficient headroom capacity at the Mersea Water Recycling Centre to accommodate the growth being proposed. This will help ensure that water quality is maintained which is important for both residents and the Oyster Fisheries around the Island. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers (e.g. NHS England) and Town Council to ensure that planned development is delivered alongside necessary improvements to infrastructure and that deficiencies are not created. Neither Essex County Council as Highway Authority or Highways England have objected to the proposed growth in West Mersea on highway grounds. The decision about any future development at Bradwell Nuclear Power Station will be taken by Central Government via the Infrastructure Planning Commission. It is not an issue for Colchester's Local Plan. The Borough Council's Emergency Planning team is currently preparing an evacuation plan for Mersea in the event of a major flood event but they have confirmed that the principles embedded in this document for evacuation will be applicable for any type of evacuation needed. The Council uses Census data provided by the Office of National Statistics which is standard practice. The Council will continue to monitor this issue and consider appropriate action where necessary.</p>
WIVENHOE		
Policy SS18: Wivenhoe	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotors of two of the allocated sites support allocations; • Clarification sought regarding the neighbourhood plan's requirement of a cemetery at Elmstead Road; • Environment Agency request involvement in the neighbourhood plan owing to flood risk issues; • Heritage assets must be considered; • Direct & indirect impacts to nature conservation sites need to be assessed; • Green infrastructure provision is essential;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely that one of the schools would need to be expanded by half a form and existing early years facilities would either need to be expanded or a new facility developed; • The hospital is unfit for purpose, the GP surgery is stretched & the dentist is closed to NHS patients; • Local infrastructure cannot cope with this number of homes.
CBC Response		
<p>The Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan will make site allocations, so the points raised and alternative sites will be considered as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan will retain the housing number and direction of growth referencing the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites to provide certainty and policy guidance until such time the NHP is made.</p>		
Development in Other Villages and Countryside		
Policy OV1: Development in Other Villages and Countryside	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy should be reworded so as not to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements; • Historic England welcome the commitment to high quality design; • A criteria regarding SuDS should be added; • Policy appears to support infill developments, which could lead to coalescence between villages;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Villages 	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development of small villages should be restricted to an absolute minimum. • The sustainability of the other villages is being reduced by the draft policy;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little opportunity for development to come forward within settlement boundaries; • Peldon should be listed as a sustainable village; • The settlement boundary for Layer Marney should be expanded to include wo brownfield sites; • Small scale development should be possible in the future. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nursery Site, Smyths Green, Layer Marney: approx. 12 dwellings; • Grassreasons Poultry Farm, Newbridge Road, Layer Marney: approx. 6 dwellings; • St Ives Road, Peldon: approx. 43 dwellings; • Land adjacent Kingsland Villa, Abberton Road, Fingringhoe: 3 dwellings; • Land adjacent Forge Cottage, Fingringhoe: approx. 15 dwellings; • Picketts Farm, Church Road, Fingringhoe: 10-80 dwellings (6.97ha); • Maldon Road, Great Wigborough: CUFC Football Training Academy 17.11ha (linked to Florence Park site, Tiptree); • Little Baddocks Farm, Easthorpe Road, Easthorpe: 102 dwellings; • Land south of Easthorpe Road, Easthorpe: 165 dwellings; • Red House, Messing: approx. 3-9 dwellings; • Birch Business Centre, Maldon Road; • White Lodge Road, Layer Marney (Local Employment Area expansion). • Development should be considered for Little Tey;
Countryside	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing needs survey for Layer Marney found that 73% of respondents support a small scale open market housing development; • The interpretation of settlement boundaries needs further thought;

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be reasonable to treat small gaps between houses in small hamlets as infill.
Alternative options considered	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village identities should not be eroded by removal of settlement boundaries. • The settlement boundary of Peldon should not be removed.
<p>CBC Response</p> <p>Allocation of the sites suggested will not be supported as they are relate to settlements identified as an “Other Villages” / countryside which suggests that allocation of the site is not supported by the spatial strategy and is considered to be unsustainable.</p> <p>In some cases there may be scope for proposals to be justified based on exceptions, need, or other site specific reasons where the benefits can be shown to outweigh the policy constraints, however, these should be tested through the Development Management Process rather than justified for Local Plan allocations.</p>		

Summary of representations to development management policies

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
DM1: Health and Wellbeing	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy is poorly worded and not practical • Include all vulnerable road users in this policy • Cross refer to Colchester Orbital project
7.5 Alternative Options considered	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Colchester Orbital route
<p>CBC Response: Policy is considered fit for purpose. Reference to Green orbital can be added to explanatory text.</p>		
Community facilities	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Colchester Orbital route

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
DM2: Community Facilities	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of planning churches in new communities • Contributions towards such facilities should be sought when it passes CIL para 123 tests • ECC welcome discussions on a site by site basis • Where an alternative is provided accessibility is not the only criterion that needs to be met
CBC Response: No significant change required. Churches are mentioned in explanatory text.		
DM3: New Education Provision	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viability should be a key consideration • Where housing growth takes place it will be essential to ensure the delivery of education facilities is undertaken in a timely and phased manner • Definition of education needs to be expanded to include early years and adult education • New schools should include a strategy for encouraging cycling to school
CBC Response: No need to repeat national policy about viability. Policy will be revised to include reference to Early Years and adult education, to clarify that new education facilities will be required to support new development and that developers will be expected to provide/contribute to such facilities. Wording will also be added to final paragraph regarding safe walking and cycling routes to schools.		
Strategic Sports	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CUFC is seeking to develop a high quality state of the art sports ground on a site in Great Wigborough • Bridleways should be maintained
DM4: Sports Provision	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions towards such facilities should be sought when it passes CIL para 123 tests • This policy should not restrain or inhibit other sports development proposals outside the 3 hub sites referred to • University sports facilities will continue to improve

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mersea should be considered as a strategic hub for sport Availability of sports and recreation facilities must be a priority
<p>CBC Response: Comments noted. Reference will be added about bridleways. Great Wigborough is not considered to be a suitable location for a new sports ground for CUFC.</p>		
DM5: Tourism, Leisure, Culture and Heritage	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk should be highlighted Cross refer to Colchester Orbital project New opportunities for rural economic growth on brownfield land should be a key consideration Walking and cycling schemes should be included
<p>CBC Response: Policy to include reference to Leisure Routes in list of examples.</p>		
Economic Development in Rural Areas and the Countryside	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barns should not be developed just because they are empty
DM6: Economic Development in Rural Areas and the Countryside	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be clarified that there is a presumption that heritage assets in a poor state of repair will be retained rather than replaced The equestrian sector provides a very large contribution to rural economics across retail and agriculture
<p>CBC Response: No significant change to policy required. There is already a general presumption about retention of buildings rather than new build.</p>		
Agricultural Development and Diversification	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A huge new town at West Tey would do immense harm to the rural area

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
DM7: Agricultural Development and Diversification	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations from ECC Highways seem to be at odds with practical common sense • Policy is unduly restrictive
<p>CBC Response: It is accepted that the Garden Community will be built on greenfield land but there are few brownfield sites remaining. Master planning is intended to address impacts on the rural area. The comments regarding Highways are noted (appear to relate to the Development Management process). No significant change required as the wording is considered to be consistent with National Guidance.</p>		
Affordable Housing	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colchester's target of affordable housing delivery is poor
DM8: Affordable Housing	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria a and b are contradictory • Housing classified as independent living should be included within the definition • The Plan proposes a level of affordable housing below that indicated as essential by its own research • The Plan does not address the housing needs of Colchester, according to the evidence base there are going to be 45% of first time buyers priced out of the market • 30% affordable housing is essential • Policy does not refer to any specific methodology for assessing overall scheme viability • Provision of affordable housing should be made in all sustainable settlements
<p>CBC Response: The Council is reviewing its evidence about affordable housing and awaiting more information about starter homes. The policy may need to be revised to reflect this. This could include changing the target and other comments made will be considered alongside the new evidence base.</p>		
DM9: Housing Density	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate density will vary across the Borough • Consideration should be given to the need for open space including SuDS

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
CBC Response: Policy reflects the comments made – no significant change considered necessary.		
DM10: Housing Diversity	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to make distinctions between housing types to ensure they do not conflict the provision of specialist housing with general market housing • Support recognition of the needs for older persons and specialist housing • Lack of precision and evidence available • Large strategic sites are not appropriate locations for self build • Objection to the requirement to provide lifetime homes • Policy needs to be strengthened to secure a range of housing types
CBC Response: Comments noted but no significant changes considered necessary. Minor wording changes could add clarity which would address many points raised. Officers disagree that large sites are not appropriate for self build.		
DM11: Gypsies, Travelers and Travelling Showpeople	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to walking and cycling distance via a safe route • Consideration needs to be given to any impact on protected sites • Local Plan should make better provision for gypsies and travellers including land for a transit site • Severalls site should not be expanded • Provision needs to be adequate
CBC Response: The number of sites planned for is supported by existing and emerging evidence at a county wide level. The Council are also working with other LA's across the county to secure Transit Site(s) in the right locations. Reference to walking and cycling and protected sites will be added to the policy.		
Housing Standards	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to waste and recycling facilities in policy DM12
DM12: Housing Standards	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any policy including specific requirements for design should be tested alongside other policies in the Plan • The Council needs to provide sufficient evidence to justify adoption of these standards

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should be more closely linked to policy DM25 • The policy is not strong or specific enough. The provision of lifetime homes will not facilitate the diversity of housing choices required for older people • Policy should not require developers to build homes to full wheelchair standards • Reference should be made to guidance
<p>CBC Response: Policy already includes a need to provide bin/recycling storage. No significant changes to policy considered necessary other than reference to Policy DM25.</p>		
Domestic Development: Residential alterations, extensions and outbuildings	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy is duplicated
DM13: Domestic Development	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential flood risk implications • Presumption to retain buildings that are heritage assets should be referenced • Policy needed on infill • Mismatch between policy and planning approvals
<p>CBC Response: Flood risk and heritage assets are picked up in other policies – no need for duplication. The principle of infill is covered in Policy OV1 and other development management policies should adequately address detail including design and amenity.</p>		
Rural Workers Housing	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is policy H6
DM14: Rural Workers Housing	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference should be included to avoid siting of rural workers in flood risk areas
Temporary Rural Workers Dwellings	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketing period is excessive, should be 6 months

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
CBC Response: Reference to Policy H6 is a typo which will be corrected. Flood risk is picked up elsewhere in the plan. Marketing period will be reduced to 12 months		
Design and Amenity	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council require additional suitably trained resources
DM15: Design and Amenity	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity should be included
CBC Response: No significant change necessary		
Historic Environment	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colchester's importance as a historic town has been underplayed • The opportunity to attract people to Colchester because of its heritage and historic assets should be optimised
DM16: Historic Environment	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should make a distinction between the two tests to ensure they are sound, at present the policy is one of blanket restriction • The local list should cover character areas, parks and gardens, structures etc • Heritage at risk should form part of the policy • First paragraph sets out a presumption against development contrary to the NPPF • Doe's Mill is in a distressing state • An area south-west of West Bergholt should be designated as an Area of Special Character • Consider conservation area status for Fernlea/ Stonecrop
CBC Response: Wording will be clarified to ensure consistency with NPPF. Local listing criteria will be revised to include buildings, structures and streets. Site specific issues are not relevant to this policy.		
Open Space	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is provision for ongoing maintenance to be made?

POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
DM17: Retention of Open Space and Recreation Facilities	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing ditches and watercourses as specific protected features should be included • Copford Parish Council has suggested protecting areas as Local Green Spaces • Habitat links should be maintained • The Fernlea open space should be recognised • Policy should recognise that where open space is developed for alternative uses greater flexibility should be provided to allow in some circumstances a smaller but improved quantity • Object proposed loss of the rugby club • Bridleways should be preserved • Any new open space should be accessible to all users
DM18: Provision for Public Open Space	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing ditches and watercourses as specific protected features should be included • It is not clear what document the Council will refer to in determining which deficits are present in an area • Policy should also cover mitigation and adaptation to climate change • Any new open space should be accessible to all users • The commuted sum should be ring fenced for the relevant community
DM19: Private Amenity Space	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should be flexible in rigidly adhering to these standards and have regard to a sites location • Variations to standards must be supported by a strong urban design case
<p>CBC Response: Mapping changes will be made where appropriate to protect open space. Point regarding smaller but better quality facilities will be included. Clarity will be included about the evidence base on which deficiencies are calculated. Minor changes to wording in policy DM17 will be made to ensure that existing ditches and watercourses are protected as part of open space to reflect their ecological and flood risk functions. Objection to loss of Rugby Club noted and site specific issues are covered in Policy NC1.</p>		

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
Promoting Sustainable Transport and Changing Travel Behaviour	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments about pavements • Proposals for West Tey do not satisfy the aim to reduce the need to travel
DM20: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Changing Travel Behaviour	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways are sought within the Local Plan to enhance footpath and cycleway provision through Marks Tey • Reference should be made to the Highways Authority Development Management Policies • How will Council deliver transport and travel policy changes when it does not have responsibility for roads • The outer circuit of the Colchester Orbital should be referred to • Policy does not go far enough in terms of a future proof policy regarding car charging points
Sustainable Access to Development	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links should be accessible to all users
DM21: Sustainable Access to Development	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements too onerous for development involving existing building stock • Sufficient flexibility should be incorporated into the policy • Reference should be made to the Highways Authority Development Management Policies • Measures should only be encouraged • Colchester cannot support increase in cars • Policy does not go far enough in terms of a future proof policy regarding car charging points • Local Plan should allow for implementation of road filtering and unbundling cycle schemes
<p>CBC Response; Reference to be made to the Highways Authority Development Management Policies in explanatory text (not policy). Technology is evolving quickly and a policy which is too specific would soon become out of date. The Council as local planning authority can influence future development of transport infrastructure.</p>		

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
Parking	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many cars
DM22: Parking	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with flexible approach to non-residential parking • A further park and ride scheme would be an asset • Some town centre car parks should remain • More visitor car parking is needed • The policy should allow reduced levels of parking for developments with high levels of affordable housing and/or small flats • Policy should clarify that sustainable locations where lower parking would be acceptable can include high density sites with good public transport
<p>CBC Response: No significant change considered necessary. Comments are mixed and reflect differing opinions on this subject.</p>		
Flood Risk and Water Management	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk and water management should be separated • Reference should be made to EA Risk of Surface Water Flooding maps • Text needs updating
DM23: Flood Risk and Water Management	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequential test needs to be applied to the Plan • Future need for CIL towards tidal and fluvial flood management
DM24: Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy would benefit from re-wording • Development should give priority to SuDS
<p>CBC Response: All sites have been considered sequentially in terms of flood risk as the Local Plan has developed. A Flood Risk Sequential Test report is currently being prepared as part of the evidence base. The Environment Agency is drafting alternative wording for policies DM 23 & DM24. Changes to policy wording will be made reflect this along with other minor text changes needed to ensure that the flood risk sections in the Local Plan are up to date.</p>		
Renewable Energy	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy reference in paragraph 7.148 are missing

POLICY	Total Reprs	Key Issues raised in Representations
DM25: Renewable Energy	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome that developers will be encouraged to meeting higher than minimum standards for water efficiency • Re-wording suggested regarding Natura 2000 sites • Anglian Water must balance need for development with protection of new and existing customers from risk of odour, nuisance and loss of amenity
<p>CBC Response: Typo to be corrected. Policy amendments are needed to strengthen protection of Natura 2000 sites and to reflect Environment Agency comments in relation to waste. Other comments noted.</p>		
Delivery Strategy and Implementation	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no IDP • A definition of infrastructure is suggested
Monitoring	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome a target relating to the historic environment
Table 1 Monitoring	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much greater detail is required, each objective should have a target and key indicator
<p>CBC Response: Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is underway to inform Submission Plan. Targets and key indicators will be reviewed and better aligned.</p>		

Blank page

6. How many representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account

All valid representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account in the preparation of the Local Plan. The regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation attracted an all-time high number of responses totalling 3102 representations from 1539 respondents. This compares to a total of 649 responses from individuals and organisations at the regulation 18 Issues and Options stage in 2015.

The summary of responses to the Issues and Options consultation includes an 'Initial Council response/next steps' for each of the themes, which demonstrates how representations pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account. Table 1, in the preceding section includes a 'CBC response', which shows how the representations to the Preferred Options consultation have been taken into account. Where relevant details of changes to the Local Plan are included.

In summary, as a result of the Issues and Options consultation meetings took place with key members and stakeholders to agree priorities for the Local Plan vision. Representations identified the need for further work to inform the Local Plan, such as updated evidence on the supply and demand of town centre uses, an updated Local Wildlife Sites Review and a Settlement Boundary Review. Issues to feed into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan were identified by consultees. Some consultees, such as Historic England, identified issues that were missing. Where this was the case the local planning authority considered what issues were perceived as missing when considering necessary further updates to the evidence base and the drafting of policies in the Preferred Options. Essex County Council and Braintree District Council expressed a willingness to work with the local planning authority on a joint approach to strategic development.

The largest number of responses to the consultation were received on a proposal for residential development of the Irvine Road orchard (289 responses.) The majority of responses took the form of an e-mail stating that allocation would be 'completely against the council's own policy on protecting urban open space, and its allocation in the previous LDF.' Other respondents noted the importance of the site as an orchard; designated wildlife site; and open space in an urban area. The LPA took account of these representations and evidence in the Local Wildlife Sites Review 2016, which concluded that the site is in favourable but declining status as an orchard with no management of the fruit trees or other vegetation in recent years. The review found that the lack of active and appropriate management, if not addressed over time, will result in further decline in the ecological value, which could lead to the site being de-designated as a Local Wildlife Site. As a result, the site was allocated for up to 8 dwellings on a maximum of 40% of the site, with the requirement for an Ecological Management Plan and Mitigation Plan for the remaining >60% of the site to enhance its ecological value.

Representations to the Centres policies set out in the Preferred Options have led to significant changes to the Centres section. This includes re-writing the Preferred

Options policy, the addition of new centres policies and the reinstatement of a retail hierarchy.

Statutory consultees suggested numerous minor wording changes in their representations to the Preferred Options to improve the robustness of the Local Plan. In the case of the draft Infrastructure policy and Developer contributions policy Essex County Council suggested a revised, merged policy addressing both, which has been incorporated into the Local Plan. The Local Plan has been amended to strength policy in relation to European sites.

Representations to the Place policies, where supported by evidence, have led to a number of changes to the Local Plan. The capacity of Britannia Car Park (Policy TC3) has increased from 100 to 150 to reflect the potential for high density town centre development and the inclusion of a requirement to have neutral effect on town centre parking was added to the policy. Northern Gateway Rugby Club increased from 150 dwellings to 340 dwellings, including 260 units of Extra Care accommodation. A site in Braiswick, Land north of Achnacone Drive, is no longer allocated, and the two sites in Braiswick will be developed together to ensure a comprehensive development that will address residents concerns in respect of access. Middlewick Ranges is now allocated for residential development following a representation from the MOD stating that the site was one of another thirteen sites across the Defence Estate to be released. A site in Abberton, Ashpark House, is no longer allocated, reflecting concerns regarding access. The LPA agrees with representations from residents in Birch about the level of services and facilities and it is now classed as an Other Village, where development will come forward through the development management process, rather than a Sustainable Settlement. Similarly, three proposed sites in Dedham Heath are no longer allocated as Dedham Heath is now classed as an Other Village rather than a Sustainable Settlement. Representations have led to a reduction in overall housing numbers on sites in Langham and a site in Layer de la Haye. Battleswick Farm in Rowhedge, which received a large number of representations (209), is no longer allocated and an alternative site in Rowhedge, promoted by a representation, is allocated instead for a lower number of homes. Two sites in West Mersea are now allocated for a lower number of homes, following consideration of the 536 representations to Policy SS15a (now policy SS12a).

7. If representation were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations

360 representations were made to Section 1 pursuant to regulation 20 and 1010 representations were made to Section 2 pursuant to regulation 20. Table 2, below, includes a summary of the main issues raised in the representations to Section 1. Table 3, below, includes a summary of the main issues raised in the representations to Section 2. Appendices E1 and E2, which are separate documents owing to their size, include a Schedule of all representations to Section 1 and Section 2 respectively, in plan order.

The Local Plan Committee agreed at its June 2017 meeting to carry out public consultation for an eight week period between 16th June and the 11th August, rather than the six week statutory period. The consultation process involved publishing the Publication Draft Local Plan and supporting information on the website; notification of the consultation to the Council's extensive list of interested organisations and individuals; and a series of public drop-in sessions which were advertised through social media, press coverage, and posters circulated to parish councils. The sessions held are detailed below;

Venue	Date
Stanway Village Hall	17 June 10-14:00
Colchester High St market stall	23 June 10-14:00
Greenstead Community Centre	24 June 10-14:00
Great Tey Village Hall	27 June 16-20:00
Marks Tey Village Hall	1 July 10 – 14.00
Abberton & Langenhoe Village Hall	3 July 16-20:00
Langham Community Centre	6 July 16-20:00
MICA Centre West Mersea	8 July 10-14:00
Abbotts Road Community Centre	12 July 16-20.00
William Loveless Hall Wivenhoe	11 July 16-20:00

At the drop-in sessions, attendees were provided with background information on the Local Plan process; access to copies of the consultation document; opportunities to ask questions of the officers in attendance; and information on how to respond formally to the consultation, including advice on using the consultation portal. Officers estimate that approximately 600 people attended the drop-in events in total.

81 representations of support were received to Section 1 and 191 to Section 2. These representations have not been summarised in this Statement as it focuses on the key issues that will be debated as part of the Examination.

Surrounding local authorities including Braintree, Tendring and Chelmsford provided positive responses to the plan, noting joint work carried out in line with Duty to Cooperate requirements. A Duty to Cooperate meeting was held with Maldon following the close of consultation to discuss any issues which did not result in the identification

of any significant issues. Essex County Council expressed broad support for the plan, noted their partnership working with Colchester Borough Council on numerous fronts, and suggested a number of minor changes to clarify wording to be considered through the Examination process. Basildon District Council has identified issues with South Essex authorities being able to meet their housing requirements in full due to Green Belt and environmental constraints and has requested that other Essex authorities, including those in the Colchester/Braintree/Chelmsford/Tendring Strategic Housing Market Area (SHMA), consider addressing this need in their targets. The Essex Planning Officers Association is developing a protocol to ensure that requests such as Basildon's for addressing requirements for dwellings to meet other SHMA needs are dealt with in a consistent and appropriate way.

Table 2. Summary of main issues raised in representations to Section 1

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
SECTION 1		
Introduction and Vision	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverability and viability questioned • Infrastructure first • Collaboration with existing communities to ensure appropriate integration of new communities • Need to have secured economic success across the area to underpin growth – economic generator needed. • Natural England – need for a high level strategic objective on protecting and enhancing natural environment. • Historic England – need for reference to distinctive character of North Essex and protecting heritage assets/character of existing settlements. • Sport England – need strategic objective that specifically covers creating healthier and active communities.
SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing infrastructure deficit and impact not addressed. Insufficient capacity to support growth. • Adverse impacts do not outweigh perceived benefits. • Highways England – support reducing the need to travel by private car • New development should become measurably more sustainable • CPRE -Garden Communities might accord with theory of sustainable development principles, but scale, location and potential impact of those proposed in North Essex questioned. • Infrastructure needs to be delivered prior to development.

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
--	---	--

<p>SP2: Spatial Strategy for North Essex</p>	<p>31</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for more overall leadership and responsibility when considering cumulative impact – must include investment in local businesses and infrastructure. • Insufficient proposals for infrastructure upgrades, lack of current infrastructure. • North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group – Ensure location of appropriate healthcare facilities to support Garden Communities. • Colchester Hospital Trust- Housing estimates used in Infrastructure Delivery Plan queried which could underestimate need for housing and consequential impact on health services. • Provision to protect the existing character of the area needed. • Clarity on location of Garden Communities needed. • Highways England – current designs are based on previously envisaged growth rates rather than new proposals. Steep change in provision and take up of public transport needed. • CAUSE – proposals for two of the three Garden Communities should be dropped – not supported by Sustainability Appraisal. • CPRE – Council hasn't demonstrated it can implement balanced communities supported by infrastructure. • Proposals for Garden Communities rely on future plans which may or may not demonstrate deliverability/viability. • Greater clarity needed on what Garden Communities are intended to achieve and whether aims could be delivered by more traditional development such as urban extensions. • Historic England – provide reference to settlements maintaining their distinctive and historic character. • Alternative site at Monks Wood given inadequate consideration. Issues raised on the selection and soundness of new settlements in respect of the proposed size/role/function within the economic geography of the area and their delivery credentials.
--	-----------	--

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
SP3: Meeting Housing Needs	23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group – Important to ensure health facilities are positioned in suitable places to enable communities to access healthcare appropriately. • No justification for applying a market signals uplift to the demographic projections. If these removed, that the need for two out of three garden communities is removed. • Developer representations received supporting upward adjustments in housing numbers to reflect increased migration from London, concerns regarding affordability, inclusion of Maldon within the Strategic Housing Market Area, and Tendring population calculation uncertainties. • Lack of housing need evidence for proposed post-2033 growth. • Basildon District Council - Unmet need for housing may arise from the South Essex Housing Market area. Amount has not been quantified but South Essex authorities may ask authorities in other HMA's in Essex to help in meeting unmet need. Issue could be overcome by a modification that introduces a review mechanism. • Simultaneous delivery of two Garden Communities – viability of this questioned. • No evidence that 'step change' in sustainable transport is possible. • Include more sites in first five year period. • Deliverability of numbers questioned, particularly since Garden Communities not able to contribute to delivery until end of plan period.
SP4: Providing for Employment and Retail	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address implications of commuting to London and include reference to its role.

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of high quality jobs questioned – plan doesn't provide explanation for how and where they'll be provided. • Lack of evidence to demonstrate Garden Communities can meet target of one job per household. • Plan over-centralises employment in large employment zones and fails to link housing to local jobs. • No evidence for why a 'higher growth scenario' should be considered – would result in identifying land for employment that will not come forward.
SP5: Infrastructure and Connectivity	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure hasn't kept pace with growth and insufficient infrastructure is planned to accompany new growth. • Delivery of infrastructure questioned – more information and certainty needed on funding sources, timescales, and how new communities will attract scale of investment required. • Wording of the policy is unclear and should be amended to require the delivery of necessary strategic infrastructure in advance of or in parallel with the specified need. • Faster broadband required, in particular to assist with service delivery • Viability evidence supporting policy is flawed. • Highways England - Roads Investment Strategy (RIS1) published in 2014, which committed Highways England to commence widening of the A12 between junctions 19 to 25 to three lanes, and to prepare options for consideration in RIS- 2 (2020-25) for widening between junctions 11 to 16 and 25 to 29. Essex County Council has been examining the feasibility of upgrading the A120 between Braintree and

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<p>Marks Tey to a dual carriageway, with a view to submitting this for inclusion into a future RIS-2 funding round. Until housing and employment is committed the road schemes can really only deal with existing challenges allowing for a limited amount of growth as the designs are based on previously envisaged growth rates rather the much more ambitious level proposed in these consultations. This means the need careful planning to ensure proposed development is in the most appropriate place with the necessary facilities and infrastructure available at the right time and a steep change both in the provision and take up of public transport, if this level of development is to be sustainable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – transport infrastructure provides an opportunity to achieve net gain in nature through biodiversity enhancement and linkage of habitat corridors. • Historic England – A120 has archaeological potential. • Colchester Hospital Trust - Growth in housing has implications for local hospital services. Concerns over population figures in Infrastructure Delivery Plan - growth underestimated. • Details on how modal shift to non-car transport methods can be achieved needs to be provided before there can be confidence on lower car use in new developments. • Introduce visionary new ideas for movement involving collaboration with transport providers. • Sport England – Strategic infrastructure should include leisure and sport, to ensure benefits of co-location and encouraging active lifestyles.

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers can only provide the mechanisms to allow infrastructure providers to provide services – it cannot provide the services.
SP6: Place Shaping principles	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In view of its deterioration, allow town centre to be replaced with housing and allow edge of centre retail growth. • Development proposals need to include green spaces to address of loss of countryside. • Large scale communities can't respond to local character. Density shouldn't exceed 60 units per hectare. • Plan must exhibit a degree of common sense on car usage. • Inability of location to be self-contained • Lack of sense of community • Infrastructure budget too low and financial model is flawed. The likely result is short-cuts in delivery of principles set out in SP6 • Location wrong for Colchester Braintree Borders GC: high commuting • Design codes can play a part but over dependence on them can make master plans too rigid. Plan making process should be process rather than product orientated. • Two sources of design policy in SP6 and DM15 is unhelpful and will cause ongoing confusion. • Needs to be greater emphasis placed on the importance of recognising and protecting the integrity of existing places. • Each phase of development needs to be sustainable in its own right. • Natural England – strengthen policy to ensure new development incorporates biodiversity creation. • Require 'high' standards rather than 'highest'.

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy is overly prescriptive in relation to design, public realm, parking and green/blue infrastructure. Blue infrastructure not defined.
SP7	47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure needs to be guaranteed to be delivered before housing • Delivery of Garden Communities must be in context of meeting housing delivery targets for plan period • Provision for places of worship should be included • Allowances for infrastructure and contingency are too low. No evidence of sound financial risk assessment. • No evidence that policy of promoting sustainable travel will work • No housing need evidence for post-2033 period. • Objectively Assessed Housing Need not properly assessed. • CAUSE summary of points covered in their submission: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed amendments required 2. Comments on Sustainability Appraisal 3. New towns: learning from the past 4. Positive vision for north Essex 5. OAN - unnecessary uplifts applied 6. Providing for employment 7. Rail constraints 8. Connectivity & infrastructure 9. Viability: West Tey's business case 10. West Tey: Costs & Risks 11. The deal for land-owners 12. Community engagement • Not certain necessary infrastructure including road and rail improvements, health, schools, etc., can be secured ahead of development. • Lack of rationale on choice of sites. • Highways England - Strong interdependence between these proposals and the improvements to the A12 and A120 and it will be essential that we work together to achieve our strategic objectives and ensure the

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<p>evidence base is robust. Cumulative impact assessment should be carried out on the impact of development of growth in villages and in the early part of the plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No economic base • Start with East Colchester first to gain expertise • Use low quality agricultural land at Middlewick before high quality at West Tey. • South Colchester should be developed to release funds for necessary transport infrastructure before greenfield land to the west of Colchester. • Delivery mechanism needs to be established before garden communities included in the plan. • Concerns regarding proposed Local Delivery Vehicles. Alternative models and funding option should be explored, ie collaborative tenure with developer or strategic finance partner. • LDVs provide for tighter control over development, but scale of proposals for three concurrent garden communities raises concern about ability and capacity of LDV to deliver all Section 1 proposals. • Insufficient community engagement • Affordable housing target of 30% queried for its deliverability and effect on viability. • Consideration required of impacts and relationship with adjoining communities. • Natural England – Green infrastructure should be delivered according to defined standards. Need to identify how net gain in local biodiversity is to be achieved.

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More guidance needed on ancillary facilities including retail and leisure uses. • Historic England – Need demonstrable consideration of impact of Garden Communities on the historic environment. Plan should contain a framework to guide how boundaries and extent of garden communities are determined. Consideration of impacts and relationship with adjoining communities. • Scale should be reduced – too big in relation to existing communities. • Ability questioned of CBB Garden Community to be holistically and comprehensively planned and phased with the agreement of all landowners. Delivery mechanisms and viability for the development of new settlements questioned - not sound to suggest that local authorities must benefit financially.

SP8	48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee infrastructure is provided before housing is built. • Provide good quality link road from A120 to A133 as an early part of development. • North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group – Primary healthcare facilities to be provided as appropriate. • All new development should be over the brow of the hill and out-of-sight of existing residents. • Public transport and Park and Ride aspirations are unrealistic • Anglian Water - Reference welcomed to an upgrade to Colchester waste water treatment plant and off-site improvements to the foul sewerage network. Refer to the phasing of improvements to align the scale and timing of the proposed garden community given that development is expected to come forward after 2033. • Loss of excellent agricultural land opposed. • Potential impact on European designated sites • Affordable housing not well located for Tendring residents nor will it help foster economic growth in Tendring.
-----	----	--

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of detail on proposed Salary Brook County Park, therefore insufficient protection of endangered species and distinctive sense of place. Essential that Salary Brook valley and adjacent woodland is safeguarded. • Lack of mention of existing flooding issues in area – specific mitigation needed to prevent exacerbating the problem. • Need to adhere to a 1.5 km buffer between Greenstead/Longridge and the new settlement. Housing must be beyond tree line at top of hill to the east of Greenstead/Longridge. • No building south of A133. • Rapid transport links need to include cycle lanes. • Concerns about traffic on existing country lanes. • Noise shielding for new roads needed. • Historic England – concerned that new settlements will be housing led rather than considering the landscape and heritage assets.
SP9	80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over rail capacity, parking capacity at stations, and potential changes to location of Marks Tey station • Objections to loss of Grade 2 agricultural land, poorer quality land should be considered first. • Current infrastructure inadequate. • Infrastructure, including upgraded A120 and A12, health and schools needs to be in place before houses built, but high levels of uncertainty regarding timings and likelihood of critical transport infrastructure improvements required in advance.

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green buffers for existing settlements should be designated and shown on proposals maps. • Policy should be more positive and precise as to integration with Marks Tey by reference to built environment, traffic, enhancements and retention of village identity and access to countryside. • Proposal would create a commuter town following on from its location on rail line to London. • Economic basis for proposal has not been made- unclear where jobs would come from. • Extent of proposed Garden Community unclear – lack of consistent mapping between authorities. • Provision of places of worship should be specifically mentioned. • Anglian Water – agree that upgrade to waste water treatment plant and off-site improvements to foul sewerage network. Refer to phasing of improvements to align scale and timing beyond plan period. • Begin with East Colchester Garden Community before starting on West. Inclusion of West Colchester is premature. • Massive Government subsidies would be required. • Negative effect on rural setting and character of existing villages. • No meaningful public transport provided until 2030. • CAUSE -CBBGC not deliverable, viable or sustainable option, nor will it meet infrastructure requirements of its own population or current local population of Braintree and Colchester. • Scale is too large • Natural England. Adequate water treatment infrastructure should be included as a safeguard to ensure that phasing of development doesn't

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<p>exceed capacity. Concerns about strength of protection and enhancement of natural environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England – No indication as to how extent of garden communities will be determined. Concern that new settlements will be housing led rather than considering landscape and heritage assets. Potential for significant archaeological interest in the A12 and A120 area, along with listed buildings. • Public transport aspirations are unrealistic. • No Plan B if Garden Community is not located by proposed A120/A12. • Clearer reference to Garden Community principles should be included. • Potential location for Tiptree spur road on/off the A12 needs to be defined. • Developer concerns over affordable housing viability.
SP10	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee infrastructure is provided before housing is built. • Anglian Water – Refer to phasing of improvements to align scale and timing of garden community given that development is expected to come forward after 2033. • Places of worship should be allocated. • Integrity of existing settlements such as Rayne and Stebbing would be under threat from proximity of proposals. • Financial viability questioned • Lack of attention to safeguarding natural and historic amenities such as historic airfield at Andrewsfield. • Developer concerns over affordable housing viability.

	Total Reps Submitted to Colchester	Key Issues of Concern raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England – proposed garden community could have significant impact of setting of Saling Grove listed building and garden. No indication as to how extent of garden communities will be determined. Stronger references to heritage asset safeguarding needed.

Table 3. Summary of main issues raised in representations to Section 2

Introduction, Vision and Objectives	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – Policies required on soil and land quality and on consideration of best and most versatile agricultural land • Historic England – Vision is too Town Centre focused. Objectives should include more explicit reference to whole Borough’s historic environment. • Essex Wildlife Trust – Objectives should commitment to wildlife corridors. • Plan shouldn’t rely on neighbourhood plans to allocate sites.
Strategic Policies SG1-SG8	139	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy for Garden Communities criticised for choice of location; lack of infrastructure; lack of job creation potential; loss of agricultural land. • More development needed to address short time housing need. Allocate more small sites, sites in small settlements. • Incorrect to assume continuation of high housing growth levels in Colchester.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different areas of Colchester not all equal in terms of sustainability and role as place. Stanway should be ranked higher in settlement hierarchy. • Historic England – Refer to both landscape and historic character, not just landscape. • Developers raised concerns over methodology used to calculate housing supply. Contingency needed to address potential non-delivery. OAHN is underestimated since it doesn't adequately consider increased migration from London; the ability of London to meet housing needs; or effectively assess key market signals. • Lack of clarity on sources of economic growth, particularly for local jobs to avoid reliance on London and commuting. • Too much employment land allocated – flooding the market doesn't necessarily reduce price and render sites more viable. • Allocate employment sites in small villages. • Centres hierarchy on Tollgate should be revisited in light of its increasing prominence. Further work needed on retail evidence following Tollgate appeal decision. • More evidence on impact thresholds for retail proposals required – thresholds queried. • Improved digital connectivity required to enable growth. • Health (including NE Essex Clinical Commissioning Group and Colchester Hospital Trust) – Health sector needs to be fully engaged throughout process to ensure appropriate levels of health infrastructure. Hospital Trust queried population and housing basis of Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Questions on accuracy and viability of Infrastructure Delivery Plan – reflect organisational commitments? Lack of statutory connection between the LDP and Local Plan.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More clarity needed on differences between strategic and local infrastructure. • Concerns about legal agreements to increase contributions should viability improve during construction phase since costs can both rise and fall until completion. • Natural England – Develop recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. To address measure required to mitigate impacts on protected sites. • Impact on deliverability and viability of providing infrastructure first questioned by developers. • More clarity needed on the relationship between Neighbourhood Plans and Garden Communities. • University of Essex – location for medium to long term expansion of University Campus identified in Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan but not in Local Plan. • Concern that neighbourhood plans take a long time to produce and are not initiated directly by the Council, causing uncertainty for developers and delay housing delivery.
<p>Environmental, Climate Change and Generic Infrastructure Policies ENV1-ENV5 & CC1 -</p>	<p>50</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSPB and Natural England – Include specific mention to Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) • Maps required to clarify areas protected for environmental designations. • Proper evaluation needed to alternative approaches to providing green infrastructure for Garden Communities.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – Recommend further wording requiring biosecurity protocol method statement prevent the spread of invasive non-native species. • Historic England – text should set out how the suite of strategic and development management policies protect the historic environment beyond policy DM16. • Essex Wildlife Trust – policy lacks a clear commitment to ensuring that developers aim to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. • Policy objectives should not be cumulative but should be considered individually. • Local Nature Reserves should be protected. • University of Essex objects to extension of Coastal Protection Belt to include land on east side of river which is currently allocated for an extension to the University campus. • Objections to deletion from Coastal Protection Belt of land lying to the east and south of Wivenhoe. • Natural England – caution should be used around term ‘irreplaceable’. Policy could be strengthened by inclusion of seascape as well as landscape character. • Environment Agency – Plan should identify a Coastal Change Management Area for any area likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast to make clear what development could be appropriate. A CCMA should be identified for Mersea Island. • Concerns over requirement that development must demonstrate a coastal location is required. • Environment Agency – add text on contributing to protection and enhancement of water bodies.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should not that application will be different in relation to certain classes of historic buildings. • Individual developments would not necessarily be expected to meet Borough-wide needs. Explanation lacking of the requirements expected of a developer when considering whether to bring a scheme forward.
Centre Policies TC1-4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England – Strengthen wording on protection of heritage assets and their settings. Infrastructure accompanying transport works in historic areas can have a significant detrimental impact – wording needed to address this. • Retail impact thresholds are too restrictive. Insufficient flexibility to allow for introduction other non-A1 uses.
North Colchester Policies NC1-NC4	43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community building a requirement. • Concerns about rugby ground proposal -maximum of 200 dwellings on site to ensure compatibility with surrounding area. Opposition to loss of habitat. • North Colchester Transport Plan is flawed – no more traffic should use Mill Road. • Highways England – Development could have a severe impact upon A12 and A120. Traffic Impact Assessment needed. This section of the A12 subject to a study for potential widening. • Allocation for 70 units south west of the Braiswick golf club does not fit with other policies in the plan. It would cause visual impact on views from West Bergholt and coalescence of West Bergholt with Colchester. • Improved infrastructure, road network improvements and vastly improved public transport links are required in the North

		<p>Colchester/North Station/Northern Gateway areas, (along with suitable car parking at sports facilities) or whole area will be at a standstill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aspirations for developer-supported bus services not accompanied by evidence of deliverability. • Objection to proposed multiplex cinema at Northern Gateway due to impact on Odeon Cinema.
South Colchester Policies SC1 - 3	171	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No measures shown to alleviate the inevitable increased volume of traffic the new Gosbecks and Berechurch Hall estates will generate in Shrub End. • Any proposed development in Gosbeck area needs to pay careful regard to sensitive archaeology and biodiversity of area. • Essex County Council – Ensure provision for provision of a primary school and early years and child care facilities as a direct result of the Middlewick development and to meet education needs arising from other Local Plan allocations in south Colchester • Objections to Middlewick allocations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic congestion already a problem - busy Mersea Rd and Berechurch Hall Rd. Junction Abbots Road and Old Heath Road very narrow and not suitable for site traffic. Where will proposed access to new estate be? 2. Lack of other infrastructure - School places, sewers, community facilities, and health provision an issues.. 3. Destruction of green space. 4. Proposal came in later than other sites considered through plan-making process 5. Loss of biodiversity and wildlife – concerns over loss of the diverse woodland and heathland habitats and 2 protected species. A Local Wildlife site which warrants SSSI designation. 6. History – archaeology needs to be preserved.

		<p>7. Healthy living. More pollution and noise. Concerns about contamination with ammunition, carcasses from foot and mouth epidemic.</p> <p>8. Public Transport. Bus routes are not easily accessible as mentioned.</p> <p>9. Queries over need for development -housing numbers already sufficient and can be met elsewhere.</p> <p>10. Reject housing proposal and create a South Colchester County Park.</p> <p>11. Few employment opportunities close by for residents.</p> <p>12. Lack of confidence in Council's ability to deliver supporting infrastructure.</p>
East Colchester Policies EC1-EC4	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Essex – support thrust of EC1, but have concerns principally relating to the deletion of the existing land identified for campus expansion; the lack of information about the Orbital route; and the working of the paragraphs requiring possible contributions to offsite infrastructure. • Sport England University site includes a lot of sports infrastructure which merits protection. • Masterplan needed to clarify boundaries of Garden Community and University expansion. • Capacity for further expansion at Whitehall queried given traffic and air quality issues. • Provide access for all user groups, including equestrians.
West Colchester WC1 – WC5	38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England – Development at West Colchester could have a severe impact upon the A12 and A120. We would wish to see a traffic

		<p>impact assessment demonstrating the potential impacts of such a proposal. Of particular concern are junctions 25,26,27,28&29. There may also be impacts upon the main line. However, although these need to be quantified this section of the A12 is subject to a study for potential widening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stane Park developer - Policy needs redrafting in light of Tollgate decision to reflect Stanway's position in spatial hierarchy. Zone one needs to be reduced in extent to remove land at Stane Park, with related criteria altered to better facilitate economic growth. Inappropriate to have blanket policy not permitting main town centre uses. An additional Zone Three should be introduced for Stane Park recognising its strategic opportunities designating it for commercial uses that have a beneficial synergy with relevant components of the Economic Area. • Historic England - though Stanway has an established economic role and has seen much new development, there remain a number of listed buildings in the area whose setting and continued beneficial use should be considered as the area is identified for growth. • NE Essex CCG - Significant proposed developments will require Health to be involved with developers in the early stages and appropriate mitigation sought to enable the appropriate Health infrastructure for this growing community. Previous experience has meant that lack of engagement with both NHS England and the CCG has resulted in poor infrastructure and no mitigation to support the existing premises. • Objection to Chitts Hill – noise pollution and poor public transport links • Land off Dyers Road – concerns over highways infrastructure. Consider closing Dyers Road at Warren Lane junction to stop use as rat run. • Sport England – Chitts Hill site – buffer zone for playing fields required to ensure no risk of ball strike issues.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should be amended to reflect Tollgate appeal decision – revise WC1 re Strategic Economic Area and Policy WC2 to remove housing allocation on former Sainsbury’s site. • Objection to Irvine Road site – poor or no access, ecological implications and better alternative sites available elsewhere. Whole site should be retained as a wildlife orchard. • Lack of evidence to support aspirations for increased bus use.
Sustainable Settlements	381	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers/landowners have proposed various sites in and adjacent to Sustainable Settlements as alternatives to those proposed in the plan. • Objections to Abberton and Langenhoe allocations – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -No village amenities, not a sustainable location -Additional traffic detrimental -Loss of countryside, effect on wildlife in and around reservoir -Disproportionate addition to village -Negative urbanising effect on village setting and landscape character- more lighting, noise - Inadequate existing infrastructure, i.e. water and broadband • Objections to Copford allocations – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic levels already high in area. Housing numbers disproportionate to other villages. Impact on natural and historic landscape Alternative brownfield sites should be used. Queensberry Ave. specific points Access to new development through existing residential street not suitable – separate access required. Hall Road specific points Loss of woodland and river valley landscape rich in birds and wildlife. Site adjacent to Local Wildlife site. Not adjacent to village amenities.

		<p>Poor access with insufficient width available to create two car width road with pavement.</p> <p>Development will compromise the setting of listed buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to Fordham allocation – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of agricultural land Primary school capacity an issue. Negative effect on listed building Would add to safety concerns and congestion on Plummers Road • Objections to Great Horkesley allocations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative impact on existing infrastructure and services ie road network, health provision and school. Area already has accepted sufficient development. Effect on wildlife. • Objections to Great Tey allocations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Late addition to plan has meant consultation is inadequate. Lack of village amenities, jobs and services Increase in traffic – lack of public transport Sewage inadequate. Negative effect on conservation area, rural character Level of development disproportionate to small village. New Barn Road/Greenfield Drive specific points Problematic access through existing estate Extra traffic on narrow lanes. Negative visual effect on open countryside and views over Roman River valley. Loss of greenfield site, brownfield should be used. Environmental and wildlife impact. Further playing fields not required. • Objections to Langham allocations
--	--	--

		<p>Level of development disproportionately high compared to other villages and compared with lack of services within village.</p> <p>Essential infrastructure needs have been unmet.</p> <p>Backfill estate type development would destroy special rural historic character.</p> <p>Water/sewage infrastructure already at capacity.</p> <p>Resident views gathered in surveys haven't been taken on board.</p> <p>School road development would exacerbate existing dangerous traffic management problems with school adjacent to business use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to Layer de la Haye allocation: <p>Appropriate vehicular access needs resolution</p> <p>Development would stress existing limited community infrastructure.</p> <p>Negative effect on village character.</p> <p>Existing roads inadequate – more traffic will cause further pollution, noise and potential danger to pedestrians.</p> <p>Negative effect on local wildlife and habitats.</p> • Objections to West Mersea <p>Unique island position of Mersea reduces its development capacity due to access and environmental constraints.</p> <p>Infrastructure already constrained, ie health, schools, water/sewage, parking. New development would need to expand infrastructure.</p> <p>No evacuation plan for Bradwell.</p> <p>Extra sports facilities queried as appropriate planning gain for development.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Housing numbers for Mersea queried due to year round residents in caravans.</p> <p>No justification for reducing land within Coastal Protection Belt.</p> <p>Impact on habitats and designated sites.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Build on brownfield land elsewhere. Neighbourhood Plan will guide development. Dawes Lane specific comment- Widening of full length of Dawes Lane required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coast Road policy issues- Houseboats - Scale and density of proposed developments must be controlled to protect historic authenticity of the marine foreshore from large residential non marine development. Development of historic vacant sites could increase potential environmental hazard. • Caravan policy issues – Problems with incremental growth of caravans and year-round occupancy straining local infrastructure and adding to traffic congestion. Policy should be tightened up to limit further extensions of caravan parks. • Objections to Rowhedge allocation – Loss of employment. Rowhedge has already accepted enough new housing. School capacity an issue. NE Essex CCG – Provision of healthcare being explored in context of new models for healthcare delivery, however no infrastructure formally approved yet. Location is peripheral to main village – lack of public transport. • Objections to West Bergholt policy Proposed area of growth doesn't fit within landscape objectives in Landscape Character Assessment. Negative impact on local facilities. • Objections to Other Villages and Countryside Policies Some small settlements considered to fall within 'other villages' rather than 'countryside'.
--	--	--

		Developers reps supporting greater flexibility for development in small settlements.
Development Management Policies	120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DM8 Affordable Housing Deliverability of 30% target and lower threshold for rural areas queried by developers DM11 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Cllr. Oxford -Capacity at Severalls Lane is 3 not 6 pitches. DM12 Housing Standards Developer concerns raised over evidence for enhanced standards for accessibility and space standards. DM19 Private Amenity Space Developer concerns over insufficient flexibility on amenity space standards. DM20 Promoting Sustainable Transport and Changing Travel Behaviour Public transport aspirations, including Park and Ride, are unrealistic. Better provision for electric vehicle charging points required.

Representations submitted to the Regulation 20 consultation proposing minor amendments for accuracy, to correct an error, and where the LPA supports the amendment, have been added to a Minor Modifications schedule.

Where more significant changes have been proposed, that require further consideration, the LPA will seek to resolve as many of these either through Statements of Comment Ground or through further discussions.

Appendix A. List of consultees

Please note that residents have not been listed in this appendix.

Duty to co-operate bodies

Environment Agency
Historic England

Natural England
Mayor of London
Civil Aviation Authority
Homes and Communities Agency
Office of Rail Regulation
Transport for London
Integrated Transport Authority
Sustainable Environment &
Enterprise
Highways England
Highways England
Marine Management Organisation
Local Enterprise Partnership

Essex County Council

Suffolk County Council
Tendring District Council
Babergh District Council
Braintree District Council
Maldon District Council
Network Rail
Essex County Council
Greater London Authority
Chelmsford City Council
Essex County Council
Network Rail
Network Rail
Historic England

Specific consultation bodies

Parish Councils

Abberton & Langenhoe Parish Council
Aldham Parish Council
Birch Parish Council
Boxted Parish Council
Chappel Parish Council
Little Horkesley Parish Council
Copford with Easthorpe Parish Council
East Donyland Parish Council
East Mersea Parish Council
Eight Ash Green Parish Council
Fingringhoe Parish Council
Fordham Parish Council
Great Horkesley Parish Council
Great Tey Parish Council

Langham Parish Council
Layer de la Haye Parish Council
Layer Marney Parish Meeting
Marks Tey Parish Council
Messing cum Inworth Parish Council
Myland Parish Council
Stanway Parish Council
Tiptree Parish Council
Wakes Colne Parish Council
West Bergholt Parish Council
West Mersea Town Council
Winstred Hundred Parish Council
Wivenhoe Town Council
Wormingford Parish Council
Mount Bures Parish Council
Dedham Parish Council
Layer Breton Parish Council

Adjoining Parish Councils

Alresford Parish Council
Ardleigh Parish Council
Brightlingsea Town Council
Bures St Mary Parish Council
Coggeshall PC
Earls Colne PC
East Bergholt Parish Council

Elmstead Parish Council
Feering Parish Council

Great Braxted Parish Council
Great Totham PC
Higham Parish Council
Kelvedon Parish Council
Lawford Parish Council
Nayland with Wissington Parish Council

Stoke By Nayland Parish Council
Stratford St Mary Parish Council
Tollesbury Parish Council

Tolleshunt D'Arcy Parish Council

Tolleshunt Major Parish Council

Tolleshunt Knights Parish Council
White Colne PC

Planning Inspectorate

Planning Inspectorate

Policing body and adjoining

Suffolk Constabulary

Essex Constabulary

Eircom UK Ltd
Fibernet Ltd
Gemini Submarine Cable System Ltd
Global Crossing
Kingston Communications (Hull) Plc
Lancaster University Network Services Ltd
Neos Networks Ltd
NTL Group Ltd
Opal Telecom Ltd
Orange Personal Communications Ltd
Regional Communications Team O2
Airwave
SSE Telecommunications Ltd
Telia Sonera International Carrier Ltd
Vtesse Networks Ltd
Vodafone and O2
Easynet Telecommunications Ltd
NWP Spectrum Ltd
Omne Telecommunications Ltd
EE
Three

EDF Energy

British Gas Connections Ltd

Anglian Water

Affinity Water
Thames Water Utilities Ltd
Essex & Suffolk Water
South East Water Plc

Cllr Anne Brown
Cllr Margaret Fisher
Cllr Elizabeth Blundell

NHS Property Services
NHS Property Services
Director of Estates & Facilities

Abellio Greater Anglia
First Essex Buses Ltd
Network Colchester
Hedingham and Chambers Buses

Sustrans - Director East of England
CTC - Development Manager

General consultation bodies

Iceni Projects Ltd

The Stanway School
Hazlemere Infants School & Nursery
Old Heath County Primary School
Greenstead & St Andrews Nursery & Infants
St Georges New Town Junior School
Equality Estates
Andrew Martin Planning Ltd
AMPRESS
CRCL
Barton Willmore
Barton Willmore

Plater Claiborne Architecture & Design & Royal Institute of British Architects Colchester Charter of Chartered Architects
Essex Roofing Company Ltd
Higgins Construction Plc
Colchester and North East Essex Building Preservation Trust
Stanley Bragg Partnership
Warren Insulation
Peldon Village Hall Management Committee
The Wine Centre
ADP
MP For North Essex
MP for Colchester
MP for Witham
Malting Green Surgery
Colchester Area Community church
Queen Elizabeth Hall
McDonald's Colchester
Sustainable Environment Consultants Ltd
Colchester CVS
Colchester Furniture Project (The Shake Trust)
Five Poets Residents Association
East Anglian Chambers
Shelter
Colchester Conservative Club
Colchester Credit Union Ltd
Fitness First
Living Streets, Colchester
Knowles Associates Ltd
The C M Cadman Group Ltd
Turley Associates
Bags o Fun
Boydens
Essex County Cricket Club
Parsons Heath Residents Association
Owen Partnerships
DPDS Consulting Group
Indasa Abrasives (UK)Ltd
Intel
CPR Essex

Edward Gittins & Associates

Barton Willmore
Gladedale Group
Forestry Commission
Colchester Chamber of Commerce
Harwich International Port
Road Haulage Association
Transport for London
Colchester PCT
Countryside Properties
Evening Gazette/Essex County Standard
Planning Potential
Greenstead Library
Wildlife and Countryside Link
Rydon Homes Ltd
Wilkin & Sons Ltd
Ian R Matthers B.S & D
Cadman Contracts
Colchester Archaeological Trust
Colchester & Tendring Women's Refuge
Colchester Arts Centre
Colne Housing Society
Disability East (EDPA)
National Playing Fields
Help the Aged
McLean Design Services Ltd
Ringway Group Ltd
The Rose and Crown Hotel
The Royal Association For Deaf People
RWCL
Sloppy Joes
Gypsy & Traveller Law Reform Coalition
Catten College
Mersea Homes
Colchester Croquet Club
Hythe Residents Association
Lexden Restorations Ltd
Indigo Planning
Britannia Storage Systems Ltd
Mayfair Investments
Colchester & District Jewish Community
Countryside Properties
Colchester Civic Society
Mumford & Wood Ltd
Hills Residential Ltd
Beaumont Seymour & Co
Colchester Mind
BAP Transport Ltd
La Farge Aggregates Ltd
Hall Duncan Associates
Flakt Woods Ltd
Bidwells
Dev Plan
Colchester Learning Shop
James & Lindsay Life & Pensions Ltd

CAPITA

BDG Design (South) Ltd
Marguerite Livingstone Associates
Ramblers Association - Colchester
Corporate Associates Ltd
Loofers Food & Coffee Place
Newman Commercials
R G Carter Colchester
The Food Company
Pertwee Estate Ltd

Scott Wilson
GVA, Director, Hotels and Leisure
Dedham Vale AONB Project
The JTS Partnership
Sales Manager
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Strutt & Parker LLP
Nicholas Percival
Fisher Jones Greenwood
T J Evers Ltd
Orchard Baptist Church
LCO Consulting Ltd
Hutton Construction Ltd
Atisreal UK
Stanway Residents Association
Colchester Friends of the Earth
Essex & Suffolk Gliding Club
Welshwood Park Residents Association
Entec UK Ltd
Morley Richards & Ablewhite
Peyton Tyler Mears
Level Ltd
The Sixth Form College, Colchester
R H M Joinery
Fenn Wright
Leith Planning
Rose of Colchester Ltd
Diocese of Chelmsford Colchester Area team
Colchester Zoo
Facility Development Manager
R & P Taylor Carpets
Paragon Legal Services Ltd
MOD - Estates
Defence Estates
Saxon House Ltd
The Theatres Trust
Dentistry
Fenn Wright
Whybrow Chartered Surveyors
MOD (Colchester Garrison)
Januarys
D F Clark Contractors Ltd

Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd
Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd
Tesco
Plater Claiborne Architecture & Design & Royal Institute of British Architects Colchester Charter of Chartered Architects
NTR Planning
FMA Ltd
St Mary Residents Association
Rural Community Council of Essex
Stephen Egerton Associates
Iceni Homes
Naylor Property Ltd
Stephen Hayhurst Chartered Town Planner
St Johns Church
Colchester Access Group
Atkins Telecom
P Tuckwell Ltd
ASM Logistics
Planning and Regeneration Consultant
Robinson and Hall
St Mary's Church
Colchester Cycling Campaign

British Telecom
Riverside Residents Association
Bidwells

Wivenhoe Conservation Area

Planning Consultant
Twenty 16 Design
TACMEP
Ray Chapman Associates
Colchester Green Links and Open Space Group
Sustrans
Natural History Society

Essex University

RSPB

Pomery Planning Consultants
Fusion Online Ltd
Taylor Wimpey
Bellway Homes
Bellway
Persimmon Homes
Persimmon Homes
Rose Builders
Harding Homes
Hopkins Homes
Bellway
Castle and Roman Road Residents Association
Dutch Quarter Association

Colchester Association of Local Councils (CALC)
Colchester Baptist Church
David Miller Associates
Technical Officer
Lexden Restorations Ltd
Strood WI
Haven Gateway Partnership
South East Local Enterprise Partnership
South East Local Enterprise Partnership
Kirkwells
Peacock & Smith
Hanover Bloc

FFT Planning Fusion
Online Ltd
Evolution Planning
Beacon Planning Ltd
Commercial Estates Group
CP Bigwood
BREEAM
Martin Robeson Planning Practice
Whirlledge & Nott
Essex Wildlife Trust
Rapeleys LLP
WYG Management Services
Lovemyland
Januaries Consultant Surveyors
The Coast Road Association
CALC
Freight Transport Association, HR Department
Prettygate Library
Tiptree Library
West Mersea Library
Colchester Rural Age Concern
Planning Design Building Consultant
Eclettico
Army Welfare Services
F & C Commercial Property Holdings Ltd
Army
The Planning Bureau Ltd
Tesco Stores Ltd Friends
of the Minorities
Stanway Library
Dr D Bateman & Partners
The Strood WI
Wivenhoe Dental Practice
Smythies Avenue Residents Association
Priory Residents Association

Transco Merchant
Projects
Keith Mitchell Building Consultancy Ltd
Federation of Small Businesses
St Johns Residents Association

Colchester Bus Users Support Group
C2 Fire Protection
Planware
Mersea Island Society
Purcell Miller Tritton
Defense Estates
Underwoods of Colchester
Chairman Mersea Island Trust
Prettygate Dental Practice
Layer Road Surgery
Colchester Institute
Godden & Rudling Building Services
Seatrade
St Johns Ambulance
Allegro Music
Essex Fire & Rescue Services
Rollerworld
Wivenhoe Sailing Club
CF Anderson & Son Ltd

Chairman/General Secretary J Sainsbury Veterans Colchester Local Association
Womens National Commission
Rennison Consultants
Andrew Martin Planning
Andrew Martin Planning Ltd
AMPRESS
Essex County Council
Essex County Council
Phase 2 Planning
Strutt & Parker
Barton Willmore
Robinson & Hall LLP
Boyer Planning
Fairhurst
Strategic Land Property Manager
Hawkspur Ltd
M J Planning
Planware Ltd
North Associates Ltd
Essex Bridleways Association
Bellway Homes
Suffolk Coastal
Persimmon Homes
Fusion Online Ltd
Indigo Planning
Gateway 120-ASP Planning
Colchester Natural History Society
Rydon Homes Ltd
Sigma Planning Services

Joseph Greenhow Planning
Smart Planning
LSR Solicitors and Planning Consultants

42 Rye Road
Knight Frank LLP
GMS Estates Ltd
John Popham Planning
John Finch Partnership
Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd
Stanfords
Terence O'Rourke Ltd
A S P
R.F. West Ltd
Fenn Wright
WL 2010 Ltd
The Johnson Dennehy Planning Partnership
KLH Architects Ltd
CBC - Northern Gateway
Planning Consultant
Su-Rosa Architecture Ltd.
Boyer Planning
Colchester East Community Association (CECA)
Deloitte Real Estate
English Architecture
KC Smith
Van Cols Ltd
BDG Design (South) Ltd
Robert Turner Assoc.
Vaughan & Blyth Construction Ltd
Aim Hire
Inland Homes
Hythe Forward
HAT Projects
Braiswick Residents Association
East Lexden Residents Assoc.
Churchillgate Residents
Autostopcock
SSA Planning Limited
Savills
Campaign for Real Ale
Gladman Development
Equity Estates
Strutt & Parker LLP
Lanswood Ltd
Ottleywhitehouse Ltd
Sally Minns & Associates
David Russell Associates
Raymond Stemp Associates
Land Management Farms Ltd
Ray Ricks Consultancy
Cheffins
Hills Building Group
Artisan Planning & Property Services
Lanpro Services
Hopkins Homes
Planware Ltd
Colne Housing Society

CBRE
Home Builders Federation Ltd
Planinfo
rg+p Ltd Planning Consultants
Pleydell Smithyman
Strutt & Parker
Terence O'Rourke Ltd
Stratus Environmental Ltd.
Indigo Planning
Indigo Planning
Lanes New Homes
Persimmon Homes
Pegasus Planning
RSPB
Wimpey Taylor Central London
Matthews & Sons LLLP
John Popham Planning
Andrew Martin Associates
C Bus
Maldon District Council
Office of Rail Regulation
Theatre Arts
Planning Associates
Dyson Consulting

Appendix B. 8 June 2015 Local Plan Committee Report



Local Plan Committee

Item

8 June 2015

Report of	Head of Commercial Services	Author	Laura Chase
			282473
<i>Title</i>	Consultation on the Colchester Borough Local Plan Issues and Options Document		
Wards affected	All		

The Local Plan Committee is asked to consider the responses received following the consultation on the Issues and Options stage of the Local Plan.

1. Decision(s) Required

- 1.1 To note the responses received following a statutory six week public consultation concerning the initial Issues and Options phase of developing a new Local Plan for Colchester.
- 1.2 To note the next steps in plan development set out in section 5 below.

2. Reasons for Decision(s)

- 2.1 To ensure the Council's planning policies are updated in order to provide a robust basis for guiding future growth and development across the Borough.

3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 No alternative options are proposed, as members need to be aware of the issues arising from the statutory consultation process and how Council plans to respond to them as it carries forward development of a new Local Plan. The alternative of not proceeding with a new Local Plan would leave the Council in a vulnerable position going forward with no clear steer for the future growth and development of the Borough. It would result in existing policy becoming outdated and not in accordance with national policy requirements.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1 At its meeting of 16 December 2014, the Local Plan Committee agreed the publication of an Issues and Options consultation document. The production of an Issues and Options document as a first stage in the development of a new Local Plan reflected national plan-making guidance as stated in Section 18 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This provides that a local planning authority must invite consultees to ‘make representations to the local planning authority about what a local plan...ought to contain’, and that the local authority should then take account of these views when developing its plan.
- 4.2 The Issues and Options document provided background on the plan-making process and posed a series of 32 open-ended questions on key issues and 3 main high level options for growth to 2032:
- Options 1A and 1B – sustainable new settlements to both the east and west of Colchester, crossing adjacent borders. Option A would not allow for a proportion of growth of Borough villages; option B would.
 - Options 2A and 2B – sustainable new settlement in the west of Colchester only, crossing the border with Braintree. Option A would not allow for a proportion of growth of Borough villages; option B would.
 - Options 3A and 3B sustainable new settlement to the east of town and an extension to the town, north of the A12. Option A would not allow for a proportion of growth of Borough villages; option B would.
- 4.3 Consultation on the Issues and Options document was carried out from 16 January to 27 February 2015. At the same time, landowners and developers were invited to put forward potential development sites. The results of this Call for Sites process are reported as a separate agenda item to this Committee. The consultation process involved publishing the document and supporting information on the website; notification of the consultation to the Council’s extensive list of interested organisations and individuals; and a series of nine public drop-in sessions which were advertised through social media, press coverage, and posters circulated to parish councils. At the drop-in sessions, attendees were provided with background information on the Local Plan

process; copies of the consultation document; opportunities to ask questions of the officers in attendance; the chance to leave initial thoughts on post-it notes; and information on how to respond more formally to the consultation.

4.4 An estimated total of 415 people attended the Council workshops which were held in a variety of venues across the Borough as follows:

- Colchester Library 17 January 10am-2pm & 27 January 2pm-6pm (45 attendees)
- Asda (Turner Rise) 24 January 10am-2pm (39 attendees)
- Great Horkesley New Village Hall 31 January 10am-2pm (37 attendees)
- Tiptree Community Centre 7 February 10am-2pm (27 attendees)
- The Mica Centre (West Mersea) 11 February 4pm-8pm (93 attendees)
- Wivenhoe Scout and Guide Hall 14 February 10am-2pm (82 attendees)
- Hythe Community Centre (in conjunction with Hythe Forward) 16 February 12pm-8pm (29 attendees)
- Marks Tey Parish Hall February 10am-2pm (200 attendees)

4.5 A summary of issues recorded on post-it notes at the workshops is included as Appendix 1. The Appendix 1 summary also reflects the key issues raised in conversation with officers at the workshops. Particular concerns included:

- The justification for further housing growth in Colchester given existing problems with congestion and infrastructure capacity (health in particular)
- Specific concerns about growth options and site allocations near attendees' homes.
- Diverse views on growth options
- Objections to development on greenfield land and open countryside, including land north of A12 and expansion outside villages
- Questions over the extent to which job growth could keep pace with housing growth
- Recognition of the need for more housing, particular affordable housing and housing for different groups – young, old, families, etc.
- The need to provide more infrastructure in advance of any further growth, with specific mention of the following facilities:
 - Roads
 - Public transport, including train and station capacity
 - Parking
 - Hospitals/Surgeries/Clinics
 - Schools
 - Cycleways, Bridleways and Footpaths
 - Open Space/Sports Facilities
- Improvements needed to Town Centre
- Preservation of Colchester's heritage

- 4.6 The East Colchester session served a dual function, as it also provided a platform for Hythe Forward to consult on local East Colchester issues. Hythe Forward's board reported as follows after the event: 'The dual consultation format gave a pleasing combination of locally relevant detail (specific to the Hythe) with the broader strategic context of Colchester Borough Council's Local Plan. Local people seemed keen to engage with both and were pleasantly surprised at the partnership working between statutory body and community land trust (CLT). The purpose of the event from Hythe Forward's perspective was simply to present initial ideas that could comprise the basis of adopted planning guidance. There were simple feedback forms available, but the main intention was to gauge the public mood with regard to the CLT's three key priorities and some more specific aspirations. 23 forms were filled in and all indicated that the CLT's priorities were considered appropriate, with 'developing high quality public space' emerging as the biggest public concern.'
- 4.7 Two Parish Councils, Langham and Layer de la Haye, held their own workshops to consider the Local Plan Issues and Options. Both sessions were very well attended, (100 at Langham and 120 at Layer de la Haye) and this high level of attendance was reflected in the subsequent submission of responses from residents from these areas. (See para 4.24.3 and 4.24.4 below on site specific responses)
- 4.8 By the close of consultation, the Council had received a total of 649 responses from individuals and organisations. The following overview of consultation responses first highlights representative views on the key themes set forth in the consultation document; then is followed by a summary of views on particular growth options and sites put forward in the Call for Sites and finally includes a section on parish council responses. The overview does not attempt to cover all responses, since more detailed summaries and links to the original 649 representations are contained in Appendix 2. While the overview does not set forth whether the Council agrees or disagrees with respondent views, it does provide information on how the Council will assemble the evidence necessary to reach a clear view on the issues raised. Following a period of evidence base development, sustainability appraisal, and policy development work, the Council will be in a position to set forth clear views on policies and growth options in the Preferred Options document to be brought to the December meeting of this committee for approval and then published for consultation early in 2016.
- 4.9 Summary of responses to questions in the Issues and Options document on key themes:

4.9.1 Vision

Those commenting on the overall vision tended to accept the need for a well-considered long term approach. Essex County Council, for example, stated that “a robust long-term strategy will provide a reliable basis on which ECC and its partners may plan future service provision and required community infrastructure for which they are responsible”. CAUSE, a residents group formed in response to proposals for development in the Colchester/Braintree border area, accepted that ‘a long-term plan that extends beyond political cycles is desirable’.

- 4.9.2 Comments on the content of the vision tended to highlight the importance of sustainability as a guiding principle, although both the general term ‘sustainability’ and the more specific planning concept of Garden Cities were viewed as contested terms that could mean different things to different people. Several respondents sought to illustrate their ideas with reference to other places ie Freiburg Germany, or the hypothetical Uttoxeter Garden City proposed in the winning Wolfson Prize entry. The Colchester Natural History Society welcomed the CBC support for garden city principles, although it considered that the Council had breached these principles in the past. Proponents for large settlements (ie Gateway 120 and East Colchester/West Tendring) felt that the vision should identify locations for new centres of growth away from the urban areas that would be sustainable and energy efficient and also contribute to the economic well-being of the Borough. Proponents of development adjacent to villages contended that growth should be more widely dispersed in a proportional manner to make villages more self-sufficient and sustainable.
- 4.9.3 In terms of further work to inform the vision, in addition to looking to best practice elsewhere the planning consultants for Stane Park considered that a study assessing Colchester’s position and function within the regional context should be prepared to inform the vision for the new Local Plan strategy which would provide evidence as to how Colchester can compete effectively against other regional destinations to achieve inward investment and growth over the course of the plan period, and reinforce and strengthen its position as a regional centre.
- 4.9.4 A number of respondents mentioned the need for joint working on formulating a vision, as part of joint work on the plan as a whole. In particular, other local authorities including Essex County Council and adjacent district councils highlighted the importance of cooperation on strategic issues. Mersea Homes’ representation highlighted the need for the vision to address issues of complexity and increasing community involvement and suggested that

Colchester should utilise university research to inform the Borough's future vision possibly running a joint exercise or having the University as an active participant in developing the vision.

4.9.5 Initial Council response/next steps:

The existing Spatial Vision in the adopted 2008 Core Strategy is considered to provide a solid basis for the vision for the next Local Plan. Equally, however, changing circumstances and priorities may lead to more fundamental changes to the vision. To redraft the vision, the Council will set up meetings with key members and stakeholders to agree priorities for the new Local Plan vision which can then be incorporated into the Preferred Options documents programmed for public consultation in early 2016. Officers will continue to keep abreast of best practice elsewhere and will use evidence from work such as the Employment Land Needs Assessment to help consider the Borough's regional role and function.

4.10 Housing

4.10.1 Justification for overall housing numbers

While many people accepted the need for housing, a significant percentage questioned the amount of additional housing needed, particularly on greenfield land. Barton Willmore on behalf of Gladman Homes submitted its own Housing Market Assessment questioning the findings of Colchester's work on housing demand and supply. The CPRE considered that the quality of the Borough's countryside for its landscape character, for its setting for town and villages, for its biodiversity and for its agricultural productivity is sufficient to say that the growth can't be accommodated.

4.10.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The NPPF requires that Local Plans meet the full, objectively assessed needs for housing. To set a target, the Council needs to ensure that its projections of housing need are based on careful consideration of population, economic and housing trends. The Council is carrying out joint work with Braintree, Chelmsford and Tendring Councils to help it set an Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) number as required by national policy. Initial work carried out by consultants Peter Brett Associates is expected imminently, and their work will form the basis of the OAHN number used to underpin housing allocations in the Local Plan.

4.11 Need for new housing to be supported by adequate infrastructure

The need for infrastructure to support housing growth was a clear and consistent theme running through a majority of responses. Many of the individual responses noted current infrastructure capacity problems and the need to make new development contingent on the up-front delivery of infrastructure across all categories, including transport, education, health, open space, telecommunications and community facilities. Essex County Council responded that the new Local Plan should ensure there are clear policies for the full provision, enhancement and funding of infrastructure arising from planned development and pointed to the mechanisms that could help to achieve this, including planning obligations, the use of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and the ability to negotiate specific contractual obligations for major strategic sites (where Garden City principles may be adopted).

4.11.1 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is in the initial stages of developing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will provide information on the infrastructure needs associated with new development and how it will be delivered. The range of infrastructure included in the plan will cover the full extent of facilities expected to be needed, including transport, utilities (including broadband), education, health, open space, and community facilities.

4.12 Need for housing for specific groups

The need for housing for specific segments of the population was raised, including older people (The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone) and gypsies and travellers (the Gypsy Council). Several landowners noted that account will need to be taken not only of overall need for different types of housing but also varying market conditions; individual site characteristics; and the fact that need for particular housing mix will change over time.

4.12.1 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment carried out by consultants for the Council provides information on the demand for specific sizes, tenures and types of housing in the Borough which will inform policies guiding those aspects of housing allocations.

4.13 Development of high quality, well-designed sustainable homes

The promotion of high quality sustainable design was frequently mentioned in individual responses. A number of East Colchester residents noted that more control should be placed on housing developers so that estates have a uniform, attractive appearance. The representation on behalf of Mersea Homes, however, stated that design codes should promote diversity not conformity.

4.13.1 Initial Council response/next steps:

Formulation of policies on housing design and sustainability issues will have regard to government guidance on issues such as viability, sustainable construction and design. Planning policy officers will work with development management colleagues to ensure that proposed policies will result in clear and effective guidance for applicants for planning permission.

4.14 Centres and Employment

4.14.1 Supporting the Town Centre and defining an appropriate role for other commercial areas of the Borough

Respondents on the issue of town centre uses and Colchester's commercial hierarchy recognised the need for the Council to comply with national guidance on this topic and for new policy to be based on an up-to-date evidence base. There were, however, varying views on how this could be achieved. While the planning consultants for Sainsbury's considered that the existing retail hierarchy within the Borough is logical and should remain, agents for Turner Rise and Tollgate interests supported a more nuanced approach to policies on town centre uses which recognise the role and potential of District Centres to accommodate some limited growth whilst the Town Centre remains the primary focus for such activity. The planning consultants for Stane Park considered that capacity for growth in the Town Centre is severely restricted due to a combination of topography, heritage assets and the constraining road network, so the Town Centre should focus on specific sectors and allow other sectoral needs to be appropriately permitted elsewhere in the area. Planning consultants for Culver Square in the Town Centre requested that the council consider specific town centre and district centre policies, in addition to setting out a defined retail hierarchy, to further clarify the vision for the future of these locations. They commented that were the situation to arise that the council were considering identifying sites outside of Colchester town centre, the impact of these sites upon the town centre is considered before allocating such sites in order to safeguard the vitality and viability of Colchester town centre.

4.14.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council will commission additional work as required to ensure its evidence base on the supply and demand of town centre uses is up-to-date and provides a reliable basis for developing a spatial hierarchy for town centre functions and activities.

4.15 Providing sufficient jobs to keep pace with housing growth

The planning consultants for Stane Park questioned the need for further land to support the delivery of jobs in Colchester and highlighted the need to have regard to market signals such as take-up rates in considering allocations. ECC stated that the role of the A120 as an economic corridor should be strengthened. ECC also highlighted the important role of education in supporting economic growth, with particular regard to the potential of joint projects with the University of Essex and development of programmes to improve educational attainment.

4.15.1 A high number of individual respondents noted that it would be important to deliver jobs alongside new housing.

4.15.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has completed an Employment Land Needs Assessment (January 2015) which will form the basis for assessing employment site allocations for the Local Plan. The next stage of work is the completion of a Strategic Employment Land Assessment which will be carried out jointly with the Strategic Housing Land Assessment and used to inform the Preferred Options.

4.16 Rural Colchester

4.16.1 Striking an appropriate balance between protecting the character of rural Colchester and meeting the need for more housing and employment

While the predominant view among respondents was that rural areas should be protected from development, many accepted the desirability of limited infill growth to meet local needs. Six parish councils supported a limited review of their settlement boundaries to accommodate growth (see separate section below on parish council responses).

4.16.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is undertaking a Settlement Boundary Review which will inform the Preferred Options document and will be published as part of consultation on the document. The Review will have regard to the particular circumstances of each village in the Borough, including the views of parish councils as expressed in their consultation responses and, where relevant, evolving Neighbourhood Plans.

4.17 Promoting Healthy Communities

4.17.1 Providing access to high quality facilities and open spaces/sports facilities to maintain healthy lifestyles

Many individual respondents highlighted current capacity problems with health facilities, Colchester General Hospital in particular. Links between health and planning were widely recognised, and the provision of open space, sports facilities and walking/cycling links were identified as important elements of sustainability requiring policy support in the Local Plan.

4.17.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The delivery of health services is a rapidly evolving area, and the Council has initiated liaison with relevant providers (including the Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS England, ECC Public Health) to ensure planning policy reflects the actual delivery mechanisms chosen for health provision. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include information on a wide range of health and community infrastructure, including hospitals, clinics/surgeries, community facilities, educational facilities, open space, green infrastructure and recreational facilities.

4.18 Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

4.18.1 Ensuring transport infrastructure keeps pace with growth

Highways England (formerly the Highways Agency) welcomed the fact that the plan looks to 2032 and beyond as they recognised that appropriate infrastructure takes a long time to deliver and this needs to be identified early in order that it comes on stream as required. They noted that the Government had made commitments to widening the A12 between Chelmsford and Marks Tey, while the A120 has not been identified for improvement. (Please also see their comments in growth options section below)

4.18.2 ECC supported the emphasis placed on sustainable transport and recommends the inclusion of policy options to implement and deliver a range of measures. As the local highway authority, ECC stated that it will ensure the appropriate and necessary assessments are undertaken as Colchester BC seeks to adopt a preferred spatial option for growth and development. ECC supported the objective to increase the numbers of people walking and cycling and noted that this will need to be embedded as part of new settlement options (if they are progressed by Colchester BC as part of the preferred spatial strategy) to reduce short journeys made by car and the impact on the local and strategic highway network. A number of specific measures were suggested to help achieve more sustainable travel patterns such as car clubs, public transport vouchers, additional cycle/walking paths, and shuttle bus services. In order to help limit impact on the local public transport networks, ECC recommended that rail and bus providers should be involved in the identification and planning of any new or improved services. The mainline rail service between Norwich and London Liverpool Street (which passes through Colchester) is often at full capacity during peak times, it will therefore be important to identify what potential impact any new development will have on these services and what can be done to limit this. (Please also see their comments in growth options section below)

4.18.3 Transport issues were raised by a high percentage of individual responses, including existing problems with road congestion, rail capacity, bus capacity, and non-motorised routes. As with infrastructure in general, many respondents considered that new transport links should be provided in advance of any new development. Some respondents noted the need to improve facilities for the full range of non-motorised transport types (walking, cycling, horse riding) and the associated health, biodiversity and environmental benefits this could bring. In particular, the potential of an orbital green route around Colchester was raised by the Colchester Natural History Society.

4.18.4 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is working closely with ECC and Highways England to carry out modelling and analysis of current and projected transport demand for all modes across the Borough, with particular regard to the transport implications of developing large new settlements. This work will be fed into the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan explaining the requirements and the delivery/funding arrangements for required infrastructure. Although no formal responses to the Issues and Options consultation were received from Network Rail or the train operator Abellio, the Council is actively engaged meeting with

both bodies to develop an agreed approach to future rail development affecting the Borough.

4.19 Heritage and Townscape

4.19.1 Preserving and enhancing the town's rich heritage

English Heritage commented that the Local Plan will be an important factor in conserving and enhancing its rich historic environment. They recommended that the Council carry out a full analysis of existing and potential historic environment evidence base sources. While largely supportive of the issues raised in the Heritage section, English Heritage considered that the consultation document missed out some issues and referred to their guidance document on Local Plans for best practice on a holistic approach to planning for the historic environment and particular issues such as assets on the Heritage at Risk Register, and Conservation Areas.

4.19.2 The ECC response stated that greater priority needed to be given in the plan to the borough's rich but finite archaeological resource, which has come under considerable pressure from development during the period of the current Local Plan, and which is more likely to be overlooked than the built heritage, when considering enhancement opportunities through high quality design. Innovative interpretive approaches to telling the story of the borough is one way in which enhancements can be secured, but this should be guided by a coordinated interpretive masterplan to ensure quality and consistency. Existing and updated Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Conservation Areas within the Borough should be included as evidence base documents for the new Local Plan.

4.19.3 A number of individual responses highlighted the importance of preserving and enhancing Colchester's heritage.

4.19.4 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has reviewed the existing evidence base on the historic environment issues used to inform current adopted policies and will update as needed to ensure that information is up to date, including evidence on the Historic Environment Record and archaeological data.

4.20 Natural Environment

4.20.1 Ensuring the protection and improvement of countryside, green spaces and corridors

Natural England supported references to the requirements for green infrastructure, biodiversity, and habitat protection within the Issues and Options document and encouraged more explicit attention to these issues as policies are developed. The Environment Agency also highlighted these issues and additionally referred to the importance of Blue Infrastructure as well as Green Infrastructure; the need to address requirements for flood risk assessment and sustainable water management systems.

4.20.2 The Essex Wildlife Trust recommended that the 2008 Local Wildlife Site Review be updated given that site conditions can change relatively quickly. They also stated that the Local Plan should address how green corridors and biodiversity can be robustly defended and enhanced, supported with evidence based on biological records and surveys.

4.20.3 A high percentage of individual responses stressed the importance of protecting open countryside and preserving wildlife habitats.

4.20.4 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has reviewed the existing evidence base on natural environment issues used to inform current adopted policies and will update as needed to ensure that information is up to date, including evidence on landscape and townscape character; flooding; Local Wildlife Sites; and water supply. In particular, detailed work will be carried out for proposed large settlements.

4.21 Growth Options and comments on particular sites

4.21.1 General points on growth options

A number of individual responses queried the need for large scale development in the first instance and considered brownfield sites within Colchester would be able to play a greater role in meeting housing need. The CPRE questioned all the growth options given their impact on the countryside and good quality agricultural land, but would not be opposed to sensible development in villages to meet local needs. Numerically, the responses were dominated by views on particular sites put forward for development. Many members of the public were concerned about the implications of development near them on their quality of life, and assumed that additional

growth would by definition result in problems such as increased congestion; infrastructure capacity problems; harm to the countryside; and poor quality development. Those who accepted in principle the need for further development to address the need for more homes and jobs frequently considered that the need should be met in a different part of the Borough.

4.21.2 Landowner/developer views on the vision correlated closely with the development they were proposing – ie those proposing development adjacent to villages supported proportionate growth, while those advocating large settlements supported the option including their proposal. Developers of smaller schemes suggested that their sites could make a contribution to housing delivery in the earlier part of the plan period in advance of the slower delivery of large settlements.

4.21.3 Views of adjacent local authorities and Essex County Council on growth options highlighted their willingness to work with Colchester to agree and refine a strategic approach. Option 1 (either A or B) was supported in principle by Tendring District Council. Essex County Council and Braintree at this stage did not express a view on options but did state their willingness to work with Colchester on a joint approach to strategic development. Maldon DC expressed a preference for Option 1B which was considered to be likely to result in a lower volume of land release needed in the rural areas, and in particular around the settlements of West Mersea and Tiptree to the south of the borough, which are close to the border with Maldon.

4.21.4 Option 1 – Development to the East and West

Highways England noted that Options 1a, 1b and Options 2a, 2b are likely to result in significant impacts on both the A12 and A120 which are already running close to capacity. They considered that modelling work, yet to be undertaken will confirm that upgrading of the A12 and A120 will be required. Their view was that it may be better to focus growth to be delivered in the early part of the planning period to the east of Colchester until the situation regarding the future improvement of the A120 becomes clearer. Significant growth around Marks Tey may only be possible with appropriate mitigation measure funded through development.

4.21.5 The Environment Agency considered that in terms of flood risk, options 1a, 1b or 2a and 2b would probably be preferable. Surface water from options 3a and 3b (in north Colchester) would have to drain through existing urbanised areas to discharge to the River Colne and would potentially increase the

vulnerability of adjacent areas to surface water flooding or flooding from minor watercourses that receive the flows from the development. Development to the west could discharge to the Roman River, while the area to the east of Colchester would drain to tidal waters via Salary Brook.

4.21.6 Anglian Water noted that all options for growth would result in a substantial requirement for new foul sewerage infrastructure and water treatment works, and they would expect to work with developers to address these requirements.

(Please see Option 2 below for comments exclusively on developments to the west, and Option 3 for comments on developments to the east)

4.22 Option 2 – Development to the West

82 respondents objected to large scale development in West Tey. The main concerns expressed included the current lack of infrastructure in the area; the need for infrastructure to be provided up-front in advance of any development; the impact on the character of surrounding villages; the loss of countryside and open space.

4.22.1 The Colchester Natural History Society consider Option 2 to be the 'least worst' option. Currently, all options include development in and at the edges of the current urban area, which runs counter to the Garden City concept of expanding green areas.

4.22.2 ECC as Highway Authority would seek a new A120 between Braintree and Marks Tey as part of any new settlement to the west of Colchester. They thought that this settlement could also require provision of a new railway station on the mainline.

4.22.3 Persimmon Homes stated that the Council could not be reliant on delivery from this site in the early part of the plan period and should therefore consider phasing of current identified allocations, alongside less infrastructure hungry schemes in the first five years of the plan.

4.23 Option 3 – Development to the East and North

22 respondents commenting on proposals for East Colchester/West Tending were largely of the view that Options 2A and B are most appropriate because

East is already well-developed and has well-used and important green open spaces nearby. Too much new development directly on the eastern border was considered to create an unpleasant and unmanageable urban sprawl which would harm character and appearance of rural area. If there is to be new development to the east, respondents from the East Colchester area considered that there should be a buffer of green land of 1.5km around Salary Brook.

4.23.1 The Colchester Natural History Society highlighted the potential for a green walking/cycling orbital route around Colchester which could include the Salary Brook Valley. A commitment to simply preserving a route was considered insufficient – the route needs to be set within a sufficiently wide area and serve as a connection between places of value and utility.

4.23.2 Essex Wildlife Trust objects to development on land to the east of Colchester as it considers it would have serious adverse impacts on an important strategic wildlife corridor including Salary Brook Local nature Reserve.

4.23.3 ECC stated that given the levels of congestion in Colchester, particularly east Colchester, ECC as Highways Authority would only be able to support a new settlement to the east of Colchester with a new link road between the A133 and A120, and a new junction on the A120. Proposals for growth to the north of the A12 will need to be informed by modelling to establish impacts. Junction 28 on the A12 was not designed/constructed to be loaded with development traffic arising from growth north of this location; a key issue to consider when assessing this option.

4.24 Comments related to sites put forward in the Call for Sites

4.24.1 Irvine Road Orchard

The largest number of responses to the consultation were received on a proposal for residential development of the Irvine Road orchard (289 responses.) The majority of responses took the form of an e-mail stating that allocation would be ‘completely against the council’s own policy on protecting urban open space, and its allocation in the previous LDF.’ Other respondents noted the importance of the site as an orchard; wildlife site; and open space in an urban area.

4.24.2 Battleswick Farm, Rowhedge

34 respondents objected to development of land at Battleswick Farm in Rowhedge, raising concerns about development resulting in coalescence of Rowhedge with the urban area of Colchester; the loss of open space/greenfield land; lack of infrastructure capacity and transport access in Rowhedge; loss of village character which is already being affected by development at Rowhedge Wharf; and impact on amenity and wildlife.

4.24.3 Layer de la Haye

32 respondents objected to the cumulative effect that residential development proposals could have on Layer de la Haye, noting concerns about constrained road access to the village; school and health capacity; the negative effect on village character; loss of countryside and wildlife habitats; and coalescence with Colchester. Some respondents noted that the need for further development could be better met elsewhere at larger strategic sites.

4.24.4 Boxted/Langham

22 respondents raised concerns about proposals to development in the Boxted/Langham area, noting concerns about current infrastructure constraints; impact on the character of villages; loss of countryside/green space/wildlife habitats. Many Boxted respondents noted that the residents of Boxted had recently been canvassed for their views in relation to their Neighbourhood Plan and that there had been overwhelming support (94%) for the maintenance of a clear green boundary between Boxted and Colchester to maintain the village identity of Boxted. Responses to the Issues and Options consultation did not address the proposal for a Garden Suburb in Langham because unlike the other Garden City/Suburb options to the east and west of Colchester, the Garden Suburb proposal for Langham was submitted through the concurrent Call for Sites process and was not included as a potential option in the Council's Issues and Options document.

4.25 Response from Parish Councils

4.26 24 Parish Councils in Colchester Borough responded to the Issues and Options consultation. Kelvedon Parish Council also responded from Braintree District. There was a varied response from the parish councils in terms of the level of support or opposition to the 6 growth options set out in the Issues and Options consultation document. 4 Parish Councils did not identify a preferred option where they could support growth. 8 Parish Councils expressed varying

degrees of support for Options 1A, 2A or 3A which promoted urban extensions with 2 proposed new settlements to the west and east of Colchester and growth to the north of the A12. Myland Community Council and Little Horkesley Parish Council, support for option 2A was conditional on new or improved infrastructure being delivered as part of any future growth. Stanway Parish Council was generally opposed to any significant new levels of growth, but, felt that if growth had to proceed, then the garden city approach was the most sustainable approach to adopt. Hence they supported option 1A over the other proposed options. Eight Ash Green Parish Council was generally more supportive of the A options, as they felt that directing growth to existing or new urban areas was more sustainable than expanding rural villages. Aldham Parish Council and Wivenhoe Town Council identified growth option 3A as their preferred option because there was more land to develop north of Colchester and because these areas had better suitable infrastructure to support new growth. Layer de la Haye Parish Council was most supportive of Options 1A and 2A where additional housing settlement areas could be developed in existing settlements which already had space to expand and where appropriate infrastructure either already exists or could be provided. Messing cum Inworth Parish Council only expressed support for option 1A as they felt that rural villages and their character and open spaces/biodiversity needed to be protected.

- 4.27 There was also varied support for the B options which included the same growth area as proposed in the A options but with additional growth in rural settlements. 6 parish councils supported at least one of the B options (Wivenhoe, Little Horkesley, Myland, Marks Tey, West Bergholt and Tiptree Parish Council). Tiptree Parish Council supported option 1B as they felt rural areas needed additional growth to prevent them from stagnating. Wivenhoe Town Council supported options 1B & 3B because they felt that there was more development land available north of the A12 while West Bergholt Parish Council felt that there was scope for limited (10%) expansion to settlement boundaries as well as urban expansions and new settlements. Little Horkesley Parish Council and Myland Community Council expressed support for option 2B, however their support was conditional on infrastructure upgrades or new facilities being delivered. Layer Marney PC had concerns about options 2A & 2B, namely, because of the number of potential development sites that had been put forward for development through the Call For Sites processes. There was no support for expanding the settlement boundary in Layer de la Haye or increasing the size of the village significantly. They were also opposed to the expansion of Colchester Town which the parish council did not feel was realistic given existing congestion and shortage of infrastructure in the Town.
- 4.28 Wivenhoe and West Mersea Town Councils and Winstred Hundred Parish Council were opposed to any growth in their areas because they felt that there was no suitable development land left, other areas had more development potential, existing infrastructure was at capacity making further growth

unsustainable or that the area was unsuitable for growth without impacting on rural character. Marks Tey Parish Council was most opposed to the 1A & 1B and 2A & 2B options which they felt were over reliant on excessive growth to the west of Colchester. They felt that growth needed to be more fairly distributed across all development areas including rural areas. They also identified the need for an alternative growth option to the west of Colchester focused around the A12 to be explored that promoted lower housing numbers than those proposed in the Issues and Options consultation paper. Wivenhoe Town Council felt that the option of no further growth was missing from the consultation paper.

- 4.29 Little Horkeley was not convinced that the areas proposed for growth under options 1A & 1B could sustain the level of development being proposed. They were also strongly opposed to options 3A & 3B due the impact on the open countryside in north Colchester and the Dedham Vale AONB. Copford/Easthorpe and Great Tey Parish Councils objected strongly to options 2A & 2B due their potential impact on the rural areas/character and on traffic and local facilities. Boxted Parish Council was also strongly opposed to the inclusion of options 3A & 3B on the grounds that development in these areas would result in creeping development between Boxted and Colchester and Dedham Vale AONB and adversely impact on the surrounding countryside character and landscape. Boxted requested the removal of these options.
- 4.30 Many of the parish councils recognised the need for small amounts of modest growth to deliver smaller houses and affordable units particularly for young families and older people. 6 parish councils expressed support for either reviewing existing settlement boundaries to help meet the above identified local housing needs or requested a meeting with the Council to discuss future housing needs and potential sites to accommodate it. These were Chappel, West Bergholt, Copford/Easthorpe, East Donyland, Layer Marney, and Great Tey parish councils.
- 4.31 7 of the parish councils who responded to the Issues and Options consultation are currently preparing Neighbourhood plans. 6 of these neighbourhood plans are expected to identify sites for growth including Boxted, Eight Ash Green, West Bergholt, Wivenhoe, and Tiptree) and). Myland and Stanway Neighbourhood Plans are not expected to deliver new housing growth through their Neighbourhood Plans. Copford/Easthorpe, Fordham and Great Tey Parish Councils are also considering preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.32 The Council will continue to work closely with parish councils to agree whether decisions on growth for their villages should be made through the Local Plan or by a Neighbourhood Plan. Parish council views on appropriate levels of growth will be included in the Settlement Boundary Review the Council is carrying out to provide the evidence base, and their views will help define the parameters for the Council's approach to village growth.

4.33 Consultation process

The Council will continue to explore new ways to inform and involve the public in plan development to increase awareness and response rates. Parish Councils are playing an increasingly important role in spreading the word about Local Plan issues and have been helpful in displaying information, encouraging responses to the consultation, and, in the case of Langham and Layer-de-la-Haye, holding consultation workshops. Some residents living in areas such as Langham and Rowhedge where development proposals were submitted in the Call for Sites exercise held at the same time as the Issues and Options consultation felt that they did not have adequate time to respond to the submissions within the consultation timeframe. They will, however, have an opportunity to comment at the Preferred Options stage on any sites that survive the rigorous filtering process of sites to ensure they meet sustainability criteria and policy objectives.

5. **Proposals**

5.1 The following section of the report sets out the next stages of plan development leading to the examination and adoption of a new Local Plan by 2017.

5.2 Development of a draft plan involves the consolidation of several strands of work as follows:

- Agreement on the plan's vision and objectives.
Member and stakeholder views will be sought to inform development of the plan's vision and objectives. In particular, it will be important for the vision and objectives to align with the Council's Strategic Plan.
- Development of realistic housing and employment targets for the provision of a 15 year development land supply. This process will be informed as noted above, by consultant work commissioned jointly with adjacent authorities.
- Sustainability Appraisal and evaluation of potential development sites.
The Council is completing a Sustainability Appraisal of potential policies and allocations. The Scoping Report for the first Issues and Options stage of this process established a range of sustainability objectives. All options for potential policies and site allocations are assessed against these objectives to compare their environmental, economic and social effects and ultimately to assess how sustainable an option is.
- Preparation of a Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. This work to be carried out by the Council will establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.

- Completion of a range of evidence base work needed to inform policies and allocations. Officers are carrying out a programme of producing and updating evidence work, drawing on both internal and external resources.
- Development of draft spatial strategy and associated policies and site allocations, ensuring that they address issues raised in the Issues and Options consultation. Policies and allocations will need to align with national policy; as well as the evolving overall spatial strategy and the local evidence base.

5.3 All of the above strands of work will be drawn together in a draft plan to provide a consistent, coherent and well-informed strategy to guide future growth in the Borough to 2032. This Preferred Options document is programmed to be submitted to the 14th December Local Plan Committee for approval in advance of public consultation on the document in early 2016.

6. Strategic Plan References

6.1 The Strategic Plan Action Plan includes a commitment to regenerating the borough through buildings, employment, leisure and infrastructure. There are also commitments to attract investment and provide more affordable homes. The development of a new Local Plan is closely linked to these objectives.

7. Consultation

7.1 Public consultation took place in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

8. Publicity Considerations

8.1 There is likely to be continued interest as the Local Plan progresses resulting in publicity for the Council.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 A budget has been allocated for Local Plan development which funds the updating of evidence based documents, consultation and examination.

10. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights implications

10.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared for the Local Development Framework and is available to view on the Colchester Borough Council website by following this pathway from the homepage: Council and Democracy > Policies, Strategies and Performance > Diversity and Equality > Equality Impact Assessments > Strategic Policy and Regeneration > Development Plan.

10.2 There are no particular Human Rights implications.

11. Community Safety Implications

11.1 None

12. Health and Safety Implications

12.1 None

13. Risk Management Implications

13.1 Review of the Local Plan will reduce the risk of inappropriate development being permitted.

14. Disclaimer

14.1 The information in this report was, as far as is known, correct at the date of publication. Colchester Borough Council cannot accept responsibility for any error or omission.

Appendix C. 19 December 2016 Local Plan Committee Report



Local Plan Committee

Item

19th December 2016

Report of	Head of Commercial Services	Author	Karen Syrett 01206 282476
Title	Local Plan Preferred Options – Consultation Report with Responses		
Wards affected	All		

The Local Plan Committee is asked to consider officers draft responses to the Local Plan preferred options consultation.

1. Decision(s) Required

- 1.1 To consider officers initial responses to the representations received following public consultation on the Colchester Local Plan Preferred Options.

2. Reasons for Decision(s)

- 2.1 To make members aware of the representations received and to inform the submission draft of the Local Plan.
- 2.2 Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, places a legal duty upon local authorities and other public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation, this is known as the 'Duty to Cooperate' on strategic matters of cross-boundary significance, which includes housing supply. Before a Planning Inspector can begin the process of examining a Local Plan, they need to be satisfied, with the Council's evidence, that the local authority has demonstrated it has done everything it can to ensure effective cooperation with neighbouring authorities and other partner organisations and has sought to resolve, as far as is possible, any cross-boundary planning issues.
- 2.3 Part 1 and Part 2 of the Local Plan have been published for consultation pursuant to Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Local Plan is subject to a statutory six week public consultation period and the Sustainability Appraisals five weeks; however, the consultations were extended to accommodate additional time for anyone taking summer holidays.

3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 Members could seek further information or could choose to proceed in a different way in relation to specific policies. The alternative of not proceeding with a new Local Plan would leave the Council in a vulnerable position going forward with

no clear steer for the future growth and development of the Borough. It would result in existing policy becoming outdated and not in accordance with national policy requirements. There could also be issues under the Duty to Co-operate requirement.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1 Work on the Council's new Local Plan began in 2014 and involved consultation on an initial Issues and Options consultation in January/February 2015. Since then, the Committee has received reports in June and August 2015 noting the results of the Issues and Options consultation and providing progress on the development of the plan and its supporting evidence base. During this period, the Council also invited landowners and developers to put forward potential sites for development which the Council has then assessed for suitability.
- 4.2 The December 2015 Committee approved an updated Local Development Scheme which set forth the timetable for Local Plan development. This was subsequently amended at the last meeting in August. The April 2016 Committee considered selected draft development management policies which were incorporated into the full version of a Preferred Options plan, containing both allocations and policies.
- 4.3 In July this year the committee considered the full Preferred Options Local Plan and agreed public consultation over an extended ten week period.
- 4.4 Consultation on the Preferred Options document was carried out from 9 July to 16 September 2016. The consultation process involved publishing the document and supporting information on the website; notification of the consultation to the Council's extensive list of interested organisations and individuals; and a series of public drop-in sessions which were advertised through social media, press coverage, and posters circulated to parish councils.
- 4.5 At the drop-in sessions, attendees were provided with background information on the Local Plan process; copies of the consultation document; opportunities to ask questions of the officers in attendance; and information on how to respond more formally to the consultation, including advice on using the consultation portal.
- 4.6 The consultation attracted an all-time high number of responses totalling 3102 representations from 1539 respondents. This compares to a total of 649 responses from individuals and organisations at the Issues and Options stage in 2015.
- 4.7 Of the total numbers, approximately 62.2% were received by people using the on-line consultation portal. This is a vast improvement on previous years where the percentage of people using the online surveys was as low as 10%. It did still mean that of the remaining 37.8%; 27.5% emailed and 10.2% wrote in, which meant they had to be put in manually. This was a very resource intensive process.

- 4.8 At the last meeting in November, Members were asked to note the representations received but at that time it was not possible to provide a comprehensive draft response. The representations have now been analysed by officers within the Spatial Policy Team and other departments in the Council. External organisations such as Essex County Council and Essex Wildlife Trust have also been contacted where there are specific issues. Because Part 1 of the Plan is a joint plan and includes cross boundary sites, the responses on this part are currently confined to comments on the two Garden Communities entailing allocations within Colchester. Further comments which await joint finalisation with Tendring and Braintree will be tabled at the meeting in the form of the 3 Councils' response to the Campaign Against Urban Sprawl in Essex (CAUSE) comments on Part 1.
- 4.9 While the analysis was being undertaken the evidence base was also being developed and has helped inform some of the changes proposed to the Plan. The tables in Appendix 1 provides a summary of the number of responses received on each part of the plan along with a summary of the key issues raised. Due to the number of responses received it is not possible to include every one verbatim or in detail but Members can view each one in full using the Local Plan software and following the link below;
<http://colchester.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=3>
- 4.10 Any proposed changes to the Preferred Options Local Plan to create the Submission version of the Local Plan will be presented to the next meeting of this Committee on February 7th 2017.

5. Proposals

- 5.1 The Local Plan Committee is asked to review the representations submitted and the proposed officer response on each to help inform the Full Submission version of the Draft Local Plan which will be presented to Members at the February meeting.

6. Strategic Plan References

- 6.1 Effective strategic planning supports the Strategic Plan Action Plan which includes a commitment to make Colchester a vibrant, prosperous, thriving and welcoming place.

7. Consultation and Publicity

- 7.1 Consultation was undertaken as detailed above.

8. Financial Implications

- 8.1 N/A.

9. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications

9.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared for the Local Plan and is available to view by clicking on this link:- <http://www.colchester.gov.uk/article/4962/Strategic-Policy-and-Regeneration> or go to the Colchester Borough Council website www.colchester.gov.uk and follow the pathway from the homepage: Council and Democracy > Policies, Strategies and Performance > Equality and Diversity > Equality Impact Assessments > Strategic Policy and Regeneration and select Local Development Framework from the Strategic Planning and Research section.

9.2 There are no particular Human Rights implications.

10. Community Safety Implications

10.1 None

11. Health and Safety Implications

11.1 None

12. Risk Management Implications

12.1 N/A.

13. Disclaimer

13.1 The information in this report was, as far as is known, correct at the date of publication. Colchester Borough Council cannot accept responsibility for any error or omission.



Local Plan Committee

Item
7

27 March 2017

Report of	Head of Commercial Services	Author	Laura Chase 282473 Karen Syrett 506477
Title	Publication Draft Local Plan		
Wards affected	All		

The Local Plan Committee is asked to agree the content of the Publication Draft Colchester Local Plan and Sustainability Appraisal for consultation and subsequent submission to the Government.

1. Decision(s) Required

- 1.1 To approve the content of the Publication Draft Local Plan and accompanying Sustainability Appraisals of Sections 1 and 2 (attached as Appendices to this report).
- 1.2 To agree to carry out a 6 week period of public consultation on the Publication Draft Local Plan, in order that representations can be made by members of the public.
- 1.3 To agree to publish and make available the Sustainability Appraisal of Sections 1 and 2 to inform consultation and engagement on the Publication Draft Local Plan and the Sustainability Appraisals.
- 1.4 To authorise the subsequent submission of the document to the Secretary of State for examination.
- 1.5 To authorise the Place Strategy Manager to make minor revisions to the document prior to publication for consultation and/or prior to submission.

2. Reasons for Decision

- 2.1 To enable the Publication Draft Local Plan to be published for public consultation.
- 2.2 To undertake public consultation in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

- 2.3 To allow effective public engagement in the review of the sustainability and environmental effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan.
- 2.4 To ensure the Council's adopted local plan framework for the Borough reflects national policy and provides a robust basis for decisions on future planning applications.

3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 The alternative options to the spatial strategy proposed in the Publication Draft Local Plan have been reviewed in the Sustainability Appraisals. The reasonable alternatives have been considered, and assessed as part of that process.
- 3.2 An alternative to the proposed consultation and submission of the Publication Draft Local Plan would be not to proceed at this time. The alternative of not proceeding with a new Local Plan would leave the Council in a vulnerable position going forward with no clear steer for the future growth and development of the Borough. It would result in existing policy becoming outdated and not in accordance with national policy requirements. The Council may not be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land and could be subject to more speculative planning applications. There could also be issues under the Duty to Co-operate requirement.

4. Supporting Information

4.1 Background – Local Plan Development

The currently adopted Local Plan for Colchester consists of the Core Strategy, first adopted in 2008, along with the Development Policies and Site Allocations, adopted in 2010. In order to keep the plan up to date, and in line with Government guidance, a Focused Review resulting in revisions to selected Core Strategy and Development Policies was adopted in July 2014.

- 4.2 As a first stage in the development of a new Local Plan, the Council carried out an Issues and Options consultation in January/February 2015. The Issues and Options document considered 6 strategic growth options involving 3 potential sites for sustainable new settlements to the West, East and North of Colchester.
- 4.3 At the same time as the Issues and Options consultation, the Council invited landowners and developers to put forward potential sites for development. This process, known as a 'Call for Sites', repeated a similar exercise undertaken in the summer of 2014. The Council considered the suitability of the sites proposed through the two Call for Sites exercises. The submissions received inform part of the evidence base to demonstrate the potential supply of land available to accommodate the growth requirements of the Borough. This work has been carried out in co-operation with neighbouring councils and Essex

County Council to ensure the Duty to Cooperate was met and to facilitate exploration of cross-boundary planning options, including Garden Communities.

4.4 This initial work was consolidated into a Preferred Options consultation held in June-July 2016 which set out the Council's preferred spatial strategy, planning policies and allocations as justified by its evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal for both Sections, incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment (this integrated appraisal is referred to as the Sustainability Appraisal). The 6 options for growth outlined in the Issues and Options were refined into one preferred option involving:

- a) a continuing focus on urban Colchester
- b) small scale development in identified 'Sustainable Settlements'; and
- c) development of two new Garden Communities to the east and west of Colchester.

The preferred spatial strategy reflected the outcome of draft Sustainability Appraisal work on Sections 1 and 2, the overall evidence base, deliverability considerations, the availability of sites, and an overall evaluation of the combination of allocations and policies that would produce the most sustainable pattern of growth. The preferred Spatial Strategy evolved from firstly, consideration of the individual characteristics and capacity of different parts of the Borough and secondly, consideration of the overall linkages and functionality of settlements within the area and the best ways of enhancing their sustainability. It was concluded that new settlement options were only acceptable if promoted as Garden Communities given that communities built on Garden Community principles would be able to address requirements for infrastructure and community stewardship as part of meeting the requirement for housing and employment land. The selection of three sites spread across the three authorities reflected consensus between the authorities on an equitable and sustainable division of growth to meet identified need.

4.5 The Local Plan has to be justified to meet the soundness test as explained in paragraph 182 of the NPPF. This means that it should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. Working in co-operation with Braintree DC and Tendring DC, it has been agreed that the most appropriate long term strategy for North Essex is to meet housing need in three new garden communities. Having regard to the Sustainability Appraisal and other factors, it is considered that new communities to the west of Braintree, between Colchester and Braintree and the east of Colchester is most appropriate.

4.6 The discounting of the North Colchester site for a Garden Community was based on the negative environmental impacts of a large Garden Community on an area of significant landscape and environmental value. Additionally, the deliverability and sustainability of Garden Communities was considered to be best served by their location in two distinct areas of the Borough as opposed to adjacent communities at East and North Colchester.

- 4.7 The Preferred Options plan was divided into two sections comprising firstly, strategic policies including Garden Communities proposals prepared jointly with Braintree District Council and Tendring District Council (Section 1) and secondly local policies and allocations for Colchester Borough (Section 2). The Preferred Options consultation, which consulted on both Section 1 and Section 2 elements, attracted 3102 representations from 1539 respondents. This compares to a total of 649 responses from individuals and organisations at the Issues and Options stage in 2015. The December 2016 Local Plan Committee received a report on the Preferred Options consultation which summarised key issues and responses.
- 4.8 While the format and content on the Publication Draft plan largely replicates that of the Preferred Options, changes have been made in response to Preferred Options consultation responses. The December 2016 consultation report highlighted many of these changes. Changes also reflect evolving policy guidance, evidence base findings, and improvements to clarity.
- 4.9 The timetable for Local Plan work is being tracked through the publication of a periodically updated Local Development Scheme (LDS), last reviewed by this Committee in February 2017. The LDS provides the timetable for delivery of all Local Plan documents, including the programmed date for adoption of a new Local Plan of September 2018. The LDS includes this referral to Committee in May with public consultation scheduled for June and July 2017.
- 4.10 **Sustainability Appraisal** – Local Plan preparation has included preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for both sections. The Non-Technical Summary of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sustainability Appraisal is included as an appendix to this report and the full SAs will be available on the Council’s website. The joint sustainability appraisal of the Section 1 plan prepared jointly with Braintree and Tendring has been prepared by Essex County Council Place Services. The Section 1 SA considers the overall sustainability and cumulative effect of the strategic planning proposals jointly made by Braintree, Colchester and Tendring, including in particular Garden Communities along with suggested mitigation measures as appropriate.
- 4.11 The Section 2 SA assesses the likely significant environmental implications of every policy and site allocation in Section 2 of the Local Plan, and the consequence of reasonable alternatives. It has tested various options to ensure that the Local Plan policies will contribute towards achieving sustainable development. The SA has suggested mitigation measures, which have been incorporated into policies.
- 4.12 **Evidence Base:** Both the strategic Section 1 and the Colchester specific allocations and policies in Section 2 are based on a comprehensive evidence base covering a wide range of topics including the following, carried out jointly with other authorities where required and available on the Council’s website:
- Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report – July 2015, Nov. 2016 update

- Further OAN topic report – Alignment of Employment Land and Floorspace with OAN – May 2017
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment – December 2015
- Strategic Land Availability Assessment – June 2016, updated August 2016
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan – May 2017
- Concept Feasibility Study for Garden Communities – June 2016
- North Essex Garden Communities Employment and Demographic Study – May 2017
- Section 1 Viability Study – May 2017
- Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment – July 2014, updated October 2014,
- Employment Land Needs Assessment – January 2015
- Employment Land Trajectory – May 2017
- Colchester Retail and Town Centre Study – December 2016
- Travel to Work Patterns – September 2015
- Green Infrastructure Strategy – October 2011
- Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitch Strategies – July 2015
- Water Cycle Study – December 2016
- Local Wildlife Study- February 2016
- Transport Modelling – June 2016 and September 2016 update
- Protected Lanes Report – December 2015
- Settlement Boundary Review – July 2016, updated May 2017
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – April 2017

The following work has informed development of the plan and will be finalised for the public consultation on the Publication Draft Plan. Interim findings have been attached as appendices to this report.

- Summary of emerging Whole Plan Viability Study findings
- Draft conclusions from Colchester’s Local Plan (Section 1 and Section 2) Appropriate Assessments.
- Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment – Colchester findings

The evidence base will continue to be developed and documents will continue to be made available.

4.13 Publication Draft Plan

The Publication Draft Local Plan is the product of a transparent and evidence-based process in line with national regulations and guidance. It is now proposed to consult on this version of the plan for a six-week period to run from 16 June to 28 July to gather views from the public and stakeholders.

Braintree District Council and Tendring District Council will consult on their own Local Plans on the same dates. Section 1 of the Local Plan is common to all three plans. The views gathered will be submitted to Government for examination alongside the plan, Sustainability Appraisal, and supporting evidence base. There will be two examinations in public involved in plan adoption. The strategic element of the Local Plan (Section 1) common to Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Local Plans will be examined jointly.

Assuming that the examiner is able to confirm that, in principle, Section 1 is sound then there will be separate examinations of each Local Plan's unique policies (as contained in Section 2 of each Local Plan).

- 4.14 The following paragraphs summarise key elements of the Publication Draft Plan. Significant changes made following the previous Preferred Options version of the plan are highlighted at the end of each section.
- 4.14 **Section 1** - Section 1 of the Local Plan provides detail about high level allocations and policies to be included in the three Local Plans prepared by Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils. Section 1 sets the strategic approach to the authorities will take to meet the objectively assessed need for development land. Its main purposes are to:
- Articulate a spatial portrait of the combined area, including its main settlements and strategic infrastructure, as a framework for accommodating future planned growth;
 - Provide a strategic vision for how planned growth in North Essex will be realised;
 - Set strategic objectives and policies for key growth topics;
 - Set out the numbers of additional homes and jobs across the area that will be needed over the period to 2033. The choices made, particularly in relation to the location of garden communities, will also set the framework for development well beyond the plan period; and
 - Highlight the key strategic growth locations across the area and the necessary new or upgraded infrastructure to support this growth.
- 4.15 The strategic housing policy SP3 reflects the evidence base work carried out by the three authorities to establish Objectively Assessed Need and to translate this into balanced provision of land to meet identified need, with a figure of 920 houses a year established for Colchester. The policy provides for an adjustment mechanism for division of housing numbers between authorities.
- 4.16 The strategic employment policy SP4 addresses the objective of creating a sustainable balance within the three authorities between jobs and the available labour force through population growth. The East of England Forecasting Model 2016 work predicts that Colchester will create 928 jobs/year through the plan period to 2033.
- 4.17 Up-front provision of infrastructure is a fundamental principle of the Local Plan, and the infrastructure policy SP5 requires that 'development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development'. It goes on to list the key transport, education, health and broadband infrastructure requirements for the strategic area.
- 4.18 The policy on place-shaping principles (SP6) establishes high standards for urban and architectural design to underpin all new development. It sets the context for the Garden Communities policies SP7-10 which establish their guiding principles and identify the broad locations of Garden Communities to the east and west of Colchester, as well as one to the west of Braintree. Local

Development vehicles are being recommended by officers as a way of meeting need which, by being locally driven, will ensure that infrastructure, facilities and services will be put in place when they are needed and that seek to ensure that land is released for housing, employment, retail and other uses. The plan states: 'Establishment at an early stage in the development of the garden communities, of appropriate and sustainable long-term governance and stewardship arrangements for community assets including green space, public realm areas and community and other relevant facilities; such arrangements to be funded by the developments and include community representation to ensure residents have a stake in the long term development, stewardship and management of their community.' The Councils are confident that a Local Development Vehicle model is viable and can deliver successful and sustainable garden communities, but will continue to explore other ways of achieving the vision that offer similar levels of confidence that the right quality of development will be delivered at the right time.

- 4.19 Agreement on the general principles underpinning Garden Communities is intended to be followed by separate Strategic Growth Development Plan Documents for each community which will be developed jointly by the relevant authorities and reported to this committee at each stage prior to formal consultation and ultimately submission.
- 4.20 **Changes made for the Publication Draft version** – No significant changes were made to the jointly developed part of the plan (i.e. Section 1) between Preferred Options and Publication Draft stages. Those changes made jointly by the three authorities and Essex County Council relate primarily to providing greater clarity and any minor modifications required to reflect updated evidence and process. The three authorities met with a Planning Inspector in April 2017 to hear his feedback on the plans. He did not raise any substantive issues of soundness, but did provide guidance on the expectations for the two-part examination of the plan and noted scope for more explanation on the background to policies. On process issues, he stated that the approach to plan making is for the authorities to determine, but that examination of the shared Section 1 would be followed by separate Section 2 examinations once there is confidence that Section 1 is sound and/or after main modifications have been proposed. He confirmed that if boundaries for the Garden Communities cannot be identified fully, then identifying the broad location is acceptable. He advised that the two elements of the plan should be referred to as 'sections' rather than 'parts'. The Spatial Strategy, formerly policy SP6, has now been moved to the front of the plan to reflect its importance and has become Policy SP2.
- 4.21 **Section 2** – Section 2 provides the specific policies and allocations for Colchester Borough as summarised in the sections below followed by key changes.
- 4.22 Vision and Spatial Strategy: Section 2 first outlines the overall vision and Spatial Strategy for Colchester, including the aspiration that in 2033 Colchester will be 'an active and welcoming town with its rich and prestigious heritage treasured and showcased for all to enjoy'. The Spatial Strategy directs development

towards the most sustainable locations and provides for supporting facilities and infrastructure to create sustainable local communities. As noted above, the spatial strategy includes the option to pursue Garden Communities which was agreed jointly with the adjacent authorities of Braintree and Tendring due to the value of providing consolidated sites according with Garden Community principles.

- 4.23 Strategic Policies: The plan includes five strategic policies to detail the spatial strategy (SG1) and to direct overall development of housing (SG2), economic growth (SG3), and infrastructure and developer contributions (SG4). Strategic policies also include guidance and support for Neighbourhood Plans (SG5).
- 4.24 Policy SG1 (Colchester's Spatial Strategy) provides for a settlement hierarchy ranking areas of the Borough in order of their sustainability merits and the size, function and services provided in each area. This Spatial Hierarchy focuses growth on the urban area of Colchester, with the Town Centre at its heart, reflecting its position as the main location for jobs, housing, services, and transport. The town centre sits above other parts of urban Colchester, and separate policies are provided later in the plan for the surrounding East, North, South and West areas of urban Colchester. Sequentially, the next tier of preferred growth includes Garden Communities covered in Section 1 which straddle boundaries with adjacent authorities and will provide new sustainable communities which will continue to grow beyond the plan period. The second tier also includes proportionate growth in existing Sustainable Settlements within the Borough, including 15 large villages and the 3 District Centres of Tiptree, West Mersea, and Wivenhoe. In the remaining Other Villages and Countryside areas of Colchester, the Council will limit new development to appropriate new infill developments; development on previously developed land; or extensions, restorations or alterations to existing building within the defined village limits. New development in the open countryside will only be permitted on an exceptional basis to preserve its rural character.
- 4.25 The Council will need to meet an Objectively Assessed Housing Need of 920 units a year over the plan period. Policy SG2 provides the allocations for different areas of the Borough to meet this need, with new development focused on the urban area of Colchester, new Garden Communities to the east and west of Colchester, as well as existing Sustainable Settlements within the borough. The number of new dwellings for each area follows on from firstly, the broad distribution established by the Spatial Strategy and secondly, the analysis of capacity, deliverability, suitability and proportionality carried out by the Council through the Strategic Land Availability Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal. Table SG2 demonstrates that the Council has identified a 16 year supply (14,720). Table SG2 details the allocations for different parts of the Borough:

Settlements and Key Development Areas		Existing commitments (2017-2033)	New Allocations (2017-2033)	Policy reference
Colchester Urban Area		5,261	2,018	TC3, NC3, SC1, SC2 EC3, WC4
Stanway		1,137	1,106	WC2
Tendring / Colchester Borders Garden Community		0	1,250	Part 1 SP7 and SP8
Colchester / Braintree Borders Garden Community		0	1,350	Part 1 SP7 and SP9
Sustainable Settlements	Abberton and Langenhoe	812	55	SS1-16
	Boxted		36	
	Chappel and Wakes Colne		30	
	Copford and Copford Green		120	
	Eight Ash Green		150	
	Fordham		20	
	Great Horkesley		93	
	Great Tey		40	
	Langham		80	
	Layer de la Haye		50	
	Marks Tey		0	
	Rowhedge		40	
	Tiptree		600	
	West Bergholt		120	
West Mersea	200			
Wivenhoe	250			
Extra Care Housing (Self Contained)		0	260	260
Total		7,210	7,868	15,078

Source: CBC Housing Trajectory May 2017.

- 4.26 Policy SG3 provides the policy and allocations to support economic growth in the Borough. This includes allocations to address the estimated potential need for between 22 - 55.8ha additional B use employment land as well as scope for further alternative economic uses in other use classes to provide flexibility in the provision of floorspace to support new jobs.
- 4.27 Policy SG4 addresses the key issue of provision of infrastructure to support new development. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been prepared to provide detail on infrastructure requirements, phasing, delivery partners and funding. The IDP uses the range of studies and information on a range of topics already contained in the Council's Evidence Base and listed in para 4.4 above and provides context and evidence for the constraints and infrastructure requirements contained in the allocations listed in the Preferred Options.
- 4.28 Policy SG5 identifies the Centre Hierarchy for Colchester which puts the Town Centre at the top, followed by District Centres, which provide an important role serving the day-to-day needs of their local populations as well as providing access to shops and services for neighbouring areas across and beyond the Borough, but not at a level comparable with Colchester Town Centre. The final level of the hierarchy for town centre uses is the Local Centre, which meet local needs and serve a small catchment area.
- 4.29 Policy SG6, Town Uses, requires that proposals for town centre uses that are not within a defined centre and are not in accordance with the Local Plan will need to demonstrate that a sequential approach has been undertaken to site selection in line with the Centres Hierarchy in SG5. The policy requires that retail proposals will need to be carried out over specified levels to avoid negative impacts on the Town Centre.
- 4.30 **Changes made to the Publication Draft version –**

Housing allocation changes: The Publication Draft version of the Table SG2 reflects the comprehensive review of allocations made following the Preferred Options consultation which has taken account of the overall spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy; consultation responses to the Preferred Options; further consultation with Parish/Town Councils and stakeholders; further site assessment work; and updates to the evidence base. Discussion of particular sites added or deleted follows in the section on Place policies below.

Changes to the Centres Hierarchy for Colchester: The Preferred Options version of the plan did not give a place in the centres hierarchy for District and Local Centres previously found in the adopted Core Strategy. This position has now been altered and is based on advice contained in the Council's Retail Study. This recommended that the Council adopt a three-tier hierarchy of centres, ie Town Centre at the top followed by District Centres and Local Centres. The Retail Study provides the evidence base behind the designation of Tollgate, Peartree Road, Turner Rise and Highwoods as District Centres, and the Council has carried out further analysis to support the designation of

smaller Local Centres which need to be of a scale to be more than a small parade of shops.

Infrastructure: Consolidation of policies on infrastructure and developer contributions: The two policies in the Preferred Options, one on infrastructure and one on developer contributions, have now been consolidated into one policy in light of the overlap between the two topics.

- 4.31 Environmental Assets Policies: The Environmental Assets section of the plan provides policies on the protection and enhancement of the Borough's natural environment and green infrastructure, ensuring continuing safeguarding in particular of the Borough's countryside and Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There is a Green Infrastructure Policy which provides for the development of new green infrastructure including a Green Orbital surrounding the urban area of Colchester. The section also includes a pollution and contamination policy to ensure development addresses and mitigates those issues.
- 4.32 This section also includes a Climate Change Policy. Policy CC1 addresses climate change and the move to a low carbon future for Colchester. The Climate Change policy provides that the Council will plan for new development in locations and ways that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, adopt the principles set out in the energy hierarchy and provide resilience to the impacts of a changing climate.
- 4.33 **Changes made to Publication Draft version –**
- Pollution and Contamination policy:** A new policy has been added on Pollution and Contamination to ensure the issues are given sufficient prominence and to clarify the ways in which planning should bolster other relevant legislation governing pollution avoidance and mitigation.
- 4.34 Place Policies: The policies and text contained within this section set out allocations and policies for specific parts of the Borough and explain how these align with the Plan's overall spatial strategy and policy objectives. The organisation of the section reflects the plan's spatial hierarchy, meaning that allocations and policies for the Town Centre and the surrounding urban area of Colchester come first, and then are followed by allocations and policies for Garden Communities and each Sustainable Settlement (existing Rural District Centres and larger villages). All allocations include information on the particular requirements of each site and specify particular requirements that must be met before planning permission could be granted.
- 4.35 Urban Colchester policies and allocations: This section divides the urban area of Colchester into five broad geographic areas (Central, East, North, South and West) in line with the plan's place-based approach. Policy TC1 provides further guidance on the mechanisms for maintaining Colchester Town Centre's pre-eminent position through support for proposals that positively contribute towards creating an attractive, vibrant and safe Town Centre that offers a diverse mix of uses and extend the time when the Town Centre is active, subject to their impact on local amenity. Policy TC2 sets out the requirements to

maintain retail uses within identified Primary and Secondary frontages in the Town Centre.

- 4.36 The Knowledge Gateway/University; Severalls/Northern Gateway; and Stanway have been given specific policies to address their unique strategic economic growth position within the Borough (Policies EC1, NC1 and WC1).
- 4.37 Some parts of Colchester have been a focus for regeneration and development over a number of years, with significant progress and delivery evident in some areas such as the Garrison and North Colchester. Other areas will continue to be a focus for regeneration and enhancement delivered via a range of mixed use, commercial, social and residential opportunities. These areas, including the Hythe (EC2), North Station (NC2) and the Zoo (WC3) have been designated as Special Policy Areas to provide a clear context against which to promote opportunities for appropriate growth and expansion, enhanced public realm and connectivity.
- 4.38 Site allocations along with specific policy considerations for other parts of the urban area of Colchester are contained in policies TC3, NC3, EC3, WC2 and WC4.

4.39 **Changes made to Publication Draft version –**

Addition of a generic policy on infrastructure and mitigation requirements: The Preferred Options version of the plan repeated a number of requirements for each allocation made, but given that many requirements are generic, it was considered that one policy could summarise the infrastructure and mitigation measures that would be expected to apply to all new developments. These include:

- Adequate wastewater treatment and sewage infrastructure
- Appropriate Sustainable Urban Drainage measures
- Proportionate mitigation for area-wide transport issues
- Exploration for potential archaeological significance followed as required by further investigation and preservation/recording.
- Section 106 contributions as relevant.
- Suitable design and screening/landscaping to minimise any negative impact on the surrounding landscape.
- Safe pedestrian access to and from the sites to services and facilities.

Additionally, further information has been included on specific infrastructure requirements for individual allocations as it has become available through preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and related highways modelling work.

Addition of transport policies for each area of urban Colchester: Policies have been added to sections for the Town Centre and East, West, North and South Colchester to reflect the particular needs in each area for specific

improvements to the road network as well as walking, cycling, and public transport improvement; travel planning; and the promotion of sustainable travel.

Retail Frontage requirements: Revisions to TC2 Retail Frontages to reflect recommendations from the Retail Study to require at least 70% retail use on each Primary Street Frontage within the Primary Shopping area and 50% on Secondary Street Frontages.

Stanway commercial policy and allocations: Policy for Stanway commercial areas has been revised to reflect the overall changes made to the Centre Hierarchy and to provide a flexible approach to future commercial development in the area in the context of uncertainty over the outcome of the Tollgate appeal for new retail development. The Council's Retail Study concludes that Tollgate does not require substantial new retail development to ensure its vitality and viability over the plan period, but its role as a District Centre could be supported through the introduction of new services and/or community facilities. An additional residential allocation has been added to the area to further compliment the mix of uses at Tollgate.

Revised allocations:

TC3 -Britannia Car Park – increase in capacity from 100 to 150 to reflect potential for high density town centre development, inclusion of a requirement to have neutral effect on Town Centre parking

NC1 – Northern Gateway, Rugby Club. Development of the Rugby Club site will now be provided for approximately 340 new dwellings. 150 dwellings were included in the Preferred Options. The revised total includes an additional area of land adjoining the Rugby Club at Oxley Parker Drive, to provide housing for 40 units, together with enhanced quality public open space which is required to be planned comprehensively with the adjoining site at the Rugby Club. Additionally, within the residential allocation, 260 units of Extra Care accommodation are expected to be delivered.

NC3 – Braiswick. The site 'Land north of Achnacone Drive', previously allocated for 30 units, is no longer included. Two sites previously considered separately, land at St. Botolph's Farm and land south of Colchester Golf Club, are now shown as one allocation for up to 70 dwellings which will need to be planned comprehensively, particularly in respect of access arrangements which will need to be directly off the B1508.

SC2 – Middlewick Ranges. The proposed allocation on land owned by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) provides for approximately 1000 new houses. The DIO proposed an allocation of 2000 dwellings, however while the site is sustainably located, there are a number of constraints at the site which will restrict the final number of dwellings that can be delivered at this location. This includes the fact that Middlewick Ranges is a designated Local Wildlife Site and a well-used recreational area. A number of environmental, archaeological, transport and ecological surveys will accordingly be required.

These survey should be commissioned as soon as possible to help determine final housing numbers and define the most suitable developable areas.

WC2 – Stanway residential sites. New residential allocations for Stanway include the redesignation of the former Sainsbury's site from employment to residential, if the retail proposal for the site does not succeed at appeal. It is proposed that the site could accommodate up to 200 units in addition to ground floor small scale service and community uses to support the role of the District Centre. Land north of London Road is proposed for up to 630 dwellings along with a new primary school with co-located early years and childcare nursery places. Design and layout of the development would need to minimise the impacts of noise from the A12. A comprehensively planned highways access would be required which takes into account adjoining residential allocations, including a new allocation to the southwest of the site for provision of up to 26 almshouses for affordable housing for the Rosemary Almshouses.

- 4.40 Other locations, policies and allocations – Policies SS1-SS18 provide allocations and guidance for the 15 large villages and 3 Rural District Centres which together are categorised as 'Sustainable Settlements'. The growth provided for in these settlements is considered appropriate to the size of the settlement; local landscape character; other local constraints; identified need; and the availability of infrastructure and suitable development sites. A generic policy is provided for smaller villages and the countryside given the limits placed on development in those areas.

4.41 **Changes made to Publication Draft version-**

Revised residential allocations and policy wording

SS1 – Deletion of land at Ashpark House Peldon Road for up to 5 dwellings; provision of 50 rather than 25 dwellings at land to the west of Peldon Road along with a new drop-off/pick-up point at Langenhoe Primary School; and inclusion of land to the east of Peldon Road for 5 dwellings.

Deletion of the site for up to 15 dwellings on land east of Birch Street (SS2 in the Preferred Options) on the basis that Birch is no longer ranked as a Sustainable Settlement.

Deletion of the three sites in Dedham Heath (SS6 in the Preferred Options). The central area of Dedham is considered to be a Sustainable Settlement, however, Dedham Heath is no longer ranked as part of that Sustainable Settlement and further residential development there, within the AONB is not supported.

SS8 Great Tey – Reduction of the allocation of the Brook Road site from 17 to 10 units; allocation of a new site on land off Greenfield Drive for 30 new dwellings and open space. Great Tey Parish Council may embark on a Neighbourhood Plan, in which case they would provide the detail for the allocations. The December 2016 Local Plan Committee report indicated that a total of 57 units would be likely to be required, comprising 17 units at Brook Road and 40 units at the new site Greenfield Drive. Following this report, a

Council officer attended a public meeting in Great Tey as requested by the Parish Council to provide information on the plan making process including how the site had been evaluated and would be considered in future. The Council received 33 letters of opposition in principle to development on Greenfield Drive subsequent to the meeting. The current proposal for 40 units retains both sites, but does give the village a lower delivery figure than initially proposed in the December 2016 report. A subsequent meeting was held with the Parish Council who are considering whether to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan.

SS9 Langham – Change to the overall housing numbers from 125 to 80 dwellings. The School Road allocations are down from a previous total of 115 to 70 as follows: site to the east of the Powerplus site to accommodate 40 dwellings plus a car park for the school; site to the west of the Powerplus site to accommodate 30 dwellings plus an extension to the adjacent recreation ground.

SS12 Layer de la Haye – Reduction in the allocated site from 50 to 35 units. This is expected to facilitate a rural exception site on adjacent land.

SS11 – Marks Tey – Modifications to reflect the evolving role of the Neighbourhood Plan in relation to the Garden Community proposal, including designation of the Anderson's site as a Local Employment site rather than as a site to be covered by the Neighbourhood Plan.

SS12 Rowhedge – Deletion of the 60 unit Battleswick Farm site and allocation of a site at the former Rowhedge Business Park for 40 dwellings and land to accommodate new health services to be agreed with the North Essex Care Commissioning Group.

SS15a West Mersea – Reduction in the Dawes Lane site from 150 to 100. Reduction in the Brierley Paddocks site from 200 to 100.

4.42 Development Management Policies: The 22 development management policies included in the Preferred Options document are intended to provide detail guiding the development management (planning application) process. They set out how development will be managed to ensure that it contributes towards the vision and objectives, via the strategic framework put in place by the policies contained in Part 1 and those covering Sustainable Growth, Climate Change, Environmental Assets and Places in Part 2. The Committee considered 11 of these policies at its April meeting. These policies have now been revised to reflect Committee comment and are included along with a further 14 policies, covering the following topics:

- Health and Wellbeing
- Community Facilities
- New Education Provision
- Sports Provision
- Tourism, Leisure and Culture
- Economic Development in Rural Areas and the Countryside
- Agricultural Development and Diversification
- Affordable Housing

- Development Density
- Housing Diversity
- Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation
- Housing Standards
- Domestic Development
- Rural Workers
- Design and Amenity
- Historic Environment
- Open Space
- Promoting Sustainable Transport and Changing Travel Behaviour
- Sustainable Access to Development
- Parking
- Flood Risk and Water Management
- Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)
- Renewable Energy, Water, Waste and Recycling.

4.43 Revisions to the Publication Draft version -

Affordable Housing target – The affordable housing target has been increased from 20% to 30% on the basis that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment provides evidence for the need for that amount, and new work carried out for the Whole Plan Viability Assessment establishes that 30% is broadly viable in the current economic climate. Draft work from the Whole Plan Viability study is attached as an appendix to this report to provide background on this point. Further work is being carried out in relation to the appropriate level and mix of affordable housing in the Garden Communities.

5. Proposals

- 5.1 It is proposed that the Publication Draft Local Plan be approved for publication in line with regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 5.2 The next stage in the Plan process will be to carry out Publication Draft consultation for a six-week period to run from 16 June – 28 July 2017. During this consultation the local authority will publish and make available the documents it proposes to submit to the Secretary of State for examination. These include:
- the Proposed Local Plan document
 - the Sustainability Appraisals in respect of Sections 1 and 2.
- 5.3 Following this consultation stage, the Council must prepare a summary of the representations made. This will form part of the submission to Government. In addition to the Local Plan and consultation summary, the Council will also submit to Government the Sustainability Appraisals, and the full range of supporting evidence base documents.

6. Strategic Plan References

6.1 Effective strategic planning supports the Strategic Plan Action Plan which includes a commitment to make Colchester a vibrant, prosperous, thriving and welcoming place.

7. Consultation and Publicity

7.1 Public consultation is being carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Sections 18, 19 and 35) and entails publication of the document and associated evidence on the Council's website, notification to stakeholders, and ensuring the availability of hard copies of the documents at the Council office and the main Library. The Sustainability Appraisals will also be available. They should inform public views on the local plan and provide an opportunity for consultation and engagement.

7.2 Consultation and engagement is programmed for a six-week period in line with Government regulations on Local Plan consultations, to run from 16 June to 28 July 2017.

7.3 The Council has programmed the following drop-in sessions to provide information on the Submission consultation and engagement:

- 17th June – 10am – 2pm – Stanway Village Hall
- 23rd June 10am – 2pm – Colchester High Street Market stall
- 24th June – 10am – 2pm Greenstead Community Centre
- 27th June - 4 – 8pm - Great Tey Village Hall
- 3rd July – 4 – 8pm – Abberton and Langenhoe Village Hall
- 6th July 4 – 8pm – Langham Community Centre
- 8th July – 10am – 2pm MICA Centre, West Mersea
- 12th July 4pm – 8pm – Abbots Road Community Centre

7.4 Prior to submission of a plan to Government for examination the Council is required to prepare a report describing the consultation carried out at each phase of the Local Plan document development process.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 There is a cost involved in undertaking consultation, both in terms of the human resource cost and the expenditure associated with the production of publicity material and copies of the consultation documents. Further resources will be required to prepare the report summarising the outcomes of the consultation. Sufficient resources are available for this work.

8.2 There will be further resources required at the examination stage: the Planning Inspectorate charges for the examination and there will be a need to appoint a programme officer to co-ordinate the examination. Planning officer time will need to be dedicated to supporting the promotion of the plan through examination process, In addition, consultants may need to be appointed to support specialist evidence base documents which underpin the plan.

9. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights implications

- 9.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared for the Local Plan and is available to view by clicking on [this link](#) or go to the Colchester Borough Council website www.colchester.gov.uk and follow the pathway from the homepage: Your Council > How the Council works > Equality and Diversity > Equality Impact Assessments > Commercial Services > Planning Policy > Local Plan.
- 9.2 There are no particular Human Rights implications.

10. Community Safety Implications

- 10.1 Adoption of a new Local Plan will support development that should enhance community safety through good design and provision of appropriate community facilities and infrastructure.

11. Health and Safety Implications

- 11.1 Adoption of a new Local Plan will support development that should enhance health and safety through design and provision of appropriate community facilities and infrastructure.

12. Risk Management Implications

- 12.1 Development and adoption of a Local Plan will help ensure that planning decisions are based on the most sustainable and deliverable options available for the Borough, thereby minimising the risk of inappropriate development and strengthening the Council's position in planning appeals.

Appendix E: Local Plan Committee Report 2 October 2017

 Colchester	Local Plan Committee 2 October 2017	Item
Report of	Assistant Director Policy and Corporate	Author Laura Chase ☎ 282473
Title	Draft Publication Local Plan Consultation Responses	
Wards affected	All wards	

The Local Plan Committee is asked to note the responses received following the consultation on the Publication Draft Local Plan.

1. **Decision(s) Required**

- 1.1 The Committee is asked to note the content of the report.

2. **Reasons for Decision(s)**

- 2.1 To make members aware of the representations received on the Publication Draft Local Plan.
- 2.3 Section 1 and Section 2 of the Local Plan have been published for consultation pursuant to Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Local Plan is subject to a statutory six week public consultation period and the Sustainability Appraisals five weeks; however, the consultations were extended by two weeks following a decision by Committee members to allow more time for response during the summer period.

3. **Alternative Options**

- 3.1 There are no alternative options – the report is a summary of the representations received. It is helpful for Members to be aware of the issues arising from the statutory consultation process as it advances to submission and examination of a new Local Plan. The alternative of not proceeding with a new Local Plan would leave the Council in a vulnerable position going forward with no clear steer for the future growth and development of the Borough. It would result in existing policy becoming outdated and not in accordance with national policy requirements.

4. **Supporting Information**

- 4.1 This report concerns the consultation undertaken on the Publication Draft Local Plan and provides a high level summary of responses received. All representations received will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination alongside the plan and supporting documents and will be considered during the examination.
- 4.2 The preparation of Local Plans is governed by The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. There is also policy and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG).
- 4.3 Work on the Council's new Local Plan began in 2014 and involved consultation on an initial Issues and Options consultation in January/February 2015. The Committee has received reports in June and August 2015 noting the results of the Issues and Options consultation and providing progress on the development of the plan and its supporting evidence base. During this period, the Council also invited landowners and developers to put forward potential sites for development which the Council has then assessed for suitability.
- 4.4 In July 2016 the committee considered the full Preferred Options Local Plan and agreed public consultation over an extended ten week period running from 9 July to 16 September 2016. As noted in the report on Preferred Options consultation considered by the 7th November 2016 committee, the consultation attracted 2995 representations from 1482 respondents. This compares to a total of 649 responses from individuals and organisations at the Issues and Options stage in 2015.
- 4.5 The Local Plan has now progressed to Publication Draft stage and this committee agreed at its June meeting to carry out public consultation for an eight week period between 16th June and the 11th August. A report detailing the consultation methodology was considered at the last meeting of the Committee on 30th August 2017.
- 4.6 The consultation process involved publishing the document and supporting information on the website; notification of the consultation to the Council's extensive list of interested organisations and individuals; and a series of public drop-in sessions which were advertised through social media, press coverage, and posters circulated to parish councils. The sessions held are detailed below;

Venue	Date
Stanway Village Hall	17 June 10-14:00
Colchester High St market stall	23 June 10-14:00
Greenstead Community Centre	24 June 10-14:00
Great Tey Village Hall	27 June 16-20:00
Marks Tey Village Hall	1 July 10 – 14.00
Abberton & Langenhoe Village Hall	3 July 16-20:00
Langham Community Centre	6 July 16-20:00
MICA Centre West Mersea	8 July 10-14:00
Abbotts Road Community Centre	12 July 16-20.00

- 4.7 At the drop-in sessions, attendees were provided with background information on the Local Plan process; access to copies of the consultation document; opportunities to ask questions of the officers in attendance; and information on how to respond formally to the consultation, including advice on using the consultation portal.
- 4.8 Officers estimate that approximately 600 people attended the drop-in events in total. In light of the cross-boundary policies and allocations in the first section of the Local Plan, a Colchester officer attended Braintree/Tendring Local Plan drop-in sessions at Coggeshall and Elmstead, while Braintree officers were represented at the Marks Tey event. An Essex County Council highways representative attended the events at Great Tey and Coggeshall.
- 4.9 At the time of writing, a total 1200 representations from 573 representors had been received. Approximately 60% of these were made using the on-line consultation system with the remainder received via e-mails and letters and then recorded on the consultation system. Further information on totals will be provided at the meeting. While the Council requested further information from respondents to clarify their views on the plan when not provided, no representations were rejected even if this further information was not submitted. All representations received within the 8-week consultation period accordingly will be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate with the information provided. The Inspector will then need to decide how they deal with those representations which do not address all points, particularly in relation to soundness and legal compliance. The following representors submitted representations on behalf of the following number of individuals:

CAUSE – 1125

Stop350 West Mersea - 1163

Dawes Lane West Mersea - 77

Middlewick – live electronic petition – approximately 1100 at close of consultation period

Copford -221

Great Tey - 69

Fordham -26

Total – 3,781

The additional individuals represented through a joint representation bring the approximate overall total of people responding to the Local Plan consultation approximately 4300.

- 4.10 Part of Local Plan preparation includes preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) which assesses the environmental implications of every policy and site allocation in the Local Plan, together with all reasonable alternatives. Two separate SA/SEA documents were prepared for Section 1 and 2 and published at the same time as the draft Local Plan for consultation. A total of XX (at the time of drafting) responses were received to the consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal documents,

and these responses will be forwarded as part of the submission of the plan for examination.

- 4.11 Issues of concern raised in the representations have been summarised in Appendix 1. This high level summary provides an overview of points made for members' information prior to submission of the plan for examination. (NB supportive comments have not been summarised as the examination will focus on scrutinising policies and allocations considered to be 'unsound'). Members and the public can view all representations to the plan in full using the Local Plan software and following the links:
Section 1 - <https://colchester.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=6>
Section 2 - <https://colchester.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=7>
The consultation system can be searched by policy numbers as well as representor names.
- 4.12 Surrounding local authorities including Braintree, Tendring and Chelmsford provided positive responses to the plan, noting joint work carried out in line with Duty to Cooperate requirements. A Duty to Cooperate meeting was held with Maldon following the close of consultation to discuss any issues which did not result in the identification of any significant issues. Essex County Council expressed broad support for the plan, noted their partnership working with CBC on numerous fronts, and suggested a number of minor changes to clarify wording to be considered through the Examination process. Basildon District Council has identified issues with South Essex authorities being able to meet their housing requirements in full due to Green Belt and environmental constraints and has requested that other Essex authorities, including those in the Colchester/Braintree/Chelmsford/Tendring Strategic Housing Market Area (SHMA), consider addressing this need in their targets. The Essex Planning Officers Association is developing a protocol to ensure that requests such as Basildon's for addressing requirements for dwellings to meet other SHMA needs are dealt with in a consistent and appropriate way.
- 4.13 **Next steps**
A more detailed Statement of Consultation will be finalised as it is one of the supporting documents required to accompany the Plan when it is submitted for examination. The issues raised will be analysed by the Inspector appointed to examine the plan, with the public examination providing the opportunity for further exploration and debate on the 'soundness' of the plan. The Council will develop Memorandum of Understanding and/or Statements of Common Ground with stakeholders as required to clarify agreed approaches to the resolution of issues raised through the plan-making process.
- 4.14 It is intended to submit the plan to Government as soon as possible once all submission materials have been completed by all three authorities submitting their linked Local Plans. The Planning Inspectorate will then notify the Councils as to who has been appointed to examine the plan and will schedule in two examinations. The first will consider the strategic and cross-boundary policies and allocations covered by Section 1 and is expected to be scheduled for early next year, while the examination for Section 2 is expected to be scheduled in

mid-2018. As noted in the report on Local Plan consultation considered at the 30 August Committee meeting, if any changes are made to the plan following the Regulation 19 consultation, these changes would be prepared as an addendum to the plan. The addendum would be subject to further consultation and, if necessary, to sustainability appraisal before submission if it is to form part of the plan to be examined.

5. Proposals

- 5.1 The Local Plan Committee is asked to note the summary of issues raised during the consultation on the Draft Publication Local Plan.

6. Strategic Plan References

- 6.1 The 2015 to 2018 Strategic Plan set out to be Vibrant, Prosperous and Thriving. The Local Plan can help achieve all of these objectives.

7. Consultation

- 7.1 Consultation on the Local Plan is guided by the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, which is available on the [Council's website](#). The recent consultation was undertaken in line with the Model Representation Form and Guidance for Plan Publication Stage Consultation published by the Planning Inspectorate, designed to assist the examination process. Braintree and Tendring also used the form.

8. Publicity Considerations

- 8.1 The report may help to publicise the reasons the Council adopted the approach it did to the recent public consultation.

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 None specifically relating to this report

10. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights implications

- 10.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared for the Local Development Framework and is available to view on the Colchester Borough Council website by following this pathway from the homepage: Council and Democracy > Policies, Strategies and Performance > Equality and Diversity > Equality Impact Assessments > Commercial Services > Local Plan.

11. Community Safety Implications

- 11.1 Development of a Local Plan will address the community safety implications of creating sustainable communities.

12. Health and Safety Implications

12.1 Development of a Local Plan will address the health and well-being implications of creating sustainable communities.

13. Risk Management Implications

13.1 The adoption of a Local Plan document will help ensure that the Council's planning policies are robust and up-to-date and will help to reduce the risk of inappropriate development being permitted

14. Disclaimer

14.1 The information in this report was, as far as is known, correct at the date of publication. Colchester Borough Council cannot accept responsibility for any error or omissions.

Appendix E1 – Section 1 Representation Schedule – see separate document

Appendix E2 – Section 2 Representation Schedule – see separate document

Appendix F: Statement of Representation Procedures

The Statement of Representation Procedures, below, was published on the LPAs website and sent to the specific and general consultation bodies.

Statement of Representation Procedures (Regulation 19)

Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Document Title:

Publication Draft Colchester Local Plan

Subject matter and area covered:

Colchester Borough Council has prepared a Local Plan which sets out a vision, strategy, objectives and policies for planning and delivery across the borough. These are first set out at the strategic level across the North Essex authorities in Section 1 of the Plan, and then followed by more detailed information on Colchester in Section 2 of the Plan. Consultation on Section 1, as a Joint Plan, is being carried out in conjunction with Braintree and Tendring District Councils.

Period for representations:

The period for submission of representations will run for eight weeks from **Friday 16th June to Friday 11th August 2017**. Representations should arrive no later than **5.00pm on 11th August 2017**.

Anonymous comments or comments received outside these dates will not be accepted.

Address details for representations:

Copies of the Local Plan and its related documents are available to view, download and make representations on at <http://www.colchester.gov.uk/currentconsultations>. Making your representation online will help us to save paper and time. It will also ensure your comments are reported exactly as you would wish them to be.

Alternatively, if you do not have access to a computer you can use the following contact details to submit a representation, although we would encourage respondents to use the response forms provided wherever possible. Electronic copies of the forms can be returned:

By e-mail to local.plan@colchester.gov.uk

Hard copies by post to: Planning Policy, Colchester Borough Council, Rowan House, 33 Sheepen Road, Colchester, CO3 3WG.

The Sustainability Appraisal is also the subject of consultation and if you wish to make any comments please use the Response Form provided <http://www.colchester.gov.uk/currentconsultations> and return it by e-mail or post using the details specified above. Please note there are two Sustainability Appraisals and supporting Non-Technical Summaries One for Section One and another for Section Two.

All valid comments received will be submitted to the Secretary of State and considered as part of a Public Examination by an Independent Planning Inspector. Please note any responses relating to Section 1, only need to be made once to Colchester, Braintree or Tendring Councils, as they will be processed together and duplicates will not be considered. Representations at this stage should only be made to the legal compliance and 'soundness' of the Plan. All representations should clearly specify in what respect(s) the Plan is considered to be unsound, and what change(s) would need to be made to make it sound. A summary of your response must be provided if the response is more than 100 words.

Please note that copies of all comments will be made available for the public to view (including your name, but will not include any personal addresses or signatures), and therefore cannot be treated as confidential.

Request to be notified:

Using the online system or response form you can request to be notified about any of the following next steps:

- Submission of the Local Plan for public examination by an independent inspector;
- Publication of the Inspector's recommendations; and
- The adoption of the Local Plan.

Location of Documents for Inspection

Copies of the Publication Draft Colchester Local Plan and supporting documentation including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment documents are available for inspection at:

Colchester Borough Council, Rowan House, 33 Sheepen Road, Colchester CO3 3WG (9:00-17:00 Monday-Friday)

Reference copies of the Local Plan have been placed in the Colchester Library. Opening times for the library can be found at:

<http://libraries.essex.gov.uk/library-locations-and-opening-times/colchester-library>

An electronic copy of the Local Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal, all of the supporting documents listed above and guidance on how to make a representation will be available to view on the Council's website:

<http://www.colchester.gov.uk/localplan>.